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Abstract

This research examines how colonial heritage built in the period of the Japanese occupation impacts national identity in contemporary South Korean society. Particular attention in this research has been given to the issues concerning the process for identity construction and meanings construction. A philosophical paradigm in approaching people-cultural heritage relations is derived from a transactional position within environmental psychology which investigates cultural heritage within the broader context of both individuals and social experience. Key identity-related theories in social and environmental psychology, including Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory, Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory and Moscovici’s (1984, 1988) Social Representation and the process of memory construction, have been employed. A multi-method approach, combining questionnaire, a Multiple Sorting Procedure and life history interviews, was adopted in order to provide more comprehensive evidence. This research found that colonial heritage is a social place strongly linked to multiple psychological motivations that contribute to an individual’s identity. Colonial heritage is experienced in our multi-dimensional life and the context in which we live. Japanese colonial heritage in South Korean society is experienced as a threat that challenges the status and pride of a nation and its citizens. However, colonial heritage simultaneously becomes an essential part of individuals’ personal identity as well as a substantial component of individuals’ community identity. When individuals perceive threats to their sense of national identity, they engage in a range of self-protection strategies. Meanings of colonial heritage, which influence construction of identity, are consistently reconstructed and transformed by personal beliefs and values, knowledge and experience, as well as society to which people belong. Although the meanings of colonial heritage are widely shared in South Korean society, colonial heritage is differently remembered and experienced across generations.
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Chapter One
Introduction

1.1 The Focus of the Research
The social value of cultural heritage has been given considerable scholarly attention, with emphasis given to active social processes and the performance of meaning making, in which sense of identity are consistently generated (e.g. Young, 1989; Harvey, 2001; Bender, 2002; Byrne, 2003; Smith, 2006, 2007; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2008). By moving away from treating cultural heritage as a fixed material past isolated from the present societal context, attention has been given to how cultural heritage is constructed and interpreted in the present societal context and how it is situated in a social and political process (e.g. Harvey, 2001; Graham, 2002; Crouch & Parker, 2003; Munasinghe, 2005; Garden, 2006; Anico & Peralta, 2009; Witcomb, 2009). In the light of this consideration, the association of cultural heritage with national identity constitutes a growing area of heritage studies which poses fundamental questions concerning how the link is constructed and maintained (e.g. Gillis, 1994; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000; Uzzell & Sørensen, 2002; Smith, 2006, 2007; Anico & Peralta, 2009; Garden, 2009; Raj Isar, Viejo-Rose & Anheier, 2011). It has often been observed that cultural heritage is appreciated as a cultural place where a sense of national identity is generated, maintained and enhanced (e.g. Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997; Graham et al., 2000; Osborne, 2001; Uzzell & Sørensen, 2002; Macdonald, 2006a, 2006b; Tilley, 2006; Smith, 2006, 2007; Harrison, Fairclough, Jameson & Schofield, 2008; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). Especially in Western societies in the post-war period, tangible cultural heritage, particularly heritage that evokes collective memories, is heavily implicated as a powerful medium contributing to creating and promoting nations and national identity due to its significant political and cultural role in creating and contesting memory (Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997; Graham, 2002; Smith, 2006; Harrison et al., 2008).

To date, cultural heritage related to national identity and nationalism is usually regarded as positive cultural heritage, tangible remains of a past golden age and
national achievement. However, the idea of cultural heritage and national identity has been extended nowadays by shifting emphasis from cultural heritage, which represents an affirmed and positively valued side of history that is cherished and celebrated, to cultural heritage associated with a negatively experienced past in national identity (e.g. Young, 1989; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Macdonald, 2006a, 2006b). Given the nature of cultural heritage in identity construction, it is apparent that negatively constructed cultural heritage in present-day society becomes problematic and introduces complex and important challenges. Along with a recent research boom in cultural heritage, the dilemmas of negative-natured cultural historic places or sites and their relationship to a sense of identity have been frequently debated in heritage literature (e.g. Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Meskell, 2002; Chung, 2003; Anico & Peralta, 2009; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). Questions have frequently been raised as to whether negative-natured cultural heritage affects the construction of national or ethnic identity in contemporary society. However, fundamental questions about whether and how these links are constructed and maintained remain unresolved. To be more specific, little is known of the exact way in which people’s sense of national identity is constructed, maintained or enhanced by or from historic built environment within lives and the broader social context. The way individuals are dealing with situations posed by cultural heritage (e.g. their threatened identity by cultural heritage) remains underexplored and poorly understood. Although recent literature provides a useful account of the way meanings of cultural heritage are constructed (e.g. Uzzell, 1998; Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998), much of heritage research does not provide an exhaustive analysis of how people make sense of cultural heritage in their lives and how these are evolving and changing over time. A problem also arises from the absence of established methodologies in heritage studies. With the exception of a few heritage researchers (e.g. Garden, 2006; Andrews, 2009; Sørensen & Carman, 2009; Uzzell, 2009a), little attention has been given to the importance of structured theory and methods for investigating the meaning of heritage. Consequently, few have addressed the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of identity from a theoretically driven position. Uzzell’s (2009a) comment, ‘there are no methods without theory’ against traditional heritage studies is not an overstatement.
Taking into account the above limitations in heritage studies, this research sets out to achieve three fundamental aims within a social and environmental psychology paradigm. Firstly, this research aims to examine the way in which the historic built environment, particularly colonial architectural heritage, is related to indigenous citizens’ sense of national identity (i.e. a manifestation of identity motivations). Second, it aims to investigate the ways in which individuals make sense of colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity (i.e. the process of meaning construction). Lastly, this research aims to explore how individuals dealt with threats to their sense of identity if colonial heritage threatened their sense of identity (i.e. threat coping reactions), as well as why its significance changes over time (i.e. meaning transformation).

The focus of this research is on the impact of Japanese colonial architectural heritage on people’s sense of national identity in a South Korean context, in which many colonial architectures and historic places have been at the centre of intensive social controversy due to their potential to threaten a sense of Korean identity. The memory of the thirty-five year period of the colonial occupation (1910-1945) remains an unforgettable psychological trauma for some South Koreans leading to a deeply-felt, continuing animosity towards the Japanese. The colonisation also bequeathed material legacies, such as symbolic structures strategically constructed not only to represent Japanese imperial dominance and colonial power but also to challenge Korean traditions and identity under the Japanese colonial occupation. Despite the official reservation, the symbolic colonial structures have been at the centre of social controversy regarding the legitimacy of their preservation for national identity in a contemporary South Korean context. The symbolic colonial structures have become contentious and emotive problems faced by South Korea, a post-colonial nation attempting to remove its shaming past and reconstruct a new national identity. It appears that physical remains of colonialism still play a part in constructing Korean identity long after the end of Japanese occupation in 1945. Nevertheless, little is known of if and how the colonial heritage impacts on the construction of Korean identity.
In order to overcome the theoretical shortcomings of earlier research on heritage, this research approaches the relationship between people and cultural heritage from the social identity standpoint. A philosophical paradigm in approaching people-cultural heritage relations is derived from a transactional position within environmental psychology. The transactional paradigm attaches great importance to sociocultural meanings that physical environment evokes and collectively represents. Not only are meanings of physical environment constructed through recurring patterns of individuals and collective behaviour, but they are also mediated by a range of social determinants, such as nature of community and communication with others about the sociocultural meanings of physical environment (Stokols & Shumaker, 1981). Central to this notion is also that the socio-cultural meanings conveyed by physical environment play a big part in creating social identity, serving as glue that binds individuals and groups to a particular environment in the social context (Stokols & Shumaker, 1981; Low & Altman, 1992). In this regard, rather than viewing cultural heritage as an isolated historic space, this research investigates cultural heritage within the broader context of both individuals and social experience. Cultural heritage is approached with an emphasis not only on the dynamic reciprocal interplay between individuals and their everyday environment, context and social relationships embedded in cultural heritage but also on the social, cultural and psychological meanings of cultural heritage. This research takes a view that people perceive and ascribe meanings to historic places collectively in their social context. To a great extent, collectively held socio-cultural meanings given to historic place may become a part of people’s identity and shape their society.

Taking into account of Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory, this research conceptualises colonial heritage in terms of group categorisation and comparison: a symbol of a perpetrator’s identity (i.e. Japanese identity), which influences Koreans’ identity. Colonial heritage, which is historic architecture built by Japanese, may be shown by indigenous citizens in a post-colonial nation as a symbol of perpetrators blocking their system of values, customs, or traditions. In this light, colonial heritage is defined as a source of potential dangers caused by Japanese with different morals, norms, beliefs, attitudes and values that conflict and violate those of South Koreans. The threats to national identity posed by colonial heritage can take various forms. These can be in the form of tangible threats derived from its materiality or symbolic threats that can emanate from individuals or group relationships. Given the nature of Japanese colonial heritage strongly related to intergroup relationship (i.e. Japanese and Koreans), this research focuses much attention on the symbolic facets of threats for conceptualising and understanding the nature of threats posed by colonial heritage. This theory also provides theoretical evidence about psychological and social elements that may have important implications for people’s perception of threat posed by colonial heritage and their reactions in response to the threats.

Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory is employed in order to provide a useful theoretical ground from which to explore the ways in which colonial heritage affects people’s identity and ways in which individuals deal with their threatened identity. The theory proposes not only dynamic psychological processes of identity construction but also multiple psychological motivations that guide their operation of the identity process. Through the lens of the Identity Process Theory, colonial heritage is described as a symbolic totem which may threaten individuals or groups’ sense of identity by challenging multiple motivations of identity, rather than uni-dimensional identity. Individuals will perceive threats from colonial heritage when colonial heritage challenges their sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity, which structures positive sense of identity. It provides a fruitful way of examining how individuals absorb meanings of colonial
heritage into their identity, how the heritage contributes to their sense of identity and how they react because of experiences involving the heritage.

The concept of Social Representation and the process of memory construction are taken into account here in order to reach a fuller understanding of the evolution of the meanings and significance of colonial heritage to a sense of identity. Social Representation pays particular attention to the structures and contents of social contexts and other social elements, which create multifaceted backgrounds for identity (e.g. group communication, social influences), that social identity theories usually ignore (Breakwell, 1986). The concept of Social Representation is particularly relevant here because it focuses on group and interpersonal communication, which illustrates how individuals come to interpret and make events or social phenomena meaningful in the process (Breakwell, 1993). Moreover, the concept of Social Representation is useful in explaining how social groups make sense of or give meaning to uncertainty conditions or threats when they encounter them (Breakwell, 2001a). These concepts offer a sound theoretical ground to explore how meanings of colonial heritage are constructed, maintained and transformed in Korean society over time and how Korean society deals with threats posed by colonial heritage.

1.2 Epistemological Paradigm

1.2.1 Social Constructionism

An epistemological paradigm employed in this research is derived from a social constructionist perspective. This research takes a view that multiple understanding of Japanese colonial heritage exists because individuals construct their own version of the heritage, rather than hold an unbiased objective knowledge of the heritage. Epistemology is a foundation for the understanding the world and in what ways knowledge about reality is expressed (Willig, 2001; Creswell & Clark, 2007). Much traditional psychology is based on a positivism paradigm, which assumes there is a direct connection between the external environment and our understanding of it; therefore, our knowledge is derived directly from objective, unbiased observation of the world (Burr, 2003; Willig, 2008). As a result, research from a positivist
perspective is concerned with identifying objective knowledge and measuring cause-effect relationships precisely (i.e. determinism). However, positivist research approaches in social science have sometimes been subjected to criticism; for instance, observation and description is always selective. Given the fact that reality is always constructed socially through interaction between individuals and the external environment and that multiple realities coexist, our perception and understanding of the world cannot possibly be absolute (Willig, 2001).

Social constructionism overcomes the biases associated with the tradition of positivism in social science. In understanding how individuals create realities, traditional constructionism relies mainly on individuals’ psychological state; however, social constructionism goes much further by considering social aspects of cognition. Burr (2003) illustrates three widely accepted social constructionist principles, which constitute the theoretical and methodological grounding of this research. Firstly, individuals construct their own understanding of the world rather than directly understand the world (i.e. anti-realism). Therefore, rather than a single objective observation of the world, which may be common-sense ways of understanding, multiple realities can coexist because realities are constituted as a form of subjective, multiple, intangible, complex mental constructions of individuals (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Secondly, not only do individuals achieve meanings or knowledge of the world. Within the social constructionist framework, many believe that our shared way of understanding the world is constructed and coloured by social processes and interaction between people in the course of their everyday lives (i.e. anti-essentialism). Thirdly, meanings of phenomena are products of specific cultures and periods of history because a shared understanding of the world would be significantly affected by a specific historical and cultural context. From this point of view, this research holds a view that, as a social process, individuals’ understanding of colonial heritage is fabricated by dynamic interaction between others in a particular cultural and historical context.
1.2.2 Research Design: Mixed Method Research

This research adopts a mixed method approach by combining quantitative and qualitative methods because it was decided that the research questions could only be answered using different methodologies, which would generate complementary findings. It is common for research based on social constructionism to employ inductive ways to build broader themes and generate a theory (Creswell & Clark, 2007). This approach naturally leads to the use of a qualitative research approach. However, some researchers (e.g. Hammersley, 1996; Speller, 2000) argue for the importance of mixed methods in social construction-based research.

Mixed-method research designs, employing both quantitative and qualitative methods, have been widely accepted as appropriate, legitimate and even preferred for a wide range of social science study. It is considered that the collaboration of two different methods leads to an in-depth examination of research problems by extending beyond either method used singly (Bryman, 1984; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003; Brannen, 2005; Creswell & Clark, 2007). Not only do they provide more comprehensive evidence for research problems than a single research approach but they also help answer research questions that a single research approach cannot answer (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003; Creswell & Clark, 2007). In this research, the quantitative method (i.e. questionnaire) serves as an instrument for the investigation of the outcomes of individuals’ experiences of colonial heritage in constructing their sense of national identity. This is because the quantitative approach has the advantage in testing and validating already constructed theories using statistical information; therefore, it allows the researcher to generalise research findings. The qualitative method (i.e. Multiple Sorting Procedure, Life History Interviews) is used as a means of investigating the dynamic process of constructing the meaning of colonial heritage in a South Korean context. Although the qualitative approach may be weak in generalising findings, this approach is suited to providing rich ‘thick description’ embedded in personal and local cultural contexts (Geertz, 1973; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003; Johnson & Onwegbuzie, 2004).
1.2.3 The Logistics of Mixed Method Research

The mixed method design employed in this research consists of three distinct studies: questionnaires (Study One), multiple sorting procedures (Study Two) and life-history interviews (Study Three). The rationale for the mixed method approach is that each research approach (i.e. sub-study) has complementary strengths to achieve the goal of this research and answer the research questions.

Study One is designed for the collection and analysis of quantitative data on social identity using questionnaires. The rationale for using the questionnaire approach is that not only does the statistical information obtained through the questionnaire examine how cultural heritage is related to a sense of national identity, but it also provides primary understanding of the impact of cultural heritage on a sense of identity to the later studies (i.e. Study Two and Three). The questionnaire study gives particular attention to how cultural heritage, both national in-group’s (i.e. Korean cultural heritage) and national out-group’s heritage (i.e. Japanese colonial heritage), is related to a sense of national identity. This study is also concerned with the role of socially related identity elements in the relationship and the difference existing between two different types of cultural heritage and generational groups (i.e. younger, middle and older generations) in terms of constructing individuals' sense of national identity.

Secondly, the Multiple Sorting Procedure focuses on a qualitative exploration of individuals’ conceptualisations of colonial heritage (Study Two). This approach is employed in Study Two in order to elicit information on how participants conceptualise colonial heritage and what they consider to be important in a way that the questionnaire, which is pre-specified construct and response modes from the researcher, does not elicit. By analysing data obtained through card sorting tasks in a systematic and structured manner, it also determines the predominant patterns the colonial buildings form with respect to a sense of identity in a South Korean context.

Lastly, life history interviews are conducted to gather qualitative data to explore the way in which individuals makes sense of colonial heritage in relation to their sense
of identity and how they deal with certain situations (i.e. threatened identity by the colonial heritage) (Study Three). This study primarily sets out not only to explore meanings of colonial heritage for individuals, but also to refines and explains the results identified from previous studies (i.e. Studies One and Two) in more depth. Particular attention in this approach is directed at the way in which individuals construct meanings about colonial heritage, as well as how these have developed and changed across their lifespan, both for them personally and the wider public context. Consequently, this approach addresses whether and in what ways colonial buildings are perceived to contribute to their identity or are experienced as possible identity threats.

1.3 Structure of the Thesis

Chapter Two reviews and evaluates the existing literature on cultural heritage and national identity in the field of heritage study. Along with the review of literature about cultural heritage, this chapter discusses national identity and nationalism that have been frequently highlighted in social and environmental psychology.

Chapter Three provides building blocks on which to construct a more detailed theorisation of the role of colonial heritage in the construction of a sense of national identity. This chapter develops the theoretical framework for this research by discussing Social Identity Theory, Identity Process Theory, Social Representations and memory construction. Colonial heritage and threats posed by the heritage are conceptualised, and understanding is gained about its evolution and the coping reactions engaged by individuals who perceived threats. This chapter also discusses psychological and social elements that may have important implications for individuals’ perceptions of threats and their reactions in response to the threats. The main research questions posed in this thesis are outlined at the end of this chapter.

Chapter Four contextualises why Japanese colonial heritage is found in a position that has the potential to threaten Korean identity in a South Korean context. The chapter describes the historical and socio-political context of South Korea after the liberation from Japan in 1945. Important socio-historical events that might
influence people’s perception of colonial heritage in post-colonial Korea are presented before discussing the nationalistic mood and fierce controversy over the heritage in South Korean history.

The following six chapters, Chapters Five to Ten, focus on the three empirical studies conducted in this research. Study One, which investigates the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of national identity, is presented in Chapters Five and Six. The detailed aims and specific objectives Study One aims to achieve are presented in Chapter Five, which also presents the detailed principles of the questionnaire adopted in this study, including the design of the questionnaire, sampling techniques and procedures, and evaluation of measurement scales (e.g. reliability of measurement scales). Demographic information and the criteria in grouping generations are also presented. Chapter Six lays out the empirical evidence in support of the hypotheses proposed in this study. It includes identity motivations salient for South Koreans and comparisons are made between two different kinds of cultural heritage. It also presents the significance of psychological and social variables that may contribute to individuals’ perception of cultural heritage (i.e. the strength of group identification, a sense of attachment and social experience).

Chapters Seven and Eight deal with Study Two, which investigates the ways in which South Koreans conceptualise Japanese colonial buildings in South Korean society. Chapter Seven begins by proposing detailed aims and specific objectives for Study Two. It also clarifies the Multiple Sorting Procedure, a main research methodology employed for Study Two. Along with the basic principles of the Multiple Sorting Procedure, the sorting procedure (e.g. a card-sorting task using photographic materials) and analytical procedure are presented. Chapter Eight presents and discusses the underlying criteria South Koreans consider important in appreciating Japanese colonial buildings, along with the dominant characteristics colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of identity in a South Korean context. The ways different generational groups (i.e. younger, middle and older generations) conceptualise colonial buildings is also compared and presented in a graphical form.
Chapters Nine and Ten focus on Study Three which explores the way in which individuals makes sense of colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity and how they deal with identity threats if colonial heritage threatens their sense of identity. Along with detailed aims and specific objectives, Chapter Nine lays out the life history approach, which is the theoretical and methodological grounding of Study Three. Moreover, it clarifies the principles of the life history interview, such as the sampling and interview procedure, interview schedule and analytical procedure. Chapter Ten presents outcomes from the life history interviews and then discusses whether and in what way colonial heritage is perceived to contribute to individuals’ identity or is experienced as a possible identity threat. This includes an examination of their perception of the threats to their identity, both within their lives and in the broader social context (e.g. personal, community, and national identity). The coping strategies adopted by South Koreans as responses to the threat posed by colonial heritage and the evolution of the significance of threats close the chapter.

Finally, Chapter Eleven summarises and discusses the empirical results and the degree to which they address the research questions. Additionally, it demonstrates how this research enhances and contributes to our understanding of the role of cultural heritage, particularly negative-natured cultural heritage, in a sense of national identity. It also demonstrates that a multi-method approach, and especially the use of life history interviews, can provide a more nuanced and dynamic understanding of the importance of colonial heritage in everyday life. It offers suggestions not only for future work in the field of heritage studies but also for cultural heritage and urban practitioners concerned with historic architecture as a mediator of national identity.
Chapter Two

Cultural Heritage: Conceptualisation and Identity Construction

2.1 Introduction

The link between cultural heritage and identity constitutes a major area of heritage studies with unresolved fundamental questions about how this link is constructed and maintained. The aim of this chapter is to conceptualise cultural heritage and its relation with national identity; it divides into two broad sections. Firstly, it will start by reviewing contemporary concepts of cultural heritage given considerable attention in recent heritage literature. Secondly, it will briefly review pertinent ideas about national identity that are widely accepted in social science. Literature on cultural heritage and its role in construction of national identity will be examined in order to understand key notions that literatures have employed in the field of heritage study today. This chapter addresses the necessity for a new theoretical framework in which the issues of colonial heritage and the construction of national identity should be studied, drawing attention to some of the weaknesses of existing heritage researches.

2.2 Conceptualisation of Cultural Heritage

2.2.1 Definition of Cultural Heritage in Heritage Study

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (2013) describes cultural heritage as ‘our legacy from the past, what we live with today and what we pass on to future generations’. Historic sites, architecture and monuments are ‘one of the most visible, accessible and tangible manifestations of heritage and are also some of the essential building blocks of heritage’ (Garden, 2006, p.394). As far as cultural heritage in Western discussion is concerned, traditionally and conventionally, the materialist approach to cultural heritage, focusing mainly on objectified or materialised heritage, has been dedicated (Smith, 2006, 2007). Especially, from the perspectives of archaeology and architecture, cultural heritage has been conceived as a material structure or a discrete site, built with identifiable boundaries (ibid). In this vein, cultural heritage, seen as ‘conveyors of meaning in a
display-based environment’ (Garden, 2009, p.272), has been approached as a technical process and an issue of conservation or management (Harvey, 2001; Smith, 2007).

Today, the social value of cultural heritage has been given considerable scholarly attention. One of the important features of work emerging in recent heritage study is that cultural heritage has become a complex concept that has wide subject scope, ranging from archaeology and architecture mainly concerning materiality (e.g. tangible features of heritage) to anthropology, sociology and psychology, which emphasise subjectivity of cultural heritage (e.g. intangible value of heritage). In this perspective, recent heritage academics have introduced a modern concept of heritage, making a paradigm shifting emphasis from only on materiality of heritage to being complexly interwoven between its materiality and subjectivity (e.g. Graham, 2002; Garden; 2006; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). That is to say, ‘cultural heritage combines the material with social construction’ (Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010, p.14), which means that cultural heritage is not only a tangible and physical place but is also a unique and highly experiential social place (Garden, 2009; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). Of particular importance in this regard is that although physical characteristics are important aspects that constitute cultural heritage, heritage is more than a simple legacy from the past, going beyond the materiality of heritage (Smith, 2006; Moles, 2009). An interesting analogy can also be found from Smith’s (2006) idea of ‘the intangibility of heritage’, which refers that cultural heritage could be seen as being intangible, such as emotion, memory and experience, since people are actively engaging with the values, affects and meanings symbolised by a physical representation of heritage. Garden (2009) draws an analogy between the notion of landscape and the concept of cultural heritage in order to stress the importance of both material and experiential qualities of heritage sites. He argues that studies focusing only on tangible natures of heritage are likely to fail to understand how people interpret, perceive and use heritage, whereas studies concentrating only on people’s perceptions of heritage may be limited to accounting for the role of material or tangible components of heritage in creating people’s perceptions. Therefore, rather than sticking to a polarised angle, both evaluating authenticity of heritage and
understanding people’s subjective interpretations of heritage would be crucial in understanding heritage because people’s interpretations, which are subjective experiences of heritage, make the material a prominent medium for conveying the past and constructing the sense of place (ibid).

2.2.2 Cultural Heritage as Social Process

One significant feature of work emerging in recent heritage study is that cultural heritage is considered a tangible subject intimately linked to a social process of meaning construction in the present social contexts (e.g. Young, 1989; Harvey, 2001; Bender, 2002; Byrne, 2003; Smith, 2006, 2007; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2008). By moving away from treating cultural heritage as a fixed tangible past material that can be isolated from the present societal context, great attention has been given to the questions of how cultural heritage is interpreted in the present societal context and how it is situated in a social and political process. The premise of this understanding lies in an attempt to understand cultural heritage as socio-cultural construction, constructed at specific social, historical and living contexts, rather than a naturally occurring phenomenon or universal (Prats, 2009; Kaplan, 2009). According to International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (2005, p.45), ‘value and authenticity of architectural heritage cannot be based on fixed criteria because the respect due to all cultures also requires that its physical heritage be considered within the cultural context to which it belongs’. This statement implies that rather than material artefacts, cultural heritage is a social product, defined and influenced by historical, political, economic and social context where the meanings are constructed and interpreted (Graham, 2002; Anico, 2009).

This argument goes further by proposing that cultural heritage could be interpreted differently, not only between cultural contexts, but also within any specific culture at any one time (Graham, 2002). By emphasising heritage grounded in a social frame, a large body of recent heritage literature appreciates cultural heritage as a contemporary social product, which is a representation of the past in the present day (e.g. Lowenthal, 1998; Urry, 2000; Harvey, 2001; Graham, 2002; Crouch & Parker, 2003; Munasinghe, 2005; Garden, 2006; Anico & Peralta, 2009; Witcomb, 2009).
Since meanings of cultural heritage are constantly redefined and reshaped on the basis of present interests and purposes, the meaning of cultural heritage differs over time and for different groups of people (Graham, 2002; Uzzell, 2009b). This idea can be observable elsewhere in recent heritage literature. Following Lowenthal’s (1998) idea that cultural heritage is contemporary products, Urry (2000, p.115) states that ‘what we take to be the past is necessarily reconstructed in the present, each moment of the past is reconstructed in the present’. Taking this view, Crouch and Parker (2003, p.398) also conceptualise cultural heritage as ‘the crystallisation of recurrent, dominant and new representation of past time, practice and place’. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996, p.6) add that ‘the present selects an inheritance from an imagined past for current use and decides what should be passed on to an imagined future’. That is to say, the original version of the past is replaced in present circumstances. This is comparable to the argument by Harvey (2001, p.334) that heritage is an outcome of present circumstances because ‘historic sites have always been presented (or intentionally not presented) within the context of political agendas and wider conceptualisation of popular memory contemporary to the time’.

All these recent understandings of cultural heritage imply that although cultural heritage, including historic architecture, monuments and memorials, is durable, it does not remain static or frozen in time (Smith, 2006; Uzzell, 2009b). As a socio-cultural process, its meaning is consistently evolving while time passes on (Graham, 2002; Gough, 2004). A good example of this can be found in Uzzell’s (1989) study on present interpretation of massacre sites during the Second World War, which illustrates that a historic site as a strong affective and emotional dimension of heritage experience has changed to a site providing a cognitive experience in a present context.

Another key perspective highlighted in recent heritage study is that people lie at the heart of this socio-cultural process that is consistently evolving. They are actively and subjectively aware of the past and meanings of cultural heritage, rather than merely passive receivers of it (Byrne, 2003; Smith, 2006; Macdonald, 2006a). In this regard, Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996, p.70) recapitulate that:
‘Heritage is ultimately a personal affair…Each individual assembles his own heritage from his own life experiences, within a unique life space containing reference points of memory and providing anchors of personal value and stability, which are not identical to those of anyone else’

In this vein, Graham et al. (2000, p.2) further propose that ‘if people in the present are the creators of heritage and not merely passive receivers or transmitters of it, then the present creates the heritage it requires and manages it for a range of contemporary purposes’. A similar idea can be found in Harvey’s (2001, p.320) study, which argues that ‘people are representative of a particular strand of heritage at a particular moment in time, reflecting the agendas, perceptions and arrangements of that time’. Therefore, cultural heritage has consistently been reconstructed and transformed with reference to people’s present experiences and interests (ibid). Additionally, cultural heritage becomes subjective and personalised by people in a transactional manner that present and past lives act on each other (Byrne, 2008). Byrne (2008, p.158) states that ‘cultural heritage is about people, communities and the values they give to heritage places’. The significance and meaning of heritage is consistently reconstructed by drawing on people’s own living experiences rather than being taken as a given (ibid). As the significance or meaning of heritage is simultaneously inherited and transformed (Byrne, 2003; Smith, 2006), identity may not be simply something produced by cultural heritage, but is something actively and continually transformed by people and communities’ reinterpretation and reassessment of their heritage (Harvey, 2001; Smith, 2007).

2.3 Heritage and the Construction of Identity

2.3.1 Concept of National Identity

Due to the ability of cultural heritage to generate social and cultural identity of social groups, association of cultural heritage with identity has been a prominent subject of discussion in heritage study (Smith, 2006; Anico & Peralta, 2009). Especially, the nature of contemporary societies, such as post-colonialism, globalisation, migration and cultural diversity, has turned cultural heritage into a central concern for many social groups, leading to the construction of identity (Anico & Peralta, 2009).
There is a broad consensus that the past is an anchor of the nation and serves as an essential ingredient in constructing and maintaining nationalism (Anderson, 1983; Uzzell & Sørensen, 2002; Liu & Hilton, 2005; Palmer, 2005). Before reviewing literature on heritage and national identity in the field of heritage study, it might be useful to briefly recapitulate pertinent ideas of nations and nationalism, which are widely accepted in social science.

2.3.1.1 Nation and National Identity

Seen from the perspective of multidimensionality of individuals’ identity, national identity is one kind of identity that sets individuals apart from others (Smith, 1991). However, due to the complex and abstract nature of nations that consist of diverse interconnected elements, such as territorial, political, cultural, and ethnic, conceptualising nations and national identity is difficult (Smith, 1991; Guibernau, 2004; Park, 2010). This gives rise to continuing discussion over nation and national identity.

In constructing arguments on nation and national identity, literatures drawing on a modernist approach have tended to focus on the way nations is structurally constructed (e.g. Anderson, 1983; Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1983). They emphasise political-based membership in constructing and maintaining modern industrial nationhood (Guibernau, 2004; Fenton, 2007; Park, 2010). For instance, in his seminal work on imagined communities, Anderson (1983) argues that a modern nation is ‘an imagined political community that is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign’ (p. 6). The reason for this is that people never know one another in the contemporary communities and nations to which they belong (ibid). Convergence of capitalism and development of communication technology serve as a catalyst for the construction of modern nations (ibid). Similarly, Gellner’s (1983) attention is directed to a contingency aspect of nations, rather than its universal necessity. He maintains that nations do not exist at all times in the sense that individuals’ loyalty and their self-identification leading to ‘a willed adherence’ construct of nations or groups. This identification may easily be comparable to Hobsbawm (1983), who sees nations as ‘invented tradition’, which
refers nations being constructed through the elements of artefacts, invention and social practice.

Unlike the modernist approach that takes more rational and purposive perspectives of nationalism, groups of literature that take the primordial perspective of national identity consider nations as a long-enduring historic identity and stress historical and symbolic-cultural attributes of ethnic bonds and sentiments in constructing nations and national identity (Fenton, 2007). This perspective is developed by Smith (1991) who argues that communities are generated by collectively shared values, belief, memories, culture and traditions. In this sense, a nation is ‘a named human population sharing historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members’ (Smith, 1991, p.14). Accordingly, ‘nations must have a measure of common culture and a civic ideology, a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas that bind the population together in their homeland’ (Smith, 1991, p.11). This identification encapsulates an idea that individuals imagine themselves as members of a nation not only by sharing geography, politics and economic features but also by sharing ethnic, cultural and historical features. This idea of national identity is particularly crucial because it fulfils various functions in constructing nations. Externally, it supports territorial (e.g. social space, historic territory), economic (e.g. territorial resources, workers) and political (e.g. legal rights, duties of legal institution) contexts. Internally, it underpins the socialisation of members as nationals and citizens (ibid). According to this perspective, national identity makes nations repositories of shared historical memories, myths and symbols. These arguments enable the link between cultural heritage and national identity to become clearer since cultural heritage can be viewed as national symbols that remind individuals of shared memories and tradition that create a sense of national identity (Palmer, 1999; Park, 2010).

2.3.1.2 Nationalism
Another important idea closely linked to cultural heritage and national identity comes from the notion of nationalism. Nationalism is closely associated with national
identity because it is an ideology and movement, which helps to create and promote nations and national identity (Smith, 1991; Fenton, 2007). Smith (1991, p.74) describes nationalism as ‘an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining the autonomy, unity and identity of a nation’, especially in industrialised, socially and culturally standardised and territorially consolidated modern states. Today, it has become commonplace to think of nationalism as an extreme instance, such as ethnic and religious conflict, conservative, fascist, communist, separatist and so on (Ignatieff, 1993; Hutchinson & Smith, 1994). However, forms of this ideology and movement vary. According to Smith (1991), national symbols and ceremonials, such as national flags, national anthems and other symbols of national identity that we take for granted, are the strongest feature of nationalism. They not only make and articulate the abstract ideology of nationalism visible and distinct for their everyday life, but also assure the continuity of an abstract community of history and destiny. He explains that:

‘They include the obvious attributes of nations-flag, anthems, parades, coinage, capital cities, oaths, fork costumes, museums of folklore, war memorials, ceremonies of remembrance for the national dead, passports, frontiers…as well as more hidden aspects such as national recreations, the countryside…style of architecture, arts and crafts, mode of town planning…all those distinctive customs, mores, styles and ways of acting and feeling that are shared by the members of a community of historical culture’ (Smith, 1991, p.77)

In terms of cultural heritage, debates about national identity have tended generally to centre on a question about the role of a legacy of a glorious past, grand monuments, cultural achievement and aesthetically impressive material culture (Smith, 2006). However, given that cultural heritage can also be seen as materialised through routine life, unofficial practices and habits in the everyday context (Mason & Baveystock, 2009), Billig’s (1995) concept of nationalism would be worth close attention here. Billig (1995, p.10) introduces the notion of banal nationalism in order to ‘cover the ideological habits which enable the established nations of the West to be reproduced’.
The key argument of this notion is that nationalism is reproduced not only by hot and exotic instances, but also by mundane and routine ways in everyday life (Jones & Merriman, 2009). By challenging traditional theorisation of nationalism, which focuses only on hot instances of nationalism restricted to extreme expression of nationalism, the notion of banal nationalism pays particular attention to familiar routines and the mundane activities of life constantly reminding people they live in nations and that they have a national identity. Firstly, Billig (1995, p.6) defines nationalism as an ‘endemic condition’. According to Billig (1995, p.93), ‘our identity is continually being flagged’. Although national symbols promoting national identity have generally been considered as outstanding or visible features in society, they are sometimes unnoticeable, as they are so familiar and so continuous (ibid). A sense of belonging to a nation that constructs national identity or national membership could be reinforced by a range of ordinary objects and repetitive everyday practices (ibid). That is to say, individuals are consistently reminded of their national identity through routine and mundane symbols, rather than an extreme or controversial political ideology.

Another important idea found in Billig’s (1995) banal nationalism is that the condition of nation-states could be the key to change from an extreme instance of nationalism to everyday routine practice of nationalism. The notion of banal nationalism describes that ‘as a nation-state becomes established in its sovereignty and if it faces little internal challenge, then the symbols of nationhood, which might once have been consciously displayed, do not disappear from sight, but instead become absorbed into the environment of the established homeland. There is, then, a movement from symbolic mindfulness to mindlessness’ (Billig, 1995, p.41). Therefore, in established societies, nationalism is observed in less visible forms, having a presence in everyday, mundane situations. These views are especially important if cultural heritage could be just such a taken-for-granted object in everyday life, but considered as a reminder of nationalism, which reproduces nationhood.
2.3.2 Heritage, National Identity and Nationalism

The association of cultural heritage with identity has been the subject of study for countless heritage researchers in a Western context. Few would doubt that cultural heritage, such as monuments, architecture and historic sites, plays a part in fostering people’s sense of national identity in society today (e.g. Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997; Graham et al., 2000; Osborne, 2001; Uzzell & Sørensen, 2002; Macdonald, 2006a, 2006b; Tilley, 2006; Smith, 2006, 2007; Graham & Howards, 2008; Harrison et al, 2008; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). It has been generally suggested that historic buildings and monuments have attained considerable significance as the most visible icons establishing nationalism (Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997). Additionally, it appears that cultural heritage is heavily implicated here as a powerful medium contributing to creating and promoting nations and national identity. As ‘a means of underpinning and affirming a characteristic unity of state, territory, ethnicity and culture’, cultural heritage plays a crucial part not only in constructing nation-states but also in enhancing unique national identity today (Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010, p.15). They serve as ‘markers or way-stones for individuals to connect to a wider sense of heritage and to locate themselves within the larger group and existing identities’ (Garden, 2009, p.271). In a similar vein, Anico and Peralta (2009), in their edited book on identity and heritage, stress that cultural heritage is ‘an influential device in the construction of nation states as well as in the identity of politics led by multiple groups that are globally situated’ (Anico & Peralta, 2009, p.1-2). By articulating cultural heritage as ‘a form of objectifying identity’, they address that cultural heritage is an effective material and symbolic device, representing unique identities. In this sense, cultural heritage in contemporary society has been used as ‘an important political and cultural tool in defining and legitimising the identity, experiences and social/cultural standing of a range of sub-national groups, as well as those of the authorising discourse’ (Smith, 2006, p.52). Especially, in Western societies in the post-war period, the importance of cultural heritage is directly linked to nationalism due to its significant political and cultural role in creating and contesting memory (Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997; Graham, 2002; Smith, 2006; Harrison et al., 2008). Particularly, tangible heritage that evokes collective
memories (e.g. historic sites, architectural buildings) has been of increasing importance for useful cultural and political resources in the process of educating, governing and regulating cultural, social, national identity and the values, tastes and conduct of the citizenry (Walsh, 1992; Smith, 2006, 2007). Moreover, it is frequently used by institutions for national buildings that accompany the formation and strengthening of states (Logan & Reeves, 2009).

National identity can be found in symbolically charged places that have been selected and memorialised, such as national monuments and their associated commemorations (Osborne, 1996). In this regard, cultural heritage related to nationalism refers to positive cultural heritage, tangible remains of a past golden age and national achievement because of the view that a legacy of a golden age serves as an anchor for nations (Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997). Especially, national heritage or monuments recognised as legitimate through institutions or experts could give temporal and material authority to the construction of identities (Smith, 2006). However, the idea of heritage and national identity has been extended today by shifting emphasis from cultural artefacts, which represent the finest, most elevated remarkable cultural achievements of the past, to cultural heritage that denotes traditional forms of the mundane and routine ways in everyday life (Nora, 2011). Cultural heritage that has been considered as a taken-for-granted object in everyday life (e.g. country houses) could become an effective tool in binding people to the wider nation (e.g. Englishness) (Palmer, 1999, 2005, 2009). For instance, despite the banality of country houses in England, which is so familiar and easily overlooked like a flag which hangs unnoticed outside a public building, they act as banal nationalism that not only strengthens a sense of national identity but also community and personal identity (Smith, 2006, 2009). In this sense, it has been accepted here that although cultural heritage would be routinely engaged in and mundanely experienced, it could be seen as one of the major vehicles of banal expressions of both self and national identity.
2.3.3 Heritage and the Construction of Identity

Concern about the role of cultural heritage in constructing identity has surfaced as an important issue in heritage study. There are currently four main characteristics in heritage literature considering this issue.

Firstly, the investigation of cultural heritage and national identity has frequently been accompanied by investigation of memory associated with the heritage. Raj Isar et al. (2011, p.10) describe this triad of heritage-memory-identity, as ‘a conceptual troika’, which are parallel and interact with one another. Indeed, the association of cultural heritage, memory and identity has been a prominent subject of discussion in a range of disciplines over recent decades and they have attached great importance to memory as a critical element in determining the impact of cultural heritage on national identity. For instance, Lowenthal (1985, p.197), in his book The Past is a Foreign Country, addresses that ‘remembering the past is crucial for our sense of identity to know what we were confirms what we are’. Similarly, in Gillis’s (1994) view, each notion of identity and memory is mutually dependent on one another: ‘the core meaning of any individual or group identity…is sustained by remembering; and what is remembered is defined by the assumed identity’ (Gillis, 1994, p.3). Viewed from this perspective, it is not surprising for us to see that cultural heritage, memory and national identity frequently remain interwoven in recent heritage study. Much of heritage literature concerning the connections among heritage, memory and identity has tended to rest primarily within significant commentaries from Nora (1989). According to Nora (1989), specific places of memory are necessary because memory has been torn and conquered by history because of the passage of time. He refers to these as lieux de memoires, sites that act as an anchor for memory and connecting people to the past. Through distinction between ‘true memory’, located in our gestures, habits, skills and traditions inherited from the past and ‘modern memory’, which relies mainly on the materiality and visibility of the image, he stresses that ‘we must deliberately create archives, maintain anniversaries, organise celebrations, pronounce eulogies and notarise bills because such activities no longer naturally performed’ (Nora, 1989, p.12). Inspired by Nora, a number of scholars from many disciplines have explored the overlapping complex relationships.
among tangible heritage, memory and identity. Recent work by heritage researchers addresses that cultural heritage is loaded with memory of the past, which is directly, consistently linked to the preservation and reconstruction of a sense of collective identities (Lowenthal, 1985; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; De Condappa, 2006; Smith, 2006; Claval, 2007). Not only does cultural heritage serve as a memorial to the events of history, but also as visual prompts for the collective memory (Young, 1989; Osborne, 2001; De Condappa, 2006; Smith, 2006; Tilley, 2006; Moore & Whelan, 2007; Harrison et al., 2008). Especially, monumental buildings are ‘the chief catalysts of collective historical identity because they seem intrinsic to their surroundings and outlast most other relics’ (Laenen, 1989, p.389).

The second point to highlight is that, although general information about the link between cultural heritage and identity is available in a number of heritage literatures, little has been known of the exact way in which people’s sense of national identity is constructed, maintained or enhanced through cultural heritage (Smith, 2006, 2007). In denoting this link, cultural heritage has so far been studied mainly within a context; that is, tangible cultural heritage is a material substance of collective identity closely linked to a sense of continuity (e.g. national, ethnic identity) (Macdonald, 2006a, 2006b). Cultural heritage was constructed by previous generations and is inherited by succeeding generations. Since cultural heritage is ‘the lasting physical inheritance from previous generations’, a durable material heritage materialises or objectifies a sense of the continuity of people across generations (Macdonald, 2006a, p.11). That is to say, historic architecture or sites remain an essential bridge between the past and present and harbingers of the future, evoking a sense of continuity and stability in modern society (Lowenthal, 1985; Till, 2003). Graham et al. (2000, p.41) support this assumption by saying that ‘acting as one means of representing the past, heritage provides meaning to human existence by conveying the idea of timeless values and unbroken lineages that underpin identity’. In addition to association of cultural heritage with a feeling of continuity, much of heritage literature on national identity has focused on a people’s membership to a social group evoked through cultural heritage. Cultural heritage that evokes the past is appreciated differently, according to different people or communities (e.g.
Tunbridge, 1984; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Ashworth, 1998; Hall, 1999; Smith, 2006). Moreover, meanings of heritage and a sense of identity are subject to not only what is interpreted, but also how it is interpreted and by whom (e.g. Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Smith, 2006). Light and Dumbraveanu-Andone (1997, p.28) note that ‘a sense of national identity is undoubtedly important for many people in giving them a feeling of belonging and identifying with a particular group whilst, at the same time, being different from other groups’. Especially, much of the literature on memory in recent heritage study is concerned with the influence of memory on the construction of social representation of the past. Collective memory, meanings and values written into cultural heritage can be diverse and depend on social groups and social backgrounds (Hutton, 1993; cited in Osborne, 2001; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Ashworth, 1998; Smith, 2006; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2008). In this sense, individuals would achieve their sense of togetherness, collective awareness and cultural solidarity (i.e. national cohesion) that is vital in the formation of national identity through common historical experience (McDowell, 2008). Similarly, different interpretations at the same cultural heritage places inevitably cause conflict (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). However, fundamental questions involving how these links are constructed and maintained remain unresolved (Smith, 2006).

The third point to highlight is that there is no evidence available to confirm whether cultural heritage actually generates people’s sense of identity. Limited amounts of literature critically discuss the way in which identity is originated, developed and changed through cultural heritage. Except for some notable exceptions (e.g. Uzzell, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Hawke, 2010; Wójcik, Bilewicz & Lewicka, 2010), it seems there is little in their research theoretically and empirically supporting their assumptions of the relationship between cultural heritage and identity. Uzzell’s (1996) study is a good example of heritage study that takes into account a theoretical framework that supports results of analysis. In trying to clarify the contribution of cultural heritage to the formation of people’s identity, Uzzell (1996) is the first researcher to discuss heritage experiences in terms of the process of social identity construction, based on social psychological theories (i.e.
Social Identity Theory, Identity Process Theory). Although his study focuses only on visitors to a local museum in a small local town (i.e. Guildford), its significance is no less relevant for those working on historic architectural heritage. The key to his research is that although a museum successfully impacts on a sense of community and identity to its visitors, only certain dimensions of identity are mainly responsible for the museum experiences, such as a sense of distinctiveness and control. Additionally, certain natures of heritage, such as legacy of people and activities of the town, serve to create people’s sense of place. Another recent attempt to offer a rationale explaining the impact of heritage is found in Hawke’s (2010) study, examining the contribution of cultural heritage to sense of place. She relies heavily on the ideas of environmental psychology to argue how local heritage contributes to people’s sense of place. The findings confirm the applicability of Uzzell’s (1996) theoretical framework by proposing that local heritage influences particular components of identity. In-depth interviews reveal that heritage contributes a sense of place not only by strengthening their feelings of pride, self-esteem, and distinctive characteristics of a place, but also supports continuity of identity through time. By adopting theoretical concepts of place and social memory, Devine-Wright and Lyons (1997) have attempted to identify theoretically and empirically the social memory of historic places in maintaining a positive national identity in Northern Ireland. Other terminology, such as ‘identity work’ (Rounds, 2006), has also been developed in an attempt to suggest a process of identity construction, maintenance and change. These challenge the view of people’s identity as discrete, stable or static and attempt to move beyond current studies suffering from a lack of theoretical logic.

Lastly, although recent literature provides a useful account of the way meanings of cultural heritage are constructed, it has often been narrowly restricted by articulating analysis of the way cultural heritage is used in terms of a uni-dimensional unity. As Portelli (1991, 1992, 1997) points out, our life and the context of where we live are always multi-dimensional. A person could simultaneously be a member of a national group and a community group, as well as an individual. In this light, cultural heritage also simultaneously exists in their personal, local and national contexts (Graham et al., 2000). It we take into account this multidimensional nature
of individuals’ identity, it is apparent that the meanings an individual attaches to cultural heritage are inextricably interwoven with meanings constructed by different levels of experience. In this light, Kong and Yeoh (1995, p. 2) address place has ‘multicoded’ meanings constructed in the personal and collective context. A useful account of multi-dimensionality of cultural heritage is found from recent heritage tourism literature (e.g. Timothy, 1997; Poria, Biran & Reichel, 2006). An interesting example is given by Timothy (1997), who classifies levels of heritage experience (i.e. personal, local, national or world meaningfulness). The key to his argument is that people do not experience cultural heritage in one particular perspective because different levels of heritage experience always overlap to some extent. That is to say, a certain historic place evokes different values and meanings for different individuals because the place is located not only in a socio-cultural context but also in their personal context (Poria et al., 2006). Drawing on Timothy’s (1997) study, Poria et al. (2006) refer to world famous heritage sites (i.e. Anne Frank House in Amsterdam) empirically demonstrating that people always perceive historic sites as combinations of world, national, local and their own personal identity, rather than a single dimension only (ibid). This implies that both institutionalised narratives about cultural heritage and subjectivity of the heritage based on personal memory and life history lay the foundation for the meaning of the heritage. Additionally, it appears that cultural heritage would not be perceived as a single heritage entity that entirely impacts people’s sense of national identity. Not only does cultural heritage contribute to the construction of national identity, but it also it serves as a trigger to community or personal identity simultaneously. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996, p.70) support this assumption by addressing that ‘heritage is ultimately a personal affair…Each individual assembles his own heritage from his own life experiences, within a unique life space containing reference points of memory and providing anchors of personal value and stability, which are not identical to those of anyone else’. Accordingly, what one person views as cultural heritage that impacts a sense of national identity may symbolise personal identity by others and become an important resource for the local community by others. Timothy (1997) proposes that when a certain heritage is seen as world heritage, people may perceive a sense of amazement or human unity. If the heritage is seen
at national levels, people may experience a strong sense of patriotism or national pride. Simultaneously, as familiar landmarks in local community, heritage invokes locals’ own collective past in a rapidly changing world. As a personal legacy, heritage simultaneously invokes a sense of nostalgia for personal life history and strengthens personal identity (ibid). What these researches attempt to argue is that cultural heritage holds a range of meanings simultaneously and, accordingly, feelings people perceive from cultural heritage vary from person to person. In this sense, it is apparent that cultural heritage located in our multidimensional life would impact not only the creation of our own national identity, but also our own individual and community identity (Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Uzzell, 2009b). If we take this into account, the general tendency to articulate and legitimise cultural heritage in terms of a uni-dimensional unity (i.e. national identity) would prevent a more sophisticated and inclusive understanding of meaning construction that affects identity. Moreover, understanding of the role of cultural heritage in constructing a sense of identity would remain limited if insufficient attention were paid to how people extract meaning from heritage through their everyday life and how it contributes to their sense of national identity.

2.4 Discussion

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a useful overview and evaluation of the existing literature on cultural heritage and national identity in the field of heritage study. The association of cultural heritage with national identity has been the subject of study for countless heritage researchers and few would doubt that cultural heritage is socio-cultural places where collectively shared memories are created and national and cultural identities are produced. Along with the review of literature on cultural heritage, this chapter examined the concepts of national identity and nationalism.

Recent heritage studies point to several promising applications for this research. If we take into account the aforementioned idea, it is significantly apparent that architectural heritage built in the colonial past is not simply a fixed tangible colonial past material that can be isolated from the present societal context. Rather, it is
situated in a present social and political process and the contemporary socio-cultural context creates meanings of colonial heritage. Accordingly, it may sometimes cause colonial heritage to be situated in contested field and in a social and cultural context. However, people would actively construct their own version of colonial heritage because they are not passive receivers of authorised historical meaning of heritage (Smith, 2006; Byrne, 2008). A review of contemporary heritage studies points out a range of conceptual and methodological issues encountered in its efforts to understand the role of colonial heritage in identity construction. Many issues remain to be explored but three key issues need to be pointed out in this section.

Firstly, although concern about its interactive role in the social context has surfaced as an important issue in heritage study, much of heritage research does not provide an exhaustive analysis of how cultural heritage is evolving and changing over time and how identity is generated and enhanced by cultural heritage within personal lives and the social and cultural context. Moreover, the ways in which cultural heritage changes people’s sense of identity remains underexplored and poorly understood. Especially, the problem arises when trying to understand the ways in which individuals are making sense of negative-natured cultural heritage in relation to their sense of identity and how their sense of identity change through the heritage.

Secondly, fundamental questions about how people’s sense of identity is constructed through experiences of negative natured heritage (i.e. colonial heritage) and how people deal with heritage for their identity remain unresolved. Equally, the potential for negative-natured heritage to act as agents and change people’s sense of identity has not been taken sufficiently into consideration by researchers; therefore, there is a need for research to address these issues.

The last and possibly the most important point related to the foregoing is the absence of established methodologies. With the exception of a few heritage researchers (e.g. Garden, 2006; Andrews, 2009; Sørensen & Carman, 2009; Uzzell, 2009a), little attention has been given to the importance of structured methods that could be applied in heritage studies. Drawing from diverse assumptions from a range of
academic disciplines, heritage researchers have greatly expanded our understanding of cultural heritage (Sørensen & Carman, 2009). However, their research rarely supports theoretically and empirically their assumptions for the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of identity. Additionally, the nature of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary fields of study dealing with their own research grounds invoke no agreed-upon or widely used methodology that could be applied to heritage study (Garden, 2006, 2009; Sørensen & Carman, 2009). Consequently no common understanding exists that has been investigated (Sørensen & Carman, 2009).

Garden (2006) addresses this issue by criticising ad-hoc approaches to analysing heritage sites that result in none of the heritage studies being easily comparable with each other. He emphasises the need for a more generalised approach that can be applied to the wide range of different heritage sites. It is clear that part of this problem stems from the paucity of theoretical frameworks and structured methodologies. This emerging critique could be supported by Uzzell’s (2009a) comments, ‘there are no methods without theory’, which argues against traditional heritage study. Therefore, given this tendency of heritage study, applying well-developed theories and conducting empirical studies with structured methods provide an insightful approach to enhancing our understanding of the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of identity.

In order to overcome the above issues, this research will approach people-colonial heritage relations from the social identity standpoint. It will be argued that the process of identity construction through colonial heritage is best understood through the concepts of identity in social and environmental psychology because these concepts incorporate the dynamic process of identity construction. In the next chapter, a more detailed examination of the way in which identity construction has been theorised in social and environmental psychology will be examined and a theoretical framework within which this research has been carried out will be outlined. Firstly, drawing on the idea of social identity, the next chapter endeavours to conceptualise colonial heritage, so that people’s interpretation of colonial heritage might be theoretically explained. In order to understand the process of identity construction and change though colonial heritage, the next chapter will also be
concerned with perceptions of threats and people’s responses. These processes will be conceptualised as the process of identity construction and maintenance.
Chapter Three
Threat to Identity and Identity Construction

3.1 Introduction
Chapter Two discussed recent literature on cultural heritage and its role in construction of national identity. Although there has been a research boom in cultural heritage and its role in identity construction, fundamental questions about whether and in what way cultural heritage impacts the creation of national identity in contemporary society remain unresolved. Especially, poor theoretical and empirical progress has been made on the question of the nature of identity constructed by negative-natured cultural heritage (e.g. colonial architectural heritage). This chapter therefore addresses a different body of literature, that of social and environmental psychology, to provide a theoretical framework for this research. Starting with an assumption that colonial heritage may serve as a symbol of a perpetrator’s identity (i.e. Japanese identity) influencing the identity of citizens in a post-colonial nation (i.e. Korean identity), this chapter will discuss two main identity-related concepts in social psychology, Social Identity Theory and Identity Process Theory, as means of interpreting and analysing the premise. Firstly, it will start by conceptualising colonial heritage and continue by discussing perceptions of identity threat. Afterwards, the construction of memory and Social Representation will be discussed to understand the evolution of the significance of colonial heritage to a sense of identity. This chapter concludes with an outline of the main research questions posed in this research.

3.2 Conceptualisation of Colonial Heritage
3.2.1 Concept of Negative Heritage
To date, cultural heritage has been applied to positive experienced history. However, one of the important features of the recent work undertaken in the field of heritage study is to focus questioning on heritage associated with negatively experienced past. Arguments have been made nowadays that not all cultural heritage reflects the bright side of history that is to be cherished and celebrated. Some historic places may be
perceived as ‘commemorating conflict, trauma and disaster’ (Rico, 2008, p.344). Historic places may find themselves situated in a contested field due to deliberate infliction of the atrocity of events associated with the places in the past (e.g. war, group perpetration, genocide, massacre) (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Logan & Reeves, 2009). Moreover, not all cultural heritages can be seen from the comfortable, harmonious and consensual view (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Macdonald, 2006a, 2006b; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). Ideologies or politics it represented create a source of dissonance, contested memory, identity and social and cultural value (e.g. former judicial systems, racial, ethnic or social conflicts) (ibid).

Today, there is terminological inflation along with a growing interest in this negatively constructed heritage. In decoding this type of cultural heritage, a range of concepts have been employed, such as dissonant heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Ashworth, 2002; Graham, 2002), contested heritage (Tunbridge, Jones & Shaw, 1996; Shaw & Jones, 1997), hot interpretation (Uzzell, 1989, 1998; Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998), negative heritage (Meskell, 2002), sites of discord value (Dolff-Bonekämper, 2008, 2010), undesirable heritage (Macdonald, 2006a), ambivalent heritage (Chadha, 2006) and difficult heritage (Logan & Reeve, 2009). These concepts sometimes overlap each other, so there is no clear-cut distinction among these concepts. However, Tunbridge and Ashworth’s (1996) concept of dissonant heritage, which refers to ‘heritage that does not conform to prevailing norms or sites that are inherently disturbing’ (Meskell, 2002, p.566), may possibly be the first in-depth discussion of negative-natured heritage. The premise of this concept is that cultural heritage would be a centre of actual or potential conflict if there were a lack of agreement and consistent congruence (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). Dissonant heritage would be generated by a number of aspects of atrocity, such as war, group perpetration, genocide, massacre, and persecution of ethnic or social groups (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). In the same vein, the idea of ‘negative heritage’, which refers to ‘a conflictual site that becomes the repository of negative memory in the collective imaginary’, (Meskell, 2002, p.558) appears as a subcategory of Tunbridge and Ashworth’s (1996) dissonant heritage. This is also the case for ‘difficult heritage’, which refers to heritage ‘representing the destructive and cruel
side of heritage…and painful or shameful episodes in a national or local community’s history’ (Logan & Reeves, 2009, p.1).

A somewhat similar concept is observed from Macdonald’s (2006a) study. She appreciates this category of heritage as ‘an undesired legacy’ and uses the term ‘undesirable heritage’, which refers to ‘a heritage that the majority of the population would prefer not to have’ (Macdonald, 2006a, p.9). In identifying meanings of colonial legacy existing in post-colonial society, Chadha (2006) uses the term, ‘ambivalent heritage’, which takes into account contradictory and incomparable meanings embedded in colonial heritage. According to his study, ambivalence of heritage would be generated by tension between its ideological and emotional significance. For example, ambivalence of a colonial-era cemetery (e.g. the funerary monument) is derived from a dual symbolic position that the cemetery occupies. On the one hand, it is a clear reminder of an oppressive occupation (i.e. a cultural product of a colonial ideology). On the other hand, it simultaneously becomes a site of mourning (i.e. a memorial artefact of personal mourning). Dolff-Bonekämper (2008, 2010), in her series of essay on Nazi’s architectural legacy in Germany, raises the issue of a capacity for monumental heritage to trigger dispute from the value perspective. Using the term ‘discord value’, which refers to the qualities of architectural heritage that may be conflicting, she proposes that conflict could be derived from natures of heritage that provoke strong discord, motivating debates. There are five parameters representing potential dissonance, which are local and temporal status (e.g. location and ownership), legal status (e.g. legal ownership and belonging), material status (e.g. material objects and preservation), formal status (e.g. design and shape) and semantic status (e.g. meaning) (ibid).

Perhaps, the most important contribution for understanding people’s interpretation of negative-natured heritage is the work by Uzzell (1989, 1998) on ‘hot interpretation’, which emphasises a strong affective and emotional dimension of heritage experience. The premise of the concept of hot interpretation is that cultural heritage would not simply be experienced in a cognitive way. Rather, it can provoke a passionate and emotional response from people because their memories and experiences colour their response towards the heritage (Uzzell, 1989, 1998; Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998).
Especially, cultural heritage, which relates to wars and conflicts and battlefields (e.g. a front line in West Berlin, massacre sites during wars), remains a hot emotional subject generating strong emotional responses from individuals, groups and communities (Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998). This category of heritage serves a touristic function that provides people with meaning and significance of the heritage and, by extension; it plays a crucial part in community development, such as promotion of the process of community reconciliation or nation building, or defusing religious or ethnic conflicts (Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998; Langley, 2011).

3.2.2 Negative Heritage and National Identity
To date, it has long been the trend to appreciate cultural heritage as ‘a cultural legacy which is both good and necessary, something that should be cherished and preserved, celebrated and promoted for its ability to represent a wide range of social and cultural identities’ (Anico, 2009, p.63). As a symbol of national history and nationalism, predominant emphasis in debate about the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of identity is usually placed on positive aspects of cultural heritage, which supports construction of positive collective identity. However, along with a research boom in cultural heritage, questions have been raised as to whether and in what way negative-natured cultural heritage affects the construction of national or ethnic identity in contemporary society. Given that cultural heritage serves as a physical proof of identity, this type of cultural heritage standing in present-day society becomes problematic and introduces a number of complex and important challenges in terms of the traditional role of cultural heritage in identity construction. For instance, unlike favourable cultural heritage representing a national achievement, negative cultural heritage, such as Nazi concentration camps, war memorials, and communist monuments in Eastern European countries, could convey meanings not welcomed in mainstream society and memories of events that people would prefer to forget today. Additionally, this physical evidence of the past may provide an identity that people today prefer not to maintain (Macdonald, 2006a).

The dilemmas of negative-natured heritage and its relationship to the construction of identity have been actively debated in heritage literature today. For instance, Chung
addresses that negative-natured historic buildings remain ‘a monumental object of the maker and the original owner’. Hence, no matter how the purpose of negative-natured historic buildings has changed, these buildings continue to be associated with painful and shameful periods and remain as historic symbols (ibid). Meskell (2002) points out that negative cultural heritage in a social context can be appropriated for use as a memorial of the past and used for educational purposes today (e.g. Auschwitz, District Six). Otherwise, it could be removed as a form of history that is designated as unworthy and undesirable and cannot be culturally rehabilitated until now (ibid). Examples of this are Nazi monuments and Communist monuments in Eastern European nations. However, fundamental questions about how these links are constructed and maintained remain unresolved.

In constructing arguments about negative heritage and its role in constructing identity, this research draws attention to Tunbridge and Ashworth’s (1996) idea of ‘heritage of atrocity’. In the past several decades, there has been a considerable body of literature devoting attention to emotive heritage of atrocity, such as a legacy of the Nazi regime (e.g. Dolff-Bonekämper, 2002; Macdonald, 2006a, b; Hagen, 2009; Wójcik et al., 2010), concentration camps (e.g. Ashworth, 2002) and massacre sites (e.g. Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998). It also includes battlefields and war memorials (e.g. Young, 1989; Gough, 2004), a legacy of a colonial-era in Third World (e.g. Henderson, 2001a, 2001b; Chadha, 2006; Jones & Shaw, 2006; Marschall, 2008) and communist monuments in Eastern European nations (e.g. Delanty & Jones, 2002; Misztal, 2009). Further representations are a legacy of civil war and other religious, political and cultural conflicts (e.g. Graham, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Dupree, 2002; Landzelius, 2003; De Condappa, 2006; McDowell, 2008; Viejo-Rose, 2011). The common factor from these studies is that they attached great importance to messages about cultural heritage and a sense of place driven from people’s experiences and memories about the heritage. That is to say, historic places associated with atrocity have been viewed as being representative of past conflict due to both the message and the sense of place people perceived (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). Additionally, the heritage comes to act as authentic memorials to painful experiences of the past and thus an explanation of the
present (Harrison et al., 2008). Another key to their arguments is the complexity of socially constructed meanings of cultural heritage (Dolff-Bonekämper, 2010). As the aforementioned, cultural heritage is a contemporary product that is always socially revised, manipulated and contested under the pressure of contemporary demands, interests, or moralities (Witcomb, 2009). Accordingly, heritage of atrocity would also induce controversies in a present-day political and cultural context because it induces many different layers of meanings and values that may be attributed to, or associated with heritage in specific space and time (e.g. Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Ashworth, 1998; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2008). Additionally, due to the intertwining of official memories with personal memories that construct social memories of the past represented through the heritage, the heritage sometime reflects fragmented identities and situates itself in a contested field and in a social context where controversy over identity is caused in present society (Anico & Peralta, 2009).

As far as the impact of negative heritage on the construction of identity is concerned, another interesting observation can be found in Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) and Ashworth’s (2002) study. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996, p.94) recapitulate that:

‘Its memory can so dominate the heritage of individuals or social and political groups, as to have profound effects upon their self-conscious identity to the extent that it may become almost a sine qua non of group cohesion in sects, tribes or states, powerfully motivating their self-image and aspirations, over many centuries’.

In line with this idea, Ashworth (2002, p.363) adds that ‘the memorability of atrocity simply makes it a powerful instrument for those who identify themselves as victims’. This self-identification of collective victim (e.g. victimised national group, ethnic group) plays a crucial role in the construction of people’s membership of a national or ethnic group (e.g. victim-group membership) and becomes a powerful instrument in establishing national identity and state-building, especially in new nations (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Ashworth, 2002). The atrocity experience is generated by perpetration on an entire group of people (i.e. all members of one
country or race) by another entire group of people, or occurred many generations earlier, such as colonialism or racism (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). In a society that was victimised by other national or ethnic groups, cultural heritage associated with victimisation plays a particularly significant role in fostering group cohesion, place identification or ideological legitimation and state-building (ibid). For this reason, negative heritage related to past perpetration and persecution of a national group is frequently used in developing nationalist ideologies for contemporary political purposes (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996).

3.2.3 Conceptualisation of Colonial Heritage in this Research

In conceptualising colonial heritage in relation to national identity, the premise underpinning the theoretical argument in this research is that colonial heritage may serve as a symbol of a national out-group’s identity (i.e. perpetrator) influencing a national in-group identity (i.e. victimised national group). Social psychology literature has emphasised social categorisation of people into out-groups and in-groups, which is an integral part of Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory. Social psychology literature under the Social Identity paradigm begins with the assumption that individuals have general tendencies to categorise themselves either into an in-group or an out-group and create ‘us’ and ‘them’ in any social context in order to perceive or achieve their positive feelings about themselves. This process sometimes leads to the emergence of prejudice towards the out-group (Rousseau & Garcia-Retamero, 2007). This notion has been transferred in recent environmental psychology studies (e.g. Bonaiuto, Breakwell & Cano, 1996; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Bonaiuto & Bonnes, 2000; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Uzzell et al., 2002; Twigger-Ross et al., 2003; Knez, 2005; Hauge, 2007). The idea is put forward that physical environment is an important composition of people’s identity and people interact with physical environment in ways that are important to their sense of identity. For instance, drawing on the Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory, Uzzell et al., (2002) propose place-related social identity. In their research on environmental attitude and behaviour, they demonstrate perceived distinctiveness of their local area over other places (i.e.
distinctiveness) and a sense of continuity based on the community memory associated with the place and the environmental past play a key role in creating positive identity. With this mind, Hauge (2007) provides evidence that dwelling serves as a physical symbol that manifests people’s social status and their success in life. Therefore, it is highly likely that place that can symbolise a positive social identity is always preferred.

With respect to the idea of threat, Social Identity literature addresses that when their group values or traditions are thought to be blocked by an out-group, the lack of group distinctiveness constitutes threats to identity (Esses, Haddock & Zanna, 1993; Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999). These can be in the form of tangible threats derived from its materiality or intangible threats that can emanate from various sources in individuals, communities, or institutional contexts. For example, four distinct types of threats causing intergroup attitudes towards out-groups have been identified by Integrated Threat theorists (e.g. Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald & Tur-Kaspa, 1998; Renfro, Duran, Stephan & Clason, 2006). These types of threats include ‘realistic threats’, ‘cultural and symbolic threats’, ‘intergroup anxieties’ and ‘negative stereotypes’. In a similar way, Branscombe et al. (1999) also illustrate four distinct classes of social identity threats. Firstly, a ‘categorisation threat’ refers to threats posed by unwanted categorisation, ‘threats to the value of social identity’ are posed by undermining the group value, ‘distinctive threat’ is posed by undermining group distinctiveness and the ‘acceptance threat’ is posed by undermining one’s position within the group. Furthermore, Breakwell (1983, 1986) addresses the form threats take can be either ‘material threats’, which would involve changing the resources available to the group, or ‘symbolic threats’, which could involve changing the conceptualisation of the group, primarily through rhetoric and propaganda, or both.

Given the nature of colonial heritage strongly related to national intergroup relationship, it is useful to focus on two unique natures of threats addressed by intergroup relations and conflict study in more detail, which are ‘realistic threats’ and ‘symbolic threats’. ‘Realistic threats’ sometimes overlap with ‘material threats’ and
are resource-based threats (McLaren, 2003). This type of threats is intimately linked to political or economic intimidations to a group and their existence, as well as to physical well-being of the group and its members (Stephan, Ybarra & Bachman, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan, Diaz-Loving & Duran, 2000a; Stephan, Stephan, Demitrakis, Yamada & Clason, 2000b). The threats arise not only from actual group competition for over resources, such as territory, job, and national resources, (i.e. Cambell’s Realistic Group Conflict Theory, 1965) but also from subjective competition that group members perceive from other groups (e.g. power, well-being) (i.e. Stephan & Stephan’s Integrated Threat Theory, 2000) (Esses, Jackson & Armstrong, 1998).

Unlike realistic threats, ‘symbolic threats’ is closely related to the notion of the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). It begins with the assumption that threats are posed by social comparison, which is a way to maintain or enhance individuals’ positive self-esteem. That is to say, the threats occur when individuals perceive that an out-group differs from their own group in terms of norms, morals, values, beliefs and attitudes (Stephan et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2000a, 2000b; Zárate, Garcia, Garza & Hitlan, 2004). These threats negatively affect positive group distinctiveness by intimidating individuals’ perception of the superiority of their groups’ customs, values, or traditions (Falomir-Pichastor, Muñoz-Rojas, Invernizzi & Mugny, 2004; Zárate et al., 2004). This notion of symbolic threats has been supported by both Sears’ (1988) symbolic racism and Stephan and Stephan’s (2000) Integrated Threat Theory. Sears (1988) proposes that threats are perceived from conflicting and violation of values and beliefs between groups. When an out-group obstructs the values, customs, or traditions of the group with which an individual is involved, the in-group members present stronger negative attitudes towards the out-group (Esses et al., 1993). In his research on American identity, Sears (1988) reveals that white Americans perceive threats to identity since they perceive that values of African Americans differ from traditional American values and the threats lead to negative attitudes towards African American (e.g. hostility).
In light of the above illustration, these two different types of threats contribute to understand and conceptualise the nature of threats posed by colonial heritage. Both realistic threats and symbolic threats are complementary, rather than exclusive (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Thus, it implies that threats posed by colonial heritage may be a mixture of realistic and symbolic threats. To a certain extent, colonial heritage may be conceptualised as a source of realistic threats that intimidate the political and economic power of South Korea and the existence of Koreans. The heritage may threaten the physical or psychological well-being of Koreans since it reflects subjective competition that Koreans perceive from Japanese. From the symbolic threats point of view, which may be more relevant in this case, colonial heritage can be conceptualised as a source of a potential danger caused by Japanese with different morals, norms, beliefs, attitudes and values. Colonial heritage may threaten Korean identity since the heritage that reflects values of Japanese conflicts and violates the values and norms of Koreans.

3.3 Perception and Evaluation of Identity Threat

3.3.1 Structure and Process of Identity

Traditionally and conventionally, socially constructed identity (i.e. social identity) has been explained in terms of a group or collective identity that is an extension of a self-concept commonly derived from group memberships, interpersonal relationships, or social position (Tajfel, 1981; Breakwell, 1986, 1993; Brewer, 2001). The notion of Social Identity provides a basic premise of how colonial heritage can be conceptualised as a symbol of perpetrators’ identity threatening indigenous citizens’ national identity. However, what was missing from the notion of Social Identity is an explicit consideration of ways in which colonial heritage affects people’s identity and ways in which individuals deal with their threatened identity.

Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory is concerned with the nature of identity formation and the way in which identity is sustained and manipulated. It constitutes a fruitful theoretical point of departure to provide theoretical evidence of how individuals absorb meanings of colonial heritage into their identity structures, how the heritage contributes to their sense of identity and how they react because of
experiences involving the heritage. The Identity Process Theory is ‘an integrative socio-psychological model of identity construction, threat and coping’ (Jaspal, 2011a, p.18), which has received considerable support in a range of empirical work in the field of social and environmental psychology. This includes migration and threats to identity (e.g. Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000), symbolic threats to multiple identities (e.g. Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010a, 2012b) and the role of physical environment in identity creation (e.g. Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Uzzell, 1996). It builds on the premise that identity is ‘a dynamic social product of interaction of the capacities for memories, consciousness and organised construal (that are characteristics of the biological organism) with the physical and societal structures and influence process which constitute the social context’ (Breakwell, 2001b, p.276). The construction of identity is manifested through an individual’s personal thoughts, actions and emotions and is significantly influenced by social contexts (Breakwell, 2001b; Twigger-Ross et al., 2003). As such, the approach is theoretical; therefore, it is necessary to state at the outset some basic ideas of the identity process theory, which are of particular interest in this research.

This theory begins by proposing a sense of identity is structured with two fundamental dimensions, which are the content dimension and the value dimension (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993). The content dimension includes both unique features of main elements of social identity (e.g. group membership, social categories) and personal identity (e.g. attitudes, values, or cognitive style). The value of each component in the content dimension is dynamically and constantly reappraised and modified because of changes in value systems (e.g. degree of importance, the salience of identity components in the social context, and the individual’s position) (Twigger-Ross et al., 2003). A key assumption of the Identity Process Theory is that individuals are ‘self-constructors’ of their identity (Breakwell, 1986, 1993). Even though the construction process of their identity is under the control of contemporary social values (e.g. social representations), individuals actively evaluate the status of their identity (i.e. ‘self-aware’) and remove, replace and renovate elements of identity to maintain a desirable identity (‘self-constructors’) using psychological processes (Breakwell, 1986, 1993, 2001a, 2001b, 2010; Timotijevic &
Breakwell, 2000). The theory proposes two dynamic psychological processes of individuals, namely ‘the process of assimilation (i.e. the absorption of new elements)-accommodation (i.e. the adjustment of the existing structure to locate new elements)’, which explain how identity absorbs new information into its structure based on the memory system, and ‘the process of evaluation’ (i.e. the distribution of value to the elements). Firstly, individuals adopt new elements of their personal identity and social identity into the already existing identity (i.e. assimilation) and adjust and find a place for the new identity elements; consequently, the elements become a part of the identity (i.e. accommodation). Afterwards, by constantly evaluating the contents of identity, individuals allocate meanings and values to both new and old identity contents (i.e. evaluation). Although the change of contents and value of identity is decided following interaction of these assimilation-accommodation and evaluation processes, these are rather subjective (Breakwell, 1993; Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000).

Recent environment studies under the Identity Process Theory paradigm reveal that physical environment influences people’s identity by either positively or negatively impacting multiple psychological motivations that structure their identity (e.g. Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Uzzell, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Wester-Herber, 2004; Hauge, 2007). Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) adopt psychological motivations of identity that the Identity Process Theory proposes and clarify the process of identity construction and what motivations of identity become salient through living in a particular residential area. They empirically demonstrate that residential area is a means to maintaining and enhancing a sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, continuity and distinctiveness. Particularly, levels of attachment to the environment play a meaningful role in a sense of identity through people’s residential environment. In their research on dynamic natures of the relationship between replacement of place (i.e. community) and identity change, Speller (2000) and Speller et al. (2002) also demonstrate that place serves as a component of individuals’ identity. Using motivations of identity proposed by the Identity Process Theory, they propose that changing environmental and social context (i.e. community) facilitates residents changing levels of their
distinctiveness (i.e. from group distinctiveness to personal distinctiveness) and continuity (i.e. past self and future self).

3.3.2 Principal Motivations of Identity

Whilst interest in contents of social identity focused mainly on a sense of self-esteem as a source of positive identity, Breakwell (1986, 1988, 1993) proposed the Identity Process Theory as a remarkable exception concerned with multiple psychological motivations that construct a sense of identity. She proposes four principal motivations that play a crucial role in operating the identity process of assimilation-accommodation and evaluation. These are a sense of personal worth and social value (i.e. self-esteem), a sense of competence and being in control of one’s life (i.e. self-efficacy), a need to maintain personal uniqueness or distinctiveness from others (i.e. distinctiveness) and a feeling that the self remains the same across time and situations (i.e. continuity) (Breakwell, 1986, 1993). Following Breakwell (1986, 1988, 1993), the existence of multiple motivations of identity has empirically been evidenced by much of identity literature under their own research interests, such as Timotijevic and Breakwell’s (2000) study of threat to identity experienced by Yugoslavian migrants, as well as Vignoles, Chryssochou and Breakwell’s (2002a) study of motivational principles in shaping Anglican parish priests’ identity. Other examples are Vignoles, Manzi, Regalia, Jemmolo and Scabini’s (2008) study on the reflection of identity motives in people’s future selves; Jaspal and Coyle’s (2009) study on role of language in British South Asian’s identities; Jaspal and Cinnirella’s (2010b) study on identity construction through media representation; and Jaspal’s (2011b) study on the function of caste-based social stigma for Indian identity. Detailed explanation of identity motivations that have been universally highlighted is presented later in this section.

Each identity motivation has been given equivalent importance in managing the identity process (Breakwell, 1993; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996). However, their salience may vary over time, and across situations and social and cultural contexts (ibid). Even developmental change of individuals across their lifespan (e.g. growth of cognitive capacity) is related to the change of the relative significance of these
motivations (Breakwell, 1993). In this respect, a certain motivation does not universally determine the experience of identity threats across situations. In perceiving identity threats, different motivations may relate differently to each other, according to the cultural, contextual or developmental basis. For instance, Uzzell et al.’s (2002) place-related social identity study examining the roles of social cohesion, residential satisfaction and place identification reveals that only two of these motivations (i.e. distinctiveness and continuity) are salient evaluative criteria in the conceptualisations of place-related social identity. Moreover, recent literature under the umbrella of the Identity Process Theory (e.g. Vignoles, Regalia, Manzi, Golledge & Scabini, 2006; Jaspal & Coyle, 2009; Jaspal, 2011b, 2012; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010a) has also extended the Identity Process Theory by evaluating the applicability of these identity motivations in their study context. Vignoles and his colleagues (e.g. Vignoles et al., 2006; Vignoles et al., 2008) have developed a customised identity model incorporating two further motivations. These include ‘meaning’, which refers to a desire to have an ultimately meaningful existence in society and ‘belonging’, which refers to a desire to retain a sense of acceptance by and closeness to others. In relation to physical environment, Droseltis and Vignoles (2010) expand on Vignoles and colleagues’ model of identity by adding three motivations, such as ‘security’, ‘control’ and ‘aesthetic needs’, for the prediction of people’s identification with places. Furthermore, in relation to ethnic conflicts and a sense of ethnic identity, Jaspal and his colleagues (Jaspal & Coyle, 2009; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010a; Jaspal, 2011b, 2012) proposed ‘psychological coherence’, which refers to the need for personal perceptions of consistency between an individual’s pre-existing identities (e.g. ethnic and religious identity). The present research focuses on four principal motivations of identity originally proposed by the Identity Process Theory since these motivations have universally been highlighted in numerous social identity studies.

3.3.2.1 Self-Esteem

Self-esteem, which has been conceived as a core motivation in traditional social psychology study, refers to the desire for a positive evaluation of self or a group to which the person is involved (Breakwell, 1992; Speller, 2000). This motivation has
sometimes been conceived as a principal identity motivation, putting other identity motivations under one great umbrella (Tajfel, 1982; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Speller, 2000). However, self-esteem has recently been appreciated as a unique psychological motivation, concerned with feelings of personal worth and social value, such as a sense of self-pride, confidence, and personal achievement in the situation in a range of social literature (e.g. Breakwell, 1986, 1992; Twigger-Ross, 1994; Lyons, 1996; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000). The ways to achieve self-esteem is culture specific (Vignoles et al., 2006). However, for positive self-esteem, it is generally acknowledged that individuals tend to engage in a range of self-enhancement or self-improvement activities, such as a change of attitude, selective perception and social comparison, seeking to value information, changing the attribution process and amplifying intergroup discrimination (Breakwell, 1988, 1993). A plethora of place studies demonstrate the person-environment relationship maintaining or enhancing individuals’ sense of self-esteem (e.g. Korpela, 1989; Lalli, 1992; Twigger-Ross, 1994; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Knez, 2005). According to common consensus, the association with a physical environment that has both physical and symbolic qualities (e.g. prestigious place, special place, interesting place to live, historic place, etc.) provides individuals with a positive feeling about themselves and boosts their self-esteem. For instance, Twigger-Ross (1994) and Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) studies on residents’ relationships with local areas and their sense of identity demonstrate that the association with positively evaluated place provokes a positive feeling to residents and consequently boosts their positive self-esteem (e.g. ‘living in Docklands makes me feel good about myself’). Especially, residents who are attached to their living area are more likely to achieve self-esteem by association with the area that harmonises with their values and desires.

3.3.2.2 Self-Efficacy
Self-efficacy is strongly linked to individuals’ feeling of competence and control of their life (Breakwell, 1988). This desire has been recognised sometimes as an element of self-esteem (ibid). However, many recent researches have empirically demonstrated that self-efficacy is one of the distinct identity motivations that induce
greater physical and subjective well-being (e.g. Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000; Vignoles et al., 2002a; Vignoles et al., 2006; Vignoles et al., 2008; Jaspal & Coyle, 2009; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010a; Jaspal, 2011b). Since the absence of self-efficacy leads to feelings of futility, alienation, depression and helplessness (Breakwell, 1993), individuals have a tendency to exaggerate their abilities to have control over the situation (Vignoles et al., 2006). For instance, Timotijevic and Breakwell’s (2000) study on migrants’ sense of identity reveals the unstable and unpredictable social context (e.g. national context) significantly decreases people’s feelings of their capabilities to have control over their life and consequently induces negative feelings about themselves, such as sadness, anger, guilt and disbelief, which become major sources of threats to self-efficacy. Under the threats, people attempt to maintain their self-efficacy by looking for a certain level of their ability to manage the situation or drawing on something positive from the negative experience they are faced with (e.g. self-change, self-growth, increased responsibility). With respect to self-efficacy associated with physical environment, a sense of manageability has frequently been highlighted in the field of place study (e.g. Twigger-Ross, 1994; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000). Manageability in the place study refers to individuals’ perception of control over the environment and daily lives with a minimum level of stress (e.g. level of crime/safety, public services, pollution, social environment, etc.) (ibid). That is to say, individuals could maintain or establish their self-efficacy not only if they perceive ability to function competently and autonomously in a social and physical environment, but also if the environment supports their everyday lifestyle (i.e. functional aspects of the physical environment). The breakdown of manageability of the environment results in feelings of futility, alienation and helplessness and, consequently, they may leave the area (ibid).

3.3.2.3 Distinctiveness
This desire is intimately linked to a sense of differentiation from others which take on not only a fundamental human need but also a key element in constructing meaning within identity (Vignoles, Chrysochoou & Breakwell, 2000; Vignoles, Chrysochoou & Breakwell, 2002b). A sense of distinctiveness is often subsumed under self-esteem because it has been considered as a way of self-enhancement.
involving the activities of interpersonal or intergroup comparisons emphasising differences between self and others (Breakwell, 1993). Individuals can achieve positive distinctiveness using multiple sources, which include their position within social relationships (e.g. position in family relationship, intergroup relation and community, professional position, social status, etc.) and difference in individuals’ intrinsic qualities (e.g. individuals’ abilities, opinions, traits, physical characteristics, etc.). Others include group membership (e.g. professional knowledge or ability, etc.) and social categorisation (e.g. uniqueness of community, etc.) and separateness from others (e.g. feelings of independence, privacy, etc.) (Vignoles et al., 2000, 2002b).

Group distinctiveness is achieved by a process of social categorization and social comparison (i.e. categorizing themselves into their in-group and out-groups and comparing their in-group with out-groups for demonstrating the advantage of their group), which have an important place within the Social Identity Theory (e.g. Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Speller et al. 2002). It is noteworthy that, rather than seeking extreme difference, a balance between difference and similarity within or between groups from others (i.e. the moderate levels of difference) is a key in maintaining or enhancing individuals’ positive distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991; Vignoles et al., 2000, 2002b). This is because the loss of distinctiveness (e.g. an out-group position merged into the dominant group) provokes a distress of the ambiguous boundary of ethnic, historical, cultural, and, as well as loss of self within group, whereas excessive distinctiveness induces feelings of alienation, isolation and marginality (Breakwell, 1993; Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000; Brewer, 2003).

When a sense of distinctiveness is threatened, people engage in a range of cognitive or behavioural reactions to maintain positive distinctiveness. For example, they identify themselves with groups that are more distinctive, define in-group membership more restrictively, discover or create another dimension of comparison, or completely avoid social comparison (Vignoles et al., 2000; Vignoles et al. 2006).

Research conducted by environmental psychologists shows that physical environment or subjects help individuals maintain or enhance their sense of distinctiveness. Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) found that people can achieve a positive distinctiveness by associating with the residential environment that provides
unique lifestyles that positively differ from the lives of those living in other areas. Individuals have a feeling of uniqueness from personal life history associated with a certain place with respect to the personal distinctiveness level. They also have a feeling of uniqueness by expressing valued attributes of their settlement at the settlement identification level. At the place identification level, they tend to distinguish themselves from residents of other places positively (i.e. seeing different types of people in a specific area). At the local identification level, they emphasise the importance of recognising people and being recognised themselves. Speller et al.’s (2002) research on relocation of community and identity change also empirically demonstrates that residents’ sense of both group and personal distinctiveness are significantly influenced by changes in a socio-physical environment. This shows that the changes to socio-physical environment lead to diminishing a sense of group distinctiveness (e.g. sameness, undifferentiated group salience) and facilitating a sense of individual distinctiveness.

3.3.2.4 Continuity

A sense of continuity is associated with a wish to maintain stable self-conceptions and feelings of connection across time and situations within identity, despite changes in one’s social environment (Breakwell, 1986, 1992, 1993; Vignoles et al., 2002a; Jaspal, 2011). This motivation differs from ‘consistency’, which refers to the absence of change in that it is associated with growth (i.e. progression) and change (i.e. turning point) of self-conception for development of the same identity, (Breakwell, 1993; Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000; Vignoles et al., 2006). Thus, a sense of continuity requires negotiation against perceived change in self-conception in their life course (Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000). Timotijevic and Breakwell’s (2000) study on immigrants and their sense of identity reveals that negotiation against perceived change is always necessary for maintaining a sense of continuity because immigrants’ present identity (e.g. ethnic identity) could be structural and contextual barriers to maintain their identity in a new society.

A strong relationship between physical environment and maintenance of a sense of continuity has been found in a number of environmental psychology studies (e.g.
Korpela, 1989; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Knez, 2005). Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) address that physical place can be used not only to maintain continuity of self but also to create, symbolise and establish new self. They clarify two distinctive natures of place-related continuity: ‘place referent continuity’ and ‘place congruent continuity’. ‘Place referent continuity’ refers to a group or person’s sense of continuity, which is established via place dependent memories. It defines place as a symbol of individuals’ identity representing their past, present and future selves. Place becomes a reference for past actions and experiences that individuals or groups wish to preserve; that is to say, the place acts as a memorial to their past, which embodied emotional significance for them. Korpela (1989) supports this type of continuity by addressing that individuals can recall their past through specific places and use the places as a concrete background not only in comparing themselves at different times but also in creating coherence and continuity in their self-conception. As place plays a role in anchoring place-referent memories, the loss of the place that embodied symbolic meanings and importance would represent a discontinuity for individuals or groups’ identities (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002). Speller (2000) and Speller et al.’s (2002) studies of forced relocation of residential area show evidence that residents’ sense of continuity has significantly been threatened by unwanted disruptions to their community, which is an emotionally salient place. Given that places where people have a strong sense of attachment act as a symbol of important personal past events in their lives, place-referent continuity is closely associated with a sense of attachment to place (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996). Unlike ‘place-congruent continuity’, ‘place-referent continuity’ is established via characteristics of places that fit with their values (ibid). In this light, place can be defined as a quality environment representing their desires and values. Hence, not only do they find and choose a place that represents their desire and values but they also attempt to change a place to represent continuity of self (ibid).

3.3.3 Conceptualisation of Identity Threat
What induces identity threats has been given a considerable attention in social identity literature. Many concepts share the notion that aversive situations or
experiences become a threat that challenges positive sense of identity. As far as personal identity is concerned, any elements including thoughts, feelings, actions or experiences challenging an individual’s self-esteem become a serious threat to personal or social identities (Breakwell, 1983, 1986). As far as group identity is concerned, any objective challenge to the power of groups that influences the capacity to control the social process can be considered an identity threat (ibid). The forms that these threats take vary. As mentioned in the earlier section in this chapter (i.e. Section 3.2.3), these can be in the form of realistic threats or symbolic or cultural threats that can emanate from various sources, such as individuals or other group relationships. Of particular importance in this regard is that threats to identity of a group and its members are inter-dependent and responses to threats to group identity will take place simultaneously at group and individual levels (ibid).

Under the Social Identity paradigm, the identity threat can be conceptualised in terms of group memberships and intergroup relations. Social psychology literature under the Social Identity paradigm begins with a notion that individuals have general tendencies to maintain their positive feelings about themselves by categorising and then positioning themselves as a member of a particular group. In this regard, the group to which people belong plays an important role in achieving their positive identity. However, associating with a certain group may induce threats to their sense of identity because this may place them at risk of stereotyping, negative representation, or prejudice (Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000). As a result, the group membership would challenge their self-definition and self-esteem. Additionally, intergroup relation literature drawing on the Social Identity paradigm addresses that threat to identity occurs when one group has capabilities or intentions to cause negative reactions to other groups (Crisp, Hutter & Young, 2009; Davis, 2000; cited in Rousseau & Garcia-Retamero, 2007). In this light, threats can be understood in terms of negative representation of out-group relationships or negative interdependence between groups (Falomir-Pichastor et al, 2004).

Under the Identity Process paradigm, threats to identity can be construed in a threefold manner. Firstly, the Identity Process Theory calls attention to multiple
psychological motivations in understanding threatened identity. Unlike social psychology literature under the Social Identity paradigm, which has mainly approached threats from the single motivation perspective (i.e. self-esteem or distinctiveness); Breakwell (1986, 1988) classifies identity threats into four different motivational threats, such as threatened self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity. Breakwell (1986, pp.46-47) states:

‘A threat to identity occurs when the processes of identity, assimilation-accommodation and evaluation are, for some reason, unable to comply with the principles of continuity, distinctiveness and self-esteem, which habitually guide their operation’.

That is to say, anything that challenges individuals’ sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity could be a serious threat to personal or social identities. There is growing evidence of the operation of these four different motivational threats in a social context, such as threatened identity due to pollution of the local environment (e.g. Bonaiuto et al., 1996), immigration and ethnic conflicts (e.g. Timotijevic, 2000; Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000), and forced dislocation of physical environment (e.g. Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002). Other examples include language use and ethnic identification (e.g. Jaspal & Coyle, 2009), negative social representation of in-group identification (e.g. Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010), social stigma and ethnic group identification (e.g. Jaspal, 2011b), conflicts of multiple identities (e.g. Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010b, 2012a; Jaspal & Siraj, 2011) and behaviour change towards environment sustainability (e.g. Murtagh, Gatersleben & Uzzell, 2012).

Secondly, by seeing threats as both a subjective and objective existence, the Identity Process Theory proposes two different natures of identity threats, which are ‘internal threats’ and ‘external threats’, forcing individuals to change not only their content dimension of identity (e.g. group membership, roles and social categories) but also value dimensions of identity (e.g. their values, attitudes and cognitive style). The internal threats originate from the threatened subjective understanding of the threat,
whereas the external threats originate from objective understanding of a change of social context. Any sort of personal change in the social matrix (e.g. changing position in relation to the social matrix, changing group membership) and social change (e.g. a modification in the size or number of groups, changing power relationship and ideologies) may act as a threat if the change challenges the four motivations of identity guiding the process of identity. For example, in a study on caste-based stigma and identity, Jaspal (2011b) investigates negative social representations of the lower caste group threatening the self-esteem among group members. Another example is from Jaspal and Coyle’s (2009, 2010a, 2010b) study on language and identity in which they identify the use of a given language challenging ethnic identity because language is a marker of identity.

Lastly, the Identity Process Theory emphasises the importance of individuals’ conscious awareness of threats in the perception of external threats. Breakwell (1986, p.48) makes a distinction between ‘the occurrence of social change’ and ‘its conscious recognition’. She addresses that although individuals are located in a position that has potential to threaten their identity (i.e. the occurrence of social change), they cannot experience the threats until they are aware of the threats. Threats gain power to threaten identity when the social context in which the individuals live and the individuals themselves add specific meanings to them (ibid). This implies that individuals’ experience of the threat is subjective. Additionally, the perception of threats relies heavily on individuals’ awareness of the threats that challenge their motivations of identity. In this sense, avoiding conscious awareness of the threats and constructing new meanings is strongly related to self-protection (ibid). Breakwell (2001b, p.273) states that ‘the personalising of social representation is part of that process of establishing and protecting an identity’. Empirical examples are found from Riggs and Coyle’s (2002) study concerning psychological well-being and identity of the homeless. They identify being homeless as a threatening social position because they feel isolated, disoriented, rejected or alienated and, consequently, they lose their sense of identity and personhood. However, some participants did not appear to perceive threats to identity.
because they subjectively construct positive meanings for their current situation, such as preparation for future self without a home.

3.3.4 Contextual Determinants of Perception of Identity Threats

Cultural heritage that evokes the past is appreciated differently according to different people or communities (e.g. Tunbridge, 1984; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Ashworth, 1998; Hall, 1999; Smith, 2006). Moreover, meanings of heritage and a sense of identity are subject to not only what is interpreted, but also how it is interpreted and by whom (e.g. Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Smith, 2006). With respect to the subjective perception and evaluation of threats, social identity literature calls attention to a range of social and personal elements (e.g. Turner, 1999; Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1997, 2002; Spears Doosje & Ellemers, 1997; Doosje, Ellemers & Spear, 1999; Branscombe et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2000a, 2000b; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002; Rousseau & Garcia-Retamero, 2007). This research focuses on salient contextual determinants that frequently appear in social and environmental literature, which are group affiliation, group interaction in socio-historic context, the perceived group status inequalities and emotional attachment to place.

3.3.4.1 Group Affiliation and Perception of Threats

With respect to a sense of identity contingent upon group comparisons, social identity literature has provided evidence for the claim that individuals’ perception of threats and their reactions to threatened group identity rely heavily upon prior levels of their group identification (e.g. national group affiliation). For instance, Branscombe et al. (1999) and Doosje et al. (1999) demonstrate that those strongly affiliated with their group are more likely to experience threats from out-groups than those who are less closely tied to their own group membership. Lower identifiers who do not feel strong ties with their own group are less likely to be threatened by the undermined group’s distinctiveness because not only do they consider the distinction between their own group and out-groups as less crucial, but they also express less interest in the improvement of their group’s status (ibid). These descriptions are repeatedly stressed by a series of Stephan and his colleagues’ studies.
on an Integrated Threat Theory of prejudice (e.g. Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). Their studies empirically reveal that high levels of group identification may inflate the salience of realistic threats, cultural and symbolic threats, intergroup anxieties and negative stereotypes.

The level of group identification also leads to differential responses to identity threats. Social identity literature (e.g. Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Branscombe et al., 1999; Ellemers et al., 1997, 2002) has provided evidence for the assumption that individuals with either low or high identification differ in their reactions to threats. Branscombe et al. (1999) address that when threats occur to the group’s values (i.e. symbolic threats), the reactions of both high and low identifiers may be equally defensive. However, real responses by individuals make may take differential forms. For instance, Branscombe and Wann (1994) address that when under threat; those with strong affiliation to their own group membership are more likely to derogate out-groups than those with lower group affiliation. Particularly, when group distinctiveness is threatened, they tend to induce out-group derogation or discrimination as a reaction to cope with threatened identity. Ellemers, et al. (1997, 2002) also address different coping strategies that individuals employ according to their levels of group affiliation. When their group’s values are under threat, individuals with strong affiliation to their own group membership are more likely to express intergroup differentiation in order to improve their own group’s status at the behaviour level or to express their loyalty to their group at the emotional level. By contrast, individuals with lower affiliation to their own group membership tend to leave or they become disassociated with their own group.

3.3.4.2 Group Interaction in a Socio-historic Context

Breakwell (1983) addresses that, without considering their historic and social context, it is difficult to see how individual or group identities are established. Similarly, individuals’ reactions to threats are also constructed within the social context and identities (Branscombe et al., 1999; Ellemers, Sprears & Doosje, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al, 2002). In connection with the social context, several key determinants, strongly related to one another,
have frequently been identified in social identity literature, such as history of intergroup conflict, qualities of out-group contact and levels of threat exposure. A series of Stephan and his colleagues’ studies on individuals’ perception of threats and their attitude towards gender, cultural and racial groups (e.g. Stephan et al., 2000a, 2000b; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002) prove convincingly that the quality of interactions with other groups affects their experience of threats from those groups. Regardless of whether it is direct or indirect, the acquired negativity derived from unpleasant intergroup interactions (e.g. wars) intensifies individuals’ perception of threats and consequently results in their negative attitude towards the out-group (Crisp et al., 2009). For instance, Stephan et al. (2000a) demonstrate that more favourable contact with ethnic out-groups (e.g. Mexican) results in less threats being felt by the ethnic in-group (e.g. American). Conversely, the more intensive the negative contacts, the more the out-group is likely to be experienced as threats (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2000b; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). Similarly, the greater the intergroup threats and conflicts, the more antagonism is showed towards the sources of the threats (Esses et al., 1998; Branscombe et al., 1999). A series of studies also provide evidence that the greater and more violent the historic experiences of conflict among groups, the more threatened individuals are likely to perceive through the out-groups (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). For instance, Stephan et al. (2002) report that blacks and whites who know the past conflict between two ethnic groups are more likely to perceive both realistic threats (i.e. threats based on economic and political resources) and symbolic threats (i.e. threats based on different values, beliefs and norms). Another frequently mentioned determinant related to the foregoing can be observed in connection with levels of threat exposure. As far as the social context is concerned, Crisp et al. (2009) prove convincingly that high exposure to identity threats in a social context can affect individuals’ feeling towards the out-group (e.g. dislike). Stephan and Stephan (2000) also support this by addressing that conflict or other types of controversy between groups in the past or present play a crucial role in creating prejudice towards the out-group.
3.3.4.3 Perceived Group Status Inequality

As far as individuals’ perception of threats posed by an out-group is concerned, recent intergroup relation literature has emphasised the significance of perceived group status inequalities to the perception of identity threats (e.g. Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002). As the aforementioned, a group to which individuals belong plays a crucial role in maintaining or enhancing their positive identity. However, perceived disparity between their group and out-groups may increase threats to their sense of identity and lead group members to experience out-groups as threats (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). For example, salient disparities in power and economy between groups are more likely to lead a lower-status group (e.g. blacks) to perceive economic and political threats from a higher-status group (e.g. whites). Conversely, the higher-status group may also experience the lower-status group as a threat because their own group’s values may be challenged by the group perceived to have inferior values. Esses et al. (1998, p.704) further add that ‘out-groups that are salient and distinct from one’s own group are more likely to stand out as potential competitors’. Additionally, when threatening information or behaviour is intentionally directed at their group by an out-group, the out-group may be perceived as a greater competitor than others. In this sense, certain out-groups seem to be perceived as greater competitors than others and the out-group becomes an object of identity threats so that feelings of being threatened are transformed into an attitude of hostility (ibid). The perception of group status inequalities also results in biased perception of their group, although there appears to be no overall agreement with the prediction. For instance, Brewer (1979) reveals that individuals in a low status group tend to engage in in-group bias because they should have a stronger need to feel good about themselves (e.g. in-group favouritism). However, the results of Mullen, Brown and Smith’s (1992) study contradict this with members in a high status group showing more bias than those in a lower status group. Despite no overall agreement with the prediction, it appears that individuals’ psychological reactions rely on their perception of the status of a group to which they belong.
3.3.4.4 Emotional Attachment to Place

With respect to perception and evaluation of threats, the salient contextual determinant that frequently appears in environmental psychology literature is degrees of attachment to place, which refers to unique subjective experience and positive emotional bonds of individuals to a certain place (Altman & Low, 1992). A subjective experience and emotional bond to the physical environment, called ‘place attachment’, has been emphasised as one of the key elements in constructing place-related social identity (e.g. Low & Altman, 1992; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000; Hidalgo & Hernadez, 2001; Giuliani, 2003; Lewicka, 2008). When a sense of attachment to physical environment (e.g. home, neighbourhood, and town) grows, individuals start to identify themselves with the environment, which means individuals’ identities are based on the environment to some extent (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Twigger-Ross, Bonaiuto & Breakwell, 2003; Giuliani, 2003; Hauge, 2007). For instance, Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) demonstrate that people would explain who they are by referring to where they live, which implies that the place has become an element of identity (i.e., identification) and a source to maintain desirable levels of their self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity. At the personal level, since a sense of attachments is promoted by personal experiences with physical environment (e.g. affective feelings towards home and neighbourhood), the attachment to the place plays an important role in individuals’ personal identity (Milligan, 1998; Gustafson, 2001; Manzo, 2003, 2005). At the community level, since daily encounters with place, community and collective involvement play a big part in creating collective social attachment, the attachment to the place is important to their feelings of community identity (Uzzell, Pol & Badenas, 2002; Speller, 2000; Speller, Lyons & Twigger-Ross, 2002; Knez, 2005; Lewicka, 2008).

Recently, the role of a sense of attachment is highlighted under the condition of threats. A sense of place attachment has been considered a key determinant in perceptions of a physical environment that threatens individuals’ identity in a number of place studies, such as threat posed by dislocation of place (e.g. Fried, 1963, 2000; Dixon & Durrheim, 2004; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002). Other threats include
degradation of environment quality (e.g. Bonaiuto et al., 1996), settlement under condition of risk (e.g. Billig, 2006) and development of new facilities (e.g. Vorkinn & Riese, 2001; Devine-Wright, 2009; Devine-Wright & Howes, 2010). These studies reach near universal consensus that perception of threats is rather subjective. For instance, Bonaiuto et al.’s (1996) case study of perception of polluted beaches and individuals’ attitudes towards the polluted beaches reveals that residents with high levels of attachment to the beaches are less likely to perceive the places as polluted. That is to say, people who have strongly attached to a place are less likely to consider the undesirable features of the place (ibid). Those highly attached to a certain place tend to highlight positive aspects of the place under the condition of threats. Similarly, a study carried by Billig (2006) proposes that because individuals’ perceptions and evaluations of threats are irrational, the perception of threats is not necessarily congruent with a realistic probability of the occurrence of threats. He demonstrates that Jewish people with higher attachment to a settlement known to be dangerous (i.e. Gaza region) were less likely to perceive the settlement is risky. Additionally, with respect to reaction, environmental literature proposes that individuals with higher place attachment are more likely to be sensitive towards threats posed by the change of environment. Williams et al. (1992) reveal that those who are highly attached to a specific place may be more threatened by change to the place and thus they are more likely to oppose the changed environment. Additionally, Devine-Wright (2009) and Devine-Wright and Howes’ (2010) studies of new development projects and place-protection action identify that those with strong attachment to a certain place perceive identity threat from conflict between the new development project and the place, which leads to negative attitudes and oppositional behaviour.

3.4 Coping with Identity Threat

3.4.1 Coping Reaction in an Individual Context

Over the last decades, the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) has had immense appeal for identifying individuals’ reactions to deal with threats to their sense of identity. Three basic strategies to acquire positive feelings of selves, such as social mobility, social change and social creativity, have
frequently emerged in literature under the social identity paradigm. Tajfel and Turner (1986) address that these coping strategies are chosen by threatened individuals on the basis of stability, legitimacy and permeability of their group status. Members of a negatively evaluated group will try to disassociate or leave themselves from the group physically and psychologically (i.e. social mobility) when the boundaries of social categories are permeable. When social categories have impermeable boundaries, threatened individuals search for a new comparison dimension, leading to more favourable comparisons being made for the group to which they belong (i.e. social creativity). This includes re-evaluating the original comparison dimension (i.e. recreating new meanings) and searching for a new comparison group lower in status than their group (i.e. downward comparison rather than upward comparison). Alternatively, they directly challenge or confront a group threatening their identity for the change of the relative status of the two groups (e.g. riots, strikes) (i.e. social change). If the above strategies are not possible, the negative social identity can be accepted by individuals (i.e. acceptance).

Ellemers et al. (2002) make interesting observations on coping strategies in the Social Identity tradition, proposing six different types of individuals’ coping reactions by considering individuals’ levels of group commitment and features of the social context. Threatened individuals employ different coping strategies, such as non-involvement to coping reactions (in the case of no threat, low group loyalty) and expression of their identity (in the case of no threat, high group loyalty). Other strategies include ‘self-affirmation’ (in the case of the threat directed to self, low group loyalty), ‘acceptance’ (in the case of the threat directed to self, high group loyalty), ‘individual mobility’ (in the case of the threat directed to a group, low group loyalty) and ‘group affirmation’ (in the case of the threat directed to a group, high group loyalty) (ibid). More recently, Petriglieri (2011) put forward a comprehensive analysis of coping responses to identity threats. She conceptualises a model for an identity threat response by categorising a range of coping reactions into two broad groups, such as ‘identity-protection response’ and ‘identity-reconstructing responses’. The responses in the former category include derogation (i.e. discrediting the source’s validity), concealment (i.e. concealing threatened
identity) and positive distinctiveness (i.e. providing identity-enhancing information). The responses in the latter category are directed towards changing a feature of the threatened identity. Threatened individuals may change the importance of their threatened identity (i.e. change of importance), modify the meanings linked to the threatened identity (i.e. change of meanings), or abandon the threatened identity (i.e. identity exit).

In approaching the coping strategies, Breakwell (1986, 1988, 1993) takes things one step further by elucidating a range of coping strategies that operate in different levels of context. She addresses that individuals employ coping strategies in order to seek to maintain identity motivations when they perceive identity threats and she defines this coping strategy as ‘any thought or action which succeeds in eliminating or ameliorating threat, whether it is consciously recognised as intentional or not’ (Breakwell, 1986, p.79). This implies that threatened individuals are employing a range of psychological or physical actions to alleviate perceived threats to their self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity and sometimes without their intention to acknowledge the action as a means of self-protection. She categorises a range of potential reactions for coping with threats into three different types of coping strategies, which are removal of aspects of the social context that generate threats; the movement of individuals into new social positions that are less threatening and revision of identity structures, enabling the identity processes to operate again according to four identity motivations. Although they sometimes overlap each other, these self-protection strategies are operated in three different levels of context, which are intra-psychic, interpersonal and intergroup levels (ibid).

The intra-psychic coping strategy, which is considered the most primary coping reaction, relies heavily on individuals’ identity process (i.e. assimilation-accommodation and evaluation) (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993). In order to alleviate perceived threats, threatened individuals either resist modifying their identity structure in ways demanded by the threatening positing identity, called a deflection strategy, or change their identity in ways that break identity motivations, called an acceptance strategy, at their level of cognition, emotion and values (ibid).
The deflection strategy could best be described as psychological self-defence (ibid). Threatened individuals deny the distressing reality or the existence of the threat (i.e. denial), or do not recognise themselves by standing outside of themselves and observing themselves in a disconnected way (i.e. temporary depersonalisation). For instance, individuals strongly attached to their own town or nation, who perceive the place as a vital component of their identity, engage in denial of physical assessment of environmental pollution to cope with the threat caused by the situation (Bonaiuto et al., 1996). Threatened individuals also attempt to remove a threat or switch it with a more acceptable form of reality by inventing mental images that enhance positive identity (i.e. fantasy). For instance, donor offspring, who feel a threatened sense of continuity due to unawareness of their donor fathers, often employ fantasy as a coping strategy to diminish this sense of loss (Turner & Coyle, 2000). Alternatively, the individuals re-interpret or re-define the threatened situation or its implication in order to eliminate its power to do this (i.e. re-construal and re-attribution).

In contrast to the deflection strategy, the acceptance strategy could best be described as self-redefinition of identity, which leads to a change of identity structure with the minimum amount of damage in order to diminish or remove identity threats (Breakwell, 1986). To alleviate threats, threatened individuals reconstruct their identity structure in advance of the threat occurring (i.e. the use of anticipatory restructuring of the identity) or set a boundary around the dissatisfying contents of their identity that may threaten the rest of their identity (i.e. compartmentalism). Alternatively, they modify meanings of identity content (i.e. compromise changes in identity) or bring about fundamental change in their identity structure by sacrificing any or all content of identity and assimilating the new components into identity when identity motivations are threatened (i.e. fundamental change). Furthermore, they switch the relative salience of identity motivations (i.e. salience of principles). In this sense, the acceptance strategy is a process of creative adaptation rather than merely capitulation to the threat (ibid). Literature reveals that these strategies have frequently been used when individuals’ multiple conflicting identities provoke a sense of identity threat. For instance, an individual suffering from managing
multiple conflicting identities (e.g. sexual, religious and ethnic identities) de-emphasises his sexual identity to deal with relationships with others (Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010a).

Intra-psychic coping strategies relying on the process of evaluation are linked to the process of subjective re-evaluation of individuals’ content of identity through social comparisons with others, as well as intrapersonal comparison that compare past and potential structures (Breakwell, 1986). Thus, threats could be diminished or removed through devaluing the element of identity that is to be threatened or simply focusing on some other element of identity and giving greater value. These psychological reactions involve changing the criteria against which it is judged, associating with another positively valued characteristic and challenging other people’s right to make judgements about the characteristic. For instance, when individuals perceive threats due to conflict of their dual identities (e.g. ethnic and religious identities), they attempt to prioritise two identities to maintain positive sense of identity (Jaspal & Coyle, 2009). A donor offspring who has threatened self-identity rejects her negative identity by exaggerating the value of her donor father and diminishing the value of her social father (Turner & Coyle, 2000).

Unlike intra-psychic coping strategies mainly grounded in a person’s cognition, emotion and values, interpersonal coping strategies rely more on interpersonal action, such as negotiation with others, in order to eradicate aspects of the social environment that generate identity threats. If stigma attached to a social group threatens individuals’ positive feelings of themselves, the threatened individuals seek to diminish its impact by isolating themselves from others (i.e. isolation) or removing themselves from the sustenance of the social network in order to evade the threatening situation appended to the social stigma (e.g. rejection, pity, or aggression). Alternatively, they may directly confront and conflict with a source that threatens the identity structure in order to diminish the threat (i.e. negativism). They may also engage in ‘psychological mobility’ (Breakwell, 1986, p.115), pretending non-threatening identity through deliberate misidentification of themselves (i.e. passing).
or simply follow a successful strategy that others have employed or they learn from others (i.e. compliance), although they may perceive themselves helpless.

The threatened individuals may also engage in intergroup coping strategies using their group membership, which is intimately linked to social identity tradition (Breakwell, 1986). These strategies involve the strategic choice of multiple group membership that eradicates threatened identity, use of group support as a source of information and engagement of group action at a collective level in the intergroup context. In order to alleviate threats derived from any particular group membership, the threatened individuals may choose a group membership they positively share with others from their multiple group membership (i.e. multiple group membership) since positively shared membership that overrides intergroup differentiation can eliminate the stigma attached to group membership. In contrast to the isolation strategy at the interpersonal level, they actively involve a social group that shares their difficulty or threats (i.e. group support) or take symbolic or physical group action designed to change the group characteristics and revise the dominant belief or value of group attributes at collective levels (i.e. group action). For example, the homeless can alleviate their perception of threats posed by the homeless experience by involvement of public project activities for the homeless (Riggs & Coyle, 2002).

Choice of the above coping strategies is determined by a series of factors, including relationship between the types of threats involved (e.g. its origin, longevity and stability), social context of its occurrence (e.g. ideological context, interpersonal networks, group memberships), prior identity structure (e.g. pre-extant identity levels) and an individual’s capacities for an information-process system (Breakwell, 1986, 1988).

3.4.2 Coping Reaction in a Group Context
In approaching a sense of identity, the focus of social identity theories, including the Social Identity Theory and the Identity Process Theory, is mainly on individuals’ socialisation (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Uzzell et al., 2002; Twigger-Ross et al., 2003). In this regard, when explaining coping strategies that threatened individuals
employ, they ignore the effects of structures and contents of social contexts and other social elements, which create multifaceted backgrounds for identity (e.g. group communication, social influences) (Breakwell, 1986). The emphasis in the concept of Social Representation differs from this social identity tradition in that it pays particular attention to the process of group and interpersonal communication in coping with threatened identity (Breakwell, 1993). Moreover, the concept of Social Representation is directed to explaining how people make sense of or give meaning to uncertainty conditions or threats when they encounter them (Breakwell, 2001a).

Social representation has long been a familiar word in discussion of group identity. Social identity literature under the Social Representation paradigm has addressed identities being built in a social representational background (Wagner et al., 1999; Breakwell, 2001b; Howarth, 2001). Social representation is commonly understood as shared understandings of social phenomena and a systematic framework for explaining events that provide the background for communication and the boundaries from which each group can be distinguished (Wagner et al., 1999; Breakwell, 2001b). Therefore, commonly shared social representation is both a badge of membership and a prime determiner of the substance of identity (Breakwell, 1993). Further explanation on the concept of Social Representation will be presented later in this chapter.

In understanding threat-coping strategies in a social context, of particular interest in this concept is that when a group’s identity is threatened, the process of social representations is emerging as one of the symbolic coping reactions (Wagner, Valencia & Elejabarrieta, 1996; Wagner et al., 1999). Approached from a group activity point of view, the process of ‘anchoring’ and ‘objectification’, an integral part of the process of social representation, can account for how people make sense of or give meaning to uncertainty conditions or threats when they confront them. In the process of anchoring, members in a social group attempt to reduce a threat from an unfamiliar object by giving it familiar classifications and names that are more familiar for them and which allow group members to communicate. The process of objectification turns socially communicated knowledge through the process of
anchoring into a specific form, including image structures, iconic forms, or metaphors that visibly reproduce a complex idea (Moscovici, 1984; Wagner et al., 1999). In this process, members in a social group develop their own interpretations of the threats. Moscovici (1988) points out that a property of social groups and social conditions’ cultural matrices and information circulating in a given society may affect members’ interpretations.

Another key factor to highlight here is that the structure of a representation can be appreciated as an outcome of the demands for a sense of identity. As mentioned earlier, a threat to identity occurs under the identity process mechanism when the processes of identity are unable to achieve an individual’s motivations for self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness, and continuity (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993). Understanding, accepting, and assimilating social representation relies heavily on these identity requirements (Breakwell, 1993, 2001b; Breakwell & Canter, 1993). For example, if individuals find that their self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness, or continuity is threatened, they will reject a particular social representation that might have potential to threaten important aspects of their identity in order to protect or regain them. In addition, they will adopt an alternative competing social representation that should help to avoid threats to important aspects of their identity (ibid)

3.5 Evolution of the Significance of Identity Threat

Meanings of negative-natured heritage are so obvious, but, there is no innate value of cultural heritage (Smith, 2007). Lowenthal (1998) addresses the meanings and values of heritage are always changing as a social process. In this regard, Smith (2007, p.2) addresses that ‘heritage is a cultural process or performance of meaning making, in which identity and cultural and social values are negotiated, affirmed or rejected’. The meaning and value of cultural heritage is not simply inherited but they are simultaneously inherited and transformed (Byrne, 2008; Smith, 2006). This is because not only individuals but also the socio-cultural contexts affect meanings of the place (Twigger-Ross et al., 2003). This issue has received far less rigorous analysis and there is little empirical evidence of how they operate over time.
and how meanings of cultural heritage are transformed and transmit as a process. To reach fuller understanding of the evolution of the significance of colonial heritage to a sense of identity, the process of memory construction and social influence needs to be taken into account.

3.5.1 Memory Construction and Transformation

The key to the argument here is that memories are not fixed things but are constantly revised in a social context. In understanding the construction of memory and its transformation, this research takes into account the passage of time and the process of memory construction taking place in a social context with an assumption that colonial heritage shifts symbolically through the progression of time and the process of memory construction.

3.5.1.1 Passage of Time

In identifying the evolution of threats, one of the key considerations in this section is memory transformation through the passage of time. Some literature (e.g. Portelli, 1991, 1992, 1997; Grim, 1996; Uzzell, 1998, 2009b) has stated that memory is collected and mobilised by the passage of time and socio-political changes. Cultural heritage was constructed by previous generations and is inherited by succeeding generations. Along with this, the meanings and value of cultural heritage are also inherited from older generations to younger generations. However, we notice that neither material heritage nor its meaning is really everlasting (Young, 1989). Kong and Yeoh (1995, p.4) address ‘place meanings evolve with each inventive interplay of time and setting, varying with individuals and the unique conditions in which they find themselves, as well as with groups of individuals whose interpretations have coalesced under distinctive conditions’. In this sense, the meanings of cultural heritage are constantly being regenerated, reinterpreted and mediated as a process over the long term (Harvey, 2001; Byrne, 2008). As a result, some cultural heritage previously neglected may newly obtain the power in society with the passage of time, while some cultural heritage previously glorified may be downgraded. Uzzell (2009) supports this idea by arguing that time changes how we understand the past and the stories we tell about the past. Changes in the way
individuals understand the past and meanings of the past are not simply because of their unreliable memory or new information but because memory is the experience mediated by representation of the past and an ongoing process of negotiation through time (Olick & Levy, 1997; Misztal, 2009; Uzzell, 2009b). Despite the prominence of recent literature that has illuminated the questions of transformation and transmissions of the nature of cultural heritage, there is little research to date that actually and empirically demonstrates it. Interesting observations on how the meaning and significance of provocative historic places change can be found from Uzzell (1989, 1998) and Uzzell and Ballantyne’s (1998) studies. By highlighting the power of time, they argue that, ‘as time separates us from past events, our emotional engagement is reduced’ (p.5). Accordingly, the passage of time leads people to represent contested heritage from an emotional way to a cognitive way (Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998). Although their research is by no means exhaustively empirical, their studies elucidate the connection between the passage of time and change of interpretation.

3.5.1.2 Process of Memory Construction

Lowenthal (1985, p.26) states ‘we continually reshape memory, rewrite history, refashion relics’. Memory literature acknowledges that memory is not a simple matter of recalling past, but a complex and continuing process of negotiation (e.g. Teski & Climo, 1995; cited in Harrison et al., 2008). It is constructed by personal engagement of activities, interaction with others and their societal context, including the institutional ideologies and the communities of everyday life (e.g. Portelli, 1991, 1992, 1997; Grim, 1996; Uzzell, 1998, 2009b; Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998). What is important is that people do not merely remember the past. ‘We are constantly revising our memories to suit our current identities’, which Gillis (1994, p.4) calls ‘memory work’. In this sense, people are reflexively conscious of the heritage and its significance (Macdonald, 2006a). Especially, the value of heritage and its relationship with us largely depend on contemporary concerns and agenda (Harvey, 2001; Witcomb, 2009), which implies that the highly politicised process of forgetting and remembering could be engaged in the construction of memories. According to Logan and Reeves (2009), this memory distortion and the fabrication of myths
frequently occur in post-colonial situations where the creation of national identity is necessary to achieve political and cultural cohesion. This strategic distortion of collective memory is called ‘wilful distortion’ of collective memory (Connerton, 1981; cited in Logan & Reeves, 2009, p.2).

In denoting the process of memory construction, much attention is given to distinction between individual memories and official or accepted memories (Macdonald, 2006). Nora’s (1989) differentiation between history and memory has had immense appeal for analysis of memory construction in recent decades. He argues that ‘history is an intellectual and secular production, which calls for analysis and criticism; at the heart of history is a critical discourse that is antithetical to spontaneous memory’ (pp.8-9). However, unlike professional historic narrative, memory ‘remains in permanent evolution and is unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation’ (p.7). Halbwachs (1992) puts forward the interesting hypothesis that individuals create memories of events they did not experience in any direct sense. He highlights two different natures of memories, which are ‘autobiographical memory’ and ‘historical memory’. Autobiographical memory is constructed through individuals themselves’ direct experience of the event, whereas historical memory is passively constructed only through indicted experience of the event (e.g. historical records). Hence, historical memory may be indirectly stimulated and reconstructed through agencies (Coser, 1992). Accordingly, autobiographical memory, which is similar to memory in Nora’s study (1989), becomes an important part in individuals’ identities. However, historical memory, which is intimately linked to history in Nora’s (1989) study, is less likely to play an important role in individuals’ identity because the past in this memory is not a vital part of their lives (Halbwachs, 1992; Olick, 1999). In recent years, further interesting conceptual tools can be found in Jan Assmann and Czaplicka (1995) and Aleida Assmann’s study (2006, 2008). The key to their argument is that collectively shared memories cannot be totally conventional because memories are products of the combination of an individual’s own understanding of the past, community perspectives of the past and political views of the past (Moles, 2009). J. Assmann and Czaplicka (1995) decode collective memory by presenting two
different levels of proximity to the everyday, which are ‘communicative memory’ and ‘cultural memory’. He points out that communicative memory, which is socially mediated, is based on everyday communications, whereas cultural memory is based on institutional communication and cultural formation (e.g. monuments, literature). In terms of memory transformation, he presents that, unlike cultural memory, communicative memory would change with the passage of time and, consequently, tend to be more institutionalised memory in the social context. A. Assmann (2006, 2008) further extends J. Assmann and Czaplicka’s idea of collective memory by proposing four different formats of memory: ‘individual memory’, ‘social memory’, ‘political memory’ and ‘cultural memory’. Individual and social formats of memory, which are intimately linked to J. Assmann and Czaplicka’s communicative memory, are grounded on individuals’ autobiographical memory and their lived experiences. These formats of memory tend to be varied because they are shared in direct or indirect relation to others, such as family, friends and colleagues. By interactive communication with others, these formats of memory could change all the time. In contrast, political and cultural formats of memory, which are directly linked to J. Assmann and Czaplicka’s cultural memory, are based on symbols, material representations and institutions (e.g. museums, literature and monuments). For this reason, these formats of memory last a long time by being transmitted across generations. Drawing on the above different formats of memory, A. Assmann (2006, 2008) addresses that a shift of generations makes a varied bottom-up memory (i.e. individual and social memory) a more standardised institutionalised top-down memory (i.e. cultural and political memory). Additionally, public narratives, literature, education, public media and intentional acts of creating symbolic memory (e.g. museum, monuments and memorials) play a crucial role in creating symbolic representation of experience in society (ibid). Recently, Moles (2009) argues that shared memories are always intertwined with more personal accounts of past. Drawing on two different types of heritage in Ireland, Moles (2009) provides evidence that different layers of social memories about historic events or sites exist. National discourse or official narratives cannot conventionalise the shared memories because the memories are always interwoven with personal memories and the influence of everyday life. Not only do personal
memories also account for the way past events are remembered the historic place but also the place is located in the socio-historical memory, which represents meaning for a whole nation (Breakwell, 1996; cited in Twigger-Ross et al., 2003).

3.5.2 Process of Social Influence: Social Representation
Social context has been widely discussed as one of the key social and cultural determinants that influence individuals’ meaning construction. In order to reach fuller understanding of a cultural process of meaning and value production in a social context, the concept of social representation is particularly relevant here because it is directed to the group and interpersonal communication, which illustrates how individuals come to interpret and make events or social phenomena meaningful in the process (Breakwell, 1993).

Social representations can be approached from both a product and process perspective (Breakwell, 2001a, 2001b). From a product point of view, social representations are a socially shared sense of views and a systematic framework for explaining a particular social event or environmental phenomenon (Moscovici, 1988; Hubbard, 1996a, 1996b). Therefore, the basis of this perspective lies in the collective natures of social recognitions and the role of interactions of events that construct group cohesion (Monroe, Hankin & Van Vechten, 2000; Breakwell, 2001a, 2001b). However, from a process perspective, social representations approach the transformation of the significance of threats as a whole process consisting of communication, exchange, argument and negotiation (Breakwell, 2001a, 2001b). As mentioned in an earlier section (Section 3.4.2), the process of anchoring and objectification can account for interpretation structures of threats. This process has flexibility to adjust to differences in groups, cultural matrices and information that circulates in a given society (Moscovici, 1988). Given this combination of the product and the process perspectives, social representations of colonial heritage are the collectively held explanations of reality (i.e. the product) that are continually re-generated by the interaction of individuals and social contexts (i.e. the process). The three most relevant ideas of social representation that illustrate the way the significance of threats is transformed are stated in the following paragraphs.
A first point to highlight is that the significance of threats could be changed by the interaction among a range of forms of the understanding coexisting within a society and cultural context. Social representations that have been shared by a majority in a large social group play an important role in everyday communication in society (Wagner et al., 1999). However, not everyone in a society has a consensual interpretation of the reality. For instance, although a society shares a common idea of colonial heritage, members in the society may have somewhat different ideas on the heritage. In terms of its function, which makes unfamiliar familiar, the process of anchoring and objectification seems like a similar mechanism. However, these two processes differ from one another. While the idea in the anchoring process is a universal or common feature of an idea that is shared in a whole society and in the same historical period, that of objectification is particular types of idea that depend on the characteristics of social groups, such as historical, cultural, intergenerational or educational differences (Billig, 1993). This implies that although a particular image of colonial heritage is accepted and shared by a majority in a social group, each subgroup or individual may develop their own unique interpretations of colonial heritage by using their own image structures, iconic forms, or metaphors that visibly reproduce a complex idea (Moscovici, 1984; Wagner et al., 1999). Therefore, it seems that multiple representations of colonial heritage are coexisting in the same society and culture. Moscovici (1988) addresses that these social representation processes lead social representations to fall into one of three different realms, which are ‘hegemonic representations’, ‘emancipated representations’ or ‘polemical representations’. Hegemonic representations are common representations shared in a large social group (e.g. nation). Thus, these representations are cohesive, uniform and consensual throughout the whole society. In the realms of emancipated representations, somewhat different versions of representations exist according to the segments of a society. By exposing new knowledge and information, members of groups would reinvent and share their own version of social representations. Polemical representations are realms of representations in which no commonly shared social representation exists due to conflicting representations across different groups (Moscovici, 1988; Breakwell, 2001a; Ben-Asher, 2003). Of particular
importance is that these social representations can transform from one realm to another realm. This transformation, such as transformation from emancipated representations to polemic representations, serves as a catalyst for social changes and innovation (*ibid*).

A second point to highlight is that meanings of events or social phenomena change along with individuals’ belief systems and values, which change across their lifetime. This implies that an individual could understand colonial heritage differently across their life span. The central argument in Breakwell’s synthesised model of social representation (Breakwell, 1993, 2001a, 2001b; Breakwell & Canter, 1993) is that the status of identity shapes social representations through influencing exposure, acceptance and uses of them. As mentioned in an earlier section (Section 3.3.1), individuals actively evaluate their identity status (i.e. ‘self-aware’) and remove, replace and renovate elements of identity to maintain a desirable identity (‘self-constructor’) (Breakwell, 1986, 1993, 2001a, 2001b, 2010; Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000). As a result of individuals’ evaluation of their identity status, they engage in the generation of social representations to achieve or maintain required states for their identity. Additionally, individuals’ self-evaluation of their identity status changes across their life courses and culture, which implies that the priority of identity motivations or the importance of motivations changes across life courses (Breakwell, 1986, 1993, 2001b, 2010).

The last point closely related to the above issues, is that the social environment also plays a part in the transformation of the significance of events or phenomena. As mentioned in the above, among multiple understandings of social phenomena or events within a society, some understandings are maintained by a majority in a highly structured social group so that these understandings become norms within the group. However, some representations are adopted by some specific groups or contexts. To employ Abric’s (1994; cited in Breakwell, 2001) terminology, these representations can be explained in terms of ‘a common core element’ and ‘minor periphery elements’ of social representations respectively. Of particular interest here is why a particular social representation has been taken in a society and plays an
important role in social communication for a long time and whose opinions create commonly accepted social representations. Billing (2006) emphasises that perception of threats is a social process, which means that individuals’ perception and evaluation of threats are influenced by cultural background to which they belong and by the way it is communicated to the public (Slovic, 1987; cited in Billig, 2006). Additionally, Breakwell (1986, 1988) emphasises the importance of the social influence process in understanding threatened identity. Meanings could be constructed not only by individuals’ belief systems and values assimilated into the identity through life (i.e. personal meaning) but also by the social influence process (i.e. social meaning) (ibid). The ideological structure generated by groups and social categories, such as propaganda and rhetoric, play a crucial role in appending specific social meanings to a current threat. Drawing on the present social meanings and personal judgements on the basis of structured identity, the meanings of the threat are constructed and transformed.

3.6 Discussion

This chapter has attempted to provide building blocks on which to construct more detailed theorisation of the role of colonial heritage in the construction of a sense of national identity under the social psychology paradigm. Key identity-related theories, including Social Identity Theory, Identity Process Theory, Social Representation and the idea of memory construction, have been employed here. This is in order to provide a useful theoretical ground to explore how colonial heritage gains the power to threaten identity, what the sources are, how individuals perceive and deal with them (i.e. the processes underlying threat and coping reactions) and why its significance changes over time.

Taking into account theories of social identity and studies carried out by social psychologists, this research conceptualises colonial heritage in terms of group categorisation and comparison: a symbol of Japanese identity, which may influence Koreans’ identity. Especially, through the lens of Social Identity Theory, it was understood as a potential danger caused by perpetrators with different morals, norms, beliefs, attitudes and values that conflict and violate those of Koreans. This
conceptualisation in this research encompasses following important issues arising from social identity-related theories.

Firstly, through the lens of the Identity Process Theory, colonial heritage could best be defined as a source of potential threats challenging multiple motivations of individuals or groups’ identity, rather than uni-dimensional identity. Individuals will perceive threats from colonial heritage when colonial heritage challenges their sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity, which habitually guide their identity process. Additionally, a threat posed by colonial heritage may originate either internally or externally or both. Thus, it is reasonable to predict that by interaction with colonial heritage, threats may arise from a conflict between multiple motivations of intra-personal identity, or demands initiated by their social positions occupied that violate motivations of identity. Furthermore, an individual’s perception of colonial heritage is subjective; accordingly, it is probable that an individual’s perception of threat from colonial heritage is also subjective. Until they are consciously aware of the threat posed by colonial heritage, the heritage does not have the power to act as a threat to a sense of identity.

Secondly, it is apparent from the above review that various psychological and social elements may have important implications for individuals’ experience of threats posed by colonial heritage and their reactions in response to the threats. Social identity literature points to group membership, which is an integral element of a sense of social identity (e.g. levels of group affiliation, intergroup interaction and group inequalities) and emotional attachment, which is the key element of place-related identity, as powerful determinants of individuals’ evaluation of colonial heritage and their response to a threat they feel from colonial heritage. Therefore, it is clear from the above that the perception of colonial heritage cannot be explained without considering identity elements individuals perceive.

The third point to highlight here is that social psychology theories provide a more beneficial way of examining coping reactions that threatened individuals may engage in. It is clear from the literature that whenever a sense of identity is threatened,
threatened individuals and social groups engage in a range of coping reactions to maintain the desirable status of identity motivations. They may take part in a range of actions of self-protection that operates in three different levels of context (i.e. intra-psychic, interpersonal and intergroup), although it is sometimes employed without their intention to acknowledge the action as a means of self-protection. Additionally, when colonial heritage disrupts everyday life in a society and the sense of identity, the social representation process may also emerge as a group activity to cope with the threats.

Lastly, the literature review has shown that meanings and significance of colonial heritage to identity construction constantly change over time as a process of social change rather than being taken as a given. In this regard, it is obvious that threats constituted by contacting colonial heritage may also be evolving. Great emphasis is given in this present research to two key foundations in the process of meaning construction: the process of memory construction and social influence, which are commonly highlighted in social psychology literature. From the process of a memory construction perspective, it is generally taken for granted that personal understanding of colonial heritage is always interwoven with its socio-cultural and political understanding, along with the passage of time. From the concept of the social representation perspective, it is also clear that the significance of colonial heritage is transformed as a whole process, which consists of communication, exchange, argument and negotiation in the social context. Although these meaning making processes somewhat differ from one another, key to the argument here is that personal understanding of colonial heritage will be functionally structured based on social representation of colonial heritage and judgement on their identity structure.

As mentioned in the Introduction chapter (Chapter 1), this research aims to explore the impact of colonial architectural heritage built by the Japanese during the Second World War on the construction of national identity in a South Korean context. Based on the review of literature on cultural heritage (Chapter 2) and social and environmental psychology (Chapter 3), this thesis poses three key research questions.
The first research question posed by this research concerns a manifestation of identity motivations: how the historic built environment, particularly colonial architectural heritage, is related to individuals’ perception of national identity in South Korean society. This question concerns:

- Whether and in what way does colonial heritage link to a sense of national identity and what identity motivations are salient for South Koreans?
- What social identity elements mediate individuals’ perception of colonial heritage and how is this manifested?

The second research question concerns the construction of meanings of colonial heritage in everyday life (i.e. the process of meaning construction): how individuals make sense of colonial heritage in relation to their sense of national identity. Specifically, this question asks:

- How do individuals form a sense of colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity in their everyday life?
- How are meanings of colonial heritage constructed within personal lives and the broader social context and how does the meaning embodied in colonial heritage influence people’s sense of identity?
- If and how do individuals experience colonial heritage as possible identity threats and what threats are prominent in their multiple levels of identity?

The third research question posed by this thesis concerns the coping reactions employed by individuals in response to threatened identity: how individuals cope with threats if colonial heritage threatens their sense of national identity, as well as why its significance changes over time. Specifically, this question asks:

- Do people perceive threat to their identity? If so, how do they deal with such threats?
- If and how do the meanings and significance of colonial heritage to identity evolve and change over time?
The detailed aims and research questions for each study (i.e. Studies One, Two and Three) are presented in Chapters Five, Eight and Nine.

To reach fuller understanding of the significance of colonial heritage to a sense of identity in South Korean society, the following chapter will describe the historical context and socio-political context of Korea after independence from Japan in 1945. Important socio-historical events in post-colonial Korea will be described in detail to contextualise the way in which Koreans perceive Japanese colonial heritage and their attitude towards the heritage.
Chapter Four
Colonial and Post-Colonial Society in South Korea

4.1 Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to contextualise why existing colonial architectural heritage in South Korea has potential to threaten a sense of Korean identity; it divides into two broad sections. Firstly, the chapter attempts to explain the socio-historic nature of Korean nationalism and then continue by discussing the intense Korean nationalism constructed during the Japanese colonial occupation (1910-1945) and after the liberation (1945). Second, it introduces social representation of colonial architecture built in the period of the Japanese occupation in South Korea that is widely accepted in Korean society. This chapter addresses the necessity for a theoretically and empirically-driven research that investigates the issue of Japanese colonial heritage and the construction of Korean identity, drawing attention to a nationalistic mood and fierce controversy over the heritage in a South Korean context.

4.2 Construction of Korean Identity
4.2.1 Nature of Korean Nationalism
To understand the strong Korean nationalism towards the Japanese, it might be useful to start by understanding the unique nature of Korean culture that has significantly influenced the construction of national identity. This section briefly deals with three characteristics of Korean nationalism, which are ethnic nationalism, Confucianism and collectivism.

The most distinctive characteristic of Korean identity comes from its ethnic and culturally homogeneous society. In an Asian context, a homogeneous ethnic nationalism has historically played a significant role in constructing national identity (Watson, 2010). Especially, ethnic nationalism prevails because Korean national unity has continued for more than a thousand years. As a result, Korean society is
strongly united by common blood, shared ancestry, territory, memories, values, traditions, historic experience, cultural achievement and a unique language (Nahm, 1983; Lee, 2006). In a study of South Koreans’ conception of nation/society, Shin (2003) offers strong evidence that South Koreans conceive their nation and society from an organic point of view. The assessment of nationalistic appropriation and the intensification of national identity in a South Korean context reveals that 75% of respondents address that ‘Koreans are all brothers and sisters, regardless of political ideology or regional residence’, which implies that Koreans have a strong sense of ethnic identity (Shin, 2003, p.17). Additionally, the assessment reveals that the majority of respondents (93%) argue that Korea has a single blood line, and more than half of respondents (64%) demonstrate a collectivistic and Confucianism view by saying that ‘in the case of a national crisis, national interests can be given priority over individual ones’ (Shin, 2003, p.15). More importantly, the ethnic homogeneity based on the long historic legitimacy of Korea gives rise to positive self-esteem for Koreans (Chun, 2012).

The second point to highlight is that Korean identity is realised through the virtues of the Confucian tradition, distinctive psychological and cultural characters in East Asian society (e.g. Korea, Japan and China) (Park, Rehg & Lee, 2005). Confucianism emphasises the respect for authority, loyalty, patriotism, hard work, education, strong family structure and the importance of human relationships (Sorensen, 1994; Yang, 1999; Park et al. 2005). During the Chosun dynasty (1392-1910), the last dynasty of Korean history, this value system provided the ideological rationale for Koreans and deeply penetrated into both social and individuals’ life as religion, philosophy and social norms (Yang, 1999). The long established Confucian values have been challenged and significantly eroded by modern values from the West; they no longer work as a religious and political ideology in South Korea today (ibid). Additionally, this value system has changed as a response to the pressures of globalisation today, such as a combination of traditional Confucianism and other modern value systems (e.g. Christianity, individualism, materialism and egalitarianism) (ibid). However, Confucianism still remains, not only as essential virtues for interpersonal relationships and daily life etiquette (e.g. family
relationships) but also as the socio-cultural norms that guide individual behaviour and societal attitudes towards social issues in Korean society (Park et al., 2005).

The third characteristic is the collective nature of Korean culture (i.e. collectivism); that is, the values of a group should have priority over personal values. It is widely acknowledged that the attitudes or behaviour of people in collectivist societies differ from those of people in individualistic societies (e.g. Triandis, 1988; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Triandis, 2001; Park et al., 2005). For example, people in a collectivist society, including South Koreans, are more likely to be group cohesive and loyal, while people in individualistic societies tend towards independence, self-reliance, and detachment (ibid). People in a collectivist society are apt to give priority to their group’s goals, whereas people in an individualistic society are apt to prioritise their personal goals (Triandis, 1988; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). According to Yang (1999), these characteristics of collectivism are more significant in a South Korean context because they overlap with Confucian ethics (e.g. harmony, cooperation, unity, and loyalty). For example, Koreans have a strong tendency to define themselves in relation to the group to which they belong, such as family, lineage, and nation (Sorensen, 1994). However, Korean culture is shifting from collectivism to individualism following economic development and modernisation in South Korean society over the past three decades (Yang, 1999). Especially, younger and more educated people in contemporary South Korean society are more likely to have individual-centred rather than collective values (ibid).

4.2.2 Korean Nationalism towards Japanese
4.2.2.1 Memory of the Japanese Colonial Occupation: 1910-1945
Chun (2012, p.36) addresses that ‘nationalism is the most distinctive meta-narrative that characterizes contemporary South Korean society.’ Moreover, Nahm (1983, p.35), who studies the nature of Korean nationalism and its transformation, emphasises that ‘Korean nationalism became offensive and anti-foreign only when foreign powers threatened Korea’s safety or offended the pride of the nation and the people’. Indeed, Korean nationalism intensified in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century when Korea was in a radically altered domestic and
international situation. The reasons for this were the establishment of the Korean Empire in 1897, the Sino-Japanese War in 1894, the assassination of the Korean Empress by Japanese in 1895, the Russo-Japanese War and a Japanese Protectorate in 1905 (Nahm, 1983; Yang, 2004). Due to the geographical significance of the Korean peninsula, Korea was a centre of actual or potential conflict in East Asia at the end of the nineteenth century (Hundt & Blieker, 2007). After the war between Japan and the Qing dynasty in China in 1894-1895 (i.e. the Sino-Japanese War) and Japan’s subsequent defeat of Tsarist Russia in 1904-1905 (i.e. the Russo-Japanese War), Korea was under the control of the Japanese empire. Korea was officially annexed as a colony of the Japanese Empire with the signing of the Japan-Korea Annexation Treaty in 1910 (Figure 4.1). Finally, the end of the Second World War in 1945 brought the end to Japanese colonial rule (ibid).

http://www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/pacificwar/timeline.htm
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Korean nationalism, especially ethnic nationalism, was radically intensified as a response to Koreans’ experience under the Japanese colonial occupation (1910-1945) (Yang, 2004; Chun, 2012). As far as an interpretation of the Japanese colonialism in the early twentieth century is concerned, there are controversies between Japanese and Korean historians. However, there is a comprehensive theme that runs throughout the extensive Korean literature on modern Korean history, which is ethnic hardship during the thirty-five year period of the colonial occupation. Much
of this literature (e.g. Jeong, 2001; Hsia, 2002; Yang, 2004) points out that Japanese imperialism differs from other Western imperialism in that its colonial policies and strategies focused more on changes at deeper levels of social and cultural spheres rather than changes in economic and technical areas, which were generally promoted by Western colonial power. With annexation in 1911, Korea vanished politically. The effort of Japanese imperialism focused not only on the elimination of the cultural and historical existence of Korea but also on the establishment of a bridgehead for further expansion of the Japanese empire to China and the whole Asian continent (Hsia, 2002). For example, as a part of Japan’s assimilation effort and eradication of Korean identity, the education of Korean history, culture and language was banned and the use of the Korean language in public places was prohibited. Additionally, Koreans were forced to worship Shinto, the native Japanese religion (Cha, 1996). A number of Korean cultural architectural heritages were dismantled and removed (e.g. Korean royal palaces, temples) and many historical artefacts (e.g. historic pagoda, monuments, status, art works) were relocated to Japan. Although there is no academic consensus on the influence of colonial occupation on the development of the Korean economy (e.g. Kohli, 1994; Haggard, Kang & Moon, 1997; Yang, 2004), it is generally acknowledged that the average economic condition of Koreans significantly deteriorated due to forced integration into the Japanese colonial policy. Jeong’s (2001) research of urban development of Korea under colonial rule shows that the Japanese owned most large enterprises and industries in Korean society during the period of the occupation. Additionally, Koreans suffered from famine due to the extraction and exploitation of natural resources in Korea, such as rice and crops, raw materials (e.g. timber), and mineral resources (e.g. coal, iron), by the Japanese colonial authority. In addition to economic suppression, Koreans became victims of Japan’s war time aggression during the Second World War period (1938-1945). Historians estimate more than one million Korean nationals were forcibly transferred to Japan during the occupation (Iwasawa, 1992; cited in Hsu, 1993). A number of young Korean men were forcibly sent to Northern Korea, Manchuria, Sakhaline and Japan for mining and heavy industry under sub-human working conditions and conscripted into the Japanese military (Hsu, 1993; Cha, 1996). Moreover, a number of young Korean women were also forcibly mobilised and
served the Japanese military as prostitutes or in sexual slavery, euphemistically called ‘comfort women’. Historians estimate that approximately 7000 to 200,000 young women were involuntarily conscripted by Japanese military during the Second World War and many of them were from Korea (Hsu, 1993; Soh, 1996; Min, 2003). Along with war prisoners, including Soviets, Americans, British and Australians, Koreans were used for experiments in a military medical experimentation unit for biological and chemical warfare, known as Unit 731 (Eitzen & Takafuji, 1997). At least one thousand war prisoners died in experiments (ibid).

These suppressions made Koreans consciously foster patriotism and ethnic consciousness. Especially, the Japanese’s assimilation effort to eradicate Korean ethnicity and its culture fuelled the rise of strong ethnic nationalism, so-called minjokjuui, which has become a political ideology in modern Korean society (Chun, 2012). Widespread Korean nationalism, which was intimately linked to strong anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, gave rise to a number of anti-Japanese movements (e.g. the March First Movement in 1919) that resulted in a number of casualties and more brutal suppression (Nahm, 1983). For Koreans, the memory of the occupation remained an unforgettable psychological trauma long after the end of Japanese occupation in 1945. Japanese colonialism generated not only strong anti-Japanese nationalist consciousness but also the ‘catch-up-with Japan’ nationalism in modern Korean society (Park, 1999; cited in Yang, 2004).

4.2.2.2 Post-Colonial Tensions and Contemporary Korean Nationalism

In tracing contemporary Korean nationalism towards the Japanese, two important political and economic events, which marked a watershed in South Korea-Japan relations, are noteworthy. One of the frequently cited key events is the normalisation of diplomatic relations between South Korea and Japan that was signed in 1965, which was called ‘The Treaty on Basic Relations between Japan and the Republic of Korea’. The historical animosities and colonial legacies in both countries gave rise to widespread political and public opposition against diplomatic normalisation in both countries (Cha, 1996). However, the treaty brought substantial benefits to both countries, including economic cooperation (e.g. inflow of
foreign capital for South Korea, a market expansion for Japan), security cooperation in the Cold War environment (e.g. against Soviet Union, China, and North Korea), ease of communication, and policy coordination (Im, 1987; Cha, 1996; Hundt & Bleiker, 2007). More importantly, it was the first diplomatic relation established between two nations after the liberation, as well as formally re-established a tie between two sovereign nations, ending the unequal relationship of the colonial-era and starting the relation anew as equals (Cha, 1996).

The period from the late 1980s to the late 1990s was also a turning point for the relationship between two countries, with the lifting of Japanese cultural exports to South Korea. Before the mid-1990s, the South Korean government controlled the import of foreign cultural content using strict policies. Especially, the government completely prohibited Japanese popular culture, including animations, movies, songs and books from the liberation in 1945 to the late 1990s (Kish, 2001; Doobo, 2005). For example, despite economic and political cooperation between the two countries since the 1960s, Japanese movies were still officially banned in South Korea in 1994, not only to defend South Korea’s cultural industry but also to protect traditional Korean values and the identities of young Koreans from Japanese culture and values (Kish, 2001). Some literature in the field of media studies (e.g. Hayashi & Lee, 2007) points that the memory of cultural genocide under the Japanese occupation (e.g. mandatory Japanese language and history education, prohibition of Korean language), which brought concerns about the loss of Korean’s linguistic and cultural identities, resulted in the ban on the import of Japanese popular culture into South Korea. Since the end of its fifty-three year ban on Japanese popular culture in 1999, South Koreans, as other Asians, have had considerable exposure to Japanese popular culture (Iwabuchi, 2002).

Despite these iconic political and cultural events, there is still a fraught relationship between South Korea and Japan today (Cha, 1996). Due to the long historic interaction and cultural and geographical proximity between Korea and Japan, the two countries have much in common in terms of both historic and contemporary cultural values (Hundt & Bleiker, 2007). In addition, the relationship between the
two countries has been politically, economically, socially and culturally important throughout the long history (Beal, Nozaki & Yang, 2001). However, the long history of conflicts, ranging from the Japanese invasions in the late sixteenth century (1592-1598) to the Japanese colonial occupation in the twentieth century, has resulted in mutual animosity between the peoples in both countries. Especially, the memory of the Japanese colonial occupation has given rise to an uncomfortable relationship between two countries today. The deeply ambivalent colonial experience still remains as a psychological trauma for South Koreans and it is difficult to deny that deep-felt, continuing animosity towards Japanese still exists long after the end of Japanese occupation in 1945.

It is very important that the memories of the colonial past are constantly reinforced and regenerated through education, sociocultural channels (e.g. mass media, literature, and cultural institutions) and public commemorations in a South Korean context (Chun, 2012). For example, some main national holidays in South Korea are strongly associated with Korean patriotism and anti-Japanese sentiment (e.g. Independent Movement Day on the 1st of March, National Liberation Day on the 15th of August) (Cha, 1996). Moreover, recent socio-political issues including unresolved official apologies for Japanese war crimes, glorification of Japan’s wartime past in Japanese textbooks, disputed islands (i.e. Dok-do) and Japanese politicians’ worship of war criminals from the Second World War have constantly reinforced anti-Japanese sentiments (Nahm, 1983). Gallup’s public opinion polls in 2012 reveal that Japan is the nation the South Koreans dislike most in the world (44.1%) (Gallup, 2013d). Another public poll carried out by Gallup in 2009 showed that more than half of the South Korean public (59.5%) do not feel familiarity towards Japan (Gallup, 2013c). Moreover, a survey conducted by MBC (one of the major national television and radio networks in South Korea) and Gallup in 2001 revealed that Japan is conceived as the most significant potential threat to South Korea in the world (31.3%) (Gallup, 2013b). Lee’s (2010) study based on periodic data on South Koreans’ attitude towards Japan also provides evidence that anti-Japanese sentiments remain highly prominent, even in the 2000s. Although the extent of dislike has slightly diminished, nearly half of the Korean public (43.7%)
still have negative feelings towards Japan, and these feelings are mainly derived from the history of the colonial past (ibid) (Table 4.1 and 4.2).

Table 4.1 Feelings towards Japan and a Sense of Familiarity with Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling towards Japan</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike (%)</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like (%)</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feeling (%)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Reasons for Dislike towards Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Historic reason (Japanese colonial history)</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dislike Japanese nationality</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History distortions and no apologies for war crimes</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Racial stereotype</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Japanese disregard for Koreans</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disputed islands</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Japanese sex culture</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dislike Japanese culture</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I don’t know</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that some researchers point out South Koreans’ ambivalent perspective on the Japanese in contemporary South Korean society (e.g. Cha, 1996; Kristof, 1998; Hah, 2005; Doobo, 2005). They argue that while Koreans disregard the Japanese on the grounds of the historical conflict between the two countries, they simultaneously perceive the Japanese as worth aspiring to (ibid). For example, surveys carried out by Chosun-Ilbo, one of the major daily newspapers in South Korea, and Gallup in 1995, reveal that, although the Korean public voted Japan the country they hated most (44.1%), most (89.8%) also perceive that there are many things to learn from the Japanese (Gallup, 2013a). Hah (2005) explains this Korean ambivalence and contradictory feeling towards the Japanese as ‘conflict of complex psychology’.
4.3 Social Representation of Colonial Architecture in South Korea

4.3.1 The Urban Environment under Japanese Rule

The Japanese colonisation bequeathed not only its spiritual legacies (i.e. strong Korean nationalism) but also material legacies, including colonial architecture and cityscape to South Korean society. Under the colonial occupation, there had been an extensive range of structural changes that transformed a traditionally agrarian community into a modern colonial society (Yang, 2004). Based on the colonial urban plan, the colonial government restructured the urban transportation network, including extended and straightened streets, new routes, railways and other transportation facilities (Jin, 2008; Kal, 2008). Along with the urban infrastructure of colonial modernisation, an increasing number of modern buildings, mostly in European style that represented preeminent Japanese’s Westernisation, were constructed in major cities under colonial Korea (e.g. Seoul, Pusan, Incheon, Mokpo, etc.) (King, 2009). The new built environment of colonial Seoul mirrored the strategy of Japanese colonialism (Jeong, 2001; Kal, 2008). New monumental colonial buildings, which included the Japanese Government General Building, the buildings of the Seoul Government Office and the Seoul Railway Station, and new streets that connect governmental and public buildings, were strategically constructed in the 1920s (Kal, 2008) (Figure 4.2). Through these magnificent western-style buildings and newly designed wide streets in the city, the imperial power was visualised and made manifest in the urban space (Jeong, 2001). The Seoul Railway Station was designed on the model of the Tokyo Railway Station and built in an imperial architecture style (Kal, 2008). As a symbol of Japanese imperial expansion abroad, this building had served as a main gateway station connecting Tokyo to the Asia mainland, China (ibid).
Along with modern administrative and public buildings, the new urban appearance with a number of new Western-styled buildings for civic and commercial facilities was developed in central Seoul, which the Japanese occupied in the 1930s (Kal, 2008) (Figure 4.3). Even though these new buildings and structures were constructed for ruling colonial Korea and the requirements of the Japanese in colonised Korea rather than Korean needs (Jeong, 2001), the construction of modern structures made major cities under colonial Korea different from other local cities that were still in a pre-modern state in Korea. In this light, Shin and Robinson (1999; cited in Kal, 2008, pp.360-361) state that Seoul under the occupation was ‘the site of colonial modernity in which the idea of nation was conflictually formed’.

Under colonial occupation, symbolic structures were also strategically constructed not only to represent the Japanese imperial dominance and colonial power but also to challenge Korean tradition and identity. These included the Japanese General
Government Building in front of the main palace of the Korean Chosun dynasty and the Japanese Shinto Shrine, which is called ‘Chosun Jingu’, at the foot of Namsan Mountain where the Korean dynasty’s worship ceremony took place (Jin, 2008). According to Jin (2008), these symbolic colonial buildings were intentionally placed in the north-south axis of Seoul in order to connect political and religious power that challenged Korean identity. Whereas the symbolic colonial places were erected on Korean territory, historic places that symbolise Korean identity were simultaneously torn down under colonial rule. Research in the field of architectural history states that an estimated 80% of symbolic Korean cultural heritage, such as historic shrines, palaces, and cultural monuments of Korea, was destroyed and removed by the colonial authority (King, 2009). For example, the majority of structures in the Kyongbok Palace, the main palace of the Korean Chosun dynasty, and main gates of the palace (i.e. Gwagwamun Gate, Heungyemun Gate) were destroyed and relocated to make space for the colonial administrative headquarters building. Other royal palaces built by the Korean Chosun dynasty (e.g. Changgyeong Palace, Changdeok Palace, Deoksu Palace and Kyunghui Palace) were renovated into venues for industrial expositions, public recreation parks, botanic gardens and zoos (Kim, M., 2010). Kim (2010, p.84) symbolises this as ‘the displacement of the monarchical authority with the symbolic projection of colonial power’. Additionally, Kal (2008) suggests that not only does the new urban environment imply the deterioration of the Korean dynasty and tradition, but it also encourages Koreans to construct a new sense of collective identity. Both the elimination of symbolic places of Korean identity and the construction of symbolic colonial places that represent Japanese imperial dominance and power continue to be a sensitive matter in post-colonial South Korea (ibid). Hence, it has served as an effective rhetorical tool in constructing nationalistic discourse in contemporary South Korea (Jin, 2008).

4.3.2 Nationalistic Discourse on Colonial Architecture

4.3.2.1 Colonial Architectural Heritage in the Level of Official Discourse

In South Korean society, the interpretation of colonial heritage is frequently linked to the Korean’s nationalism (Chung, 2003; Jin, 2008; Kim, S, 2009; Park, 2012). The colonial architectural heritage has been shown as an undesirable legacy of a colonial
past and a symbol of Japanese imperialism that affect Korean identity (Park, 2012). In this light, under the institutional slogans of ‘restoration of the national spirit’, ‘rectification of history’ and ‘creation of new Korea’, a number of architectural legacies of Japanese colonialism have been removed (Jin, 2008). The elimination of the colonial architectural heritage has generally been considered ‘spiritual decolonisation’, which refers to ‘the colonial legacy on the psyche, culture and language of the people that has not been swiftly removed through territorial and political decolonisation’ (Park, 2012, p.23).

The social discourse on the issue of the elimination of the former Japanese Government General Building could provide an example that clearly illustrates the way Koreans see their nation’s past and a legacy of the colonial past today (Figure 4.4). Built in 1926, the gigantic Japanese-built capital building in Neo-Renaissance European style blocked the Kyongbok palace, a symbol of the Korean Chosun Dynasty, and played a role as the chief colonial administrative office under the rule. Ironically, after the liberation in 1945, this former administrative centre of the Korean colony was used as the Republic of Korea’s National Assembly and continued to serve as a symbolic place of South Korea’s politics until 1983. Afterwards, this government office building was converted again into the National Museum of Korea in 1986. Although the building was directly implicated in Japanese colonialism, it had been reused due to Korea’s financial difficulties as a new-born country (Jin, 2008). After intense social debate, the building was demolished as part of the government’s national project for reconstruction of Korean identity in 1996.
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Figure 4.4 The Former Japanese Government General Building (Before Dismantled)
(Source: Lee, 2009)
The building had survived the nation's important historical moments, including independence from Japanese colonial rule, ideological conflicts and the Korean War (1950-1953) and a military regime, as well as having played a significant role in post-colonial South Korea. However, the building found itself situated in a contested field due to its image as a symbol of colonial occupation that could not be forgotten by Koreans (Jin, 2008; Kim, 2010). As one of the most visible legacies of colonial imperialism, the building had continually reflected the image of colonial repression, triggering Korean nationalistic sentiment (Hsia, 2002; Kim, 2010). The issue of the legitimacy of the preservation of this symbolic architecture has frequently been highlighted in the institutional context (Choi, 2010). In 1990, for example, the Roh Tae-woo government (1988-1992) declared the importance of demolition or relocation of the former Japanese Government General Building for the construction of Korean identity. He proclaimed that:

‘We should move the Japanese Government General Building to another place outside the Kyongbok Palace in order to recover our self-esteem tarnished by Japanese imperialism. At the same time, we have an obligation to educate our offspring of this historical lesson.’

(Donga-Ilbo, 1990; cited in Choi, 2010, p.203)

The Kim Young-Sam government (1993-1997), the first civil government since the 1960s, promoted a political reformist campaign called ‘Correcting Korean history’ and carried out institutional projects to restore the national spirit through demolition of the legacies of Japanese colonialism (Kim, 2009). In 1993, President Kim exclaimed its incongruity with Korean identity by addressing ‘It is wrong to preserve our national heritage in the Japanese Government General Building’ (Choi, 2010, p.203). Afterwards, as the first step of the re-visioning and reconstruction of Korean identity, he proposed the demolition of the building. The nationalistic interpretation of the colonial building is evident from the politically imposed spatial rhetoric:
‘Fellow citizens, history is a creative process in which what is wrong is liquidated and what is good is preserved. Today, we have undertaken the historic task of beginning the removal of the former Government-General office building. Only by dismantling this building can we truly restore the appearance of Kyongbok Palace, the most important symbol of legitimacy in our national history.’

(President Kim Young Sam, 15th August 1995; cited in Chung, 2003)

Despite fierce social controversies, the demolition began on South Korea’s Liberation Day, marking the 50th anniversary of the end of Japanese rule with a huge official ceremony (Figure 4.5). The dome, a symbol of the building, was cut with national celebration, which Hsia (2002, p.11) illustrated ‘a public gesture of decapitation’, and displayed at the Independence Hall Museum as part of a monument to commemorate the demolition. After the complete removal of the building in 1996, the reconstruction project of the Korean royal palace was undertaken; King (2009, p.626) remarks this as an ‘institutional effort of the artificial production of lieux de memoire’, sites of memory.

![Figure 4.5](http://ehistory.korea.kr/page/pop/photo_pop.jsp?photo_PhotoSrcGBN=PT&photo_PhotoID=22665&detl_PhotoDTL=#n)
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Figure 4.5 Demolition of the Former Japanese Government General Building in 1996

In addition to the Government General Building, modern cultural structures, including the former residence of the Government General during the colonial occupation and an apartment complex for foreigners in Namsan Mountain, were destroyed under the institutional slogan of ‘restoration of the national spirit’ in the 1990s (Jin, 2008). This replacement project evoked intense public debate regarding methods used to deal with the historic legacy and the national past. Some
academics (e.g. Hsia, 2002; Jin, 2008) also criticise that this destructive rhetoric reflects the efforts of the government’s manipulation of patriotic emotion, extreme Korean nationalism and the inferior-superiority complex of their political purpose. However, the symbolic importance of these events has entered public discourse. For example, following the government announcement in 1993, Shin (1995, p.606; cited in Jin, 2008), a nationalist sociologist, maintains that ‘the social role of the national central museum is to be an educational institution, encouraging the national esteem for national history and culture. However, the national cultural heritage in the building, the symbol of colonial rule, makes Koreans feel inferior, so we cannot expect any positive educational effect’. Regarding the destruction of the Government General Building, Chosun-Ilbo reported that ‘It was a ritual not just for the restoration of a palace…but for the restoration of history.’ (Chosun-Ilbo, 27th October 2001; cited in Choi, 2010, p.201). Moreover, Donga-Ilbo (1993), a major daily newspaper in South Korea, published ‘The value of the restoration of the Kyongbok Palace could not be estimated in dollars and cents, because it is both a matter of the Korean people’s abilities to reconstruct the building in the traditional manner and a matter of national self-esteem’ (Donga-Ilbo, 10th August 1993; cited in Choi, 2010, pp.193-194). Donga-Ilbo (1996) maintains that ‘Given that the Japanese intended to obliterate Korean aspirations for independence by destroying the royal palace and the Seoul fortress, it was only natural to demolish the former colonial headquarters as a symbolic gesture of closing a painful chapter of Korea’s history’ (Donga-Ilbo, 16th November, 1996; cited in Callahan, 1999).

4.3.2.2 Public Discourse on Colonial Architecture

In the study of the nature of nationalistic discourses in postcolonial society, Chun (2012, p. ii) characterises contemporary Korean nationalistic discourse as a product of a combination of ‘top-down directly from the government’ and ‘bottom-up in both traditional media and new social media’. Chun (2012, p.36) maintains that ‘nationalism is the most distinctive meta-narrative that characterizes contemporary South Korean society… the government indoctrinates nationalist discourse through the prescribed school curriculum from an early age. Additionally, this foundation is constantly reinforced through various sociocultural channels; including mass media,
print media, and cultural institutions, such as national museums.’ This
distinguishing nature of Korean nationalism is observable elsewhere in the publics’
perception and interpretation of colonial heritage in the South Korean context. In
the narrative in Korean society, it is not difficult to see that colonial architecture was
constructed to discontinue Korea’s history and spirit. For example, the construction
of the colonial headquarters on the grounds of the Royal Palace was to colonise the
Korean people ‘spiritually and symbolically’ (Callahan, 1999). Additionally, it is
generally believed that the Japanese authority strategically restructured the colonial
capital, Seoul, and built public buildings to show Japan’s supremacy over Korea and
to proclaim the new nationality (Kang, 1999; Chung, 2003; Neff, 2007; King, 2009).
The Japanese Government General Building, an overwhelming Renaissance-style
granite structure with a copperplate dome in the form of the Japanese crown, was
designed to visually present Chinese character ‘Nichi’ (日). Another massive
European-styled building, the City Hall in central Seoul, was designed to look like
‘Hon’ (本). From an aerial view, by combining with those described by these
Japanese-built buildings and the landscape of Seoul formed a word ‘Nippon’ (大日本),
which means ‘Great Japan’ in Japanese characters in the centre of Seoul (ibid).

In connection with the spiritual invasion, the colonial architecture has frequently
been interpreted in geomantic terms, Feng-Shui, a form of East Asian geomancy that
perceives the land as a human body (Park, 2012). In a large section of the Korean
public, the colonial architecture has been regarded as ‘Feng-Shui invasion’ by the
Japanese on Korean territory (Jin, 2008; Park, 2012). As a gigantic iron stake
driven into the concentration point of Korean energy, the colonial structure
suppresses and cuts the vital forces of Korean energy. The Government General
Building also became a prime example of the rhetoric of Feng-Shui in South Korean
society due to its location. The story goes that the Japanese colonial authority
deliberately constructed the building in front of Kyongbok Palace, which was
carefully planned according to the traditional Korean geomancy theory, in order to
block the energy flowing down from Pugak Mountain, situated behind the palace,
and to cut the life vein of Korean energy (Kang, 1999; Chung, 2003; Park, 2012)
(Figure 4.6).
Although the widespread geomantic theory has not been supported scientifically, the geomantic discourse concerning colonial architecture has been widely supported by the media and literature in Korean society. For example, in dealing with the issue of the building, Lee (1995, p.80; cited in King, 2009) stated that ‘they (the Japanese) wanted to crush the national spirit of the Korean people by interfering with the geomantic layout of the Chosun capital, which was centred around the palace…the Japanese hoped to make Koreans their eternal servant’. The Korean Times, a major English-language daily newspaper in South Korea, also reported:

‘The colonists have been charged with building their headquarters intentionally non-aligned to the palace building in an attempt to disgrace the royal authority of the kingdom they had annexed. Upon construction of the Government General’s Office, they moved Kwanghwa-mun to the east of the palace and dismantled the waterway around the front courtyard.’


Thus from a Feng-Shui invasion perspective, Korea is still affected by negative forces from Japanese colonial power. The elimination of the colonial structure, the
force creating undesirable Feng-Shui, is an effective way to restore Korean identity as well as Korean autonomy, control and power (Park, 2012). This public understanding of the colonial buildings, amalgamated with the geomantic idea, implies that the existing colonial architecture in post-colonial Korean society has continually and significantly impacted people’s sense of national identity and their national consciousness for more than four decades after the liberation (Kim, 1998; Park, 2012). Additionally, it appears that the geomantic idea behind the government slogan ‘reconstruction of national spirit’ became a basis for the reconstruction of popular memory and the imagination of the nation in South Korean society (Jin, 2008).

4.3.3 Dilemmas of Colonial Architecture
Macdonald (2006a) addresses that undesirable and contested natured heritage may raise complicated issues on the legitimacy of their preservation for national identity. Despite the widespread nationalistic understanding of the colonial heritage in South Korea, it has been difficult to achieve a public consensus over the legitimacy of its preservation for national identity. Intense social debates surrounded the decision to remove the Government General Building throughout the 1990s. Public poll conducted by the National Museum of Korea in 1991 revealed that more than half of participants (i.e. 77% of professionals and 65% of the public) supported the demolition of the building, whereas another survey in the same year revealed that more than half of the responses were in favour of its preservation for the commemoration of the colonial past and considering the cost of the demolition (Yoon, 2007; Park, 2012). The removal of the colonial buildings still triggers academic and social debates in Korean society (e.g. Kim, 1998; Jin, 2008; Kim, 2010; Chun, 2012; Park, 2012).

As previously mentioned, the pro-demolitionists, who approach colonial heritage from a strong nationalist perspective, are prone to perceive the heritage as a legacy of colonial imperialism that is still associated with a painful and shameful period the Koreans prefer to forget and which needs to be removed in order to revise the memory of people where national identity is endangered. Meanwhile,
preservationists criticise the elimination of colonial heritage by stressing various values that the colonial heritage embedded. The preservationists, who approach the colonial heritage from an education perspective, highlight didactic meanings of the heritage, especially for younger generations. They, especially conservative historians, appreciate the colonial-era buildings as a testimony of history. Despite its tragic history, the heritage is a part of Korean history that should be remembered and commemorated, and needs to be used as a commemoration site, as is the Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland (Lee, 1991; Kim, 1991; cited in Choi, 2010). In line with this, some people attach great importance to its historic value in post-colonial Korea (Choi, 2010). In the case of the Government General Building, it could be seen as an icon of post-colonial Korea because it was the birthplace of the Republic of Korea and a witness of important political events in South Korea after the liberation (Jin, 2008; Choi, 2010). Additionally, some architectural historians highlight the value of the colonial heritage. For example, a Japanese architectural research society counters the destruction of the Government General Building by arguing that the building is one of the finest architectural masterpieces in the page of modern architectural history (Choi, 2010). The preservationists also criticise the government’s decision to demolish it as an authoritarian measure and people’s nationalism is deliberately encouraged for their political benefits (Kim, 1998; Hsia, 2002). For example, Hsia (2002) argues that the Government General Building was strategically demolished to promote the civil government’s image of democratic reform and national legitimacy. In the same vein, Park (2012) criticises that the institution has used unscientific folklore and popular myth (i.e. Feng-Shui geomancy) to control the thoughts and actions of the Korean public. Furthermore, Bae (2002; cited in Jin, 2008) argues that the effort to construct national identity through the demolition of colonial legacy in Korean society is a representation of the lack of autonomy among the colonised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><a href="http://ehistory.go.kr/page/pop/photo_pop.jsp?photo_PhotoID=19087&amp;photo_PhotoSrcGBN=PT#n">http://ehistory.go.kr/page/pop/photo_pop.jsp?photo_PhotoID=19087&amp;photo_PhotoSrcGBN=PT#n</a></th>
<th><a href="http://www.chpri.org/board/content.asp?bCat=%C7%F6%C0%E5%B0%ED%B9%DF&amp;bCode=6212&amp;page=82&amp;sColumn=&amp;sText=">http://www.chpri.org/board/content.asp?bCat=%C7%F6%C0%E5%B0%ED%B9%DF&amp;bCode=6212&amp;page=82&amp;sColumn=&amp;sText=</a></th>
<th><a href="http://www.bba.or.kr/bbs/board.php?bo_table=temple_news&amp;wr_id=83">http://www.bba.or.kr/bbs/board.php?bo_table=temple_news&amp;wr_id=83</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The old Blue House</td>
<td>b. The old Seoul City Hall</td>
<td>c. Beomeosa Temple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7 Removal of Legacies of Japanese Colonialism in South Korea

Many material structures inherited from colonisation have been destroyed through wartime destruction (i.e. the Korean War in 1950-1953) as well as rapid economic and social development of South Korea. Today, limited numbers of modern cultural heritage and sites including colonial architectural buildings are officially reserved as Registered Cultural Heritage (Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, 2013). However, despite the official reservation, a number of colonial buildings and historic places have been at the centre of intensive social controversy regarding the legitimacy of their preservation for national identity. Sometimes, it is eliminated as a symbolic performance to end negative foreign influence over Korean identity. The widespread nationalistic understanding of colonial heritage and social controversies do not merely illustrate how the Japanese colonial heritage is perceived and interpreted in contemporary South Korean society. They also imply how colonial heritage is one of the most contentious and sensitive problems faced by South Korea, a post-colonial nation struggling to reconstruct a new national identity. It can perhaps only be speculated whether the destruction or preservation of the heritage would be an effective way to construct national identity. However, it is clear that the physical remains of colonialism still play an important role in constructing national identity after the end of colonial rule. Additionally, the impact of colonial heritage on the construction of national identity would never be as simple as it seems because there are various interpretations and perceptions of colonial buildings in remembering the past. Hence, the issues of Japanese colonial heritage and construction of Korean identity still remain to be explored in more detail in a contemporary South Korean context.
Chapter Five
Study One: Questionnaire

5.1 Introduction
The focus of Study One is on whether and in what way colonial heritage is related to a sense of national identity. The rationale for this study is that not only does the statistical information obtained through the questionnaire identify how cultural heritage is related to a sense of national identity, but it also provides understanding of the impact of colonial heritage on a sense of national identity to the later studies (i.e. Studies Two and Three). This chapter discusses the questionnaire approach, the principal methodology for Study One. It starts by proposing the aims and specific objectives for Study One to achieve and follow it with a section presenting the more detailed questionnaire approaches adopted in this study to address the research questions. Furthermore, it discusses the design and conduct of the questionnaire and the sampling and specific measurement scales applied.

5.2 Aim and Objectives
This study focuses primarily on the first research question, in order to understand the way in which cultural heritage is related to individuals’ sense of national identity, with a more detailed examination of two different types of cultural heritage (i.e. their own national group’s cultural heritage and colonial heritage which is not their own cultural heritage). Firstly, this study provides an understanding of how individuals identify cultural heritage in a South Korean context, such as types of cultural heritage that South Koreans identify, the degree of their ability to identify, and people’s sense of attachment to the heritage. Secondly, this study examines the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of national identity and the identity motivations that are differently salient for South Koreans. Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process theory is employed as it provides the theoretical background of applicable identity motivations (e.g. self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness, and continuity). Lastly, some assumptions embedded in social identity theories are examined, particularly Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986)
Social Identity Theory, such as the strength of group identification (i.e. affiliation and group status), a sense of attachment, and social experience in relation to national identity. These include a detailed examination of generation difference. The objectives are to understand:

1. Individuals’ identification of cultural heritage and intergenerational difference: 1.1) nature of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage) and 1.2) generational difference in identifying cultural heritage

2. Individuals’ attachment to national in-group heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage) and national out-group heritage (i.e. Japanese colonial heritage), and intergenerational difference

3. The role of cultural heritage in the perception of national identity, and comparisons between two different types of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage)

4. The link of social identity components to perception of cultural heritage in relation to their sense of national identity: 4.1) national group identification (i.e. affiliation and group status), 4.2) emotional attachment to place, and 4.3) group interaction in socio-historic context

5.3 Questionnaire: Sampling and Procedure
The questionnaire was conducted in May and June 2010 in South Korea. Six hundred and sixty four valid data sets were obtained. Samples were drawn from South Koreans living in Seoul, South Korea, by using non-probability sampling techniques, a mixture of convenience sampling and purposive sampling (e.g. quota sampling, snowball sampling). Non-probability sampling techniques may curtail the generalizability of research findings because intentionally selected samples do not represent the overall population (Sekaran, 2003; Vanderstoep & Johnston, 2009). Additionally, the choice of samples may lead to a bias which challenges the validity of research findings (Heckathorn, 2002). Despite the disadvantage, it is widely acknowledged that non-probability sampling techniques are more feasible and
flexible than random sampling techniques in terms of research cost and time, and ease of access to source of information (Watters & Biernacki, 1989; Kemper, Stringfield & Teddlie, 2003; Sekaran, 2003). Watters and Biernacki (1989) also emphasise that non-probability sampling techniques (e.g. targeted sampling) are more powerful tools than random sampling techniques, if carried out appropriately and population parameters are known. This study employed non-probability sampling techniques because selecting participants in the position to offer the required information (i.e. South Koreans who have grown up and living in Seoul where many symbolic Japanese colonial architectural heritage are located) could be expected to provide the most information for the research questions. Although random sampling techniques produce generalizable information, information derived from the population who do not meet research criteria (e.g. participant’s age, residence, living history, ethnic, nationality) may not be useful to answer the research questions. Not only to reduce the biases associated with non-probability sampling techniques but also to increase credibility of the obtained information, a large number of samples were selected in this study (i.e. over 600 participants). Additionally, participants were recruited through a structured process. Sampling began with an examination of lists of local educational institutions (e.g. universities), community centres (e.g. local community centres, senior welfare community centres, community clubs, citizen groups), and local business companies and private organisations in Seoul, and requested their participation in the questionnaire study by emails and telephone. The researcher also asked participants to recommend others they may know who also meet the criteria, which is snowball sampling. When they confirmed interest in this study, the researcher visited and briefed them beforehand as to the nature, content and purpose of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was self-administered; therefore, the questionnaires were distributed to participants and the researcher revisited them a week later to collect the questionnaire. The samples were also selected non-randomly according to a fixed quota. The researcher specified the minimum number of samples in each generational group (e.g. minimum of 200 samples in each generation group for the questionnaire), and continued sampling until the required number of participants was achieved.
5.3.1 Demographic Information and Generation Grouping

59.8% of the participants (397 respondents) were male and 40.2% of the participants (267 respondents) were female in this study (Table 5.1). The average age of participants was 40 years (Table 5.2). 99.5% of participants (661 respondents) were born in South Korea, and their average length of residence in South Korea was 39.95 years.

Table 5.1 Sex of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Age Band of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were formed from three different generation groups of South Koreans (i.e. 211 older generations, 227 middle generations, and 226 younger generations) to identify any inter-generational differences in South Korean society. The key criteria in grouping generations were the periods following two political and economic events which marked a watershed in the modern history of South Korea (Figure 5.1):

- Korean society after the normalisation of diplomatic relations between South Korea and Japan (1965)
- Korean society after the lifting of Japanese cultural exports to South Korea (1988)
One of the key criteria in grouping generations in a South Korean context was the normalising diplomatic relations between South Korea and Japan (1965). The samples from the older generation were recruited on the basis that their early life (e.g. childhood) was spent under Japanese colonial rule (before 1945) and post-colonial South Korean society. This generation is highly likely to have a significant amount of either direct or indirect experience of Japanese colonial rule in their everyday lives. Another key turning point in the modern history of South Korea could be observed in connection with the lifting of Japanese cultural exports to South Korea in the late 1980s. Before this period, Japanese popular culture (e.g. animations, movies, songs, books) was strictly prohibited in South Korean society and high antagonism towards Japanese nationality existed in South Korean society. The samples from the middle generation were chosen from people who have grown up in a society holding high antagonism towards Japanese nationality based on the colonial history and who were less likely to contact Japanese popular culture at their younger age. The younger generations were recruited on the basis that they have grown up after the lifting of Japanese cultural exports to South Korea. Therefore, they are less likely to be affected by past inter-group conflict (i.e. colonial history) and less likely to have antagonism towards Japanese nationality. It was anticipated that each different generation in South Korea would have a variety of life experiences under different social contexts in South Korea.

![Figure 5.1 Generation Divisions in Study One](image)

Drawing on the above criteria, three different generation groups were identified in this research: the younger generation were defined as young adult Koreans above 18
years and under 30 years, the middle generation were those aged between 30 and 49 years, and the older generation referred to South Koreans over 50 years. The samples in this study consist of two hundred and twenty six South Koreans from the younger generation (34.0%), two hundred and twenty seven South Koreans from the middle generation (34.2%), and two hundred and eleven South Koreans from the older generation (31.8%) in South Korean society (Table 5.3).

Table 5.3 Participants from Three Generation Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger generation</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle generation</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older generation</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>664</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Pilot Study

In advance of the main questionnaire study that took place in Seoul in 2010, all measurement scales were piloted on small samples of South Koreans living in the UK (i.e. 20 Korean students in University of Surrey and 20 Korean residents in New Malden, Surrey) in February 2010, and South Koreans living in Seoul, South Korea (e.g. 20 local university students and company workers) in April in 2010. Problems related to the wording of the measurement items and the length of the questionnaire was uncovered during the two pilot studies. For some participants, especially from the older generation group, the wording of the measurement items and format of the questionnaire were over-complex. Additionally, the majority of participants spent more than twenty minutes in completing the questionnaire and the completion time for the older generation participants was longer. These problems not only restricted the number of people willing to participate but also raised issues concerning understanding of the measurement items and the quality of the obtained data. In order to minimise inconsistency in interpreting questions and to simplify the format of the questionnaire, some changes were made to the wording of items in the final version of the questionnaire.
5.4 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire consisted of five main sections covering issues related to heritage identification and national identity in this study. The sections are presented below and a copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix 1.

Cultural Heritage Identification

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to examine cultural heritage that South Koreans identify as their own cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage) and out-group's cultural heritage (i.e. Japanese colonial heritage). Participants were asked to identify up to five aspects of Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage. Afterwards, they were asked to rate the heritage they think is most typically Korean and Japanese colonial heritage from the list they had already specified. This task was located at the very beginning of the questionnaire in order to maximise their inspiration for cultural heritage.

Sense of Attachment to Cultural Heritage

In order to measure the degree to which the participants have a sense of attachment to cultural heritage, a modified Place Attachment Scale (Williams & Roggenbuck, 1989; Williams, 2000; Williams & Vaske, 2003) was used. Williams and his colleagues introduced a number of statements for measuring various types of place attachment (e.g. emotional/symbolic/functional attachment). In this questionnaire, seven items were chosen from their measurement scales because they were reliable and the items could be adapted to measure participants’ attachment to cultural heritage. Items that could best fit a heritage setting were included, such as ‘I feel this heritage is a part of me’, ‘this heritage is very special to me’, ‘I identify strongly with this heritage’, ‘this heritage means a lot to me’, and ‘this heritage says a lot about who I am’. The participants were asked to rate the perceived level of attachment to Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage using a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’, with a midpoint of ‘neither agree nor disagree’.
**Cultural Heritage and a Sense of National Identity**

The way cultural heritage links to a sense of national identity was examined through the interpretive lens of Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory. She argues that four main psychological motivations control identity processes, which are self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness, and continuity. The measurement scales, comprising fifteen item scales, were devised with the aim of measuring the extent to which participants derive their sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness, and continuity from cultural heritage, and identity motivations salient for South Koreans. The self-esteem scale, capturing the participants’ general feeling of personal worth and social value as Koreans, consisted of four items: heritage make me feel that “I am proud to be Korean”, “I sometimes feel that being Korean give me confidence”, “I do not feel good about being Korean” and “Knowing I am Korean does not make me feel good about myself”. The self-efficacy scale, measuring the participants’ feelings of confidence and of being in control of their life as Koreans, consisted of four items: “being Korean provides me with lots of opportunities”, “being Korean gives me advantage in life”, “As a Korean, I often feel successful” and “I feel as though I can achieve my goals in life because I am Korean”. The distinctiveness scale was designed with the aim of measuring their desire to maintain uniqueness as well as distinctiveness from other nationalities. The four items were: “being Korean make me feel special”, “being Korean makes me feel better than other nationalities”, “Being Korean does not make me feel different from other nationalities”, and “Being Korean, I feel I have much in common with other nationalities”. The continuity scale, capturing the participants’ feelings of the existence of self as Koreans across time and situations, comprised three statements: “being Korean gives me a real sense of my heritage”, “being Korean gives me a strong belief in the future”, and “Being Korean gives me a sense of destiny”. In addition to these key questions based on the Identity Process Theory, three simple questions were added in order to obtain information on how much they feel cultural heritage is related to their sense of national identity (e.g. familiarity, centrality, positivity). The rating in these questions used a seven-point Likert scale.
National Group Identification

The theoretical orientation adopted in this measurement was based on Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory, which focuses on the notion that the strength of membership of groups and group categorisation would influence inter-group attitudes. The strength of national in-group identification was assessed using five item scales derived from Barrett’s (2007) Strength of Identification Scale (SoIS), a multi-item measure of the strength of national, state, and ethnic identification. This measurement scale consisted of a set of five items measuring degree of identification (“To what extent do you feel Korean?”), pride (“How proud are you of being Korean?”), importance (“How important is it to you that you are Korean?”), feeling (“How do you feel about being Korean?”), and internalization (“How you would feel if someone said something bad about Korean people?”). A seven-point Likert scale specified the degree of agreement with each measurement item. Perceptions of national group status in comparison with Japanese nationalities was measured using a series of specific emotions towards the national out-group (17 emotions) derived from Fiske, Cuddy and Glick’s (2003) intergroup emotions scale, measuring perceived out-group’s status. This measurement scale consists of a series of emotions usually felt towards out-groups according to different intergroup statuses, such as groups seen as high status (e.g. warm: admiration, respect, fond of, inspired by, pride in, trust; cold: jealousy, fear, suspicious of) and low status (e.g. warm: pity, sympathy; cold: anger, contempt, disgust, hatred, resentment, despise). The participants were asked to indicate the extent to which any of these emotions in the list applied Japanese nationalities (e.g. how much do you feel …towards Japanese?).

Demographic Measures

In the last section of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to provide information on their personal background. The first part of this section focused on the participants’ personal and family life history, such as their place of birth, length of residence in South Korea, and personal and family life under Japanese colonial rule. The second part of this section consisted of questions identifying their demographic characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate their age, gender,
position in family (e.g. generations), employment status (e.g. full time paid, part time paid, studying, retired), their perceived social class (e.g. working class, middle class, upper class), and education level attained. The background information obtained through this section identified the existence of any influence from the participants’ personal characteristics on their heritage identification with respect to a sense of national identity.

With the above main sections covering research questions in Study One, several extra questions (e.g. views about Japanese colonial buildings, personal life history) were added in order to collect primary information in constructing later studies (e.g. Studies Two and Three). Finally, the participants were asked to indicate their willingness to participate in a Multiple Sorting Task (Study Two).

5.5 Measurement Scales

5.5.1 Initial Data Screening

In advance of a main data analysis, key data screening techniques were applied to inspect for missing data, to check outliers, and to test for normality of the obtained data. Firstly, descriptive analysis was carried out to inspect for missing data. The result indicated that there were a few missing values in some cases and they emerged randomly. These missing values were managed by calculating mean values for the variables and giving every missing data item these values. Additionally, some missing cases were excluded if required for specific analysis. Secondly, this study employed two statistical methods, a box plot and an absolute value of skewness and kurtosis. The box plot showed that there were several extreme values in some item scales. In order to identify how much of a problem these outlier cases were likely to be, the original mean and the 5% trimmed mean were compared. The result showed that the two mean values in each item were very similar; therefore, it appeared that the values were not too different to the remaining distribution. Accordingly, these cases were retained in the data file. Additionally, the normality of the data was assessed by absolute size of skewness and kurtosis values, and a histogram. The result represented that the absolute values of all items were less than 2; therefore, the distribution of scores for each item was reasonably normal.
Lastly, negatively worded measurement items and items with a negative sign were reversed before a score was calculated for the scale, in order not to cause response bias in analysing data. Therefore, four items in the measurement of the effect of heritage on a sense of national identity (i.e. item 7, 11, 12, 15) and one item in the measurement of the strength of national in-group identification (i.e. item 5) were recoded (Table 5.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Scales</th>
<th>Recoded Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and a sense of national identity</td>
<td>7. Being Korean does not make me feel different from other nationalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Being Korean, I feel I have much in common with other nationalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I don’t feel good about being Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Knowing I am Korean does not make me feel good about myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National in-group identification</td>
<td>5. How would you feel if someone said something bad about Koreans?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 Reliability of Measurement Scales

Measurement of Heritage Attachment

Reliability analysis was carried out to establish the robustness of a multi-item measurement scale of heritage attachment. Firstly, seven items on the heritage attachment scale were applied to both national in-group heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage) and national out-group heritage (i.e. Japanese colonial heritage). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value verifies the sampling adequacy for the analysis (the in-group heritage, KMO = 0.930; the out-group heritage, KMO = 0.915), and all KMO values for individual items were >0.90, which was well above the acceptable limit of 0.50 (Field, 2009a). Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity also supported the factorability of the correlation matrix. An initial analysis to check the eigenvalues for each component in the data indicated that there was only one component with eigenvalues over Kaiser’s criterion of 1. In terms of reliability of measurements, the attachment measurement scales adapted to both two different types of cultural heritages all had high reliabilities, a standardised Cronbach’s alpha = 0.937 and 0.944 respectively (Table 5.5).
Table 5.5 Principal Component Factor Analysis Statistics for Heritage Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Attachment</th>
<th>Korean Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Japanese Colonial Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel this heritage is a part of me.</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This heritage is very special to me.</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I identify strongly with this heritage.</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This heritage means a lot to me.</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I’m very attached to this heritage.</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This heritage says a lot about who I am.</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I get more satisfaction out of visiting this site than from visiting any other place.</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Motivations of National Identity

Reliability analysis on a multi-item measurement scale for a sense of national identity consisted of four subscales (i.e. self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity) was carried out after the scale was applied to both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage. The result represented stability and consistency of the measurement in this research context, confirming that a sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity subscales had good internal consistency with good reliabilities.

Self-esteem: The standardised Cronbach’s alpha measure of reliability for four items applied to both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage was 0.776 (n = 664).

Self-efficacy: Reliability analysis revealed that the measurement scales adapted to both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage all have high reliability, a standardised Cronbach’s alpha was 0.863 and 0.896 respectively (n = 664).

Continuity: When applied to both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage, the measurement scales for continuity, consisting of three items, had good internal consistency, with a standardised Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.762 and 0.813 respectively.
Distinctiveness: Reliability analysis on the measurement of distinctiveness showed that the measure of distinctiveness had lower reliability in both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage, a standardised Cronbach’s alpha was 0.474 and 0.377 respectively. These measurement items are presented in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6 Measurement Items for Four Key Motivations of Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations</th>
<th>Measurement Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>1. I am proud to be Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I sometimes feel that being Korean give me confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I do not feel good about being Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Knowing I am Korean does not make me feel good about my self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>5. Being Korean provides me with lots of opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. As a Korean, I often feel successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. I feel as though I can achieve my goals in life because I am Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Being Korean gives me advantages in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>9. Being Korean gives me a real sense of my heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Being Korean gives me a sense of destiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Being Korean gives me a strong belief in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>12. Being Korean makes me feel better than other nationalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Being Korean makes me feel special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Being Korean does not make me feel different from other nationalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Being Korean, I feel I have much in common with other nationalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of National Group Identification

Reliability analysis on the multi-item measurement of the strength of national ingroup identification was conducted in order to confirm whether five item scales derived from Barrett’s (2007) Strength of Identification Scale (SoIS) consistently reflected the construct in this research context. The result showed that all five subscales had good internal consistency, with standardised Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of above 0.8 (i.e. 0.837) (Table 5.7).
Table 5.7 Measurement Items for National Group Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>How much do you feel Korean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>How proud are you of being Korean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>How important is it to you that you are Korean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>How do you feel about being Korean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalisation</td>
<td>How would you feel if someone said something bad about Korean?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability analysis on the measurement scale of national group status (i.e. identification of Japanese nationalities) was conducted in order to confirm whether the scale derived from Fiske et al. (2003) consistently reflect the construct in this study context. The result shows that all four subscales have good internal consistency, with standardised Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .723, .890, .668, and .686 respectively (Table 5.8). Based on the result of Corrected Item-Total Correlation, item ‘Pride’ which did not correlate very well with the subscale of ‘warm, competent and high status’ (.223) was removed for further investigation.

Table 5.8 Measurement Items for National Out-group Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-group Status</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High status</td>
<td>Warm: <em>Admiration</em>, <em>Trust</em>, <em>Respect</em>, <em>Fond of</em>, <em>Inspired by</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cold: <em>Jealousy</em>, <em>Fear</em>, <em>Suspicious of</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>Warm: <em>Pity</em>, <em>Sympathy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cold: <em>Despise</em>, <em>Hatred</em>, <em>Resentment</em>, <em>Disgust</em>, <em>Contempt</em>, <em>Anger</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Six
Cultural Heritage and a Sense of National Identity

6.1 Introduction
The previous chapter discussed the questionnaire approach, the principal methodology for Study One. Drawing on this approach, this chapter analyses whether and in what way cultural heritage is related to a sense of national identity. It divides into two broad sections. First, it starts by proposing research hypotheses designed through the lens of social and environmental psychology theories. Second, it analyses the link between cultural heritage and a sense of national identity. This includes an examination of individuals’ identification of cultural heritage, strength of attachment to cultural heritage, and identity motivations that are particularly salient for South Koreans. This study also analyses the role of socially related identity elements in people’s perception of cultural heritage. Comparison will be made between two different types of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage), as well as generational groups (i.e. younger, middle and older generations) in terms of constructing individuals’ sense of national identity.

6.2 Research Hypothesis
6.2.1 Identification of Cultural Heritage and a Sense of Attachment
A basic assumption in Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory is the group to which people belong plays an important role in achieving their positive self-identity. Individuals have an ability to self-enhance their social identity by striving to differentiate their group from other groups (i.e. social categorisation); this is achieved by evaluating their group relative to other groups and seeing themselves as better than other groups (i.e. social comparison). By doing so, they manage to have positive feelings about themselves and, consequently, achieve positive self-identities. Environmental psychology literature also suggests that place or sites could be conceptualised as a symbol of a social group (e.g. Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Speller et al., 2002) or as social categories (e.g. Bonaiuto et al., 1996). Hence, individuals are highly likely to choose places that
help to maintain and develop their positive identity, and keep away from places that impact negatively on their identity (Twigger-Ross et al., 2003). Drawing on these assumptions, the following hypotheses may be developed.

**Hypothesis 1:** For their national cultural heritage, individuals are more likely to choose their own national cultural heritage than cultural heritage.

**Hypothesis 2:** Individuals’ identification of cultural heritage (i.e. both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage) may differ among the generational groups.

According to Brown and Perkins (1992, p.284), place attachment arises from ‘the behavioural, affective and cognitive ties between individuals and/or groups and their socio-physical environment’. It sometime occurs without consciousness (ibid). In this sense, much environmental psychology literature proposes that a sense of attachments are encouraged not only by personal experiences with the socio-physical environment but also by daily encounters with place, community and collective involvement (Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Uzzell et al., 2002; Knez, 2005; Lewicka, 2008). In the light of this consideration, this study assumes that individuals are more likely to have stronger sense of attachment to their own cultural heritage because they may have positively experienced the heritage over time. Especially, the older generation are more likely to have higher levels of a sense of attachment to the cultural heritage due to their life experiences associated with cultural heritage.

**Hypothesis 3:** Individuals are more likely to have a stronger sense of attachment to their own national group’s heritage than cultural heritage associated with a national out-group.

**Hypothesis 4:** The older generation are more likely to have higher levels of a sense of attachment to the cultural heritage than the younger generations.
6.2.2 The Role of Cultural Heritage in a Sense of National Identity

Under the Social Identity paradigm, an enormous range of social identity studies begin with the assumption that maintaining identity is strongly associated with self-esteem. However, one of the key arguments in Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory is that processes of identity construction are guided through multiple psychological motivations of identity that acquire equal status. These are a sense of personal worth and social value (i.e. self-esteem), a sense of confidence and being in control of one’s life (i.e. self-efficacy), a need to maintain personal uniqueness or distinctiveness from others (i.e. distinctiveness) and a feeling that the self remains the same across time and situations (i.e. continuity). Following Breakwell (1986, 1988, 1993), the existence of multiple motivations of identity has been evidenced empirically by much of identity literature under their own research interests (e.g. Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000; Vignoles et al., 2002a; Vignoles et al., 2006; Vignoles et al., 2008; Jaspal & Coyle, 2009; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010a, 2010b; Jaspal, 2011b). In the light of this consideration, this study assumes that if cultural heritage could act as a social category providing individuals their sense of identity in its own right, the heritage may act as a trigger for a sense of national identity determined by an interaction between the four different types of identity motivations.

Hypothesis 5: Koreans’ cultural heritage is more likely to contribute to Korean’s self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity, in comparison with Japanese colonial heritage.

Hypothesis 6: The salience of identity motivations may differ according to the characteristics of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage).

6.2.3 A Sense of National Identity and Social Identity Variables

Not only is the construction of identity manifested through an individual’s nature (e.g. personal thoughts, actions and emotions) but it is also significantly influenced by social environment (Breakwell, 2001a; Twigger-Ross et al., 2003). In examining the role of social identity variables in the perception of cultural heritage, this study
limited itself to examining three prominent contextual determinants, which are group identification, emotional attachment to place, and group interaction in a socio-historic context, that frequently appear in social and environmental psychology literature.

6.2.3.1 Group Identification and Perception of Cultural Heritage

As far as a sense of identity contingent upon group comparisons is concerned, social psychology literatures under the Social Identity Theory paradigm address individuals’ prior level of in-group identification playing a crucial role in perceiving a sense of identity that may arise from intergroup relationships. Such literatures include Branscombe & Wann (1994), Doosje et al. (1999), Branscombe et al. (1999), Stephan & Stephan (2000) and Stephan et al. (2002). For example, people strongly identifying with their in-group are more likely to feel threatened by out-groups, whereas low identifiers not feeling strong ties with their own group are less likely to be threatened (Branscombe et al., 1999; Doosje et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). This is because the low identifiers may not only consider the distinction between their own groups and out-groups as less crucial, but also express less interest in the improvement of their group’s status (Branscombe et al., 1999; Doosje et al., 1999). In the light of this, it could be assumed that individuals’ perceptions of cultural heritage are likely to differ according to the degree to which they feel strong affiliation with their own group membership. To be more specific:

**Hypothesis 7:** Individuals with stronger national group membership are more likely to perceive national identity from their own cultural heritage than those who are less strongly affiliated to their own national membership.

**Hypothesis 8:** Individuals with strong national group membership are less likely to perceive national identity from colonial heritage.

With respect to individuals’ group identification and its role in their sense of identity,
much scholarly work under the Social Identity Theory paradigm has also been conducted on in-group and out-group status differentials (i.e. perceived unequal group status) (e.g. Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002). It is widely accepted that the perception of group status inequalities results not only in the perception of identity threats but also in the biased perception of their group. However, the prediction of its relationship is unclear. Some literature claims individuals in a low status group are more likely to engage in in-group bias because they have a stronger need to feel good about themselves (e.g. Brewer, 1979). However, Mullen et al. (1992) claim that a group with lower societal status does not automatically lead to in-group bias and opposite predictions of the effects of status can be found in their experiment research. Despite no prediction receiving overall agreement, it appears the status of the group to which individuals belong may be a key determinant of their psychological behaviours. In light of this, it would be assumed that individuals’ perception of national group status may have important implications for their perception of cultural heritage.

Hypothesis 9: Individuals’ perception of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage) may differ according to the perceived status of the group to which they belong.

6.2.3.2 Heritage Attachment and Perception of Cultural Heritage

In environmental psychology study, a sense of attachment to physical environment has been emphasised as one of the key elements in constructing place-related social identity. It is widely accepted that both individual aspects of identity and community aspects of identity are constructed through a subjective experience and emotional bond to the socio-physical environment (Brown & Perkins, 1992; Low & Altman, 1992; Speller, 2000; Hidalgo & Hernadez, 2001; Giuliani, 2003). Additionally, a sense of attachment has been considered a salient contextual determinant in perceptions of a physical environment (e.g. Fried, 1963, 2000; Bonaiuto et al., 1996; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Dixon & Durrheim, 2004). Bonaiuto et al. (1996) revealed that those highly attached to a certain place are more likely to highlight positive aspects of the place and less likely to highlight
undesirable features of the place under the condition of threats (e.g. polluted local area). Based on findings from previous place studies, this study assumes that individuals’ perceptions of cultural heritage in relation to their sense of national identity may be influenced by their attachment to the cultural heritage to some extent.

**Hypothesis 10:** Individuals with higher levels of a sense of attachment to Korean cultural heritage are more likely to perceive a sense of national identity from the heritage than those with lower levels of attachment.

**Hypothesis 11:** Individuals with higher levels of a sense of attachment to Japanese colonial heritage are more likely to perceive a sense of national identity from the colonial heritage than those with lower levels of attachment.

6.2.3.3 Group Interaction in a Socio-historic Context

In understanding the way in which individual or group identities are established, social psychology literature has emphasised not only the importance of their intra-personal nature but also their historic and social contexts (e.g. Breakwell, 1983; Branscombe et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002). In connection with the social context, several key determinants, strongly related to one another, have frequently been identified in social identity literature, such as the qualities of intergroup interaction, experience of the past intergroup conflict and levels of threat exposure. Social identity studies (e.g. Stephan et al., 2000a, 2000b; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002; Crisp et al., 2009) prove convincingly that either direct or indirect negative contact with certain out-groups intensifies individuals’ perception of threats and consequently results in their negative attitude towards the out-group. A series of inter-group relation studies also provide evidence that those who have experienced the greater and more violent intergroup conflict are more likely to be threatened by the out-group (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). Similarly, it has also been suggested that high exposure to identity threats in a social context can affect individuals’ feelings towards the out-group (Crisp et al., 2009). This study assumes that individuals’ perceptions of cultural heritage are likely to be modified by their social
experience in relation to Japanese nationality. For the purposes of measurement, the impact of group interaction in a socio-historic context is operationalized in terms of testing for differences between generation groups. Although there may be individual differences within a generational group, it is probably reasonable to anticipate that each different generation in South Korea would have had different social experiences in South Korea. For example, the older generation, which played a major role in Korean society before the normalisation of diplomatic relations in 1965, is more likely to have a significant amount of either direct or indirect experience of colonial rule (i.e. negative out-group contact) in their early life. However, the younger generation, which grew up after this period when South Korean society began to import Japanese culture in the 1990s, is less likely to have negative experience of Japanese identity because they are more likely to have experienced a significant amount of Japanese popular culture in their everyday lives than any previous generation. Specific hypotheses are as follows:

**Hypothesis 12:** The older generation is more likely to perceive a sense of national identity from Korean cultural heritage than younger generations do.

**Hypothesis 13:** The older generation is less likely to perceive a sense of national identity from Japanese colonial heritage than younger generations do.

### 6.3 Results

#### 6.3.1 Identification of Cultural Heritage

In order to explore the nature of cultural heritage people identify as their own national cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage (*Research question 1.1*), descriptive analysis was carried out. It was anticipated individuals are more likely to choose a national cultural heritage reflecting their own outstanding national history and nationalism than a cultural heritage that harms their sense of identity (*Hypothesis 1*). Participants were asked to identify up to five aspects of both types of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and colonial heritage) and the
findings support these two assumptions. The majority (92.6%, 615 respondents) specified historic places officially designated and preserved as national treasures in Korean society as representative of Korean cultural heritage (Table 6.1). Just under half of the participants (41.4%, 275 respondents) designated historic royal palaces built by the Joseon Dynasty (i.e. Kyongbok Palace), the last and longest ruling dynasty of Korean history (1392-1897), which left a substantial bequest to modern Korean values (e.g. socio-cultural values, norm, language, etc.). Following historic royal palaces, historic shrines and temples (i.e. Bulguksa Temple) (27.9%, 185 respondents), and historic gates (Namdaemun) (23.3%, 155 respondents) were most frequently designated as their own national cultural heritage (Figure 6.1). What these historic places have in common is they are highly likely to be considered as symbolic historic places that represent an outstanding Korean history, which supports construction of a positive sense of national identity. No one specified cultural heritage associated with a shaming national past (e.g. the colonial occupation) as his or her own national cultural heritage. In other words, individuals are less likely to choose their own national cultural heritage that harms their sense of national identity.

On the other hand, with regard to cultural heritage related to Japanese occupation, the participants designated symbolic architecture representing the Japanese colonial power and oppression. Around half of the participants (58.0%, 385 respondents) designated historic architecture related to the former Japanese colonial government and reflecting the political power under Japanese rule (e.g. the old Japanese General Government Building, the old buildings of Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison, etc.) (Figure 6.2). As well as architecture strongly related to Japanese colonial rule, participants referred to public-related buildings and public facilities constructed by the Japanese during their occupation that have subsequently played an important role in South Korean society after independence in 1945, such as railway stations (18.5%, 123 respondents), and business commerce-related buildings, including banks, companies and department stores (8.3%, 55 respondents).
Table 6.1 Types of Korean Cultural Heritage and Japanese Colonial Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean Cultural Heritage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese Colonial Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Royal Palaces</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrines/Tempests</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Gates</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Fortresses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Pagodas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Tombs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Remains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Villages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1 The Most Frequently Emerged Korean Cultural Heritage

Figure 6.2 The Most Frequently Emerged Japanese Colonial Heritage
(Source: a. Baek, 2005)

A one-way between-group analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the three different generational groups in order to answer research question 1.2; namely, whether generational difference could lead to difference in identifying cultural heritage. It was predicted that identification of cultural heritage (i.e. the degree to which individuals are able to identify cultural heritage) may differ among the
generational groups (*Hypothesis 2*). The finding supports this prediction. With respect to the national in-group’s cultural heritage, participants from the older generational group are significantly more likely to identify Korean cultural heritage (M=4.64, SD=.765) [F(2, 661)=7.225; p=0.001]. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey’s HSD test indicated there is no difference between the younger generation (M=4.32, SD=.996) and the middle generation (M=4.38, SD=.930). It is important that the generational difference was more significant in identification of Japanese colonial heritage. It was found that the older generation is significantly more likely to identify Japanese colonial heritage (M=4.64, SD=.765), whereas the younger generation (M=2.24, SD=1.407) and the middle generations did (M= 3.11, SD=1.553) is the group least likely to identify colonial heritage [F (2, 661)=77.087; p=.000]. These findings demonstrate that generational differences could lead to differences in identifying cultural heritage. The younger generation is less likely to differentiate colonial cultural heritage from Korean cultural heritage.

### 6.3.2 Strength of Attachment to Cultural Heritage

It order to answer research question 2, descriptive analysis of the levels of people’s attachment to cultural heritage was carried out. The finding supports *Hypothesis 3*, which predicts individuals are more likely to have a stronger sense of attachment to their own national group’s heritage than cultural heritage associated with a national out-group (Table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Heritage</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to prove *Hypothesis 4*, which predicts the older generation are more likely to have a higher sense of attachment to cultural heritage than the younger generation has, a one-way between-group analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. With respect to the level of their sense of attachment to Korean cultural heritage, the three generational groups were found to significantly differ from one other. In comparison with other generation groups, the older generational group is more likely
to feel a stronger attachment to Korean cultural heritage (M=5.13, SD=1.121), and the younger generation is less likely to have attached to the cultural heritage (M=4.26, SD=1.136) [F (2, 661)=32.298, p=.000]. However, no generational difference exists at the p<0.05 level in terms of the degree to which they feel attachment to colonial heritage [F (2, 619)=2.063, p=.128], which suggests all generations have a lower sense of attachment to the colonial heritage. Hence, the hypothesis predicting the older generation group is more likely to have a stronger sense of attachment to cultural heritage, in comparison with younger generational groups, is partially supported in this research context.

6.3.3 The Role of Cultural Heritage in a Sense of National Identity

Research question 3 asked in what way cultural heritage works in constructing a sense of national identity. It was predicted that individuals’ own national cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage) is more likely to contribute to their sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity, in comparison with the national out-group’s heritage (Hypothesis 5). Additionally, it was assumed that the salience of identity motivations may differ according to the characteristics of cultural heritage (i.e. their own cultural heritage and the colonial heritage) (Hypothesis 6). In order to prove these predictions, the questionnaire evaluated the psychological motivations of identity (i.e. self-esteem, self-efficacy, continuity, distinctiveness) particularly salient for South Koreans.

In order to prove Hypothesis 5 and 6, firstly, it examined the extent psychological motivations of identity are derived from Korean cultural heritage. The result from descriptive analysis shows a sense of self-esteem was the most salient motivations of national identity derived from the national group’s cultural heritage (M=5.42, SD=.907). This finding suggests individuals feel good and confident about themselves and are proud to be South Korean through their interaction with their own cultural heritage. Following a sense of self-esteem, a sense of distinctiveness (M=4.75, SD=.808) and a sense of continuity (M=4.59, SD=1.082) were also salient, suggesting individuals feel a sense of superiority and uniqueness from being South Korean through their interaction with their own cultural heritage. Cultural heritage
also contributes to maintaining and enhancing individuals’ stable self-conceptions as Korean and feelings of connection across time. A sense of self-efficacy was the least salient motivations of national identity contributed by Korean cultural heritage, in comparison with the above identity motivations (M=4.23, SD=1.045). In the same way, descriptive statistics measured the extent colonial heritage contributes to motivations of national identity. As in the case of Korean cultural heritage, a sense of self-esteem was the most salient motivation derived from colonial heritage (M=4.41, SD=1.183), although it was much less salient than for Korean cultural heritage. Following a sense of self-esteem, distinctiveness (M=4.01, SD=.826) and continuity (M=3.74, SD=1.274) were likely to be persuaded by colonial heritage. A sense of self-efficacy was the least salient motivations of identity (M=3.38, SD=1.167).

In order to identify the salience of identity motivations persuaded by cultural heritage, comparisons were made between two different kinds of cultural heritage. The finding supports Hypothesis 5 because the result shows Korean cultural heritage, their own national cultural heritage, is more likely to contribute to their sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity, in comparison with the national out-group’s heritage (i.e. colonial heritage). Hypothesis 6 is not supported in this research context. When comparing four principles of identity derived from two different types of cultural heritage, it is noticeable that the structure for salience of identity motivations is identical for each heritage (Table 6.3). That is to say, a sense of self-esteem would be the most salient identity motivation derived from both the national in-group and out-group’s cultural heritage (M=5.42, SD=.907 for Korean cultural heritage, M=4.41, SD=1.183 for colonial heritage). However, a sense of self-efficacy was the least salient motivation of identity persuaded by cultural heritage (M=4.23, SD=1.045 for Korean cultural heritage, M=3.38, SD=1.167 for colonial heritage). The only difference between the two different types of cultural heritage is the salience level of identity motivations derived from each cultural heritage. This finding suggests that regardless of types of cultural heritage, cultural heritage would play a part, particularly in construction of individuals’ sense of national identity by giving rise to their sense of self-esteem.
Table 6.3 Comparison between Korean Cultural Heritage and Colonial Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Principles</th>
<th>Korean Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Colonial Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4 Influence of Social Identity Variables

6.3.4.1 National Group Identification and a Sense of National Identity

Bivariate correlation analysis was carried out in order to answer research question 4.1, which asks whether and in what way the strength of individuals’ national group membership leads to difference in perceiving cultural heritage in relation to their sense of national identity. It was predicted individuals with strong national group membership are more likely to perceive national identity through their own cultural heritage than those who are less strongly affiliated to their own national membership (Hypothesis 7). It was also anticipated that individuals with strong national group membership are less likely to perceive national identity through colonial heritage, which is the symbol of the out-groups’ identity (Hypothesis 8).

Firstly, in order to confirm Hypothesis 7, bivariate correlation analysis was used to measure the relationship between individuals’ sense of national group membership and identity motivations they perceive through their own national cultural heritage. The analysis revealed a significantly strong relationship between two variables (Table 6.4). That is to say, the strength of their national group membership was significantly related to their perception of four main principles of national identity. Especially, strong and positive correlation existed between the membership and a sense of self-esteem (r=0.697, n=664, p=0.000). This finding suggests those with strong Korean membership are significantly more likely to perceive self-esteem through their own national heritage. In addition to a sense of self-esteem, those with strong national membership are also more likely to perceive a sense of continuity (r=0.597, n=664, p=0.000) and self-efficacy (r=0.553, n=664, p=0.000) through their interaction with their own cultural heritage. In comparison with other
identity motivations, a sense of distinctiveness had relatively less strong association with their national group membership ($r=.448, n=664, p=0.000$). This finding successfully supports Hypothesis 7.

This analysis also evidenced very weak positive correlation between the strength of individuals’ national group membership and identity motivations they perceive through colonial heritage. In comparison with the national in-group’s heritage, a very weak positive relationship existed between their strength of national group membership and their perception of a sense of continuity ($r=.238, n=664, p=.000$), self-efficacy ($r=.191, n=664, p=.000$), distinctiveness ($r=.181, n=664, p=.000$) and self-esteem ($r=.175, n=664, p=.000$). This finding suggests that, unlike a prediction that individuals with strong national group membership are less likely to perceive national identity through colonial heritage (Hypothesis 8); individuals with strong national membership are also likely to perceive national identity through colonial heritage in this research context. Especially, those with strong Korean membership are more likely to perceive a sense of continuity through colonial heritage. However, the relationship between national group membership and their perception of national identity is very weak.

Table 6.4 Correlation between National Group Membership and a Sense of National Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Principles</th>
<th>Korean Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Colonial Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson’s Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bivariate correlation analysis was carried out in order to confirm Hypothesis 9, which predicts that individuals’ perception of cultural heritage (i.e. their own cultural heritage and the colonial heritage) may differ according to the perceived status of the group to which they belong. The result does not support the hypothesis. Unlike individuals’ sense of national group membership, there was no evidence of the postulated relationship between group status and a sense of national identity (Table 6.5). This finding demonstrates that individuals’ perception of their national group
status does not seem to exert influence on individuals’ perception of a sense of national identity through cultural heritage.

### Table 6.5 Correlation between Group Status and a Sense of National Identity from Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Principles</th>
<th>Korean Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Colonial Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson’s Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.4.2 Heritage Attachment and a Sense of National Identity

Bivariate correlation analysis was performed in order to answer research question 4.2, whether and in what way a sense of attachment to cultural heritage leads to difference in perceiving national identity through cultural heritage. It was predicted individuals with higher levels of a sense of attachment to their own cultural heritage are more likely to perceive a sense of national identity through the heritage than those with lower levels of attachment (Hypothesis 10). Additionally, it was anticipated that individuals with higher levels of a sense of attachment to the colonial heritage are also more likely to perceive a sense of national identity through the heritage than those with lower levels of attachment (Hypothesis 11).

Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationship between individuals’ sense of attachment to cultural heritage and the level of their perception of identity motivations principles. With respect to Korean cultural heritage, a strong positive correlation was found between a sense of attachment and perception of identity principles ($r=0.492$, $n=664$, $p<0.000$). This finding demonstrates those with a strong sense of attachment to Korean cultural heritage were significantly more likely to perceive four identity motivations through their own cultural heritage, in comparison with those not attached to the cultural heritage, as predicted in Hypothesis 10. Especially, among four motivations of a sense of identity, a strong positive correlation existed between a sense of attachment
and a sense of continuity, suggesting that the stronger the attachment individuals have, the more they perceive a sense of continuity through Korean cultural heritage.

With respect to colonial heritage, the analysis also evidenced a positive correlation between people’s sense of attachment and their perception of identity motivations from the heritage (r=.335, n=625, p<0.000). This finding supports Hypothesis 11, which predicts individuals with higher levels of a sense of attachment to colonial heritage are more likely to perceive a sense of national identity through the heritage than those with lower levels of attachment. Especially, the result demonstrates that the stronger the attachment individuals have to the colonial heritage, the more they perceive a sense of self-efficacy through the heritage.

Table 6.6 Attachment to Cultural Heritage and a Sense of National Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Principles</th>
<th>Korean Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Colonial Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson’s Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4.3 Group Interaction in a Socio-Historic Context

A one-way between-group analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out on the three different generational groups in order to answer research question 4.3, whether and in what way different social experience leads to difference in perceiving national identity through cultural heritage. This study predicted the older generation is more likely to perceive a sense of national identity through their national cultural heritage than the younger generation does (Hypothesis 12). It was also predicted that older generations are less likely to perceive a sense of national identity through colonial heritage than younger generations do (Hypothesis 13). The result confirmed the degree to which individuals’ perception of national identity through cultural heritage differs among the generational groups (Table 6.8). With respect to national cultural heritage, post-hoc comparisons using Tukey’s HSD test indicated the older generation is more likely to perceive a sense of self-esteem (M=5.58, SD=.920) [F (2,
661) =4.9, p=.007], continuity (M=5.13, SD=1.002) [F (2, 661) =53.8, p=.000], and self-efficacy (M=4.62, SD=.987) [F (2, 661) =35.5, p=.000] through Korean cultural heritage than the other two generational groups do. However, no generational difference was found in the level of a sense of distinctiveness [F (2, 661) =1.0, p=.335]. This finding supports *Hypothesis 12*.

Table 6.7 Mean Scores for Generational Groups in terms of National Identity: Korean Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Principles</th>
<th>Generational Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Generation</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to colonial heritage, a similar trend could be found to the case of Korean cultural heritage. In comparison with the younger generation, the older generation is more likely to perceive a sense of national identity through colonial heritage. This finding is contrary to this study’s prediction (*Hypothesis 13*). It was found that the older generation is significantly more likely to perceive a sense of self-esteem (M=4.61, SD=1.322) [F (2, 661)=5.9, p=.003], continuity (M=4.14, SD=1.368) [F (2, 661)=18.2, p=.000], and self-efficacy (M=3.70, SD=1.198) [(F (2, 661)=17.5, p=.000] through colonial heritage. No statistically significant difference was found in the level of a sense of distinctiveness [F (2, 661)=1.4, p=.226] (Table 6.9). Although this finding does not support *Hypothesis 13*, it demonstrates that different social experience leads to difference in perceiving national identity through cultural heritage. It was identified that regardless of the type of cultural heritage, the older generation is more likely to perceive a sense of self-esteem, continuity and self-efficacy through cultural heritage, in comparison with the younger and middle generations.
Table 6.8 Mean Scores for Generational Groups in terms of National Identity: Colonial Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Principles</th>
<th>Younger Generation</th>
<th>Middle Generation</th>
<th>Older Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Conclusion
This study has investigated whether and in what way cultural heritage is related to individuals’ sense of national identity. The questionnaire was seen as the most appropriate methodology for this study because this approach has the advantage of testing social identity theories using statistical information. Furthermore, it also enables the researcher to compare two different types of cultural heritage statistically (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and colonial heritage) and generational groups (i.e. younger, middle and older generations) with regard to each research question. The research questions and hypotheses were designed and examined through the lens of social psychological theories, which include Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory and Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory Identity Process Theory. Taking into account theories of social identity and data obtained through the questionnaire, conclusions may be drawn as follows:

The first research question in this study explored to what extent people are able to identify Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage. The results demonstrated that colonial heritage differs from Korean cultural heritage in terms of a sense of national identity. When appreciating Korean cultural heritage, people appeared to select cultural heritage that makes them feel positive about the national group to which they belong. They were apt to select cultural heritage or historic places representing an outstanding Korean history and national achievements that support construction of their positive Korean identity. They did not choose cultural heritage strongly related to other national or ethnic groups, and cultural heritage that
may harm their positive national identity (e.g. historic places or structures associated with the colonial past). Colonial heritage was appreciated as a symbol of Japanese identity representing Japanese colonial power and oppression (e.g. the former colonial government buildings, public buildings). A similar pattern of appreciation of cultural heritage was repeated among three generation groups in a South Korean context. However, the younger generation were less likely to differentiate colonial cultural heritage from Korean cultural heritage.

Research Question 2 concerned people’s attachment to national in-group heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage) and national out-group heritage (i.e. Japanese colonial heritage) and the result confirms a stronger sense of attachment was developed towards Korean cultural heritage compared to Japanese colonial heritage. With respect to the level of their sense of attachment to Korean cultural heritage, it was found that the older generation was more likely to have a stronger sense of attachment to Korean cultural heritage than younger generations have. However, there was no generational difference in terms of the levels of a sense of attachment to colonial heritage; that is to say, all generations in South Korea have a lower sense of attachment to colonial heritage. This finding is not consonant with previous environment studies addressing a sense of place attachments arising not only from personal experiences with place but also from daily encounters with place and community involvement (Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002; Uzzell et al., 2002; Knez, 2005; Lewicka, 2008). Perhaps, this is because cognitive experience associated with Japanese colonial heritage in South Korean society (e.g. dominance of colonial power, oppression) may play a part in inhibiting the development of a sense of attachment to the heritage in South Korean society.

The main concern of Research Question 3 was to understand the role of cultural heritage in a sense of national identity. In order to explore the way in which cultural heritage is related to a sense of national identity, this study measured individuals’ sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity. This study confirmed that cultural heritage, both Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage, plays a part in individuals’ sense of national identity by giving rise
to a sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy distinctiveness, and continuity. Especially, a sense of self-esteem became the most salient motivation derived from cultural heritage, whereas a sense of self-efficacy appeared to be relatively less salient in comparison with other motivations. This means that through their interaction with cultural heritage, people were feeling good and confident about themselves, as well as proud to be South Korean. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage contributed similarly to multiple psychological motivations of identity. However, the contribution of the colonial heritage was less significant than that of Korean cultural heritage.

Research Question 4 asked whether and in what way social identity elements mediate individuals’ perceptions and evaluations of cultural heritage. Four key elements frequently appearing in social and environmental psychology study were considered in this study, which are individuals' national group affiliation, perception of national group status, emotional attachment to place, and experience of a unique social context.

Firstly, this study confirmed that individuals’ sense of their national group membership has important implications for their perceptions and evaluations of cultural heritage. Individuals with stronger Korean membership were more likely to perceive national identity through Korean cultural heritage than those less strongly affiliated to Korean membership. That is to say, the stronger an individual’s sense of Korean affiliation (i.e. Korean membership), the more they perceived self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity through Korean cultural heritage. Stronger national group membership also positively link to people’s perception of a sense of identity from Japanese colonial heritage. This means that individuals with stronger Korean membership were also likely to perceive four identity motivations through the colonial heritage. Especially, the stronger an individual’s sense of Korean affiliation (i.e. Korean membership), the more they perceived a sense of continuity through the colonial heritage. This result does not seem to echo previous social identity literature addressing levels of group affiliation increasing the salience.
of threats (e.g. Branscombe et al., 1999; Doosje et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002).

Secondly, individuals’ perceptions or evaluations of cultural heritage differed depending on how much they were attached to the cultural heritage. An increase in a sense of attachment to cultural heritage was strongly associated with an increase in perception of national identity through Korean cultural heritage, as well as a decrease in negative views about colonial heritage in relation to national identity. Especially, the stronger an individual’s sense of attachment to Korean cultural heritage, the more they perceived a sense of continuity through Korean cultural heritage. This positive correlation between a sense of attachment and a sense of continuity echoes Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) idea that places to which people have strong attachment serve as an icon representing continuity of the past and future and confirm the existence of self. The stronger an individual’s sense of attachment to Japanese colonial heritage, the more they perceived a sense of self-efficacy through the heritage. This suggests that individuals strongly attached to colonial heritage are likely to perceive competence to have control over the situation through the heritage. This positive correlation echoes Bonaiuto et al. (1996) and Billig’s (2006) study addressing people with a strong sense of attachment to place tending to highlight positive aspects of the place under the condition of threats.

Thirdly, individuals’ perceptions or evaluations of cultural heritage differed according to unique social experiences. The older generation, which has a significant amount of either direct or indirect negative experience related to the colonial past (i.e. negative out-group contact), appeared to perceive a stronger sense of self-esteem, continuity, and self-efficacy through both types of cultural heritage. Especially, the older generation perceived a sense of self-esteem from both types of cultural heritage, which indicates they feel confident about themselves and are proud to be South Korean through their interaction with Korean cultural heritage, as well as with Japanese colonial heritage.
Unexpectedly, no evidence of the postulated relationship between individuals’ perceptions of national group status was found in comparison with Japanese nationals and their perception of cultural heritage. This finding does not support previous intergroup relation literature addressing perceived disparity between their group and out-groups increasing threats to their sense of identity and leading group members to experience out-groups as threats (e.g. Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002).

Using questionnaires, this study measured whether and in what way cultural heritage is related to a sense of national identity and how social identity elements link to individuals’ perceptions and evaluation of cultural heritage in relation to their sense of national identity. Comparison was made between two different types of cultural heritage (i.e. Korean cultural heritage and Japanese colonial heritage) and among generational groups (i.e. younger, middle and older generations). The next empirical study, Study Two, goes further by shifting the focus to understanding the way in which individuals makes sense of Japanese colonial buildings in South Korean society that was not revealed in this questionnaire study. Additionally, a detailed examination will be conducted into what they consider important in conceptualising the colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity. Rather than a ‘top-down’ approach, the questions can be answered by a ‘bottom-up approach’, in which participants express and articulate what they consider important in perceiving colonial heritage. Therefore, the following chapter will discuss a Multiple Sorting Procedure, the principal methodology for Study Two.
Chapter Seven
Study Two: Multiple Sorting Procedure

7.1 Introduction
The previous questionnaire study (i.e. Study One) investigated how Japanese colonial heritage is related to a sense of national identity. The questionnaire study identified that that colonial heritage and Korean cultural heritage were mutually exclusive with regard to a sense of national identity, and plays a part in individuals’ sense of national identity by giving rise to multiple psychological motivations. The study now turns to the examination of how individuals conceptualise colonial heritage in relation to their sense of national identity that was not revealed in the questionnaire study. This chapter proposes the aims and specific objectives for Study Two to achieve before it focuses on the Multiple Sorting Procedure, the principal methodology for Study Two. The choice of method, its design and the process for data collection, which pertain to the philosophical assumptions, are explained.

7.2 Aim and Objectives
The primary goal of Study Two is to explore the ways in which individuals are conceptualising Japanese colonial buildings in relation to their sense of national identity that was not revealed in a researcher-imposed study (i.e. the questionnaire). This study attempts to identify the underlying criteria individuals consider to be important when appreciating the colonial buildings and conceptualising the colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity. By analysing data obtained through the Multiple Sorting Procedure in a systematic and structured manner, this study determines the predominant patterns that the colonial buildings form with respect to a sense of identity in a South Korean context. This includes a detailed examination of generational difference. The objectives are to understand:
1. What underlies individuals’ interpretation of colonial buildings: the criteria individuals employ in appreciating colonial buildings and comparisons for different generations.

2. How individuals conceptualise and what they give priority in constructing colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity and comparisons for different generations.

3. Socio-psychological properties that colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of identity in South Korean society.

4. Predominant patterns colonial buildings form with respect to a sense of identity in a South Korean context.

7.3 Multiple Sorting Procedure: Card Sorting Task

The theoretical basis for the approach employed in Study Two is derived from Canter, Brown, and Groat’s (1985, p.79) notion that ‘an understanding of the categories people use and how they assign concepts to those categories is one of the central clues to the understanding of human behaviour’. From this position, the research method employed in this study is the Multiple Sorting Procedure, ‘a technique for examining how participants place constructs into categories and how they then label the distinctions between the categories’ in any given context (Barnett, 2004, p.289). By sorting materials that characterise the area of interest (e.g. photographs, cards with words, drawings), participants are encouraged to articulate what they give priority in constructing a certain issue (ibid). The rationale for this procedure is that ‘the meanings and explanations associated with an individual’s use of categories are as important as the actual distribution of elements into the categories’ (Canter et al., 1985, p.88).

This technique has been used in a variety of psychology research which emphasises the importance of categorisation processes (Barnett, 2004). A range of environmental research has also frequently employed the Multiple Sorting Procedure, such as the meaning of architecture (Groat, 1982), the education and development of architectural concepts (Wilson & Canter, 1990), aesthetic judgement of architectural
design (Hubbard, 1994), interpretation of built environment (Hubbard, 1996a, 1996b), socialisation and architectural preference (Wilson, 1996), landscape perception (Scott & Canter, 1997), and social attribution and interior style (Wilson & Mackenzie, 2000). One of the reasons for the Multiple Sorting Procedure being frequently employed in psychology literature is that this technique is able to overcome the shortcomings of questionnaires and interviews in that it does not overly restrict or frame interviewees’ responses, but rather enables the exploration of participants’ conceptual systems (Groat, 1982; Scott & Canter, 1997). In contrast with a researcher-imposed approach (over-deterministic framework), the Multiple Sorting Task allows participants to freely categorise provided materials to be sorted (e.g. photographs) using their own idea. Hence, this technique helps the researcher understand how participants conceptualise a certain issue (Scott & Canter, 1997). Moreover, the Multiple Sorting Procedure produces more structured data sets which can be analysed by more sophisticated techniques, such as Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (POSA), Smallest Space Analysis (SSA) and Multidimensional Scalogram Analysis (MSA). Therefore, this technique explores participants’ construct systems in a structured and systematic manner (Barnett, 2004). For the above reasons, the Multiple Sorting Procedure was adopted for understanding how individuals conceptualise Japanese colonial buildings and what constructs and categories they use to interpret the colonial buildings. For this, a card-sorting task using photographic materials was carried out. The detailed procedure is presented in the following sections.

**Photographs of Japanese Colonial Buildings**

This study used colour photographs of Japanese colonial buildings standing in South Korean society. Although there is academic debate on validity and reliability of the use of photographs in simulating real environment (e.g. Scott & Canter, 1997), photographs have been widely used in the field of psychology (Stamps, 1990; Palmer & Hoffman, 2001). The set of colour photographs for this study comprised twenty-four buildings built in the period of the Japanese occupation (1911-1945), comprising four of each of the following six building types: government office buildings, educational buildings, commercial business buildings, public cultural buildings,
residential buildings, and religious buildings (Table 7.1). Canter et al. (1985) and Barnett (2004) agree that the twenty-four photographic cards are suitable for a sorting task. The photographic cards for this study are provided in Appendix 2.

Table 7.1 A Set of Colonial Buildings for Multiple Sorting Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Colonial Buildings for MST</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The old Japanese General Government Building 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The old Seoul City Hall 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Seodaemoon Prison History Hall 1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The old Korean Supreme Court 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seoul National University medical school (SNU 1) 1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Seoul National University of Technology 1 (SNU 2) 1942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The old main hall of Seoul National University (SNU1) 1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seoul National University of Technology 2 (SNU 2) 1942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The main hall of Shinsaegye Department Store 1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The old main building of Jeil Bank 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The old main building of Bank of Korea 1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Korean Electric Power Corporation office (KEPCO) 1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The old Seoul Railway Station 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The old Dongdaemoon Stadium 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The Seoul Municipal Assembly Hall 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Myungdong Art Hall 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The old Japanese Residence in Goonsan (Residence 1) 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The old Japanese Residence in Pusan 1 (Residence 2) 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The old Japanese Residence in Pusan 2 (Residence 3) 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The old Japanese Residence in Uleungdo (Residence 4) 1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Gunsan Dongkuksa Buddhist Temple (Temple 1) 1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mokpo Higashi-Honganji Temple (Temple 2) 1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Kyeongju Seokyeongsa Buddhist Temple (Temple 3) 1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The old Sorokdo Japanese Shinto Shrine (Shrine) 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Government office Buildings (1-4), Educational buildings (5-8), Commercial business buildings (9-12), Public cultural buildings (13-16), Residential buildings (17-20), Religious buildings (21-24)

Coeterier (1983), who tested the validity of photograph techniques in environmental study, emphasises the importance of participants’ recognition of the places photographs represent. He reveals that photographs could not be reliably used as
representations of places because there might be a high probability that even participants who directly experienced places might not recognise the same place in the photograph. In this sense, Scott and Canter (1997) suggests ways to improve participants’ recognition of photographs, such as using a photograph pool generated by participants for a selection of photographs, as well as the labelling of photographs. This study adopted two ways to improve the standard of the simulation. Firstly, participants took part in the selection for photographs of the Japanese colonial buildings. Initially, the researcher determined twenty-four Japanese colonial buildings that were frequently mentioned by participants in the questionnaire study (i.e. participants’ designation of Japanese colonial heritage) and selected colour photographs of each building. During the pilot study, a sample of each participant group was asked whether it was difficult to recognise the buildings. By discarding and changing unrecognised photographs of the buildings, photographs which best clearly represented the subject of colonial buildings were selected. Secondly, identification of the colonial buildings in the photographs was enhanced by attaching labelling to the front of photographs indicating the name of the colonial building today. Additionally, as Canter et al. (1985) and Barnett (2004) suggested, each photographic card was numbered from one to twenty-four in order to facilitate recording the information of each sort.

7.4 Sampling and Procedure

7.4.1 Sampling

The sorting tasks were conducted in May and June 2010 in South Korea. In total, a voluntary sample of sixty respondents took part in this study. All participants were initially recruited from the participant groups in Study One. Citizens of Seoul, the capital of South Korea, were selected for this study because the majority of Japanese colonial buildings chosen for this study are located in Seoul. This sampling could increase opportunities to explore participants’ views on colonial buildings in more depth. Like the questionnaire study, the samples comprised three different generation groups (e.g. the younger generation, middle generation, and older generation), and the criteria in grouping generations in a South Korean context have already been highlighted in Chapter Five (Section 5.3.1). These generational
groupings could reveal the effect of life experiences and demographic characteristics on the interpretation of colonial buildings. Regarding the sample size in this study, previous research (e.g. Wilson & Canter, 1990; Wilson & Mackenzie, 2000) suggest that a sample size of fifteen to twenty participants is sufficient to produce a stable structure using a multiple sorting task. In this study, the samples were selected non-randomly according to a fixed quota, and each generational group consisted of twenty participants (i.e. 20 younger, 20 middle, and 20 older generations).

### 7.4.2 Pilot Study

In advance of the main card-sorting tasks that took place in Seoul in 2010, the process of the sorting tasks in this study were piloted on small samples of South Koreans living in the UK (i.e. 5 Korean students in University of Surrey) in February 2010, and South Koreans living in Seoul, South Korea (e.g. 5 local university students and members of local community centres) in April in 2010. The pilot studies highlighted some problems related to the structured sorting tasks and the selection of photographs of the colonial buildings. For some participants, sorting variables and sorting criteria employed in the structured sorting tasks were over-complex. Additionally, some photographs could not clearly represent the subject of colonial buildings. Since these problems raised issues concerning the quality of the obtained data (i.e. reliability), sorting variables and criteria employed for the structured sorting tasks were reduced and simplified. In order to improve participants’ recognition of colonial buildings, some photographs were changed in the final version of the photographic cards.

### 7.4.3 Procedure: Sorting Task Design

The Multiple Sorting Procedure in this study was developed in line with the procedure suggested by Canter et al., (1985) and Barnett (2004). The card-sorting task was designed as a combination of free sorting and structured sorting. All participants were interviewed individually to carry out the card-sorting task.
**Free Sort**

Free sorting tasks were designed to elicit individuals’ own ways of appreciating colonial buildings. By analysing criteria freely used by participants, it aimed to explore criteria for their appreciation of colonial buildings and inter-generational differences (*Research question 1*). At the beginning of the task, the researcher introduced participants to the nature of the research and gave them twenty-four photographic cards representing Japanese colonial buildings in South Korea. The participants were given about five minutes to familiarise themselves with the buildings on the photographic cards. Thereafter, the participants were encouraged to sort the photographic cards into groups using criteria that they felt important in making distinctions between the buildings. No restriction was made on the number of groups (i.e. categories) or the number of cards within each group (i.e. distribution) to identify various aspects of their idea of Japanese colonial buildings. The numbers of cards in each group were noted on a separate form when the participants completed each sort. This sorting process was continued until their sorting criteria were exhausted.

**Structured Sort**

Structured sorting tasks were designed to investigate how individuals conceptualise and what they give priority in constructing colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity (*Research question 2*). Additionally, it aimed to explore socio-psychological properties that colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of identity (*Research question 3*) and predominant patterns colonial buildings form with respect to a sense of identity in South Korean society (*Research question 4*). For an assessment of individuals’ interpretation of colonial buildings in relation to their feelings of national identity, the participants were asked to classify the cards according to their assessment of 1) attachment to the colonial buildings, 2) typicality of the colonial buildings, 3) significance to national identity and 4) threats from the colonial buildings. A first structured sort measured individuals’ sense of attachment to the colonial buildings. The participants were asked to classify pictures of Japanese colonial buildings according to the extent of their sense of attachment to the buildings, such as (1) very attached, (2) quite attached and (3) not
at all attached. Afterwards, they were asked to classify the cards according to the degree of typicality of the buildings, and to categorise the cards into three different groups, such as 1) very typical 2) quite typical, and 3) not at all typical. This sorting task aimed to identify what elements of the buildings give individuals feelings towards the colonial buildings (e.g. external appearance, meanings associated with the buildings, roles of the buildings, history associated the buildings etc.). The third sorting task examined the significance of the colonial buildings in structuring a sense of national identity. The cards were classified according to the extent to which the colonial buildings are significant to the participants’ sense of national identity. As in the case of other structured sorts, sorting categories in this task designated quantitative grouping, such as 1) very significant, 2) quite significant, and 3) not at all significant. The purpose of this task was to identify elements making the buildings significant to a sense of national identity. The last structured sort measured what extent to which the colonial buildings represent a threat to a sense of national identity. The participants were requested to classify the cards from those that represent a threat to the feelings of Korean identity the most, to those that do not represent a threat to a sense of Korean identity (i.e. 1) very threats, 2) quite threats, and 3) not at all threats). By doing so, it aimed to identify the characteristics of Japanese colonial buildings challenging a sense of Korean identity. Interview instructions and data sheets are presented in Appendix 3

7.5 Analytical Procedure

For a comprehensive approach to interpreting the meaning of Japanese colonial buildings, two data analyses were performed in this study. In the first instance, a content analysis of the free sorts employed by participants was performed in order to understand what underlies people’s interpretation of Japanese colonial buildings and to make comparisons with different generations. Secondly, Guttman’s Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (Guttman & Greenbaum, 1998) was used for the data obtained through structured sorting tasks to reveal certain types of colonial buildings related to people’s sense of national identity.
7.5.1 Content Analysis

Content analysis was employed for the free sorting tasks. The efficiency of content analysis in the analysis of free sorting tasks has been identified by a number of literatures (e.g. Groat, 1982; Sixsmith, 1986; Wilson & Canter, 1990; Hubbard, 1994, 1996a, 1996b; Scot & Canter, 1997; Wilson & Mackenzie, 2000). Using content analysis, the researcher reduced the large volume of data obtained through the free card-sorting task (i.e. 152 constructions) into more manageable content categories and to summarise main concerns in the interpretation. This procedure involved categorising the sorts on the basis of conceptual similarity and extracting key statements from the sorts to reduce information and maintain original meanings.

After the classification scheme was established, criteria that the participants developed in their card-sorting were content analysed. Content analysis was carried out initially by the researcher. Afterwards, to achieve consistency between raters, a list of construct categories generated, together with the key statements, was given to a second independent rater, who was familiar with this research topic. The second rater subsequently classified each statement from the full data (i.e. 60 participants) to construct categories or created new categories if the rater thought these were necessary. Once the second rater classified the data, the results from the researcher and the second rater were compared to measure the reliability of the classification scheme. The researcher and the second rater negotiated any disputed categories and agreed solutions between them. A number of literatures that employed the Multiple Sorting Procedure (e.g. Groat, 1982; Wilson & Canter, 1990; Wilson & Mackenzie, 2000) suggest that two independent raters are considered to be adequate to achieve a high level of reliability in coding structure.

As the content analysis relies heavily on the researcher’s subjective judgements, it is important to estimate reliability by examining inter-rater consistency and to measure the reliability of the analysis systematically (Lombard, Snyder-Duch & Bracken, 2002; Seuring & Gold, 2012). The reliability in this study was statistically tested by using Cohen's Kappa, a reliability measurement technique most commonly recommended in the content analysis (Lombard et al., 2002). When coding is perfectly reliable, Cohen's Kappa value approaches 1, whereas the value approaches
0 when there is no agreement (Cohen, 1960). The inter-coder reliabilities for each of the generation groups’ category description (i.e. α coefficient of the agreement) were 0.924 (the younger generation group), 0.879 (the middle generation group), and 0.897 (the older generation group) (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2 The Inter-Rater Kappa Coefficients for the Content Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Younger Generation</th>
<th>Middle Generation</th>
<th>Older Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kappa’s coefficient</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.2 Multi-Dimensional Scaling Procedure

7.5.2.1 Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (POSA)

The data obtained through structured sorting tasks was analysed through Guttman’s Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (POSA), which is a specific form of Multi-Dimensional Scaling procedures (Guttman & Greenbaum, 1998). Multi-Dimensional Scaling procedure is an analysis technique, identifying how each of the variables (i.e. structure sorts) relate to one another, and how each combination of the variables related to the items themselves, consequently revealing underlying structures and relationships implicit in individuals’ multi-criteria decisions (Sixsmith, 1986; Wilson, 1995; Wilson & Hammond, 2000). This technique was particularly chosen here because the results of the analysis are represented in a graphical form that allows visual interpretation of the complex relationships between variables as a set of points in dimensional space, rather than statistically or as tables that conventional statistical methods produce. The spatial distance between the points in multi-dimensional spaces indicates the conceptual similarity between profiles (Coxon, 1982).

Several Multi-Dimensional Procedure models are used in academic research. Within the field of environmental psychology, in particular, Multi-Dimensional Scalogram Analysis (MSA) (e.g. Groat, 1982; Wilson & Canter, 1990; Krämer, 1995; Hubbard, 1996a, 1996b; Scott & Canter, 1997; Wilson & Mackenzie, 2000) and Smallest Scalogram Analysis (SSA) (e.g. Groat, 1982; Sixsmith, 1986; Krämer, 1995; Wilson, 1996) appear to be effective tools for classifying different patterns that the
physical environment takes under their study (e.g. architectural style, architectural preference etc.). Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (POSA), which this study employed, seems to be similar to Multi-Dimensional Scalogram Analysis (MSA) in that POSA represents the result as points in a multi-dimensional diagram on the basis of similarities of profiles so that it allows visual interpretation of complex relationships. However, POSA goes beyond MSA which examines only general relationships between items based on Guttman’s original notion of one dimensional scale whereby observed profiles were those defined by the accumulative score (i.e. quantitative differences) (Dancer, 1990; Guttman & Greenbaum, 1998; Levy, 1998; Brown & Barnett, 2000). POSA considers the order feature of the items based on the assumption of ‘internal inequalities’ that profiles of features are quantitatively similar but qualitatively different (Dancer, 1990; Shye, 1985; Levy, 1998). Therefore, POSA enables us to characterise each of the subjects by showing both qualitative and quantitative differences through the position of the points in a geometric space (Shye, 1985; Canter, 2004). Levy and Amar (2000, p.22) suggest that ‘systematic and detailed study of the similarities and differences among the structuples is facilitated by viewing them in the space of the smallest dimensionality that can preserve the partial order’. In this sense, this study used POSA with base Coordinates (POSAC), a form of Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (POSA) that uses base co-ordinates in order to determine the most efficient two-dimensional representation that represents the relationships of order and quality between the Scalogram (Shye, 1985; Canter, 2004). Conceptual similarity shows in a two-dimensional space through spatial proximity (Dancer, 1990; Guttman & Greenbaum, 1998; Porter & Alison, 2001; Barnett, 2004).

7.5.2.2 Analytical Process of POSA
Like the other Multi-Dimensional Procedure, POSAC produces an overall plot diagram representing the similarities and differences among items as well as a series of item diagrams for each of the variables (Wilson & Canter, 1993). The individual item diagrams provided by POSAC help in determining why the profiles differ and how these variables (i.e. features) contribute to the overall POSAC diagram (Canter, 2004). Plots in the individual item diagrams can be divided into regions according
to each different category of a construct. Six major ways to partition plots is widely accepted in POSAC: X, Y, J, L, P, and Q-axes (Figure 7.1). X positioning is horizontal and partitions along the X-axis, whereas Y positioning is vertical and partitions along the Y-axis (Taylor, 2002; Tzfati, Sein, Rubinov, Raveh & Bick, 2011). The X and Y partitioning are considered particularly informative in the interpretation of the POSA analysis because these two partitioning defines the position of profiles in the POSAC space (Dancer, 1990; Borg & Shye, 1995; Taylor, 2002). Variables forming a region along the X and Y partitioning form the qualitative differences among interaction profiles because these partitions are orthogonal (Porter & Alison, 2001; Taylor, 2002; Tzfati et al., 2011). J-axis indicates differentiation according to the strength of the characteristics, whereas L-axis indicates differentiation according to the kind of characteristics (Taylor, 2002; Tzfati et al., 2011). Q and P-axes play a subordinate role in partitioning the POSAC space because the Q partitioning accentuates the effect of primary partitioning (i.e. X or Y partitioning), whereas the P partitioning reduces the effect of primary partitioning (Borg & Shye, 1995; Porter & Alison, 2001; Taylor, 2002; Tzfati et al., 2011).

![Diagram of POSAC partitioning](image)

**Figure 7.1 Types of Partitioning in POSAC**
(Source: Taylor, 2002; Tzfati et al., 2011)

There has been a limited attempt in the literature to use POSAC in environmental research. It seems clear, however, that POSAC enables the researcher to compare
Japanese colonial buildings regarding their similarities across four identity-related variables (i.e. typicality, attachment, significance, threats). Additionally, POSAC is a useful method for exploring the way people conceptualise a range of Japanese colonial buildings and for determining certain types of colonial buildings in terms of a sense of national identity. The groupings imposed by participants on the photographs (i.e. Japanese colonial buildings) can be represented by profiles, which can be compared with the profiles for all the other Japanese colonial buildings. The results were represented geometrically as points in the two dimensional spaces, which is the key part of the POSAC. The colonial buildings that have often been conceptualised in the same way were closely positioned. Thus, the greater the similarity between the colonial buildings according to the profile, the closer they are together in the space and vice versa. If two or more colonial buildings shared identical profiles, these buildings were represented by the same point. HUDAP (Hebrew University Data Analysis Programme, 2001) was used for POSAC in this study. Partial Order Scalogram analysis of these twenty-four Japanese colonial buildings across the four structure sorts showed that there was a wide range of group structures, ranging from the colonial buildings not associated with a sense of national identity through to the buildings playing a highly significant role in a sense of national identity that contain all four indicators of structure.
Chapter Eight
A Qualitative Exploration of Conceptualisations of Colonial Heritage

8.1 Introduction
The previous chapter discussed the Multiple Sorting Procedure, the principal methodology for Study Two. Drawing on this approach, this chapter analyses how individuals conceptualise Japanese colonial buildings in relation to their sense of Korean identity. The first part of this chapter explores the underlying criteria individuals consider important in appreciating colonial buildings and their reasons. The second part compares the ways each generational group conceptualise colonial buildings. The underlying structures and relationships implicit in the multi-criteria evaluation of colonial buildings are investigated and dominant characteristics that colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of identity in a South Korean context are identified.

8.2 Underlying Aspects in Appreciating Colonial Buildings
8.2.1 Criteria in Appreciating Colonial Buildings
Free sorting tasks were carried out in order to explore what underlies individuals’ interpretation of colonial buildings in South Korea (Research question 1). By analysing criteria freely used by the participants, inter-generational differences in the criteria individuals employ for appreciating colonial buildings were examined. During the sorting tasks, one hundred and fifty-two different sorts were carried out by sixty participants, with an average of 2.5 sorts per participant. Initially, these sorts were grouped into seventeen distinct categories of constructs that emerged from the criteria, which indicate the constructs and categories participants use to interpret colonial buildings. The construct categories are listed in Table 8.1, along with percentage figures indicating the frequency with which they are mentioned.

It became immediately apparent that participants had little difficulty in developing their criteria in respect of identifying salient features of Japanese colonial buildings.
It also became clear that people see colonial buildings in different ways and that evaluation criteria vary from person to person. A wide range of constructs emerged in categorising colonial buildings, which reveals that constructs are not simply based on particular architectural properties of colonial buildings. Some constructs were more tied to the physical features of colonial buildings (e.g. style, structure, exterior, and scale of the buildings). However, these were often linked to personal emotions and feelings (e.g. a sense of familiarity, preference, and interest), the contemporary functions those buildings accommodated in the community today, and socio-historic factors underlying the colonial buildings (e.g. colonial and post-colonial history associated with the buildings).

The seventeen constructs were aggregated into four broad construct categories, which are socio-historic, architectural properties, community life and personal affective (Table 8.1). The socio-historic factors of colonial buildings were most commonly used as criteria by all participants in appreciating colonial buildings (38.2%, 58 sorts). What these constructs have in common is colonial buildings were evaluated based on the political and social meanings embodied in the buildings. These include historic values of colonial buildings (e.g. memorials, cultural heritage of colonial and post-colonial Korea), roles of the buildings in the past (e.g. colonial government-related buildings, Japanese houses), symbolic meanings associated with the buildings in modern Korean history (e.g. suppression, modernisation), and sentiment associated with Korean history (e.g. sadness, antagonism, confidence, happiness). Following the constructs based on socio-historic factors of colonial buildings, architectural properties of colonial buildings were frequently employed as criteria for their interpretation (36.8%, 56 sorts). Colonial buildings were simply appreciated based on architectural properties of colonial buildings rather than meanings embedded in the buildings. These include style of buildings, visual image from the exterior, physical structure, size and materials, and location of buildings. Colonial buildings were also appreciated with respect to their role in community life today (13.2%, 20 sorts). There were three dominant concerns with respect to current community life, which are the current functions of the buildings in a community, usefulness of the buildings today, and purpose of the buildings (e.g.
private, public). The participants also appreciated colonial buildings based on their personal emotions towards the buildings (11.8%, 18 sorts). The buildings were appreciated according to levels of familiarity in individuals’ everyday life, personal preference and interests.

8.2.2 Inter-generational Difference in Appreciating Colonial Buildings

Research question 1 also asked if and how each generational group differ in appreciating colonial buildings in South Korean society. As can be seen from Table 8.1, the socio-historic aspects (38.2%) and architectural properties of the colonial buildings (36.8%) are of great concern to all generation groups. This suggests individuals placed importance on socio-history and physical features of colonial buildings in Korean society today. However, Chi-Square analyses of the categories reveal there was a statistically significant difference between the generations in their construal of the buildings ($\chi^2 = 23.585, \text{df} = 6, p = .001$). This suggests that although many constructs are shared in South Korean society, different generational groups appear to emphasise different aspects when interpreting colonial buildings.

The result indicates the older generation are more likely to construe colonial buildings based on their perception of historic and social value or meanings associated with the buildings in South Korean society. More than half of the sorts completed by the older generation (54.4%) were concerned with socio-historic factors of colonial buildings, such as historic value or meaning, past uses, symbolic role under the rule, and sentiment based on colonial history. The constructs the younger generation employed (41.1%) were more likely to be related to physical properties of the buildings, such as external appearance, style, structure, location, and scale of the buildings, and the function of the buildings in contemporary society. Similar to the younger generation, the largest percentage of constructs completed by the middle generation was also concerned with the physical features of the buildings (35.4%), which suggest they relied heavily on physical cues in appreciating colonial buildings.
From the above, it is apparent that when construing colonial buildings, older generations are more likely to attach greater importance to the symbolic meanings associated with the buildings that are significant in both a personal and social context. However, the meaning associated with colonial buildings for younger generations appears to be less important to their personal or social life. The younger generations are more likely to attach greater importance to the physical properties and the role of the buildings in social life today that are significant to qualities of their everyday life.

Table 8.1 Frequency of the Main Themes Used for Each Generational Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Themes</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Generations (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-historic factors</td>
<td>Historic value</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role in the past</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic meanings</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic sentiment</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonial history</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural properties</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building structure</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Image from exterior</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building scale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community life</td>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal emotion</td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Conceptualisation of Japanese Colonial Buildings

Using the data obtained from structured sorting tasks, the research explored how individuals conceptualise colonial buildings and their priorities in constructing colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity (Research question 2).
For the assessment, four sorting criteria were provided, which are 1) typical colonial heritage, 2) attachment to the buildings, 3) significance of the buildings to national identity and 4) threat to national identity. In order to identify inter-generational differences, each analysis was carried out separately according to generational groups.

8.3.1 Younger Generation’s Conceptualisation of Colonial Buildings

Figure 8.1 presents the main two-dimensional diagram of POSAC for the younger generation. Item plots for each of four variable items, which are ‘typicality’, ‘attachment’, ‘significance to national identity’, and ‘threat to national identity’, are mapped into separate two-dimensional diagrams, which are shown in Figures 8.2 to 8.5. Shye (1995; cited in Tzfati et al., 2011) suggests that a coefficient of 0.80 and above generally acknowledges the configuration of data structure is unique and meaningful, and variation of the scores is systematic across the partial order. In this analysis, the coefficient of corrected representation (CORREP) is 1.00; indicating the POSAC diagram correctly represented 100% of the profile pairs (i.e. a perfect fit) and all profiles were partitioned into a space without exception.

As seen in Figure 8.1, twelve unique profiles were derived from the set of twenty-four Japanese colonial buildings, which indicates some colonial buildings shared an identical profile with other buildings. As mentioned in the previous chapter (Chapter 7), the degree of difference for colonial buildings in the profiles can be identified through the degree of dispersion of the points in the space indicated. The main POSAC diagram indicates there are clear differences between a former colonial government building (e.g. the old building of Seoul City Hall), located in the bottom left hand side, and Japanese residential buildings (e.g. Residence 1, 2, 3, 4), mainly in the upper right-hand side of the space. Public buildings that have served politically and socially significant roles in both colonial and post-colonial South Korean society (e.g. the old Seoul Railway Station, the old building of Korean Bank) are also closely positioned with the government buildings.
An analysis of the differences among the colonial buildings was made in terms of four items (i.e. typicality, attachment, significance, and threats). In order to understand the dimensionality of the colonial buildings, each of the four item plots was divided in a way to ensure the regions comprise the same score for profiles on those items. Each variable’s coefficient of monotonicity was examined in order to measure the extent to which the division is accurate (Table 8.2). A coefficient of 1 represents that the same score of variables are perfectly positioned in one partition (i.e. a perfect partition); however, any coefficient above 0.8 is widely acceptable (Shye, Elizur & Hoffman, 1994; Porter & Alison, 2001). These partitioned item diagrams for the four variable items are shown in Figures 8.2 to 8.5. Each of the item plots and partitioning into regions, which is internal discrimination, played a crucial role in understanding the overall configuration of colonial buildings (i.e. Figure 8.1).
Table 8.2 Coefficient of Weak Monotonicity between Each Item: Younger Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typicality</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The X-Axis: Threat to National Identity

The item measuring ‘threat to national identity’, which is whether Japanese colonial buildings represent a threat to a sense of national identity, is partitioned along the X-axis with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 in POSAC space. The X-axis partitioning of the item ‘threat to national identity’ indicates whether Japanese colonial buildings representing a threat to the feelings of national identity plays a fundamental role in structuring the younger-aged participants’ overall configuration of colonial buildings. As can be seen in Figure 8.2, colonial buildings displayed as profile 2, which represents a threat to a sense of national identity, lie in the left-hand region. Conversely, the right-hand region was characterised by colonial buildings not representing a threat to a sense of national identity and these buildings were displayed as profile 3. This shows all former colonial government buildings and public buildings are appreciated as prominent structures representing a threat to the feelings of Korean identity. The majority of commercial, business and educational buildings that have played socially significant roles in Korean society, as well as Japanese religious facilities built under colonial rule, are also appreciated as the same type of colonial building. All Japanese-styled residential buildings, which are physically significant but politically irrelevant, and the majority of cultural buildings, which are politically irrelevant (e.g. the old Dongdaemun stadium, theatres), are appreciated as physical structures not representing a threat to a sense of Korean identity. This finding indicates the political or social relevance of buildings becomes a key determinant in perceptions of colonial buildings that threaten individuals’ identity, rather than physical features of colonial buildings.
The Y-Axis: Attachment to Colonial Buildings

The item measuring ‘attachment to Japanese colonial buildings’, which is whether participants are attached to colonial buildings, is partitioned along the Y-axis with a coefficient of monotonicity of 1.00. This way of partitioning indicates a sense of attachment to the buildings plays a key role in structuring the younger generation’s overall configuration of colonial buildings, along with the representation of a threat to national identity (X-axis). However, a sense of attachment to the buildings (Y-axis) qualitatively differs from the representation of a threat to national identity (X-axis) in that this partition is orthogonal to that of the item ‘threat to national identity’.

The colonial buildings to which younger-aged participants felt the highest degree of attachment, as displayed by profile 1, are positioned at the lower region of Figure 8.3; the buildings to which the participants feel no attachment lie in the upper region and these are displayed by profile 3. The region between these two extreme regions presents colonial buildings participants felt have intermediate levels of attachment. The findings demonstrate that colonial buildings with which citizens have frequent contact in their everyday life and buildings that support their social life today (i.e. the old building of Seoul City Hall, Korean Bank, Seoul Railway Station, and
Shinsaegye Department Store) were conceived as the most attached colonial buildings. However, all Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings and the majority of educational buildings (e.g. SNU2, SNUT1, 2) were conceived as the least attached buildings. This implies the younger generation’s sense of attachment to the buildings relies heavily on the buildings’ socio-cultural role and position in contemporary society.

The Joint-Axis: Typical Colonial Buildings / Significance to National Identity
Two items, ‘typical Japanese colonial buildings’, which is whether buildings are viewed as typical colonial heritage, and ‘significance to national identity’, which is whether buildings are significant to a sense of national identity, partition a group of colonial buildings along the Q-axes with coefficients of monotonicity of 0.99 and 0.96 respectively. This indicates these two variable items played subsidiary roles in structuring their overall configuration of colonial buildings. The colonial buildings viewed as the most typical colonial heritage were displayed as profile 1 and lie in the lower left-hand side in the space (Figure 8.4). In contrast, non-typical colonial buildings, displayed as profile 3, lie towards the top-right of the diagram. An
intermediate degree of typical colonial buildings are located in the centre of the space and displayed as profile 2. This configuration indicates the majority of colonial buildings are viewed as typical colonial buildings. Especially, the old buildings of Seodaemun Prison and Seoul City Hall, symbolic colonial government buildings representing political oppression under the occupation, appear as the most typical colonial buildings. On the other hand, a Japanese religious building (e.g. temple 3) and the old Dongdaemun Stadium, are less politically significant and appear as non-typical colonial buildings. This result suggests individuals’ appreciation of typical colonial buildings relies heavily on political meanings embodied in the heritage, rather than unique physical features of the heritage.

The results for ‘significance to national identity’, which measure the significance of colonial buildings to a sense of national identity, showed parallel patterns to those for the item measuring typical colonial buildings. Colonial buildings most significant to a sense of Korean identity are positioned in the lower left-hand side of the space and displayed as profile 1 in Figure 8.5. The buildings that are not significant to a sense of Korean identity lie towards the top-right of the plot. Colonial buildings in
the middle of the space, displayed as profile 2, indicate the buildings having an intermediate degree of significance. This configuration indicates the old buildings of Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison in the lower left-hand side in the Q-partition, are the most significant to a sense of Korean identity. In contrast, Japanese religious buildings (e.g. Buddhist temple1, 2, 3 and Shinto shrine) and residential buildings in the top right-hand side are not significant to a sense of Korean identity. Comparison with the partitioning of ‘typical colonial buildings’ (Figure 8.4) reveals that the old buildings of Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison are viewed as typical colonial buildings significant to a sense of national identity. Although Japanese-styled residential buildings and the majority of religious buildings are viewed as typical colonial buildings, they are not significant to a sense of national identity.
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Figure 8.5 Item Diagram for ‘Significance to Korean Identity’: Younger Generation

**Superimposition of Four Variables**

To understand the socio-psychological properties of colonial buildings in South Korean society, the partitions explored by four variable items are superimposed in Figure 8.6 (From Figures 8.2 to 8.5). The solid lines in the superimposed diagram
represent the partitions into regions according to the basic items (i.e. X and Y axes), which are ‘threat to national identity’ and ‘attachment to the buildings’. These basic regions are divided by the other two items working as a combination of the base items (i.e. Q axis), ‘typical Japanese colonial buildings’ and ‘significance to national identity’, which are illustrated by broken lines. The diagram shows the major division of Japanese colonial buildings that emerges to distinguish between two extremes groups of buildings in terms of national identity. One extreme group of buildings in the bottom-left of the diagram has a higher degree of all four variable items explored. The buildings in this group, including the old buildings of Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison, are the most typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. In contrast, the other extreme group of buildings shown in the upper right-hand side has a lower degree of all four variable items. This group of buildings includes Japanese-styled residential buildings. The other colonial buildings with an intermediate degree of all four variable items are located between these two extreme regions.

It appears the former colonial government buildings are located in the same region as typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. This suggests the government buildings are viewed in a conventional way such that the typical Japanese colonial legacies are seen to intimidate a sense of Korean identity significantly. Educational, commercial business and public cultural buildings are also important to a sense of national identity, although they are less significant, in comparison with the government buildings and their impact on a sense of national identity may not always be negative. Some public cultural buildings, including a public theatre (i.e. Assembly Hall), public stadium (i.e. the old Dongdaemun Stadium), and art theatre (i.e. the old national theatre), are not perceived as colonial legacies challenging a sense of national identity. However, some public buildings that have played a significant socio-economic role in modern South Korean society (e.g. the old building of Seoul Railway Station and Korean Bank) are viewed as significantly challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings are not significant to a sense of national identity, although they are viewed as typical colonial buildings. This finding
indicates that, for the younger generation, colonial buildings that have served politically or socially significant roles in both colonial and post-colonial South Korean society are viewed as colonial legacies closely linked to a sense of national identity.

The superimposed diagram shows that a sense of attachment overlaps with the regions where the group of colonial buildings linked to national identity is located. The old building of Seoul City Hall is simultaneously experienced as a typical and significantly challenging colonial building in terms of national identity and a building to which they are strongly attached. This overlap provides evidence that colonial buildings are not simply experienced from the perspective of the national historical context.

Figure 8.6 Superimposed Four Variable Items: Younger Generation
8.3.2 Middle Generation’s Conceptualisation of Colonial Buildings

Eleven unique profiles appeared from the set of twenty-four Japanese colonial buildings and these were mapped into the two-dimensional POSAC diagram (Figure 8.7). The coefficient of corrected representation (CORREP) is 1.00. There are similarities with the diagram for the younger generation in that clear distinction exists between the former colonial government buildings and the Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings in the overall diagram. The government buildings are mainly positioned in the bottom left hand side; meanwhile, the residential and religious buildings are mainly positioned in the upper right hand side of the space. The old Seoul Railway Station, one of the politically and socially significant public buildings in South Korean society, is closely positioned with the government buildings in the bottom left hand side. The structure of the main POSAC plot is explained by detailed individual plots of the four items.

As in the case of the younger generations, each of the four item plots was partitioned using a score for the coefficient of weak monotonicity of items (Table 8.3). The partitioned item diagrams for the four variable items are shown in Figures 8.8 to 8.11.

Figure 8.7 Main POSAC Plot for Twenty-Four Japanese Colonial Buildings
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### Table 8.3 Coefficient of Weak Monotonicity between Each Item: Middle Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typicality</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The X-Axis: Attachment to the Buildings / Significance to National Identity**

Two items measuring ‘attachment to colonial buildings’ and ‘significance to a sense of national identity’ partition a group of colonial buildings along the X-axes with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 (Figure 8.8). This X-axis partitioning indicates ‘attachment to the colonial buildings’ and ‘significance to national identity’ substantially contribute to the overall structure of the POSAC diagram. Colonial buildings to which the middle-aged participants are strongly attached, lie to the left-hand side of the space known as profile 1. Next to this, colonial buildings to which the participants have a moderate degree of attachment are located in profile 2. The right-hand side region, where colonial buildings named profile 3 are positioned, is characterised by colonial buildings to which the participants have no sense of attachment. The partitioning reveals the participants from the middle generation group have a sense of attachment to the majority of colonial buildings, except for all Japanese religious facilities and some Japanese-styled residence (e.g. Residence 1, 3). Especially, they have a stronger sense of attachment to the old building of Seoul Railway Station. The old Japanese Government General Building and the old building of Seoul City Hall are also viewed as strongly attached buildings.
A similar way of partitioning emerges in the item measuring ‘significance to a sense of national identity’ (Figure 8.9). Colonial buildings significant to a sense of Korean identity lie to the left-hand side of the space named profile 1, whereas buildings completely irrelevant to a sense of national identity are positioned in the right-hand side of the space under the name profile 3. The buildings with intermediate levels of significance are positioned between these two extreme regions (profile 2). This configuration shows the majority of colonial buildings, apart from Japanese-styled residential buildings and religious facilities, are construed as significant to a sense of Korean identity. The majority of the former colonial government buildings, including the old Japanese Government General Building, the old buildings of Seodaemun Prison and Seoul City Hall, and the old Seoul Railway Station, are located in the same region as the most significant buildings. A comparison of these two X-axes’ partitioning demonstrates there is an overlap between ‘attachment to colonial buildings’ and ‘significance to a sense of national identity’. This indicates colonial buildings to which participants have strong attachment (i.e. the old Japanese Government General Building and the old Seoul Railway Station) have parallels in the buildings significant Korean identity.
Japanese colonial buildings are also partitioned by the Y-axis with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 in the POSAC space (Figure 8.10). The configuration shows colonial buildings viewed as highly typical, as displayed as profile 1, are positioned in the lower region of the space. The old building of Seodaemun Prison that represents domination of Japanese power and oppression, as well as the old buildings of Korean Bank and Seoul Railway Station that have played politically and socially significant roles in South Korean society are positioned in this area. The old Dongdaemun Stadium, Assembly Hall and SNUT2 lie in the upper region of the space where non-typical colonial buildings are located (profile 3). This configuration is very much like that of the younger generation group in that the degree of typicality of colonial buildings is not simply ordered by the degree of physical features of the buildings. Instead, the degree of the typicality relies heavily on the political meanings the buildings embodied and their role in South Korean society.
The Joint-Axis: Threat to National Identity

With regard to whether colonial buildings represent a threat to national identity, the buildings are divided into two different groups by the P-axis, with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 in POSAC space (Figure 8.11). Colonial buildings representing a threat to a sense of national identity lie in the lower left-hand side of the space (profile 2). The upper right-hand corner, in which profile 3 appears, is characterised by colonial buildings not representing a threat to a sense of national identity. This configuration reveals all former colonial government and educational buildings are viewed as colonial legacies representing a threat to a sense of national identity. The majority of public and cultural buildings are also viewed as prominent structures challenging a sense of national identity. However, all Japanese-styled residences, the majority of commercial business buildings (e.g. the old building of Shinsaegye Department Store, Jeil Bank, KEPCO) and the old Dongdaemun Stadium are not viewed as physical structures representing a threat to a sense of Korean identity. Unlike the younger-aged participants, the majority of religious buildings are also not viewed as physical structures challenging a sense of Korean identity.
Superimposition of Four Variables

A superimposed diagram demonstrates the socio-psychological properties of colonial buildings in South Korean society (Figure 8.12). The solid lines in the figure show the partitions into regions, according to the base items structuring the overall conceptualisation (e.g. X-axis: ‘attachment to colonial buildings’, ‘significance to national identity’; Y-axis: ‘typical colonial buildings’). The broken line in the diagram indicates items working as a combination of base items (P-axis: ‘threat to national identity’).

Colonial buildings having a higher degree of all four variable items are positioned in the lower left-hand corner, whereas colonial buildings with a lower degree of all four variable items are positioned in the upper right-hand side of the space. Colonial buildings having an intermediate degree of all four variable items are located between these two extreme regions. Similar pattern outlines can be found in the case of the younger-aged participants. The majority of the former colonial government buildings (i.e. the old buildings of Japanese Government General Building, Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison) are positioned in the same location as the buildings.
that are typical and significantly challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. Especially for the middle-aged participants, the old buildings of Seoul Railway Station and Seodaemun Prison are the most typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity in South Korean society. In contrast, the majority of Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings, which are physically significant but politically irrelevant, are viewed as typical colonial buildings but completely irrelevant to a sense of national identity. The old Dongdaemun Stadium is viewed as a non-typical colonial building, although it is significant to a sense of national identity. The majority of educational, public, cultural, commercial and business buildings are viewed as colonial legacies significant to a sense of Korean identity. However, the majority of public cultural buildings (e.g. the old Seoul Railway Station, theatre, and assembly hall) and educational buildings (e.g. SNU1, 2, SNU1T1) are appreciated as challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. Furthermore, the majority of commercial and business buildings (e.g. the buildings of Shinseagye Department Store, Jail Bank and KEPCO) are viewed as significant historic structures not threatening a sense of national identity.

The superimposed diagram also shows the middle generation has a sense of attachment to the majority of colonial buildings significant to a sense of Korean identity, regardless of the impact on a sense of national identity (e.g. threats). Especially, the old Seoul Railway Station is simultaneously experienced as a colonial building to which they were strongly attached as well as a typical colonial heritage significantly challenging a sense of Korean identity.
8.3.3 Older Generation’s Conceptualisation of Colonial Buildings

Figure 8.13 shows the two-dimensional POSAC plot diagram presenting the position of the eleven unique profiles of colonial buildings with a coefficient of corrected representation (CORREP) 1.00. This main POSAC diagram presents clear distinction between government buildings and Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings that have already been shown by the younger and middle generation groups. The government buildings are mainly positioned in the bottom left-hand side; Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings are positioned in the upper right-hand side of the space. Unlike the POSAC diagrams for other generations, some educational buildings (e.g. SNUT1, 2) are closely positioned with residential and religious buildings in the upper right-hand side.
Four detailed item plots, which provide detailed information on the structure of the main POSAC plot, are presented in Figures 8.14 to 8.17. Each of the four variable items partition a group of colonial buildings in a way that the regions of the diagram comprise the same score of profiles for those items in order to determine how these four items contribute to the overall configuration (i.e. Figure 8.13). Each of the four item plots was partitioned using a score of coefficient of weak monotonicity of items (Table 8.4).

### Table 8.4 Coefficient of Weak Monotonicity between Each Item: Older generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typicality</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The X-Axis: Significance to National Identity / Threat to National Identity**

Items measuring ‘significance to national identity’, which determines whether colonial buildings are significant to a sense of national identity, and ‘threat to national identity’, which determines whether colonial buildings represent a threat to a
sense of identity, partition a group of colonial buildings along the X-axis with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 in the POSAC space. Colonial buildings positioned in the left-hand side of the diagram are displayed as profile 1 and represent buildings with the highest degree of significance to a sense of national identity (Figure 8.14). Three former colonial government buildings, including the old Japanese Government General Building and the old buildings of Seodaemun Prison and Seoul City Hall, are the most prominent structures for a sense of national identity. The buildings irrelevant to a sense of national identity are positioned in the right-hand side of the space and known as profile 3. All residential buildings and the majority of religious buildings (e.g. Temples 1, 2, 3) are included in this type of colonial building. Colonial buildings occupying the centre of the space and named profile 2 (e.g. educational, commercial business and public cultural buildings) represent buildings having an intermediate level of significance to a sense of national identity.
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Figure 8.14 Item Diagram for ‘Significance to Korean Identity’: Older Generation

A similar way of partitioning emerged in the item measuring ‘threats to national identity’ (Figure 8.15). Colonial buildings representing a threat to a sense of
national identity are positioned in the left-hand side of the diagram and displayed as profile 2. Two former colonial government buildings, which are the old Japanese General Government Building and the old building of Seodaemun Prison, are viewed as prominent colonial legacies challenging a sense of Korean identity. In contrast, colonial buildings not representing a threat to a sense of national identity are located in the right-hand side of the space and are named profile 3. The majority of colonial buildings are positioned in this area. This configuration demonstrates the older generation are less likely to view colonial buildings as prominent colonial legacies challenging a sense of Korean identity.

Comparison with the partitioning of ‘significance to national identity’ (Figure 8.14) shows the partitioning for the highest degree of significance is almost parallel to the highest degree of representation of a threat to national identity partitioning. This means that the old Japanese Government General Building and the old building of Seodaemun Prison are viewed as the most significant and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. The old building of Seoul City Hall, another colonial government building highly significant to national identity, differs from
these two government buildings in that this building does not represent a threat to a sense of national identity. Although the majority of colonial buildings (i.e. public cultural buildings, educational buildings, and commercial business buildings) are appreciated as significant colonial buildings to a sense of Korean identity, these buildings do not represent a threat to Korean identity.

**The Y-Axis: Typical Colonial Buildings**

The item measuring ‘typical colonial buildings’ partitions a group of colonial buildings along the Y-axis partitioning with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 in the POSAC space (Figure 8.16). This Y-axis partitioning indicates that, for older-aged participants, the aspects of typical colonial buildings directly serve to structure the overall POSAC diagram, along with items measuring ‘significance’ and ‘threats’ (X-axes). Highly typical colonial buildings are located in the lower region of the space and named profile 1, whereas the non-typical colonial buildings exhibited by profile 3 lie in the upper region of the space. The configuration is very much like that of the younger and middle generation groups in that the degree of typicality of colonial buildings is ordered by the degree of symbolic features of the buildings, rather than physical characteristics of the buildings (e.g. Japanese traditional structure). The majority of the former colonial government buildings, including the old Japanese Government General Building, the old building of Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison, occupy the same region where highly typical colonial buildings are located. Additionally, colonial buildings that have served politically and socially significant roles in both colonial and post-colonial South Korean society, such as the old buildings of Seoul Railway Station, Korean Bank, and SNU, also appear in this region. The old buildings of KEPCO, one of the business buildings, and SNUT, an educational building, are appreciated as non-typical colonial buildings exhibited by profile 3. The majority of commercial business and public buildings, Japanese-styled residences and religious buildings are positioned in the region where a group of colonial buildings reflecting intermediate levels of typical features is gathered (profile 2).
The Joint-Axis: Attachment to Colonial Buildings

A group of Japanese colonial buildings is partitioned along the P-axis with coefficients of monotonicity of 1.00 in the POSAC space (Figure 8.17). The colonial buildings to which older-aged participants have the highest degree of a sense of attachment are positioned in the lower left-hand side of the space. In contrast, the buildings with which the participants have no attachment are positioned in the upper right-hand side and named profile 3. The colonial buildings occupying the centre of the space and named profile 2 represent the buildings to which participants have intermediate levels of a sense of attachment. This configuration reveals participants from the older generation group appear to have a feeling of attachment towards the majority of types of colonial buildings, excluding some educational buildings (e.g. SNUT 1, 2) and residences and religious buildings (e.g. residences 1, 4, temples 1, 2, 3, shrine). Especially, they have a stronger attachment to two symbolic colonial buildings that have played a significant role in modern Korean society, which are the old Japanese Government General Building and the old Seoul Railway Station.
Superimposition of Four Variables

In order to understand the features of colonial buildings in the Korean context, the above four items are superimposed in one space (Figure 8.18). The solid lines in the diagram show the partitions into regions, according to these basic items (e.g. X-axis: ‘threat to national identity’ and ‘significance to national identity’; Y-axis: ‘typical Japanese colonial buildings’). A combination of the basic item ‘attachment to colonial buildings’ (i.e. P-axis) is drawn by broken lines in the diagram and partitions the basic regions into finer regions. A group of colonial buildings in the bottom left-hand corner in the overall item diagram has the highest degree of all four variable items explored. On the other hand, the other group of colonial buildings positioned in the upper middle right-hand side have the lowest degree of all four variable items. The majority of colonial government buildings (i.e. the old buildings of Japanese Government General Building, Seoul City Hall, and Seodaemun Prison) are viewed as the most typical and significant colonial buildings in terms of a sense of Korean identity. Especially for the older generation, the old Japanese Government General Building and the old building of Seodaemun Prison are viewed in a stereotypical way such that the Japanese colonial heritage is seen to
intimidate a sense of Korean identity significantly. All public cultural and commercial business buildings and some educational buildings (e.g. SNU 1, 2) are also viewed as typical and significant buildings in terms of a sense of Korean identity. However, these buildings do not challenge a sense of Korean identity. Although residential buildings and religious facilities are viewed as typical colonial buildings, the majority of them (e.g. residences 1, 2, 3, 4, temples 1, 2, 3) are completely irrelevant to a sense of Korean identity.

If the distinction is taken across the partitioning based on a sense of attachment to colonial buildings, some similar pattern outlines can be found in the case of middle-aged participants. Regardless of the impact of colonial buildings on a sense of national identity, participants from the older generation group appear to have a feeling of attachment towards the majority of types of colonial buildings. Particularly, they have a strong attachment to the old Japanese Government General Building; the most typical and challenging colonial heritage in terms of a sense of national identity.

Figure 8.18 Superimposition of the Four Partition Lines: Older Generation
8.4 Understanding Colonial Buildings in South Korean Society

8.4.1 Conceptualisation of Japanese Colonial Buildings

In order to explore socio-psychological properties that colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of identity (Research question 3) and to identify predominant patterns colonial buildings form with respect to a sense of identity in a South Korean context (Research question 4), three generation groups’ POSAC diagrams were compared. A comparison of the three generation groups’ POSAC diagrams demonstrates inter-generational similarities as well as differences in their conceptualisation of colonial buildings.

As can be seen from the three diagrams (i.e. Figures 8.6, 8.12, and 8.18), the colonial buildings are scattered across each diagram, indicating the colonial buildings are not automatically imbued with the same meanings in national identity. The buildings lie in roughly equivalent positions in the three diagrams, indicating the three generations construe these colonial buildings similarly.

Firstly, politically relevant and socially significant colonial buildings are commonly viewed in a conventional way such that the typical Japanese colonial legacies are seen to threaten a sense of national identity significantly. The former colonial government buildings (e.g. the old building of Seoul City Hall and Seodaemun Prison, and the old Japanese Government General Building) and public buildings that played a politically and socially significant role in modern South Korean society (e.g. the old building of Seoul Railway Station) are viewed as the most typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. Although Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings, which visually display distinctive physical features of Japanese heritage, are viewed as typical colonial buildings, these buildings are not significant to a sense of national identity. This finding indicates physical features of colonial buildings do not solely determine people’s appreciation of colonial buildings in relation to national identity. Rather, political or social meanings embedded in colonial buildings (e.g. domination of Japanese power, oppression) become a key determinant in appreciating colonial buildings with respect
to a sense of national identity.

Secondly, although public, cultural, business and educational buildings are viewed as historic buildings significant to a sense of Korean identity, meanings embedded in these buildings are not homogeneous. Some colonial buildings, especially socially and politically significant buildings (e.g. the old buildings of Seoul Railway Station and Korean Bank), are frequently appreciated as typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. However, some socially, politically and physically unremarkable buildings (e.g. the old building of Dongdaemun Stadium, Shinseagye Department Store) are frequently viewed as historic physical structures not challenging a sense of identity.

Lastly, three generational groups appear to have a sense of attachment to colonial buildings, regardless of the meanings of the colonial buildings in terms of national identity. The former government buildings and public buildings, viewed as the most typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity (e.g. the old building of Seoul City Hall), become buildings to which participants from all three generation groups feel a strong sense of attachment simultaneously. This indicates that people employ complex, multi-strata viewpoints in interpreting colonial buildings. Additionally, this provides evidence that not only was colonial heritage experienced from the perspective of the national historical context, but it also was simultaneously experienced from other contexts.

A similar substantive pattern is repeated among three generation groups in a South Korean context; however, some differences among the three generations are observable. Although the three generations appear to construe colonial buildings as symbolic icons significant to national identity, the older generation is less likely to accept features of colonial buildings threatening a sense of national identity, in comparison with other generations. For the younger and middle generations, more than a half of the colonial buildings in the sample for this study are viewed as colonial legacies representing a threat to a sense of national identity. However, for the older generation, the majority of colonial buildings, excluding two symbolic
colonial buildings (i.e. the old Japanese Government General Building and the old building of Seodaemun Prison), are not viewed as colonial legacies challenging a sense of national identity.

In comparison with other generations, the younger generation are less likely to be attached to colonial buildings. In terms of the types of colonial building to which they feel the strongest sense of attachment, the older generation group appears to have a stronger sense of attachment to colonial buildings that left a significant mark in the modern history of South Korea in terms of politics and socio-economics (e.g. the old Japanese Government General Building, the old Seoul Railway Station). However, the younger generation have a strong sense of attachment towards buildings with which they have frequent contact in their everyday life today and the buildings supporting their social life today (e.g. the old buildings of Seoul City Hall, Shinsaegye Department Store, Korean Bank and the old Seoul Railway Station). These findings would provide empirical justification for different viewing of colonial buildings among generation groups in Korean society.

8.4.2 Types of Japanese Colonial Buildings
The buildings are discriminated according to features obtained through the partial order structure of each of four variable items (Research question 4). This would give rise to four broad types of Japanese colonial buildings in South Korean society, which are symbolic colonial heritage, modern historic architecture, historic buildings in a foreign style, and ordinary old-fashioned buildings (Table 8.5). Some colonial buildings are viewed in a stereotypical way such that the Japanese colonial legacies are seen to intimidate a sense of national identity significantly, which can be thought of as ‘symbolic colonial heritage’. Especially, politically relevant and socially significant colonial buildings in South Korean society, such as the former colonial government and public buildings, are seen in this light. Some colonial buildings, which have supported citizens’ everyday life in post-colonial South Korean society, are appreciated as ‘modern historic architecture’ influencing a sense of national identity (e.g. commercial business buildings, public cultural buildings and educational buildings). Unlike symbolic colonial buildings, the significance of
these buildings to a sense of national identity is not always accompanied by threats to national identity. The Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings differ considerably from former colonial government buildings in that these buildings, which are politically irrelevant but physically significant, are not construed as colonial buildings linked to a sense of national identity. A common feature of these buildings is that the buildings prominently display unique physical features that Koreans could easily discriminate from their own buildings. Therefore, these buildings are thought of as ‘historic buildings in a foreign style’ that display unique architectural characteristics. Some socially and physically unremarkable colonial buildings neither present visible clues that they discriminate from ordinary old-fashioned buildings in South Korean society nor are associated with a sense of national identity. The buildings in this type may be thought of as ‘ordinary old-fashioned buildings’ existing in South Korean society. Some educational and commercial business buildings in society are seen in this light.

Table 8.5 Classification of Japanese Colonial Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Generation Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Colonial Heritage</td>
<td>• Seoul City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seodaemun Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Historic Architecture</td>
<td>• Korean Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seoul Railway Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Government General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seodaemun Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SNU1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• S. Department Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KEPCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• M. Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assembly Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dongdaemun Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Buildings in a Foreign Style</td>
<td>• Residence1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temple1,2, Shrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-fashioned Buildings</td>
<td>• Temple3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5 Conclusion

This study has explored the ways in which individuals are conceptualising Japanese colonial buildings in South Korean society and what they consider important in conceptualising the colonial buildings in relation to a sense of national identity. The Multiple Sorting Procedure was employed as a main research instrument. The data obtained through the free sorts was analysed using content analysis in order to understand what underlies people’s interpretation of Japanese colonial buildings and to make comparisons among different generations (Research question 1). Partial Order Scalogram Analysis (POSA) of the structured sorts was performed in order to identify the way each generation group conceptualises colonial buildings in relation to a sense of national identity (Research question 2). Socio-psychological properties that colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of national identity (Research question 3) and predominant patterns colonial buildings form with respect to a sense of national identity in a South Korean context were also identified using POSA (Research question 4). Key findings in this study encompass a number of important aspects, as discussed below.

The first research question asked what underlies individuals’ interpretation of colonial buildings in South Korean society. It appears that people appreciated colonial buildings in different ways which varied from person to person. Their appreciation of colonial buildings was not simply based on particular architectural properties of the buildings. In this study, four main concerns frequently emerged in construing Japanese colonial buildings. Some appreciations were simply tied to the physical features of colonial buildings (e.g. style, structure, exterior, and scale of the buildings) whilst other appreciations were more concerned with functions those buildings accommodated in the community today (e.g. community life). These were often linked to personal emotions towards the buildings (e.g. a sense of familiarity, preference, and interest) and socio-historic factors underlying the colonial buildings (e.g. colonial and post-colonial history associated with the buildings). Although there were common dimensions in sorting colonial buildings, the older generation were more likely to sort the colonial buildings according to the socio-history associated with the buildings, while the younger generations appeared
to rely more on physical properties of the colonial buildings. The older generation appeared to be concerned with symbolic roles of colonial buildings under Japanese rule, historic value and meanings of the buildings in both colonial and post-colonial Korean society, as well as the sentiment derived from history associated with the buildings. The sorts the younger generation employed were more likely to be related to external appearance of the buildings, such as style, structure, exterior, location, and scale of the buildings, as well as the function of the buildings in contemporary society.

The second research question asked how individuals conceptualise and prioritise in constructing colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity. The findings demonstrate that colonial buildings are not material structures that automatically highlight a sense of threat to national identity. Firstly, symbolic meanings associated with colonial buildings became a key determinant in appreciating colonial buildings with respect to a sense of national identity. The results showed that their typical features, significance to national identity, and the representation of threat to their feelings of national identity were not solely determined by their physical features or external appearance. Instead, their political relevance and social significance in South Korean society played more crucial roles in appreciation of colonial buildings with respect to a sense of national identity. In this light, not only the former colonial government buildings but also public buildings both politically and socially significant in South Korean society were prominent structures influencing a sense of national identity. Secondly, the operation individuals undertake to conceptualise colonial buildings was multidimensional. An overlap existed between the colonial buildings to which people have strong attachment and the colonial buildings representing a threat to a sense of national identity. For instance, the old building of Seoul City Hall was viewed as one of the most typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity, but it also was simultaneously viewed as a building to which they have a stronger sense of attachment. This finding demonstrates that not only is colonial heritage experienced from the perspective of the national historical contexts, but it is also simultaneously experienced from the perspective of other contexts.
This overlap also provides evidence that individuals employ complex, multi-strata viewpoints in interpreting colonial buildings, which suggests consideration of the multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage is necessary in order to understand complex individuals-colonial heritage relationships. Thirdly, although three generations in South Korean society construed colonial buildings similarly, there were inter-generational differences. In comparison with other generations, the older generation appeared to construe colonial buildings as symbolic icons significant to the feelings of national identity. They were more likely to attach greater importance to the symbolic meanings associated with the buildings significant in both a personal and social context. For the older generation, the significance of colonial buildings to a sense of national identity was not always accompanied by the threat to national identity; moreover, they were less likely to accept features of colonial buildings challenging a sense of national identity. The older generation appeared to have a stronger sense of attachment to the buildings that left a significant mark in the post-colonial history of South Korea politically or socio-economically (e.g. the old building of Seoul Railway Station, the Japanese Government General Building). The younger generation appeared to feel a stronger sense of attachment towards buildings supporting their community life in contemporary South Korean society (e.g. the buildings of city hall, department store, and a bank).

Research Question 3 explored socio-psychological properties that colonial buildings communicate with respect to a sense of national identity in South Korean society. Clear distinction existed between the former colonial government buildings and Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings. The government buildings differed considerably from the residential and religious buildings in that the government buildings, which are politically and socially significant in South Korean society, were viewed in a stereotypical way such that the Japanese colonial legacies are seen to threaten a sense of national identity significantly. In contrast, the residences and religious buildings, which are visually significant but not socially politically significant, were viewed as historic buildings irrelevant to a sense of national identity. Educational, commercial business and public cultural buildings were also significant to a sense of national identity; however, these buildings are not
homogeneous in relation to a sense of national identity. The buildings in this type need to be carefully interpreted because the impact on a sense of national identity is not necessarily negative. In light of this consideration, colonial buildings in South Korean society were classified into four distinctive types of colonial heritage according to their dominant symbolic or physical features (Research Question 4). ‘Symbolic colonial heritage’ was thought of as the most typical and challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. Therefore, a sense of national identity communicated through these buildings was intimately linked to threats to national identity. Colonial buildings categorised as ‘modern historic architecture’ were thought of as modern cultural heritage that influences a sense of national identity. However, they do not automatically highlight a sense of threat to national identity. ‘Historic buildings in a foreign style’ are thought of as historic buildings that prominently display unique physical features allowing South Koreans to easily discriminate from their own buildings. Despite the distinctive features of Japanese heritage, they were not viewed as challenging colonial buildings in terms of national identity. Lastly, ‘old-fashioned buildings’ do not present visible clues that discriminate from ordinary old-fashioned buildings in Korean society. One important aspect to be drawn from the above is that a sense of national identity communicated through colonial buildings would not automatically highlight a sense of threat to national identity. It is too simplistic to regard colonial buildings as just an architectural manifestation of threatened national identity.

Using the Multiple Sorting Procedure, this study explored ways in which individuals conceptualise Japanese colonial buildings in South Korean society. Due to individuals’ complex, multi-strata viewpoints in interpreting colonial buildings, this study suggests a consideration of the multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage in relation to a sense of identity. The next empirical study (i.e. Study Three) explores this issue further by identifying the way in which individuals construct their identity using colonial heritage and how they deal with their threatened identity if colonial heritage threatens their sense of identity. Using life history approaches, a detailed examination of how their perception of colonial heritage have developed and
changed across their lifespan, both for them personally and the wider public context will be carried.
Chapter Nine
Study Three: Life History Interviews

9.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses Study Three, which explores the way in which individuals construct meanings for the colonial buildings, as well as how they deal with certain situations (i.e. threatened identity by colonial heritage), both within their lives and in the broader social context. The focus of this chapter is to addresses the preliminary issues when designing and conducting life history interviews, the principal methodology for Study Three. It begins by identifying the aims and specific objectives Study Three is expected to achieve. Afterwards, it explains the nature of the life history approach that influences how this study was designed and conducted. Following this, it will explain the procedures adopted for the life history interviews used to address the research questions in this study. Finally, it addresses the design and the process for data collection and data analysis in detail.

9.2 Aim and Objectives
Study One statistically measured how cultural heritage is related to a sense of national identity. Following the study, Study Two examined the way individuals conceptualise Japanese colonial buildings and what they consider to be important in conceptualising Japanese colonial buildings in a geometrical manner. The rationale for this third study is that not only does the data obtained through the life history approach explore the various ways of constructing the meaning of colonial heritage in a Korean context, but it also refines and explains the results identified from previous studies (i.e. Studies One and Two) in more depth. The focus of this study is on the process of meaning construction and the coping with threatened identity: the way in which individuals constructs meanings of colonial heritage, as well as the coping reactions employed by individuals in response to threatened identity both within their lives and in the broader social context. By employing the life history approach as a main methodology, particular attention is directed to how individuals experience colonial heritage and how meanings of colonial heritage have originated,
developed and changed across their lifespan. The ideas of Social Representation and memory were adopted here because these ideas postulate the process of meaning construction within their lives in the broader social context. Social identity theories were applied since these theories posit not only identity motivations and a range of identity coping responses employed by individuals. The specific objectives are to understand:

1. The way in which individuals experience colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity: If and how colonial heritage is perceived to contribute to individuals’ multiple levels of identity (e.g. personal, community, and national identity).

2. Whether and in what way colonial heritage is experienced as possible identity threats and what threats are prominent for individuals’ multiple levels of identity.

3. The way in which individuals respond to identity threats and outcomes of identity threats.

4. What elements contribute to development and change to the meaning of the colonial heritage.

9.3 Life History Approach

It is generally accepted that the ways people interpret and respond to the past may differ according to their life experiences and memories of them, which lie in institutional ideologies, and in the communities of their everyday life, and the ways people understand the past and the meanings attached to the past have been changed by the passage of time (e.g. Portelli, 1991, 1992, 1997; Grim, 1996; Uzzell, 1998, 2009b; Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998). A life history approach is a research technique that enables one to uncover the way in which individuals construct meanings of phenomena, as well as how these have developed and changed across their lifespan, both within their lives and in the broader social context. The life history approach is a specific form of oral history approach, which is a qualitative interview technique
that elicits and records people’s memories of past experiences (Field, 2007, 2009b). Traditionally, the oral history approach has been used widely in related fields, most prominently in history and anthropology, with the purpose of providing new or additional information to the written historical record and for collecting ordinary people’s voices that have normally been hidden from written history. Rather than investigating written or recorded information about the past, this approach is concerned with how individuals remember the past and how they perceive the past in the present, as a present reflection on the past (Eller, 1990). Accordingly, the Oral History Association (2012) describes oral history as ‘a field of study and a method of gathering, preserving and interpreting the voices and memories of people, communities, and participants in past events.’

The life history approach follows the same assumptions and concepts as the oral history approach. However, it differs from the oral history approach in that while an oral history approach examines one point in the life course and its impact on individuals’ lives (e.g. war experience); the life history approach examines the memories and the changes experienced from right across the life span, up to the present day. By examining people’s earlier life (e.g. family background, childhood, home, schooling), adult life (e.g. employment, marriage, parenting), and later life (e.g. retirement), the life history approach explores how individuals remember, experience and interpret a certain event in their lives and how these have established and changed within their lives in the broader social context, and the context behind changes over their lifetime (Uzzell, Gatersleben & White, 2010; White, Uzzell, Gatersleben & Räthzel, 2010). Therefore, it investigates how the past is remembered and represented, rather than what actually happened in the past (Eller, 1990).

Since the life history approach investigates the past by means of personal memories, the subjectivity is thought to be the key issue raised in connection with the life history approach. It is acknowledged that a story told by interviewees would be inaccurate, distorted, biased, and sometimes recreated for a reason according to their personal interpretation and subjective memories of their experience of the past.
In this sense, the subjectivity of oral sources incurs some criticism in that data obtained through a life history approach may not be reliable \((\text{ibid})\). Additionally, immaterial, individual and idiosyncratic natures of oral sources are frequently criticized by social science that focuses on objectively measurable facts (Portelli, 1997). However, Portelli (1997, p. 82) argues that ‘measurable or not, subjectivity is self a fact, an essential ingredient of our humanity’. Individuals’ interpretation of the past would be changed by current attitudes, values, and practice, as well as with time under different social conditions and with the addition of new experience and knowledge (Uzzell, 2009b). Therefore, ‘what is now known as the past was not what anyone experienced as the present’ (Uzzell, 2009b, p.5). Oral sources provide evidence that ‘not just what individuals did, but what they wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, not what they think they did’ (Portelli, 1981, pp.99-100). Additionally, life history researchers emphasise that the subjective or biased memories of the past are rather a good source of information about the meaning of the event that they have today, because understanding why the story has been constructed and recollected in that certain way gives us the insight into interviewee’s values, practices, and beliefs that have been created over time against the common sense of history (White et al., 2010). Additionally, understanding the similarities and disparities between different accounts of the past tells us a great deal about the real nature of complex phenomena \((\text{ibid})\). These natures make the life history approach different from traditional psychological approaches and provide unique information that could not be obtained from traditional psychological approaches, which focus only on individuals’ present day behaviours and attitudes. This is one of the main reasons that recent innovative psychological study (e.g. Uzzell et al., 2010; White et al., 2010) have become increasingly interested in the potential of the life history approach in conducting psychology research.

9.4 Sampling and Procedure

9.4.1 Sampling

Using non-probability sampling techniques (e.g. purposive sampling and snowball sampling), eighteen South Koreans were recruited in Seoul, South Korea in 2011. It is generally believed that seeking interviewees to represent the average population is
crucial in conducting research, especially positioned in the quantitative area. However, the life history approach emphasises sampling from a variety of social groups. Literatures that employed the life history approach (e.g. Portelli, 1997; Uzzell et al., 2010; White et al., 2010) suggest that although data obtained from unrepresentative samples may not be representative of the population as a whole, the data can illustrate a range of possible dimensions of experience and provide an insight into the reasons why some people have that unique experience. From this perspective, the purpose of the sampling in this study was to draw on a variety of experiences associated with Japanese colonial buildings, rather than some notion of the average and to provide an insight into the reasons why some people have constructed those unique meanings for colonial buildings.

The nature of the life history approach, relatively long interview time (lasting between one and two hours each) and the very subjective nature of interview topics, led the researcher to employ a snowball technique. The participants were initially recruited by emails and telephone calls to local institutions, senior welfare centres, local community centres, community clubs, citizen groups, and voluntary organisations in Seoul, from which previous participant groups in the previous studies were selected (i.e. Studies One and Two). However, the researcher also asked potential participants to recommend others they may know who also met the criteria (e.g. participant’s age, residence, and nationality). The researcher continued recruiting people until six participants in each of the three generation groups were acquired. Most participants were residents of Seoul city; some of them were residents in Seoul’s Metropolitan area.

As in the case of the questionnaire study (Study One) and the Multiple Sorting Procedure (Study Two), interviewees were selected from three different generation groups of South Koreans, and six participants were chosen from each generation group (i.e. six older generations, six middle generations, and six younger generations). This is because it was anticipated that each generation in South Korea would have different life experiences under different social conditions in South Korea. Similar to the sampling criteria used in the previous studies, the key criteria
in grouping generations were social and historical events in South Korea (i.e. normalisation of diplomatic relations between South Korea and Japan in 1965 and the lifting of Japanese cultural exports to South Korea in the 1990s). It was felt important to divide the population according to these social events because their life experiences had to be either directly or indirectly affected by the particular social context in South Korea.

9.4.2 Interview Procedure

Interviews were carried out by the researcher in February and March 2011 in Seoul, South Korea. The interview was a dynamic conversation, rather than a one-way interaction (e.g. asking questions and then getting an answer). Interviewees were allowed to talk freely about whatever they wanted to talk about and to speak fully without interruption, even when the content seemed irrelevant at times. Interviews normally lasted between one and two hours and each interviewee was interviewed individually in a face-to-face conversation. The interviews were conducted in the interviewees’ native language (i.e. Korean). Timojevic (2000), who interviewed with non-English speaking interviewees, points out that the use of a non-native language in the interviews might incur not only invalid discourse but also less willingness to participate in the interview if interviewees are not fluent in English. The interviews were carried out either in the interviewees’ homes or other places convenient for the interviewees; they were recorded using two digital voice recorders, SONY ICD-UX74 digital voice recorder and a SAFA A78 digital voice recorder before being transcribed by the researcher into a Microsoft Word document.

It is worth noting the unique ethical considerations applied to this study. It is generally assumed that psychology research should guarantee anonymity and confidentiality of participants. However, anonymity and confidentiality are not always spontaneously assumed in the life history approach. In some cases naming interview data offers the interviewee ownership of their own story as well as increases the value of the data (Uzzell et al., 2010; White et al., 2010). From this perspective, when giving their permission for the data from voice recording and transcription being used solely for this study and further research work, interviewees
were offered the option to naming their recorded life story. After the interviews, the researcher asked the interviewees whether they wished to put their name on their recorded interview data. If they did not wish to, they remained anonymous.

9.4.3 Interview Schedule
One of the notable aspects that differentiates a life history interview from a questionnaire or even a normal in-depth interview is that the researcher allows the interviewees to talk about their life experiences and it is through this account that identity related issues emerge (Portelli, 1997, Uzzell et al., 2010). For this reason, the life history approach has potential to gather richer and more diverse information and various subjective experiences of the interviewee’s life (Portelli, 1997; Thompson, 2000; Uzzell et al., 2010). In this study, the researcher did not ask for this information directly but it came out of the way that talk about their daily lives and what is important for them. In this light, the interviews in this study were conducted as dynamic conversations. To some extent, interviewees could take control of the interviews and they played an important role in determining what structure the interview should follow. In order to provide interviewees with some guidance as to what to discuss, this study incorporated an interview schedule based on schedules developed by Howarth (1998), Thompson (2000) and Uzzell et al. (2010). Details of the interview schedule are presented in Appendix 4. The interview schedule in this study was designed to follow interviewees’ experiences in their lifespan, beginning with interviewees’ earlier life to their present-day life.

The interview schedule consisted of two different sections (Table 9.1). The first section consisted of questions covering interviewees’ childhood, work, marriage, children, retirement and their present-day life. It focused on interviewees’ life histories and experiences associated with Japanese colonial heritage. In this section, the researcher sought interviewees’ memories and experiences from across their life spans in order to investigate the way in which interviewees interpret the colonial heritage, and how these have originated, changed and developed over time and the full context behind changes over the lifetime. In the second section of the interview, the researcher asked interviewees’ life histories associated with Japanese colonial
buildings in Seoul. This section of the interviews was preceded by watching short video images of symbolic colonial buildings. Five familiar landmarks in central Seoul, demonstrating Japanese colonial history today, were selected and video-taped, for 3 to 5 minutes per building (i.e., the old Seoul City Hall, Seoul Railway Station, Korean Bank, Shinsaegye Department Store, Tappol Park). It was believed that showing video images of the buildings would encourage interviewees to recall their personal memories related to the buildings and, consequently, enhance their ability to interpret the buildings more personally during the interviews.

The interviews rarely progressed in a linear way from past to present and no attempt was made to force progress in a linear way from childhood to adulthood by sticking rigidly to the interview schedule. During the interviews, challenges were made to what the interviewees said if their stories did not appear to fit with what they had previously stated. Additionally, some questions regarding participants’ life histories associated with Japanese colonial heritage were asked when appropriate.

Table 9.1 Outline of Life History Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Main Themes</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section One</td>
<td>1. Preliminary background</td>
<td>Interviewee’s name, origin, and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Family background</td>
<td>Family information and memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Daily life in childhood</td>
<td>Home life, social life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Community and social class</td>
<td>Memories of community life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. School days</td>
<td>School life, school trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Life after school and work</td>
<td>Home life after leaving school, work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Marriage and parenting</td>
<td>Marriage, parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Present day</td>
<td>Daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Two</td>
<td>Life experience associated with the buildings</td>
<td>Personal Memories associated with the buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.5 Analytical Procedure

9.5.1 Thematic Analysis

The information obtained through the interviews was managed and interpreted using Thematic Analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006) and a qualitative analysis tool, MAXQDA. Thematic Analysis is an analytical method to identify, categorise,
analyse, and report commonly recurring themes and patterns across a large volume of qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.79). The key feature of Thematic Analysis is a systematic process minimising a large volume of qualitative data. A large body of data is encoded into ‘the basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding phenomenon (i.e. coded) (Boyatzis, 1998, p.63), and then sorted into a cluster conveying patterned meanings (i.e. themes) (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Through the process for encoding qualitative information using themes and codes, the researcher can usefully condense key features of data and interpret the data set in more detail (ibid). This analytic process is one of the conventional techniques in qualitative analysis, such as Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), Grounded Theory and Discourse Analysis (Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Holloway & Todres, 2003). However, the fact that Thematic Analysis is theoretically flexible in approaching and analysing qualitative data leads to a range of different possible ways of analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic Analysis in this study was conducted from a social constructionist perspective, looking at individual accounts socially produced by interactions with others in a socio-cultural context, rather than simply inhered within individuals (i.e. Constructionist Thematic Analysis).

In Thematic Analysis, it is widely accepted that themes within data could be driven either from the data themselves (i.e. data-driven inductive approach) or from the researcher’s theoretical interest (i.e. theoretical-driven deductive approach). Data-driven inductive Thematic Analysis occurs when the researcher attempts to construct themes directly from the raw information itself (e.g. interview transcripts) without a particular theoretical framework that anchors the analytic claims. On the positive side, this approach produces a richer description of the data overall, in comparison to theory-driven codes. Additionally, this approach is more likely to obtain higher validity and inter-rater reliability because the results are directly driven from the raw information. However, this approach would not go beyond producing mere description of the data because the themes identified are less likely to link to the specific research questions and topics that researchers are concerned about (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Moreover, this approach is more likely to increase uncertainty and
ambiguity of the analysis, in addition to much time developing codes and themes, in comparison to theory-driven approach (Boyatzis, 1998).

Theory-driven deductive Thematic Analysis starts from the assumption that theories exist that can be applied to the phenomenon (Diesing, 1972). Therefore, the analysis is guided by research’s theoretical or analytic concern in the specific area of the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and, consequently, the elements of the code, construction of themes, and even naming of themes is highly dependent on the elements of the theory (Boyatzis, 1998). Not only is this approach more likely to offer a detailed analysis of some aspects of the data by focusing on specific features of the data, but also to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity of the analysis using already established theories. However, on the negative side, the nature of this approach could result in lower validity and inter-rater reliability (i.e. lower consistency of judgement) (Boyatzis, 1998). Additionally, this approach is less likely to provide a rich description of the data, both by narrowing the researcher’s analytic field of vision and ignoring the specifics of the context in which the data is created. Consequently, it leads the researcher to focus more on previously understood features of the data and to miss other key potential aspects (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The method of approach chosen for this study was a combined technique of data-driven inductive and theory-driven deductive approaches, whereby themes were initially generated inductively from the raw information (i.e. life history interview transcripts) and then verified and articulated deductively with social identity theories (i.e. Social Identity Theory, Identity Process Theory). Researchers who have discussed this hybrid approach (e.g. Boyatzis, 1998; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006; Halland, 2007) suggest that a combination of these two different approaches can be useful when the analysis is designed to start with an inductive approach because themes from raw information can be meaningfully expressed using theories. Moreover, by using a hybrid approach to thematic analysis, the results could be more legitimate by supporting theories or prior research more than the data-driven inductive approach does. In this study, a starting point in the data was taken by
using inductive thematic analysis. The researcher read the life history interview transcripts repeatedly with the intention of merely exploring the life experience and subjective experience associated with Japanese colonial architecture and coding it diversely without paying attention to the specific themes related to a sense of identity. Afterwards, the analysis was driven by specific research questions connected to the theoretical concepts. Across the inductively derived themes and coding, the researcher paid particular attention to the features related to a sense of identity and developed potential themes that would elicit information in this area. As primary themes, four psychological motivations of identity derived from Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory (i.e. self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity) were considered and these themes were applied to the codes and themes in this study. Detailed discussions concerning these identity motivations are illustrated in Chapter Three (Section 3.3.2). Therefore, the interpretative power of this analysis was maximised since this study integrated themes emerging directly from life history interviews with the tenet of social identity theories that anchor the analytic claims. The detailed process of thematic analysis in this study is described in a later part of this section.

Lastly, this study employed a latent level of data analysis, rather than a semantic level of data analysis. The semantic level of analysis could yield insights as it identifies the sentences and phrases in which interviewees used it and therefore compares the word they used to those of others. However, to understand the meaning of the word to them and the meaning of the word as it was used in a particular moment, the latent level of analysis is necessary (Boyatzis, 1998). A descriptive observation (e.g. semantic content analysis) was not the aim of the data analysis in this study. The researcher gave same importance to all comments that emerged during the interviews, regardless of those frequencies. In developing themes, therefore, this study looked beyond a mere observation of what an interviewee said during the interview (i.e. semantic levels of Thematic Analysis) so that a more insightful analysis of richness of the raw information was made.
9.5.2 Process and Practice of Thematic Analysis

Firstly, interview data from eighteen interviewees (i.e. audio-recorded interviews) was transcribed into MS-word software to conduct Thematic Analysis. Following data transcription, the interview transcripts were input into the MAXQDA computerised qualitative data management programme. Taking into account the research questions and topics, the researcher read the transcription carefully in order to identify meaningful units of text. Afterwards, to generate a criterion-referenced model which served as a basis for developing the code criterion model of codes, the researcher selected sub-samples from each of three generational groups (i.e. 2 participants from each generational group).

The second phase involves developing an initial criterion model of codes from the sub-sample data. An inductive approach was employed during the coding of transcripts from sub-samples. This means that the researcher created initial categories based on the interview transcripts from the selected interviewees (i.e. 6 sub-samples). The developed initial codes and themes were subsequently applied to interview transcripts from other selected interviewees and reviewed to discover and develop different themes and a code among the interviewees. By in-depth review of the interview transcripts from the selected six interviewees (e.g. comparison and contrast to interview transcripts from other sub-samples), an initial criterion model of codes, which served as the basis for developing the code, was inductively developed.

Afterwards, the inductively developed preliminary themes were articulated into meaningful themes for the purposes of this study using social identity theories. For instance, themes related to psychological motivations of identity (e.g. self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness, continuity) were generated. After the review by a supervisor, these articulated themes were applied to the entire interview transcripts. Information relating to individuals’ sense of identity and their life experience associated with colonial heritage were identified and coded into corresponding themes. The same units of text were included in more than one category. Afterwards, the results were reviewed and refined to confirm that a title, sub-themes, extracted codes and data supports each category.
Chapter Ten
Threat to Identity and Coping Reaction

10.1 Introduction
The previous chapter discussed the life history approach, the principal methodology for Study Three. Drawing on this approach, this chapter identifies the ways in which individuals construct meanings of colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity and how they deal with threats if colonial heritage threatens their sense of identity. It divides into two broad sections, starting with an assumption that our life and the context of where we live are always multi-dimensional (Portelli, 1991, 1992, 1997). First, it will examine whether and in what way colonial heritage is perceived to contribute to individuals’ identity or experienced as a possible identity threat. This includes an examination of the threats prominent for their identity, both within their lives and in the broader social context (e.g. personal, community, and national identity). Second, it examines how individuals who perceived threats determine what to do in response to the threats and outcomes of those threats. Examination of the evolution of the significance of threats will be included in this section.

10.2 Perception and Interpretation of Colonial Heritage
This section explores how individuals experience colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity (Research Question 1), whether and in what way colonial heritage is experienced as possible identity threats, and what threats are prominent for individuals’ identity (Research Question 2). In order to answer to these questions, the method of analysis used in this study drew from the multidimensional narrative modes of history telling, which was proposed by Portelli (1991, 1992, 1997). Key to this analytic model is that social or historical events are identified and located in time in terms of both linear succession (i.e. chronology) and vertical paradigms (i.e. temporal simultaneity). In addition to chronology of time (i.e. the horizontal dimension of time reflecting the accumulation of life experiences and horizontal division into key events, periods and epoch), time could be divided vertically into various narrative levels by considering the multi-dimensional life and the context in
which we live. Portelli proposes three ways of organising historical narrative in terms of point of view, which are the institutional mode, the collective mode and the personal mode. The institutional mode of narrative is related to a nation or to the world. In this mode, certain events are experienced from the perspective of politics, government, ideology and the national and international historical context. In the collective mode, the events are experienced from the perspective of the life of the community and the neighbourhood. Lastly, in the personal mode of narrative, the events are more related to private, family life and personal involvement in the two other levels. Those three modes of individuals’ experiences always overlap and combine at the same time (ibid). Uzzell (2009b) supports his idea by addressing our experiences in the horizontal and vertical analytical axes could be mechanisms to order our memories and to help us make sense of the past. In this study, narratives of individuals’ experiences of colonial heritage are analysed by a three-dimensional analytic framework and themes have been classified into three separate categories for the purposes of this study (i.e. colonial heritage linked to the personal paradigm, communal paradigm, and institutional paradigm).

The interviews provide evidence that not only is colonial heritage experienced from the perspective of the political, government, ideological and national historical contexts, but it is simultaneously experienced both from the perspective of community life and personal life histories. The following sections explain the way colonial architecture and place in South Korea have been perceived and interpreted by individuals in the personal, community and institutional modes of their identity structure. Those three modes of individuals’ experiences of colonial heritage have always overlapped and merged. Therefore, it should be noted that although themes have been classified into separate categories for the purposes of this study, many of these themes overlap.

10.2.1 Colonial Heritage Linked to the Personal Paradigm

From the personal identity perspective, colonial heritage has been appreciated as a material object not only symbolising the individual’s social position, but also expressing their achievement and competence, resulting in positive self-evaluation.
It also serves as a personal memorial presenting their personal and family history, coming to maintain their sense of continuity.

10.2.1.1 Social Categorisation and Positioning

Fuhrer and Kaiser (1992; cited in Speller, 2000) argue that places, as carriers of personal identity, reflect personal identity to others by facilitating information about the self to others. Speller (2000) further explains that if place can be personalised, the place serves as a symbolic mirror of certain aspects of personal identity. During the interviews, some interviewees, especially older interviewees, often evidenced colonial buildings to illustrate their personal value, coming to evaluate personal self positively. Taking Hwang (66) as an example, the old Japanese Government General Building, which stood in the centre of Seoul, serves as a symbolic mirror of her identity by supporting accounts of being a Seoul person.

“I was born in 236 Naeja-dong, Seoul. You know, being born in Naejadong means I’m a real native of Seoul. It is right in front of the Japanese General Government Building. [...] I lived there for 18 years before I got married. You know, we were born and grew up in Seoul, so we’re intelligent people.”

(Hwang, 66, female)

Close attention to her comment, “I’m a real native of Seoul. It is right in front of the Japanese General Government Building”, reveals that the old Japanese General Government Building was intentionally chosen because the iconic building, located in the centre of Seoul, could symbolise who she is (i.e. a real native of Seoul) and help her in positively distinguishing herself from others. This idea also permits association with Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) notion of symbolic qualities of place, explaining that physical places symbolise an individual’s self-image. Additionally, it is consonant with Droseltis and Vignoles (2010) assertion that people tend to relate to places providing a sense of self-esteem. Her following comment, “we were born and grew up in Seoul, so we’re intelligent people” is of particular importance because this comment provides evidence of a strong relationship between a sense of distinctiveness and self-esteem. For her, the association with the old Japanese General Government building was regarded as her pride, linking her to the
heart of Seoul, and the heart of the country (i.e. a sense of self-esteem). The building provided her symbolic qualities, fitting into the self-concept she wished to present, an original Seoul person (i.e. a sense of distinctiveness) and, consequently, boosts a positive feeling about her as a Seoul citizen.

Vignoles et al. (2000, 2002b) point out that an individual’s position within social relationships is one of the main sources of positive distinctiveness. It appears colonial buildings serve as an indicator representing individuals’ privileged positions in social relationships. It also encourages individuals to maintain or achieve positive self-esteem. This was exemplified by Hee (90), who used to work at the Association for the Lodging Industry in Seoul. He boasted his social status by talking about an old building, the Chosun Hotel, built by the Japanese colonial government in 1914. He said:

“The Chosun Hotel was the best hotel in Seoul and it had been from the colonial era. No ordinary people were allowed to use this high standard hotel, but I had the freedom of it because I’m a privileged one. I was a managing director in an Association of Accommodations, so I always dealt with general managers or vice presidents of hotels”

(Hee, 90, male)

His comments, “I’m a privileged one”, could be interpreted as his self-representation that he is different from ordinary people in Korean society. Additionally, it seems that the old hotel building symbolises him and he wants to identify with the building. This comment could be explained in terms of a strong link between a sense of distinctiveness and self-esteem (e.g. Breakwell, 1986, 1993; Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Vignoles et al., 2000). That is to say, he could derive his positive self-esteem from perceiving himself as a special person in a position with access to the hotel in Korean society. Therefore, the old building seems to be more a symbol of social status, which contributes to his feeling of difference from others (i.e. distinctiveness) and his self-evaluation (i.e. self-esteem) rather than a simple physical structure.
Some interviewees, especially older interviewees again, provide evidence of colonial heritage becoming a symbolic object separating generations from each other. For example, Hee (90) proudly explained colonial-era buildings and Japanese Shrines that used to be in central Seoul under colonial rule.

“Shiseagye Department Store, and was it Jungjaok? It was Midopa Department Store also; they were all Japanese’s buildings [...] Yes, the Great Shrine, called the Great Shrine of Chosun, was an amazing place, of course. [...] After Independence, the Great Shrine was torn down and replaced by Namsan Park today, wasn’t it? [...] People today don’t know this. I’m a person who really experienced these things in my lifetime. Well, although some people were born in the colonial era, just a few people can give full details like me.”

(Hee, 90, male)

By referencing a number of colonial buildings in Seoul, Hee (90) defines himself as one of a few remaining witnesses who experienced social and political upheaval in Korea’s history. His last comment, “although some people were born in the colonial era, just a few people can give full details like me.” clearly shows his sense of distinctiveness is accentuated by comparing his life experiences under the occupation with that of others who could not have experienced the period. Although his comments were not made about a specific colonial heritage being a symbolic object illustrating personal value, he is referring to a particular period of time which gives rise to a feeling of uniqueness in Korean society today, which consequently accentuates their sense of distinctiveness.

10.2.1.2 Self-Competence, Personal Achievement and Self-Esteem

By referencing colonial architecture, some interviewees, especially older interviewees, boasted how they managed their social lives and what they achieved in their lives, clearly a successful attempt to boost both their senses of self-efficacy and self-esteem. It could also be relevant to a sense of continuity. During the interviews, Hee (90), the oldest interviewee who had directly experienced the colonial occupation, recalled his life under the occupation. The colonial-era architecture gives rise to a feeling of pride for Hee. He started his comments by
saying, “Nobody drafted either into the Japanese army or hard labour could survive. My uncle was also taken away to a coal mine and went through all sorts of hardships and died there.” He followed this with his life story, relating how he managed his life under suppression.

“I was involved in the construction of an airfield for the Japanese Air force. I worked as a bookkeeper on the construction site. [...] They were strictly watched by Japanese military police all the time, but I lived very well and I was treated in a very special way, which I did not recognise in my circumstance at that time. I went to a hot spring in Haeundae and a Dongrae hot spring hotel, and I had nice food every day with the Japanese.”

(Hee, 90, male)

His comment “I lived very well and I was treated in a very special way, which I did not recognise in my circumstance at that time.” suggests he is very proud of himself because he could successfully manage his life by working for a Japanese construction company in the colonial-era, the time of hardship in Korean history. Unlike ordinary Korean men who suffered under the occupation, he successfully managed to survive the social ordeal. This tendency bears resemblance to Speller’s (2000) study that reports people who have experienced hardship in the environment could achieve their self-esteem by their achievement. Hee’s comments continued:

“As is commonly said today, I may be seen as a pro-Japanese collaborator, but I knew the knack of living under the occupation. I survived and I feel proud of myself. If I had not done that, I could not have supported my family”.

(Hee, 90, male)

His later comments show the public criticism of pro-Japanese activities in the colonial era did not significantly attenuate his self-esteem because the focus of his values was more on all he had done for his life and his family. The old building of Seoul City Hall, another symbolic colonial government building at the centre of social controversy, was in Hee’s (90) mind as a symbolic place showing his golden age.
“I can’t stress enough what a familiar and important place it is [...]. I often walked into the building because I had to work with City Police, Defence Department, Interior Ministry and other departments. I often attended meetings taking place in the building. [...] You know I received the mayor’s commendation for my service.”

(Hee, 90, male)

His comment indicates the memories of his golden age associated with the old colonial building gave the building personal significance. It seems clear the old Seoul City Hall building serves as a personal monument displaying his personal achievement in his life history. It gives rise to not only feelings of pride but also pleasant reminiscences, which become substantial components of his identity.

10.2.1.3 Personal History and Maintaining Continuity

The interviews reveal colonial heritage also serves as a repository of nostalgia, supporting individuals’ sense of continuity. For example, a short quotation from Oak (82), who spent her youth in the colonial capital Seoul, explained nostalgia appeared in her mind through colonial-era buildings in Seoul. She said, “These buildings conjure up memories of my good old days [...] I don’t know how I can express this feeling, it’s ‘Nastukashi’ in Japanese. Things like ‘I miss the old days’. I remember the old days through this”. It seems that, with the passage of time, life under occupation in her youth has transformed into personal nostalgia; colonial buildings are acting as a memory aid for her life history.

Many interviewees provide useful evidence on the power of colonial heritage to support individuals’ sense of continuity. This is intimately linked with Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) notion of place-referent continuity that emphasises a sense of continuity constructed through place dependent memories. Older interviewees frequently illustrated how their autobiography has become closely intertwined with colonial buildings and places. Colonial heritage becomes a personal memorial that individuals wish to preserve, as well as a symbolic place that has embodied emotional significance for them. For example, the old Japanese General
Government Building, the chief administrative building under colonial occupation has been positioned in Hwang’s (66) mind.

“It was my playground really. I was very tiny at that time, so I could pass through the hole in the wall. We always played puss in the corner and hide-and–seek there and back home across the street. [...] It was the place I always played with my friends [...] This building always reminded me of my childhood.”

(Hwang, 66, female)

It appears Hwang is emotionally bonded to the old Japanese Government General Building, the symbolic colonial government building, because the building is a focus for her reminiscences about her childhood. Her comment, “It was my playground”, represents the building reawakening up exciting memories for her as a child. That is to say, despite being a symbolic place representing the Japanese colonial power and oppression, it is not seen as a place of fear. Another interesting example of this was given by Gong (70). For him, the old building of the Seoul Railway Station employs a nice mix of reminiscences, sorrow and joy, as well as a collection of reminiscences about his life history. He said:

“I took a train for my honeymoon at this station. When I was a child, I came here to go to my grandparents’ house. I was also there to greet nice people and to see them off. Oh, yes, I took a train for my school field trip as well. You know, we all took a train for travel at that time [...] I like this building very much. [...] You know, this building is different from others. The old Japanese General Government Building is in history, but this building has been in my life because I’ve used this building all off my life.”

(Gong, 70, male)

His comments illustrate that the old building of the station is in his mind as a familiar place where he contacts his past life and follows the trail to his past. His frequent interaction with the building not only threads his past and present, but also creates an emotional bond with the building. This is in line with Milligan’s (1998) ‘interactional past of place’, suggesting an emotional link to place could be formed by past experiences associated with place. In this light, the higher meaningfulness
of the experience associated with the colonial building leads to higher attachment to the building. His comments, “This building is different from others” and “The old Japanese General Government building is in history, but this building has been in my life because I’ve used this building all off my life.”, are of particular importance because they evidence the strong relationship between place-referent continuity and a sense of place attachment. It provides evidence that emotional bonds of individuals to colonial heritage could be a determinant in perceptions of heritage that threatens their identity.

Memories of family life and family members associated with colonial heritage are another important aspect in interpreting and perceiving colonial heritage. For some interviewees, but more often expressed by older interviewees, colonial buildings are important as a way of remembering family life. An example is given by Gong (70) of Japanese residential houses conjuring up memories of his family life during the Korean War (1950-1953).

“Propeller bombers, not jet bombers, came and strafed Seoul because the Allied forces couldn’t get into Seoul. Well, the Samgakji area was a ferocious battlefield in Seoul; in fact, I was there at that time. I was in a house built by the Japanese in the battlefield. We made fools of ourselves at the house because we were told that bullets could not pass through blankets; therefore, we flattened ourselves with a blanket pulled over our heads in the hot summer. How stupid we were! [Laughing] You know, if just one bomb fell on the house, we would not have survived. We did not need to pull the blanket over our head. It was a stupid thing to do.”

(Gong, 70, male)

Despite dreadful memories, he was pleased with stating his experiences, as a survivor of the war. Looking from the perspective of a sense of continuity, not only iconic buildings (i.e. the old Japanese General Government Building), but also non-iconic buildings, such as residential houses, give rise to a sense of continuity in the personal context. Hee (90) identified another example related to non-iconic
colonial buildings, as he lived in a Japanese-styled house built by the Japanese and the house is overlaid with memories of his family life. He said:

“My family couldn’t stand the life in the North after liberation, so we returned to the South by crossing the 38th parallel. I remember it was one day in October 1948 and we walked all the way South carrying our children on our backs. [...] We settled into a small Japanese house in Ulgiro-4ga in Seoul, which was a Japanese company house in the colonial era. My son, who is now 70 years old, still remembers the house. [...] When we returned home after the Korean War, we were devastated because all our household possessions had been destroyed by the bombing. Fortunately, the house survived during the war, so we restored it. Although the house was in a bad state, thanks to the house we could scrape a living after the war. The house still exists.”

(Hee, 90, male)

The house becomes a reference for the traumatic and difficult past his family experienced. However, it simultaneously becomes a family legacy that threads his family’s past and present because he follows the trail to his family’s past through the house. For him, the Japanese house where his family grew up serves as a symbol confirming the existence of their family across the past and present. It also becomes a physical object reflecting how his family survived the ordeal. In this light, it seems themes of continuity here overlapped with self-efficacy. Korpela (1989) supports this type of continuity by addressing that individuals can recall their past through specific places and use places as a concrete background not only in comparing themselves at different times but also in creating coherence and continuity in their self-conception.

Another interesting point is that colonial heritage serves as a personal memorial, triggering reminiscence of individuals’ family members who stick in their minds and embodies important personal meanings, which offers another way of maintaining a sense of continuity. One example is given by Oak (82). The old building of the Bank of Korea conjures up memories of her father who drew a picture of the building in her childhood. She was very excited and delighted with expressing her memories.
“Whenever I see this building, I remember my father. We used to have a magazine published by the Korean Bank a long time ago. Once, my father drew a picture of this building for the cover of the magazine. So, when I see this building, I always recall his drawing. Yes, he drew this view of the building and the picture of this view was printed. It’s a nice building, isn’t it? [laughing] Here, exactly this view! Here!”

(Oak, 82, female)

Her comments displaying her relationship with the building focused exclusively on her nostalgia. It explains how colonial symbolic buildings can retain significant positions for individuals. The building may represent the colonial oppression, but personally she can bring back positive memories. It appears that for older generations, the colonial buildings are less likely to be associated with negative memories, but positive ones about the way life was lived, and to family memories. What is especially noteworthy here is that since colonial heritage plays a role in anchoring place-memories, unwanted disruptions to the emotionally salient place or its disappearance result in disruption of individuals’ sense of continuity. For example, Hwang (66), who was born and brought up in the centre of Seoul, was very disappointed by the disappearance of old Japanese buildings and Japanese-styled houses, a repository for her childhood memories.

“There used to be some Japanese buildings, which I thought were really nice. However, it is so difficult to find these buildings these days. It is very hard to see them, isn’t it? When we went to the Kyongbok Palace the other day, we could not find any Japanese-style buildings around the palace. I feel as if the houses are still there. [...] The government didn’t get our approval for this, did they? I feel it’s a shame to get rid of the buildings.”

(Hwang, 66, female)

For her, the dismantled buildings and houses undermined her sense of continuity because her personal memorials have disappeared. This is consonant with Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) assertion that unwanted disruption of an emotionally salient
place, such as a familiar building or familiar place where they have grown up, could threaten a sense of continuity. Lim (31), who spent his childhood with Japanese-styled houses, gave the example of not being able to trace his past via the houses where he had grown up because the houses had been removed due to urban redevelopment.

“The town is still in my childhood memory. [...] The house had a unique structure. I remember the style of these houses, another house above the other houses, along the stairs and there is another one. One day, I just wanted to go and see the houses where I spent my childhood but I found they had all vanished without a trace because of urban redevelopment.”

(Lim, 31, male)

His comment “I wanted to go and see these houses where I had spent my childhood” indicates the Japanese houses, which are spatial mnemonics for his childhood, are a source of his personal identity, which is no longer available. The radical change of the landscape of the town resulted in propounding a sense of disorientation and a sense of alienation for him. Hwang and Lim’s comments are consonant with social and environmental psychologists’ assertions that the loss of physical places that embodied symbolic meanings would result in discontinuity for individuals or groups’ identities (e.g. Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000; Speller et al., 2002). It is also consonant with Fried’s argument that ‘any severe loss may represent a disruption in one’s relationship with the past, the present and to the future….It is a disruption in that sense of continuity which is ordinarily a taken for granted framework for functioning in a universe’ (Fried, 1963, p.153). Approached from this point of view, the disappearance of colonial heritage could be a critical symbolic threat to the continuity of their personal identity because the disappearance results in discontinuity of their life history and sense of identity.

The ways in which individuals experience colonial heritage under the personal paradigm were summarised in Figure 10.1. The conclusion to be drawn from the above is that, under the personal paradigm, colonial heritage was not a colonial legacy representing Japanese colonial power and oppression. It rather became a
symbol of self-concept leading to their positive self-evaluation in ways that correspond to psychological motivations of identity. Individuals’ autobiographies became closely intertwined with colonial heritage experienced as a personal monument displaying how individuals managed their social lives and what they achieved in their lives. Colonial heritage also contributed positive self-evaluation by serving as a carrier of personal identity, reflecting an individual’s unique social position in social relationships (e.g. social status, social position, unique generational groups). Colonial heritage was also experienced as a personal memorial, evoking their personal and family history and placing them in a story of on-going continuity.
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**Figure 10.1 Perception of Colonial Heritage from the Personal Context**

### 10.2.2 Colonial Heritage Linked to the Communal Paradigm

From the perspective of community life, colonial heritage has been invoked not only as a physical marker of past community life strongly associated with a sense of continuity, but also a symbolic marker of social categorisation that accentuates a sense of distinctiveness and self-esteem. Additionally, it is associated with a quality of community life that supports their community life.
10.2.2.1 History of Community and Maintaining Continuity

Colonial heritage in a community setting serves as a physical reminder of a community’s past, which is strongly linked to place-referent continuity (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996). On the one hand, colonial buildings in central Seoul conjure up a picture of urban landscape of Seoul in the past. Using these buildings, older interviewees, including Hee (90), Oak (82), Gong (70), Hwang (66) and Han (64) remain in touch with a community’s past in a rapidly changing social and physical context. On the other hand, colonial architecture and places act as physical reminders that represent past community lifestyles that encourage people to feel the social and cultural continuity of the community. For Bae (50), seeing Changgyeong Palace, which was converted into a zoo and botanical garden by the colonial government, stirred up feelings of nostalgia for their past community lifestyle, such as recreational activities.

“Seoul citizens often went to Changgyeong Palace for a picnic under the cherry blossoms in the spring. The cherry-blossom viewing party took place at night. [...] Due to the night cherry-blossom viewing party and a zoo, the palace was one of the most popular places where lovers come on dates.”

(Bae, 50, female)

Her comment is in line with Devine-Wright and Lyons’s (1997, p.35) observation that ‘place can be interpreted as repositories of specific meanings, memories, values and emotions with are shared by member of a particular group’. A frequent reference by older interviewees was made to the Hwashin Department Store building, which was built in 1937. The building was an exciting place to go to for Seoul citizen in the past. Gong (70) said:

“Only the Hwashin Department Store building had a lift in Seoul before the Korean War. People queued more than 100 metres to take the lift. Do you know why they take the lift? Because, they enjoyed riding the lift in the same way as a ride at an amusement park! There was a time when people enjoyed that [laughing] [...] We called it ‘Seunggangi’ rather than the term ‘lift’ because ‘lift’ was a foreign word at that time. The lift was great fun and we have really good
memories about the lift in the building. I was very sad when the building was removed. Well, I could not help it because it was an urban plan to build a better building. In fact, the floor space of the building was a little bit limited”

(Gong, 70, male)

His comment implies that the building became a spatial and symbolic memory for the older generations who were emotionally attached to the building, which accentuates place reference continuity. For this reason, not only does the destruction of the building in 1988, which is one of the forms of the disruption of spatial continuity, result in the loss of a remembered past but it also results in losing ‘categories of past experience’ (Milligan, 1998, p.9). His comment, “I couldn’t help it because it was an urban plan to build a better building”, clearly illustrates his sense of helplessness in resisting the destruction, which definitely reduces his sense of self-efficacy. This suggests, as previous social and environmental studies have shown, that the deprivation of a person’s ability to function competently and autonomously in a social and physical environment could be a major source of threat to identity concerning self-efficacy (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000; Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000). Hence, the disappearance of the department store building results in not only the loss of continuity but also a breakdown of a sense of manageability (i.e. self-efficacy). A last comment from Gong, who was emotionally attached to the building, “In fact, the floor space of the building was a little bit limited.” is noteworthy because it could be linked to the coping strategies he employed. The coping reactions are discussed in a later section in more detail.

10.2.2.2 Social Categorisation and Social Inclusion

An important premise of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) is that positive group distinctiveness is achieved by categorizing themselves into their in-group and comparing their in-group with out-groups. Within the framework of social identity theories, the interviews confirm that identification with symbolic colonial heritage could have similar processes as identification with social groups. It appears that positive distinctiveness and self-esteem are accentuated by associating with colonial heritage that has symbolic qualities in the community. For example, the Hwashin Department Store building
emerged again in Hee (90) and Gong’s (70) references, as a symbolic structure that provided them with a sense of distinctiveness, and, consequently, boosts their positive feelings as Seoul citizens.

“Because the Hwashin Department Store was the best department store in our country at that time, seeing the building was the best experience for country bumpkins who came to Seoul.”

(Hee, 90, male)

“When friends living in the countryside came to Seoul, we took them to the Hwashin Department Store building. Showing them the building was the best treatment for them.”

(Gong, 70, male)

These short comments show they interpret the building as a symbolic object reflecting modern civilisation in the community’s past rather than a material structure. The building provided them with unique lifestyles that positively contrasted with the lives of others living locally. Consequently, their self-esteem is also clearly accentuated through the building, which provides a privilege of enjoying modern life in Seoul. This is consonant with Lalli (1992) and Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) finding that positive self-esteem can be boosted by associating with prestigious places. In further mapping out the link between colonial buildings and their sense of distinctiveness, another interesting aspect is found from Bae (50). For those born and brought up in Seoul, symbolic colonial buildings such as the old Japanese Government General building, are material objects which they have seen and experienced in their everyday routine and a part of their everyday life. Bae started her comment by saying that “The buildings are just familiar to me rather than nice or amazing. Because we lived in Jongro”. Her comments continued:

“It is rather familiar because we, people who live in Seoul, always pass by this building. I think people from the countryside may feel differently when they saw the building but we don’t because this is a building we’ve always seen.”

(Bae, 50, female)
Bae’s comment shows she distinguishes Seoul citizens from residents of other South Korean cities by emphasising their different perceptions of the building, a routine building within the community setting rather than a symbolic colonial place. This can be seen as a case of ‘physical insidedness’ (Rowles, 1983) in which feelings of familiarity and routine with physical environment emerge from the routine of daily life. These references do not clearly represent how colonial buildings became an object accentuating a sense of self-esteem. However, it could easily be assumed that their relationship with these buildings in their social life might impact on some interviewees’ self-esteem because the association with symbolic buildings in their everyday life may encourage people to feel pride from living in Seoul, a modern capital city.

10.2.2.3 Valued Attributes and Maintaining Self-Efficacy and Self-Esteem
Some interviewees referred to colonial buildings being socio-cultural facilities supporting their everyday social life in community, such as transportation and shopping facilities. An interesting example is found from Hee (90).

“*The Seoul Station is absolutely crucial in our life because when we go to our hometown, we get in and out of trains in this building. When we came to Seoul the first time, our grandmother came to get us. We were worried if we could not see them in the station. You know, no matter who they are, Seoul Station would be absolutely crucial for everyone.*”

(Hee, 90, male)

It appears that the old Seoul Railway Station building was interpreted and perceived as a crucial community facility that supported Seoul citizens’ everyday lifestyles. More importantly, he also expressed the collective level’s emotional bonds with the building that offers a local setting for social interaction in the community. This is intimately linked to Hay’s (1998) claim that place may create not only an individual level’s sense of attachment but also the collective level’s sense of attachment. Especially, his comment “*The Seoul Station would be absolutely crucial for everyone*” illustrates the building has become an integral part of community life.
The Shinsaegye Department Store building, built in 1930, despite its past associations, provides Han (64) with shopping opportunities:

“Although I was just doing window shopping sometimes, I often came to the department store because it differs from other shops. Products are beautifully placed on display in a beautiful building. In olden days, there was no modern department store in Seoul, so when we saw well-displayed products and showcases, um, how can I put this feeling, maybe it was marvellous? [...] Because we always shopped in messy traditional markets, we felt the building was so refined. When shopping here, how can I put this feeling? You know, we sometimes feel superior to others when we go to fancy places, don’t we? Well, maybe it wasn’t all that great, but it definitely made me feel great.”

(Han, 64, female)

Her comments can be explained in terms of a sense of manageability (Twigger-Ross, 1994; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Speller, 2000) in which the colonial building supports a community’s everyday social life, and consequently accentuates their sense of self-efficacy. Additionally, Han’s comments, “superior to others” and “it definitely made me feel great” imply that her sense of distinctiveness and self-esteem was reinforced by using a quality place. Association with a quality place provokes a positive feeling about herself and consequently boosts her positive self-esteem. Another example is found from Noo (20) who emphasises the external appearance of colonial buildings. By comparing them with other modern Korean buildings in the city centre, she positively evaluates colonial buildings in Seoul.

“These buildings look nice, don’t they? I mean the structure of the buildings. Well, these buildings are so lovely, their frontage somehow doesn’t blend in well with their modern surroundings though. You know, these buildings have frequently appeared in movies. I think Seoul could be much nicer than now, if all buildings in Seoul are in the similar style as them, looking more historic.”

(Noo, 20, female)

Her comment shows that she perceives colonial buildings in Seoul as physical objects that enhance the quality of the cityscape of Seoul. Her last comment “I think Seoul
could be much nicer than now, if all buildings in Seoul are in the similar style as them, looking more historic” is of particular interest because she believes that colonial buildings would be better because the buildings would remind Seoul citizens of Seoul’s historical past. It seems that she values the past independently of the nature of that past (i.e. the dominance of a conquering power).

10.2.2.4 Quality of Environment and Threatened Continuity and Self-Esteem

Many interviewees referred to their association with the colonial heritage in their lives and emphasised its significance to their community life. When describing what comes to mind when they see colonial heritage, some of them were apt to connect it to unpleasant places in the community from the perspective of physical qualities today, rather than historic memories associated with the places (e.g. the colonial oppression). Taking Gong (70) as an example, he was concerned about the neglect of Pagoda Park, one of the iconic places symbolising Koreans’ spirit of resistance under the occupation. He said:

“When I was young, the park was a perfect setting for romance in Seoul. However, this is not a park anymore because of elderly men. It should have been a tourist attraction in the city. This park has changed to a shelter or playground for the elderly nowadays. Yes, I would say it’s a shelter for the elderly.”

(Gong, 70, male)

He commented on the park with great delight, referring to when he was young: “the perfect setting for romance”. However, he felt the park to be incongruent with values of community life today. The change of physical condition of the park was so marked that the positive image attached to the park in the community has been eroded today. His later comment, “it’s a shelter for elderly”, could be deemed to represent threatened identity because an individual’s self-esteem is boosted by living in a physical environment that fits with their values and desires (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996). From this point of view, the park changing to a shelter for elderly men today is incongruent with the way of community life. The neglect of the park
has resulted in not only the decrease in sense of place, familiarity, attachment, and personal memory related to the place, but also the change of its social meaning and associated social memories. Mann’s (32) comments provide another evidence for the expression of a sense of continuity in a citizen’s relationship with colonial heritage.

“Because of too many elderly men, I don’t pass through this way and I’m sure everyone has the same idea. There are too many pigeons in the park too. No one wants to go into the park. I guess women especially never want to go into the park because elderly men try to hit on them. It’s scary, isn’t it?”

(Mann, 32, male)

The park was perceived as an unpleasant place citizens are reluctant to visit. His comments, “I don’t pass through this way” and “It’s scary, isn’t it?” clearly represent they do not wish to be associated with the park where elderly men and its atmosphere do not represent their values. Gong and Mann’s comments are very similar in that they do not view the park from the perspective of colonial past. Rather, the park is experienced as a local park in their community today. It suggests that the colonial past would be invisible within the community context.

While some interviewees, including Noo (20), perceive and evaluate colonial buildings as important assets that enhance the qualities of cityscapes (Section 10.2.2.3), others view the buildings as material objects that ruin the beauty of the city today. For example, Shim (20) views colonial buildings as physical structures that spoil the modern cityscape of Seoul. She focused on their out-dated image of the historic place.

“A gloomy atmosphere from the building doesn’t make me have a good feeling. Well, when it comes to its design, it is somewhat remote from other neighbouring buildings. Therefore, simply if I see this building, I’m just thinking that it has been preserved partly because it is a historic building. I just think its design doesn’t blend in well with its surrounding and I don’t think it looks beautiful.”

(Shim, 20, female)
This can be explained in terms of Speller’s (2000) idea that self-esteem could be boosted by personal positive evaluation of place and, similarly, self-esteem could be diminished by negative evaluation of the place. Seen from this point of view, the above comments explain the close association between place identification and a sense of self-esteem. Negative evaluation of the local environment results in dissatisfaction and consequently reduces a sense of place-congruent continuity and self-esteem.

The ways in which individuals experience colonial heritage under the community paradigm are summarised in Figure 10.2. One important aspect to be drawn from the above is that individuals rarely derive colonial past from colonial heritage in the community context. Colonial heritage in a community rather encouraged individuals to achieve positive group identity. Colonial heritage was experienced in terms of symbolic qualities of their community that differentiate themselves from others living locally. Colonial heritage was also associated with physical qualities of their community, fitting into socio-cultural facilities and environments supporting their everyday social life. Furthermore, colonial heritage served as a physical reminder of a community’s past, as well as a symbolic reminder evoking memories of past community lifestyles.
10.2.3 Colonial Heritage Linked to the Institutional Paradigm

Colonial heritage in the institutional context has frequently been invoked as a symbol of the shameful history of Korea that challenges status and pride of a nation and its citizens (i.e. South Koreans). Although these threats take various forms, threats to national identity caused by the heritage are mainly in the form of symbolic threats derived from memories of an aggressive colonial past, including incongruity with national values and ethnic ability past. Shameful ethnic characteristics exemplified through their attitudes to the management of colonial heritage are also included.

10.2.3.1 Incompetent Past and Threatened Self-Efficacy

Lowenthal (1975) suggests that certain architectures and places come to symbolise a society’s shared memory. Especially, historic places could trigger socially shared memories about national past that provide positive value to national identities (Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997). In this context, colonial heritage triggers memories of the shaming history of Korea, which reduces Koreans’ sense of national identity. Colonial buildings, especially symbolic colonial buildings in central Seoul, serve as a reference for some interviewees to recall the conquered colonial past of Korea. For example, the old Seoul Railway Station building is always in Gong’s
Symbolic colonial buildings in Seoul, especially colonial government buildings, became a frequent reference for threatened self-efficacy. The old Japanese Government General Building, which was the chief colonial administrative building, was most notable. Taking Oh (27) as the example, the old building in the precincts of the Korean royal palace was demeaning. He said:

“They attacked the heart of Korea. By building a headquarters of colonial government in front of the royal palace, they controlled everything in Korea. It may have been understandable if they had just destroyed and wiped out the palace, but constructing the building, which lasts long as the colonial legacy, is more terrible.”

(Oh, 27, male)

His short but powerful comment “they attacked the heart of Korea” is of particular importance because it is a symbolic representation illustrating the relationship between colonial heritage and national identity in the Korean context. By personifying the royal palace, the colonial building was interpreted as a significant danger that not only humiliates the Korean dynasty but also attacks a symbol of Korean identity, giving rise to a feeling of incompetence, and consequently inducing negative feelings of self-efficacy. His comment also exhibits that, as an undesirable legacy of a colonial past, its impact on Korean identity remains in Korean society.

When talking about colonial heritage, interviewees also referred to hardships that Koreans experienced under the occupation. Historic colonial places being used as a
memorial today; the old building of Seodaemun Prison frequently appeared in their references. For Seung (27) and Bae (50), the old prison building is overlaid with memories of ethnic suppression under the occupation.

“I was scared of this building. The building was said to be haunted. The building is very dark and spooky, because I was told a number of the Koreans were killed in this building. I was very sad because Koreans were killed by the Japanese in this building in Korea.”

(Seung, 27, male)

“I saw the scene, I felt very sad. I was deeply moved by the scene of a too narrow, dark and gloomy atmosphere. You know, people participating in the independent movement were kept in this prison during the Japanese colonial period. I felt so terrible and the scene made my heart break.”

(Bae, 50, female)

Their comments illustrate they relived the ethnic suppression under the occupation through the building. The building echoes the time when Koreans struggled for autonomy under the occupation, and consequently induces negative feelings, such as sadness (“I was very sad”, “the scene made heart break”), which could be one of the main sources of threats to self-efficacy demonstrating that the social context significantly decreases people’s feelings of their capabilities to have control over their life (Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000). Although themes of self-efficacy here may overlap with that of continuity, social memories provoked through the place in turn give rise to undesirable consequences for their sense of self-efficacy.

**10.2.3.2 Incongruity in National Value and Threatened Identity**

The interviews provide evidence for a sense of place-congruent continuity in individuals’ relationship with colonial heritage, which was expressed in two ways. Firstly, a frequent reference was made to the inappropriateness of colonial heritage in Korean society today because colonial heritage does not fit with Koreans’ desires and values. Symbolic colonial buildings in central Seoul become a frequent reference for threatened place-congruent continuity. For example, Gong’s (70) comments
show that the old Japanese Government General building was interpreted as a building incongruent with national values today.

“I didn’t like this old building of the Government General either because Japanese students come and see this building for their school trips and feel proud of what their ancestors did in the past. I read a paper concerning their wish to continue their ancestors’ achievements and I feel it is totally unacceptable to leave this building in Korea. I mean, I don’t want to see the building serving as their educational centre.”

(Gong, 70, male)

The building is incongruent with an independent nation that has overcome the colonial past not only because of symbolic meanings attached to the building but also its inappropriate use today (e.g. “their educational centre”). Lim (32) and Tae (27) raise another noteworthy feature in their comments by stating the old Seoul City Hall building built by the Japanese colonial authority in 1926 maintains their sense of continuity. They commented that the colonial building does not represent Korean values, a post-colonial nation constructing new national identity.

“This is a city hall. It doesn’t make sense for the city hall building in Seoul, the centre of Republic of Korea, to be a colonial building built by the Japanese. [...] Besides, Seoul is selected as a UNESCO Design city, isn’t it? If we consider this, the building must be removed.”

(Lim, 32, male)

“Many Koreans won’t approve the use of this building because it was used in the colonial era, and the legacy of the colonial era is for it still to be used as a City Hall in Seoul, which is the capital of Korea. It would be better to remove it and to build a new one demonstrating Korean identity and classic Korean beauty.”

(Tae, 27, male)

Their comments demonstrate that the old Seoul City Hall building is inextricably linked with maintenance and enhancement of national identity, due to its symbolic meaning (i.e. government office, the centre of Korea). The city hall building was
regarded as a symbol of Japanese identity that still impacts on Korean identity by occupying the centre of Seoul. In this sense, their later comments “the building must be removed” and “I think it is better to remove and build a new one demonstrating Korean identity and classic Korean beauty” are of particular importance here. According to Feldman (1990), the absence of a sense of continuity can result in general dissatisfaction and finding alternative places that are congruent with self. These provide evidence to suggest that the building serving as a symbolic building of Korea is so incongruent with Korean values that removing a marker of a shaming national history and reconstructing the place that represents Korean values could be a way to maintain a sense of continuity. These reactions are in line with Duncan’s (1973) assertion that individuals tend to modify physical environment in order to represent their present selves. Additionally, threats come from a lack of originality in urban structure. Old colonial-era public buildings, including the Seoul Railway Station, became prominent examples. For Han (64) and Jin (49), there was a tendency to compare modern historic buildings in Korea with buildings in Japan.

“Japanese buildings are a lot like ours. They’re so similar with ours. Such buildings, not Japanese residential houses, well, modern buildings, yes, public buildings. I could say they’re identical. I wasn’t very happy when I saw them. It made me feel that ‘Oh, we were really a colony of Japan!’”

(Jin, 49, female)

“In Japan, I found that the structure of the Tokyo Railway Station is very similar to that of Seoul Railway Station. No, I would say they are identical, such as the blue dome on the roof. Therefore, after travelling Japan, I don’t know how I put this feeling. [...] Anyway, I wasn’t happy, not because they have the same buildings, but they built the same buildings in Korea. Damn, the Japs, do they really think Korea is their own country?”

(Han, 64, female)

Comments made by Han and Jin suggest they feel they are living in places not congruent with Korean values because identical buildings standing in Seoul and
Tokyo provoke fears of the blurring of ethnic, cultural, and historical, which result in threats to distinctiveness. Their last comments, “Oh, we were really a colony of Japan” and “Damn, the Japs, do they really think Korea is their own country?” also explain that not only did cultural assimilation conjure up a shaming history of colonial Korea that reduces a sense of national identity but it also gave rise to a deep antipathy towards the Japanese.

10.2.3.3 Ethnic Difference and Threatened Distinctiveness and Self-Esteem

In the social psychology field, it is widely acknowledged that people achieve both positive personal and collective self-esteem by categorising themselves and comparing their group to others (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). What the interviews reveal is the other side of the coin in connection with colonial heritage within an institutional paradigm. Colonial heritage sometimes results in negative self-evaluation of their ethnic group (i.e. Koreans) past, which echoes Jost’s (2001) negative stereotype of an in-group. Hwang’s (66) short but powerful comment “Japanese were ahead of Koreans at that time.” represents how colonial heritage offers a chance for individuals to compare Koreans to Japanese, and how the heritage provides a threat to a sense of self-esteem. Many interviewees tend to resort to ethnic comparison through the quality of colonial buildings in Seoul by saying “How could they build the buildings solidly? How do buildings still remain intact even after one hundred years?” (Hwang, 66, female). “Buildings built by Koreans are dirty with age, but Japanese buildings are still tidy” (Sam, 27, female), and “The buildings still remaining intact today tell us how Japanese do fine work and build substantial structures like the Germans do.” (Mee, 65, female). When talking about the old Japanese General Government Building, Mann (32) especially referred to the awe-inspiring design of the building. He said, “The building was gorgeous. Both the interior and exterior of the building were really nice.” Afterwards, he compared this building to other buildings built by Koreans in the same period. His comment continued, “Compared with Koreans’ buildings, Japanese’s buildings are far better in terms of their durability and design”. He continued,
“Japs are amazing. How could they construct buildings so well? [...] Buildings built by Koreans in the early 1900s are decrepit and at risk of collapse, but the buildings built by them are very solid and they look like European-style buildings, like French-style architecture. They are geniuses. I know Japs always get awards for architectural design even today.”

(Mann, 32, male)

These comments show that he thinks these buildings serve as physical evidence of the superiority of the Japanese. The Japanese are more intelligent and more civilised than Koreans and, consequently, become a source of some distress, diminishing their sense of self-esteem. Close attention to these comments reveals that many interviewees evaluate the Japanese in fairly positive terms. This reaction permits association with Jost’s (2001, p.93) study, suggesting that members of a lower status group are apt to show out-group favouritism by adopting unfavourable stereotypes of their group. Schdev and Bourhis (1985, 1987, 1991; cited in Jost, 2001) demonstrate that unlike members in a higher status group who display in-group favouritism, members in a lower status group are apt to engage in out-group favouritism.

10.2.3.4 Nationalism and Negative Self-Evaluation

Crocker and Major (1989, p.619) point out that ‘those who have internalised society’s negative views on their group should be at particular risk from low self-esteem.’ This idea could be applied to this context. One of the notable findings to emerge from the interviews is that many interviewees were ashamed of being Koreans due to unfavourable stereotypes of their ethnic group, exemplified through their attitudes to the management of colonial heritage. This is exemplified by Hwang’s (66) comment, “Koreans are too good at rationalising their behaviour”. She added that, “If we go to Europe, we can easily find old cathedrals with dark surfaces, old bricks and stones. I’m sure Koreans would demolish the cathedrals immediately because they are ugly. They keep buildings for centuries, but we never let them lie.” This is echoed by Han (64), who said, “It is a real shame that Koreans are too quick to change everything. Whatever may be the cause, Koreans
get rid of historic things thoughtlessly.” These comments illustrate that Koreans were construed in fairly negative terms. The negative group involvement undoubtedly generated threats to their self-esteem.

When talking about the disappearance of colonial buildings in Korean society, it was taken a step further to become criticism of the widespread nationalistic understanding of colonial buildings in Korean society. It has resulted in negative views of their own ethnic group (i.e. Koreans) and, consequently, reducing their self-esteem. For example, Lim (32) referred to the destruction of colonial buildings rather than expose the inferiority of Korea to others.

“We disgrace ourselves. I don’t understand why we expose our national shame in public by our own hands. I mean, if foreign visitors, maybe just few of them, ask us why a building in good condition is being destroyed, how could we explain this? I don’t know how they see Koreans and whether they could understand us if we answered that Koreans destroyed this building just because it was built by the Japanese.”

(Lim, 32, male)

Close attention to his comment, “We disgrace ourselves” implies that the destruction of colonial heritage is a way of self-stigmatisation, which results in a negative view of their own ethnic group (i.e. Koreans) and, consequently. Oh (27) echoed Lim’s comment, by saying that:

“The building may have been constructed with Korean citizens’ tax at that time and if Korean citizens’ tax has to pay for the destruction and reconstruction again, it wouldn’t be a bad idea to continue to use the building. It wouldn’t be so bad if we used the building with the knowledge of when and why this building was constructed. It is rather too nationalistic and chauvinistic if we dislike this building just because it was built by the Japanese.”

(Oh, 27, male)

His comments are consonant with Bae’s (2002; cited in Jin, 2008) assertion that the effort to reconstruct national identity through the demolition of a colonial legacy is a
representation of the lack of autonomy among the colonised. In this context, unfavourable stereotypes of Koreans mirrored through nationalistic understanding of the past produce negative outcomes for membership in a given national or ethnic group (i.e. self-esteem). Threats to identity arose because they were ascribed to membership of an ethnic group that is stigmatised.

The ways in which individuals have experienced colonial heritage in an institutional context are summarised in Figure 10.3. Under the institutional paradigm, colonial heritage was experienced as a marker of the shaming history of Korea. Colonial heritage triggered shaming memories of a conquered colonial past of Korea, comprising ethnic suppression and hardships Koreans experienced under the occupation. The heritage was perceived as a symbol of Japanese identity that does not fit with Koreans’ desires and values. The heritage was also perceived as not only a symbolic icon evoking ethnic incompetence in the past, in comparison with the Japanese, but also as physical evidence displaying negative stereotypes of Koreans, exemplified through their attitudes to management of colonial heritage.

Figure 10.3 Perception of Colonial Heritage from the Institutional Context
Figure 10.4 presents how colonial heritage is experienced in individuals’ multi-dimensional life and their life in a South Korean context.

10.3 Restoration Strategies for Threatened National Identity
This section explores the way in which individuals respond to identity threats and outcomes of identity threats (Research Question 3) and what elements contribute to development and change to the meaning of the colonial heritage (Research Question 4). The interviews reveal that individuals who perceived threats employed three psychological or physical coping strategies as responses to the threat posed by colonial heritage. These include the reconstruction of self-identity, the re-conceptualisation of the colonial heritage, and reconstruction of memory as group
coping. Of particular importance in this regard is that those who perceived threats sometimes engaged in these coping reactions inadvertently and unintentionally. Additionally, the interviewees gave evidence that people’s response to threats took place simultaneously both at group and individual levels because threats to group identity (i.e. Korean identity) and its members are inter-dependent (Breakwell, 1986, 1993). Detailed explanations of the coping reactions employed by interviewees are presented below.

10.3.1 Reconstruction of Self-Identity

Individuals who perceived threats engaged in self-protection strategies operating in different levels of context. In order to alleviate perceived threats to their sense of national identity, interviewees attempted to reconstruct their identity, which is strongly related to Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) intra-psychic coping reactions. The self-redefinition of their identity includes the changing salience of identity, psychological mobility, and inter-group and intra-personal comparison.

10.3.1.1 Changing Salience of Identity

The interviews reveal individuals tend to prioritise their personal identity in interpreting colonial heritage, which is in line with one of the Breakwell’s (1986) intra-psychic coping strategies linked to the process of subjective re-evaluation of individuals’ content of identity. Taking Hwang (66) who has a strong attachment to colonial buildings as an example, the old Japanese Government General Building was deliberately interpreted from the perspective of her personal identity. She said:

“I may think ‘the building was built in the Japanese colonial era’ and ‘this is a vestige of the 36 years’ occupation’. But this building didn’t have any bad influence on me.”

(Hwang, 66, female)

It seems that she managed the threat by devaluing her national identity that is to be threatened or simply by focusing on her personal identity that is less threatening and giving it greater value.
Another coping reaction related to switching the relative salience of a sense of identity can be found from Gong’s (70) comments. In the early part of the interview, he expressed his negative feelings for the old Seoul Railway Station building. By viewing the old building through a lens in his national identity, the building was perceived as a symbolic object that triggers memories about the colonial expansion of the Japanese Empire, which attenuates his sense of national identity (Section, 10.2.3.1). However, he tended to give his personal identity greater value in interpreting the building. He said:

“I’ve always come and used the Seoul Railway Station because the train to my grandparents’ house starts out from the station. I like this building. [...] This building embraces a nice mix of reminiscences, sorrow and joy for Koreans. Although the Japanese built this building, we’ve used this building longer.”

(Gong, 70, male)

Gong who attached the building of the old Seoul Railway Station seeks to accentuate his personal identity by reawakening pleasant personal memories and memories of the building. The close attention to his comment, “Although the Japanese built this building, we’ve used this building longer” reveal that the positive identity was perhaps maintained by understanding the old building at different levels (i.e. personal and community identity). Gong diminishes the threat by minimising its value associated with colonial history and inflating its value associated with personal history. In this light, the old building has come to be regarded as an important place of his individual memories which transcends the negative meaning of national history embedded in the building (i.e. times of colonisation).

10.3.1.2 Psychological Mobility
Some interviewees, mostly younger interviewees, attempted to deal with the potential threat to self-esteem by dissociating themselves from other Koreans, who they evaluate negatively. The most significant example of this was given by Seung (27), who exhibited a lower level of national group affiliation much like other younger interviewees. His comment criticised the widespread nationalistic understanding of colonial heritage:
“That’s an outdated idea. It doesn’t matter who built the building because we’ve used these buildings well so far. [...] Although metal spikes were driven in this building, it all depends how Koreans do. I really hope people change their perspective of the building. That’s an outdated idea and their way of thinking is behind the time. I don’t know if it is revenge for Japanese oppression, but I don’t think it is right.”

(Seung, 27, male)

The form of self-enhancement can be noticeable in his derogation of other Koreans who are in favour of the destruction of the architecture: “That’s an outdated idea and their way of thinking is behind the time”. The simple words employed in his comment, ‘revenge for Japanese oppression’, show he appreciates the destruction of the architecture in a Korean society as a representation of social stigma. His continues:

“I’m different from other Koreans. I haven’t met someone who feels the same way. We have to admit that Koreans were incompetent, but no one would admit that. Everyone dislikes my view, but I keep speaking up.”

(Seung, 27, male)

His short comments “I’m different from other Koreans”, implies how he deals with the potential threat to his self-esteem. He attempted to differentiate himself from others because the threats are mainly generated by his negative group involvement. By dissociating himself from the Korean ethnic group psychologically, he attempts to evade the threatening situation appended to the social stigma. Another coping reaction for dealing with the potential threat to self-esteem posed by seeing themselves as Koreans is to differentiate themselves from older generation who directly experienced the colonial period. Younger interviewees including Noo (20) and Shim (20) do not give colonial buildings much significance by saying that ‘I didn’t experience the past’. For example, when talking about the old building of Seoul City Hall, Mann (34) explained that:
“Except elderly who experienced the colonial era, young generations including me today don’t put much meaning to the buildings. Because this building has been used as a Seoul City hall since we were young, this building is just a Seoul City Hall where Mayor Oh works”

(Mann, 34, male)

Their comments suggest that they tend to separate themselves from the older generation group who suffered from the occupation and see themselves in a disconnected way. This psychological reaction can be observed in connection with Breakwell’s (1986) ‘psychological mobility’ and ‘temporary depersonalisation’, Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) ‘psychological social mobility’ and Ellemers et al.’s (2002) ‘individual mobility’. Breakwell (1986, 1988, 1993) addresses that if stigma attached to a social group threatens individuals’ positive feelings of themselves, the threatened individuals seek to diminish its impact by isolating themselves from others. Especially, individuals with lower affiliation to the group tend to leave or disassociate with the group to remove threats (Ellemers et al., 1997, 2002).

10.3.1.3 Inter-Group Comparison
According to Breakwell (1988, 1993), individuals with threatened identity tend to engage in a range of self-enhancement or self-improvement activities, such as a change of attitude, selective perception and social comparison, seeking to value information, changing the attribution process and amplifying intergroup discrimination. The interviews provide evidence that some interviewees, mostly younger interviewees, attempted to diminish the threat to their identity by comparing Koreans with other ethnic groups. Some interesting quotations by young interviewees, including Oh (27) and Noo (20), conceptualise colonial buildings as physical evidence of how Koreans are different from other ethnic groups. Oh’s (27) short comment, “Preserving even Japanese built buildings proves that Koreans’ mentality is far better than the Japanese” emphasises the difference of Koreans from the Japanese, who destroyed Korean cultural heritage (e.g. royal palaces) in the colonial era. The fact that Koreans still allow Japanese colonial buildings to stand demonstrates that Koreans are morally superior. Similarly, Noo (20) conceptualised
colonial buildings as physical evidence of national achievement that induces a sense of confidence and pride from membership of Koreans.

“I would say these buildings made us feel very confident and proud of our country rather than ashamed. If we see other countries, um, anyway, you know many countries are still under rule like colonial occupation. They are still suppressed, but we are not. We could rapidly overcome. If I think of this, I would say Koreans are very patriotic”

(Noo, 20, female)

Her comments suggest that not only does she compare Koreans with other ethnic groups but emphasises the fact that Korea now has its independence as compared with some other countries. Interestingly, however, she does not exactly know which countries are still under rule. Her use of the word ‘could’ suggests that she sees this inherent trait of Koreans who will defend their country and overcome oppressors in the future as well; thus she is making a link between past and future. She finishes by making a patriotic statement about which she undoubtedly includes herself. This reminds one of Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) strategy of ‘social creativity’, in which people search for a new comparison group lower in status than their group (i.e. downward comparison rather than upward comparison). Recent social identity literature (e.g. Vignoles et al., 2000, 2002b; Jaspal & Coyle, 2009; Jaspal, 2011b) confirms that for their positive self-evaluation, people tend to compare themselves to other group members who are less privileged than them and see themselves as better than other groups. In this context, by positively distinguishing Koreans from other ethnic groups who are still under external rule, she deals with the stigma attached to national group membership. Especially, her reaction seems to echo Ellemers et al.’s (1997, 2002) study in which individuals under threat but with strong group membership are more likely to express not only inter-group differentiation but also their loyalty to their group in order to improve their own group’s status.

Some interviewees engage in another form of group comparison, such as amplifying out-group discrimination (i.e. Japanese) as a strategy for coping with the negative
feeling associated with membership. Interviewees, including Shim (20), frequently derogated the Japanese.

“How could they do that to us? We introduced civilisation and institutions to Japan. Culture and knowledge from Asia were transmitted to Japan via Korea. We brought them up [laughing], how dare they betray us? However, I condemn Japan but pity the Japanese because they don’t know the past because they were not taught.”

(Shim, 20, female)

Rather than anger or hostility towards Japanese, she felt pity for their lack of historical knowledge today. Especially, the expression, “We brought them up”, was employed metaphorically, possibly to highlight their immaturity. This reaction seems to echo Branscombe and Wann’s (1994) study where people with higher group affiliation are more likely to induce out-group derogation as a coping reaction. It could also be explained in terms of the notion of in-group favouritism, which is the foundation of social identity theories. It seems she minimises the threats caused mainly from negative group membership and enhances her self-esteem.

10.3.1.4 Intra-Personal Comparison
To reduce threats posed by colonial heritage, interviewees tended to re-evaluate their identity comparing past selves, which would be linked to a form of self-enhancement through intra-personal comparison (i.e. intra-personal comparison) (Breakwell, 1986). A frequent reference, especially from the younger generation, was made to their changing life stage (i.e. age) and the accompanying a change in evaluation. An example can be taken from Oh (27): “As I get older, I think I’m getting generous about colonial buildings”. It shows that as Oh gets older, colonial buildings that significantly threatened his sense of national identity become common historic buildings less linked to a sense of national identity. Mann (32) supports Oh’s comments by identifying changes in value attached to history.
“I see these buildings differently now. Compared to the past, I mean, when I had a strong sense of history in my school days, I just see these buildings without thought now. Their historical importance never crosses my mind. Instead, I simply feel these are unique-looking buildings. These are my historic values now. I don’t make any extra effort to think of their meaning.”

(Mann, 32, male)

One of the common denominators within their comments could be explained as ‘the eroded significance of colonial heritage to a sense of national identity’. The change led them to interpret colonial heritage from a nationalistic perspective, based on a commonly shared social representation of colonial heritage in South Korean society to a more moderate one (i.e. cultural heritage less linked to threats to identity).

Sam’s (27) comment is of particular importance because she provides evidence that changes in her views towards colonial buildings and the Japanese were perceived to occur in response to her broadened experience and the accompanying change in her belief systems. She said:

“(Regarding Japan), the first thing that came into my head was a bad country which invaded our country, but now it isn’t. Young students don’t have many opportunities to expose themselves to different cultural ideals and beliefs, do they? I thought what older people or teachers say is always right. [...] However, as we get older, we can learn diverse cultures, can’t we? We still keep knowledge from school in our head though. As I get older, I have greater ability to think critically through diverse cultures.”

(Sam, 27, female)

Her last comment “I have a greater ability to think critically through diverse cultures” reveals that the her broadened life experience and the accompanying a change in her belief systems gave rise to key turning points of her changing views on colonial heritage. Yong’s (34) broadened personal experience, in particular through travel, had an effect on his changing views. His travels to Japan induced a change of his perception of the heritage, as well as his views of the Japanese. He said,
“Travelling in Japan gave me a lot to think about”. He extended his comments on his feelings towards the Japanese.

“My view of the Japanese changed positively after travelling to Japan. I have to admit that I had a lot of bad feeling towards the Japanese but they completely changed during my travel. Frankly, I was very shocked at that time, really, maybe because it was my first overseas trip. I must say it was an amazing country if we don’t think of the historical issues with us. I was very impressed with their very neat and well organized environment. There’s a lot we can learn from them.”

(Yong, 34, male)

It appears that travel set him apart from commonly shared interpretation of colonial heritage in South Korean society. The widespread stereotypical belief towards the heritage and the Japanese (i.e. anti-Japanese idea) in Korean society was lessened or even removed by experiencing different cultures.

Coping strategies associated with the reconstruction of self-identity is summarised in Figure 10.5. In order to alleviate perceived threats to their sense of national identity, individuals who perceived threats redefined their identity structure with the minimum amount of harm. Four different ways to re-define their identity were most prominent in this context. Individuals who perceived threats also dealt with potential threat to their identity by prioritising their personal identity and devaluing national identity (i.e. change of salience), or evaluating their present identity by comparing with past selves (i.e. intra-personal comparison). They also removed threats by dissociating themselves psychologically (i.e. psychological mobility) from other Koreans, who they evaluate negatively. They also attempted to remove threats by re-evaluating Koreans through social comparisons with other ethnic groups (i.e. inter-group comparison).
10.3.2 Re-Conceptualisation of Colonial Heritage

In addition to the reconstruction of their identity, those who perceived threats also attempted to reconceptualise colonial heritage, which is linked to Breakwell’s (1986, 1988) deflection strategy, a form of psychological self-defence. This coping strategy differs from the aforementioned coping strategy (i.e. reconstructing identity) in that colonial heritage that threatens national identity would be re-evaluated in different ways in order to diminish or remove the threat. These psychological self-defence strategies include searching for positive aspects for a sense of identity, selecting alternative representations, constructing new images and rejecting the existence of the threat.

10.3.2.1 Searching for Positive Aspects for a Sense of Identity

Those who perceived threats attempt to remove threats by redefining the meaning of colonial heritage or by constructing new meanings that enhance positive identity. For some interviewees, colonial buildings have been redefined as a marker of the national achievement that retains a significant position for national identity. When talking about symbolic colonial buildings in central Seoul, Hee (90) proudly talked
about Korea’s progress after liberation in 1945, rather than focusing on colonial history associated with the buildings. “It’s a different world now compared to how it was in the past” said Hee (90), who experienced his early life in the colonial era of Seoul. Here, the colonial era buildings in Seoul gave rise to feelings of pride for him. He continued: “These buildings make me think that we’re now living in a paradise, a real paradise on earth, rather than reminding me of the hardship under the occupation. It is amazing how Korea has grown up rapidly after independence, both the cities and countryside. It’s really amazing progress”. He redefined colonial buildings standing in central Seoul as physical evidence representing how Korea has rapidly progressed, suggesting that people can gain a sense of self-esteem by living through hardship (Speller, 2000). Lim (32) also shows that the Pagoda Park conjures up the image of oppression in the past. He said, “Oh, dear, I can imagine many people shed blood for independence in this place, didn’t they?” He added, “I would say it was rather good history because it could be the starting point of the foundation of Korea. Without them, there would be no country called Korea in the world today”. He re-interpreted the threatened situation in order to eliminate its power to do this. Pagoda Park was redefined as a good place that represents the indomitable spirits of Koreans and, consequently, gives him a positive feeling about himself.

Another notable finding to emerge from the interviews is that many interviewees attempt to maintain their positive identity, drawing on something positive from colonial heritage. Many of them stress didactic values that the colonial heritage embedded. Bae (50) appeared to construct its positive meanings for younger generations.

> “People are not really happy to see the building, are they? Well, let me ask my mom if she feels bad [Laughing]. I don’t think that’s right. It doesn’t hurt my pride. Rather it makes us arm ourselves mentally, for our children especially.”

(Bae, 50, female)

Her comments show that she denies social understanding of colonial heritage, which echoes one of Breakwell’s (1986, 1988) deflection strategies, ‘denial’. Close
attention to her comment, “it makes us arm ourselves mentally”, reveals she attaches great importance to didactic meanings of colonial heritage for Koreans instead. A similar reaction can be found from another part of her comments. When talking about the old Seodaemun Prison building, she commented, “Oh, I was feeling that the Japanese were really terrible and it made me think we should not forget such things”. This is linked to Ashworth’s (2002) notion that atrocity can be remembered as ‘a lesson for the present and hope for the future, as much as a description of the past’ (p.364). Jin (49) echoed her comments, saying that:

“Um, it’s a great place where we can see and learn about our history. I heard that Japan preserves Hiroshima where the atomic bomb was dropped, I haven’t been there though. The Jewish also preserve this kind of place. When I was in Vietnam the other day, I saw many human skulls and skeletons, the victims of the Killing Field. It makes me feel that we learn something by remembering the painful and shameful parts. You know history repeats itself.”

(Jin, 49, female)

She also appeared to re-define its implication in order to remove its negative influence to Korean identity, which is strongly related to Breakwell’s (1986, 1988) re-construal and re-attribution strategy. Especially, her first comment, “it’s a great place where we can see and learn about our history”, provides evidence that a source of the threats could be removed effectively by changing the criteria against which the colonial buildings have been judged (i.e. shameful meanings associated with the buildings) and associating with positively valued characteristics of the buildings (i.e. didactic roles for future generations).

10.3.2.2 Accepting Alternative Representation
According to Breakwell (1993, 2001b) and Breakwell and Canter (1993), people reject a particular social representation that might have potential to threaten important aspects of their identity, and adopt an alternative competing social representation that helps to avoid threats to important aspects of their identity. This psychological coping reaction was also applied to the Korean context. When
talking about the old Shinseagye Department Store building, Lim (32) was concerned about its significance to retail industry.

“This building has significant value if seen from the retail industry point of view. The history of the Korean retail industry can be divisible into two distinct periods, such as the period before peddlers and after peddlers. In the history of the retail industry, this building marks a turning point in Korean retail industry.”

(Lim, 32, male)

Rather than accepting negative social representation of the building in Korean society (e.g. a colonial-era department store built by Japanese), he personally re-conceptualised the building as a physical milestone representing the development of the retail industry of Korea, which consequently gives feelings of continuation of a Korean retail industry. Lim (32) and Oak (82) appeared to construe the old Government General building in positive terms. By adopting alternative representations of the symbolic colonial government building, they were dealing with a source of threats to Korean identity. Lim (32) said:

“Although this building served as the Japanese General Government office under the occupation, it was also the place where the first president of Korea, President Lee, declared the foundation of the Republic of Korea. The building reminds us of the name of the country, the Republic of Korea.”

(Lim, 32, male)

His comment shows that the building is considered as a witness of modern Korean history, offering a sense of continuity rather than a legacy of colonial occupation threatening their self-efficacy. Oak (82) echoed Lim’s feelings, by saying that:

“The South Korean Army raised a national flag on top of this building when they recaptured Seoul during the Korean War. Although this building was used in such ways under the occupation, it holds a special place in Korean history. The South Korean government was established in this building, and the national flag was raised on this building during the Korean War. This building has such
national history. You don’t know how deeply we were moved when our national flag was raised on top of the building.”

(Oak, 82, female)

The comments from Oak (82) provide evidence that the colonial building represents the history of the nation, indicating biographical continuity of Korea after the Japanese occupation. Rather than accepting widespread negative social representation of the building in Korean society (e.g. a symbol of Japanese imperialism), Lim and Oak attached greater importance to its historic value in post-colonial Korea (e.g. a witness of history of Republic of Korea). In this light, they believe that the loss of the government building represents not only self-abasement of Koreans but also a discontinuity of Korean history.

10.3.2.3 Constructing a New Image

Kong and Yeoh (1995) point out that not only memories of the past but also present experiences contribute meanings of a specific place. In this context, the significance of colonial heritage to national identity was considerably eroded through new images of colonial heritage constructed in everyday life. During the interviews, the old Seoul City Hall building, one of the symbolic colonial government buildings, was frequently referred to as a public place where Seoul citizens gather for cultural events. That is to say, the meanings of the building changed through the present experience of citizens. In speaking about the building, Bae (50) said:

“Our children don’t know this building was built by the Japanese. I also didn’t tell my son about the history of the building, so I don’t know how much he knows about this building. Perhaps, they may think this place is a venue for cheering the Korean national football team and for protests and demonstrations”

(Bae, 50, female)

Many younger interviewees were consonant with her comments. When talking about the old Seoul City Hall building, they said without hesitation, “The building brings back memories of the World Cup.” (Oh, 27, male), “I can’t remember its history, but I’ve been there during the World Cup.” (Noo, 20, female), and “I
mingled with people there because many cultural events are taking place at the city hall square nowadays.” (Yong, 34, male). These short comments from the younger interviewees illustrate they are highly apt to associate the building with recent memories, rather than the colonial history embedded in the building. It provides evidence that although the image of the building is derived from both inherited understanding of the past and their everyday experience, they attached greater importance to their everyday experience associated with the building in perceiving the building today. It seems that the new image of the building today provides a watershed between the building in history and the building in the present.

Similarly, some interviewees also highlight the value of colonial heritage in the community, rather than in colonial history (i.e. outstanding landmarks in community). For example, “(Korean Bank is) a representative bank in our country” (Lim, 32, male), “(Seoul Railway Station is) a starting point for the transportation.” (Mann, 32, male) and “(Seoul City Hall is) the heart of the city” (Han, 63, female). Mann (32) further emphasised importance of the old Korean Bank as a tourist attraction in central Seoul.

“(Today, these places have become popular tourist attractions. A number of foreign tourists shoot their pictures there now. I think the old Korean Bank building is now a new landmark of Seoul because it is located in Myeongdong, central Seoul, one of the most popular places for tourists to visit.”

(Mann, 32, male)

His comments show its negative power on national identity was eliminated by switching the negative image of the building (i.e. economic suppression) with its new image, which is more acceptable in the community (i.e. a tourist attraction in city centre). These coping strategies can be linked to the process of subjective re-evaluation of colonial heritage, one of Breakwell’s (1986) intra-psychic coping strategies. It is also consonant with Breakwell’s (2001, p.273) argument that ‘the personalising of social representation is part of that process of establishing and protecting an identity’.
10.3.2.4 Rejecting the Existence of Threat

In contrast to searching for alternative meanings of colonial heritage, some interviewees simply rejected its significance to national identity. Especially, younger interviewees either intentionally or unintentionally tended to deny its power over a sense of national identity or the existence of the threat. This coping strategy resonated very strongly with Seung (27) and Shim (20). Seung’s (27) comments, “It’s okay if we’ve used these buildings well so far. Now, Korea isn’t controlled by Japan, is it? [...] The buildings are owned by Korea now” show his intentional rejection of its significance to Korean identity. The answer from Shim (20), another young interviewee, was very much like that of Seung. Shim (20), who shows strong ethnic group affiliation in her comments, also dealt with the potential threat to a sense of national identity by rejecting its significance. She said:

“A lot of us don’t even know this as a colonial building. As a Korean, I’m full of confidence and there are so many things to be proud of. It has just passed into history. [...] It became a part of our history.”

(Shim, 20, female)

Even though their identity is located in a position that has potential to be threatened, they do not experience the threats by denying the existence of the threat. This psychological self-defence is intimately be linked to Breakwell’s (1986, 1988) deflection strategy (i.e. denial). Shim’s comment, “It has just passed into history”, is of particular importance because it appears that colonial heritage is located in historical memory, meaning she no longer has a strong relationship and it is no longer an important part of her personal life. Her reaction can be explained in terms of Breakwell’s (1986) notion of conscious recognition, addressing that threats gain power to threaten identity when individuals themselves add specific meanings to them. In this context, adding specific new meanings to colonial heritage and ignoring the value of the heritage is strongly related to their self-protection activities.

Coping strategies for re-conceptualisation of colonialism are summarised in Figure 10.6. Four different ways of coping were most noticeable in this study. Those who perceived threats sought to find positive meanings of colonial heritage (i.e.
seeking positive aspects) or accepted alternative representations of colonial heritage that helps to avoid threats to important aspects of their identity (i.e. alternative representations). They also established new images of colonial heritage with less potential to threaten their identity (i.e. constructing new image). Furthermore, they simply rejected the existence of the threat (i.e. rejecting threats).
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**Figure 10.6 Coping Reaction 2: Re-Conceptualisation of Colonial Heritage**

### 10.3.3 Coping Reaction in a Group Context

Historic places support national identity by evoking social memories and meanings (Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997). The interviews revealed that Korean society has attempted to reconstruct memories of the colonial past not only to diminish the threats posed by shaming colonial history but also to enhance national identity. This group coping reaction is in line with Gillis’s (1994) ‘memory work’. According to Logan and Reeves (2009), this memory work frequently occurs in post-colonial situations where the creation of national identity is necessary to achieve political and cultural cohesion. A range of group coping reactions Korean society engages in are observable elsewhere in interviewees’ perceptions and interpretations of colonial heritage. It is especially noteworthy that group coping strategies
employed in Korean society are mainly grounded in psychological victimisation. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) and Ashworth (2002) argue that self-identification of collective victim plays a part in the construction of people’s group membership and becomes a powerful instrument in constructing national identity. In this context, colonial heritage evoking collective memories of victimisation has become a powerful instrument in fostering national group cohesion and establishing national identity in Korean society. Detailed explanation and examples are given below.

10.3.3.1 Construction of Nationalistic Ideology
Harvey (2001) and Witcomb (2009) address the value of cultural heritage and its relationship with community largely depend on contemporary concerns and agenda, which implies that the highly politicised process of ‘memory work’ could be engaged in the construction of discourse of cultural heritage. In South Korean society, specific social meanings are appended to colonial heritage through social representations emphasising shaming history of Korea and its nationalistic ideologies. During the interviews, a frequent reference was made to the nationalistic ideology in South Korean society. For example, when talking about the construction of her values placed on colonial history, Jin (49) commented on her youth under the period of military dictatorship of President Park.

“President Park was assassinated when I was in the third grade in high school. How can I explain this, you know, before it happened, we had to have a fixed view on history. That’s how I lived my life at that time. I just meekly did as I was told and I was taught like that at school as well.”

(Jin, 49, female)

According to Dolff-Bonekämper (2010), authoritarian rule in less democratic societies plays a more significant role in constructing discourse of cultural heritage. Although her comments did not clearly represent how colonial heritage was represented at that time, it could be assumed that the military government in Korea in the 1970s, the most powerful institutional group, might have impressed a representation of colonial heritage and retained the ideological representations of the heritage. Another interesting example is found from Lim (32), who commented on
popular institutional propaganda and rhetoric when the long period of military dictatorship ended and the Non-Military Government was launched in the 1990s. He said:

“Slogans such as ‘Revisioning Korean history’, ‘Pull up Japanese stakes from our territory’, ‘Eradication of last vestiges of the colonial regime’ were so popular when President Kim’s government was launched. All books concerning Japan always said they are bad because we were badly occupied by them, without any explanation of why they invaded us and why we were occupied. This is because history books say only the results without any explanation of the causes, we always learnt about the Japanese as bastards in history class.”

(Lim, 32, male)

His comment, “without any explanation”, explained the politicised process of memory construction has been involved in the construction of the meaning of colonial heritage. That is to say, the government defined colonial heritage. This process of memory construction in Korean society could also be explained in terms of Lewicka’s (2008) argument that the first political reaction from the new government was to wipe out all reminders of the bad history, in times of political transition. Although the heritage was not an original product of the military regime, the heritage could be perceived as a legacy of the bad history (i.e. the colonial era and the military regime). Additionally, this process is intimately linked to Assmann’s (2006) notion of political memory, which refers to memory made by institutions for the construction of identity. Assmann (2006) proposes that ‘institutions and larger social groups…do not ‘have’ a memory; they ‘make’ one for themselves with the aid of memorial signs, such as symbols, text, images, rites, ceremonies, places, and monuments…Together with aspects such as memory, these groups and institutions ‘construct’ an identity’ (2006, p.216). Especially, the political memory is more powerful in ethnically homogeneous nations compared with multicultural nations (ibid). This idea could give us a clue why meaning construction of colonial heritage through the social process is more powerful in South Korean society, which consists of a single homogeneous ethnic group.
10.3.3.2 The Process of Social Influence

With institutional ideologies in South Korean society (e.g. Korean nationalism, anti-Japanism), social communication in everyday life has significantly impacted on the re-interpreted, re-thought, and re-presenting of meanings attached to colonial heritage. During the interviews, a range of elements of social communication, including literature, education, public media and memorials, were widely referred by interviewees. It appears these social and cultural determinants have significantly influenced how individuals come to interpret and make colonial heritage significant. For example, Oh (27), one of the younger interviewees, explained what he learnt about the old Japanese Government General Building in his primary school. He said, “Teachers told us that constructing a colonial government office in the centre of Korea, especially directly in front of the Korean royal palace, proves how the Japanese are really terrible. [...] The school taught us the history of these buildings in detail. During the field trip to the Kyongbok Palace, they told us that ‘these are Japanese buildings, so you should remember and think about whether these buildings need to be in our country’.” His comments illustrate that his understanding of the old Japanese Government General Building was significantly influenced by school education. Similar to Oh, a reference to school education was repeated by Shim (20), another younger interviewee.

“You know, I didn’t experience the period of Japanese occupation in my life. Therefore, I could say I’ve just experienced it through history text books. I didn’t know we were severely squeezed out by the Japanese. Well, what I want to say is we learned world and Korean history. I know many countries were under occupation in that period. However, if we compare our country to them, um, can I say invaders less exploited them? The Japanese oppressed our country so severely.”

(Shim, 20, female)

Her first comment “I didn’t experience the period of Japanese occupation in my life. So I could say I’ve just experienced it through history text books.” is of particular importance because it has several implicit meanings. Firstly, it appears the way she approaches colonial heritage and the Japanese today is hugely affected by text books.
Additionally, this comment illustrates that colonial heritage becomes a source of threats to her identity when she was aware of the threats, which implies that an institutionalised memory, which Assmann (2006) calls cultural and political memory, gives colonial heritage the power to threaten a sense of identity. This is consonant with Lowenthal’s (1975, p.6) assertion that ‘the past gains further weight because we conceive of place not only as we ourselves see them but also as we have heard and read about them’. The interviews also reveal the institutionalised memories of colonial heritage in South Korean society were enforced through memorials and commemoration. This is consonant with Assmann’s (2006) argument that one of the efficient ways to organise collective memory is to use sites or monuments. An example is found from Bae (50).

“*I felt so terrible and the scene made my heart break. Yes, the old prison really reminds me of the stories I learnt in the history class. I not only saw this place in history books, I actually saw the place with my eyes. Oh, I was feeling that the Japanese were really terrible and it made me think we should not forget such things.*”

(Bae, 50, female)

Her comment, ‘*Yes, the old prison really reminds me of the stories I learnt in the history class*’ illustrates the old prison building, which has been converted to a memorial, rehabilitates the memories of an atrocity experience she learnt at school. In this sense, the construction of memorials in South Korean society could be explained by King’s (2009, p.626) term of an ‘institutional effort of the artificial production of lieux de memorie’, sites of memory.

A frequent reference was also made to mass media, such as TV programmes and news. When talking about colonial buildings in Seoul, Hwang (66) said, “*Because we’ve heard so much about bad stories about the buildings in our life, we have a bad image of the buildings. You know, when you watch TV dramas.*” This short comment clearly illustrates the role of mass media in people’s understanding of the past and colonial heritage. During the interviews, an uniform reference to symbolic colonial buildings in Seoul was derived from Feng-Shui interpretation of colonial
buildings. Seung (27) explained the old Japanese Government General Building by saying, “I often see this building in TV programmes and news. Feng-Shui destroying iron stakes were found in the basement of this building and the shape of the building represents Japan.” The same interpretation was observable from Mann’s (32) comments.

“In a way, it was a shame when I heard the building was going to be dismantled. But I came to understand the demolition when I watched the TV news saying that the view of Inwang Mountain is obstructed by the building and it blocks Korean energy originating from the mountain.”

(Mann, 32, male)

This provides evidence that the process of social influence constructed explicit, homogeneous and institutionalised memories, and it has strongly influenced people’s perception of colonial heritage in South Korean society. In line with this homogeneous interpretation of colonial heritage, important quotations are found from Mann’s (32) later comments. He continued:

“The Japanese are bad, without question. In a sense, it was like brainwashing in my everyday life. I mean, we don’t talk about why they are bad. I guess my parents were also brainwashed and this idea is passed from generation to generation. Even at home, we say ‘Japanese bastard’ all the time.”

(Mann, 32, male)

His comment, “brainwashing in my everyday life”, explains that nationalistic understanding of colonial heritage constructed by social influence suffuses people’s all present perception. This echoes Chun’s (2012, p.36) argument that in constructing meanings of colonial past, ‘the government indoctrinates nationalist discourse through the prescribed school curriculum from an early age. Additionally, this foundation is constantly reinforced through various sociocultural channels; including mass media, print media, and cultural institutions, such as national museums’. The group and interpersonal communication illustrates how individuals come to interpret and make events or social phenomena meaningful in the process (Breakwell, 1993).
As a result of the social influence, memories of colonial heritage become a more homogeneous and institutionalised memory in South Korean society. These homogeneous interpretations of colonial heritage in Korean society imply that this interactive social communication of colonial buildings, combined with nationalistic ideologies, became a basis for reconstruction of social memory of a colonial past and the meaning of colonial heritage.

The group coping reactions engaged in by Korean society are summarised in Figure 10.7. One particularly prominent group coping strategy is reconstruction of their memory of colonial history and colonial heritage. Nationalistic ideology and ways of social communication (e.g. education, literature, media and memorials) were frequently employed in constructing institutionalised top-down memory of colonial history and colonial heritage.
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Figure 10.8 presents three main coping strategies employed by individuals who perceived threats in a South Korean context.
10.4 Discussion

This chapter has attempted to identify the way in which individuals construct meanings of colonial heritage in relation to their identity and how they deal with their identity if colonial heritage threatens their identity. A life history approach was seen as the most appropriate methodology because it sets people’s memories, experiences and interpretations in a broader social context. Three key identity-related theories, Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), Identity Process Theory (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993) and Social Representation (Moscovici, 1984, 1988) have been employed as the theoretical ground to explore whether and in what way colonial heritage is perceived to contribute to individuals’ identity or experienced as possible identity threats. These
theories provide analytic tools to interpret how individuals deal with their threatened identity and how colonial heritage gains the power to threaten identity and how its significance changes over time.

Data obtained through life history interviews illustrates that colonial heritage becomes an important place, providing individuals with a sense of personal, community and institutional identity. Under the institutional paradigm, colonial heritage has been experienced as a source of possible identity threats with a result that individual who perceived threats respond by engaging in a number of psychological or physical coping reactions. This study also confirmed that the ways people understand colonial heritage and the meanings attached to colonial heritage have changed according to their life experiences, which lie in institutional ideologies and in the communities of their everyday life.

Key findings in this study encompass a number of important as discussed below.

First and possibly the most important point related to this study is that the mechanism individuals employ to make sense of colonial heritage is multidimensional (Research Question 1: The way in which individuals experience colonial heritage). These patterns of understanding colonial heritage seem to echo Portelli’s (1991, 1992, 1997) views on the multi-dimensional aspect of life and the context in which we live. The meaning of colonial heritage is a product of the combination of an individual’s own understanding of heritage, community perspectives on heritage and political views of heritage. On one hand, colonial heritage becomes a carrier of personal identity, reflecting an individual’s personal identity to others. It facilitates information about the self to others, such as their unique social position, which accentuates their positive distinctiveness and self-esteem. It also becomes an important place, representing personal achievement and competence in their life and enables them to evaluate themselves positively. Moreover, it serves as a personal memorial that evokes their personal and family history placing them in a story of on-going continuity. Under the local community paradigm, colonial heritage is experienced not only as a physical marker of past
community life inextricably linked with their sense of continuity, but also as a symbolic marker categorising their social community that accentuates a sense of distinctiveness and self-esteem. Additionally, it is appreciated in terms of what it provides in their community, fitting into their everyday community life, which can be seen as an example of place-congruent continuity. Finally, colonial heritage from the national identity perspective has frequently been perceived as a potential danger, becoming repositories of shared memories and symbolic meanings that evoke a sorrowful reminder of Korean history that significantly challenges the pride and status of a nation and Koreans. As symbolic totem that presents unfavourable ethnic differences, it is significant to all generations’ sense of national identity. The perceived threats are discussed in a later paragraph. The role of colonial heritage in identity construction cannot be totally conventional because individuals do not simply experience colonial heritage from the single fixed position of their identity. That is to say, individuals experience colonial heritage not only from the perspective of a political, governmental, ideological and national historical context but also simultaneously from the perspective of community life and personal life history. In this sense, colonial heritage does not seem to be all associated with the colonising past in terms of aggressive occupation, but rather perhaps reference to other sets of values. Colonial heritage may represent a general oppression, but personally the heritage can bring back positive personal or community memories. Therefore, multiple representations of colonial heritage, including competing and contradictory versions of the heritage exist in Korean society. It implies that to offer a full account of the impact of cultural heritage on national identity, consideration of multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage is necessary since personal identity cannot be dissociated from society when understanding colonial heritage.

The second point to highlight is that colonial heritage challenges multiple motivations of individuals’ sense of collective identity, rather than a uni-dimensional aspect of identity (e.g. self-esteem) (Research Question 2: whether and in what way colonial heritage is experienced as possible identity threats). Especially, it was understood that colonial heritage challenges four principal motivations of identity, which are self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity. In the
community context, threats take the form of realistic threats derived from its material nature that emanate from the physical well-being of community (e.g. the quality of living environment). This threat is strongly associated with the maintenance and enhancement of place-congruence continuity and self-esteem. Threats to national identity posed by colonial heritage are predominant. This was mainly in the form of symbolic threats derived from memories of a shaming colonial past. The threats arise not only from memories of ethnic suppression, which induces negative feelings of self-efficacy, but also from its incongruity with national values today (e.g. an independent nation that has overcome a colonial rule). Colonial heritage sometimes results in the negative self-evaluation of ethnic groups derived from group comparisons between Koreans and the Japanese and unfavourable self-stereotypes of Koreans. The negative group involvement undoubtedly generates threats to their feelings of positive distinctiveness and consequently attenuates their self-esteem. Considering this finding, it is clear that colonial heritage is intimately linked with a sense of national identity in a South Korean context.

The third point to highlight is that when individuals perceive threats to their identity, they will engage in self-protection strategies operated in three basic patterns. These are reconstruction of self-identity; re-conceptualisation of colonial heritage; and involvement of group coping reactions (Research Question 3: the way in which individuals respond to identity threats). That is to say, those who perceived threats employ either any or all of these three patterns of coping strategies to alleviate perceived threats to their self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity.

In order to deal with the threatened aspects of identity, individuals firstly attempt to protect or configure their identity structure in ways demanded by the threatening identity. They frequently appear to prioritise their personal identity or dissociate themselves from the group psychologically. Another means of coping includes the subjective re-evaluation of Koreans through social comparisons with others, who are less privileged than Koreans, or by means of the derogation of the Japanese, as well as intra-personal comparisons of their past and present identity structures. Re-conceptualisation of colonial heritage seems to do the opposite because the reactions are directed towards the source of threats. Those who perceived threats attempt to
reconceptualise colonial heritage in different ways by searching for its positive meaning for a sense of identity and selecting alternative representations of colonial heritage. They also appear to reconstruct new images of colonial heritage and simply reject the existence of the threat. However, group coping reactions differ from other coping reactions linked to intra-psychic coping reactions mainly grounded in a person’s cognition and values. These coping reactions are strongly related to the highly politicised process of memory construction. To deal with their threatened national identity, shared understandings of colonial heritage and a systematic framework for explaining colonial heritage that provides the background for communication are developed using nationalistic ideology and the process of social influence in Korean society. These group coping strategies are mainly grounded in psychological victimisation. Interestingly, it has become a powerful instrument in fostering national group cohesion and establishing national identity in Korean society. This self-victimisation seems to echo Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) and Ashworth (2002) who emphasise the role of self-identification of collective victims in the construction of group membership. It is important to highlight that these three different response ways of coping with threats are combined in order to deal with threats effectively and to maintain or enhance their positive identity. These coping reactions seem to be somewhat consonant with coping strategies introduced in social identity literature (e.g. Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993; Timotijevic, 2000; Ellemers et al., 2002; Petriglieri, 2011), especially in terms of reactions based on identity-protection and identity reconstruction (Petriglieri, 2011) and self-protection strategies operating in different levels of context (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993; Timotijevic, 2000).

Moreover, it is important to point out the meaning of colonial heritage is not a simple matter of recollection of the past, but it is an outcome of a complex and continuing process of negotiation in a social context (Research Question 4: what elements contribute to development and change to the meaning of colonial heritage). In the South Korean context, meanings of colonial heritage are obvious and relate to a sense of national identity which in turn impacts upon citizens’ positive Korean identity. However, the heritage has been continually re-interpreted, re-thought, and
re-presented not only according to changes in individuals’ belief systems and values but also according to the social context to which individuals belong and the way it is communicated to the public in Korean society. This is related to personal structure, changes in the individuals’ life stage and the accompanying a change in evaluation that would downgrade its significance to a sense of national identity. The change also leads individuals to interpret contested heritage from a nationalistic way (i.e. colonial heritage that significantly threatened this sense of national identity) to a more moderate one (i.e. cultural heritage less linked to threats to identity). A change in its significance for a sense of national identity also seemed to have occurred as a result of the societal context, including institutional ideologies and the communities of everyday life. Colonial heritage obtains further power in society not only by institutional ideologies, but also by means of other forms of social communication, such as literature, education, public media and memorials. Additionally, new meanings of colonial heritage appear to be an outcome of present experience. Meanings of colonial heritage that have constructed contemporary society have resulted in the change of social meaning and memories of colonial heritage and, consequently, it would erode the significance of colonial heritage to a sense of national identity. The evidence above seems to indicate that the significance of colonial heritage as a social process for a sense of national identity changes because the impact of colonial heritage on national identity relies heavily on whether the social context in which the individuals live and the individuals themselves add specific meanings to them.

Lastly, it is important to highlight that the way in which individuals remember and experience colonial heritage differs across the generations in Korean society. Although Korean society shares a common understanding of colonial heritage, older generations are apt to attach greater importance to its symbolic meanings for their personal life, whereas younger generations are apt to attach greater importance to its symbolic meanings in the social and institutional context. When considering the process of meaning making, which includes the process of memory construction and social representation, it is not surprising that meanings of colonial heritage tend to be varied for older generations. In perceiving and interpreting colonial heritage, older
generations focus more on their personal memories associated with colonial heritage in their life history. It appears the meaning of colonial heritage is mainly constructed on the basis of memory of personal life events they experienced directly, which is inextricably linked with autobiographical memory (Halbwachs, 1992) or individual and social memory (Assmann, 2006, 2008). Colonial heritage frequently appears to be personalised in order to present personal value, such as social position, personal achievement, and personal life history. As a result, colonial heritage has been conceived as an important symbolic object that contributes to their personal identities. However, colonial heritage for younger generations appears to be a less important part of their personal life or form of personal identity because memory of colonial heritage is passively constructed through social agencies, which is inextricably linked with the construction of historical memory (Halbwachs, 1992) or political and cultural memory (Assmann, 2006, 2008). It is not surprising that a relatively uniform interpretation of colonial heritage (e.g. memory of atrocity) exists since their memory of heritage has mainly been generated and stimulated through a societal context, including institutional ideologies and everyday communication. This memory transformation in Korean society seems to echo Assmann’s (2006, 2008) memory transformation in terms of memory change with the passage of time, from a diverse bottom-up memory (e.g. individual and social memory) to a institutionally standardised top-down memory (e.g. cultural and political memory).

To reach fuller understanding of the impact of colonial heritage to Korean identity, the following chapter will discuss the results by combining the research findings from three different studies (i.e. Studies One, Two and Three).
Chapter Eleven
Discussion

11.1 Introduction
This research set out to investigate how Japanese colonial heritage impacts people’s sense of national identity in South Korea. Drawing on identity theories in the field of social and environmental psychology, this research aimed to explore the way in which the historic built environment, particularly colonial architectural heritage, is related to indigenous citizens’ sense of national identity (Research Question 1). Secondly, it sought to investigate the way in which individuals makes sense of colonial architectural heritage in relation to their sense of identity (Research Question 2). Lastly, it sought to answer how individuals deal with threats to their sense of identity if colonial heritage threatens their sense of national identity, as well as why its significance changes over time (Research Question 3). This chapter begins by discussing the researcher’s background in approaching the research questions. Secondly, it summarises and discusses empirical results and the degree to which they address the research questions. This chapter also suggests how this research contributes to and enhances our understanding of the relationship between cultural heritage and national identity. Lastly, it discusses the applicability of this research framework to future heritage study.

11.2 Reflexivity: Researcher’s Background
The researcher embarked on this research to understand how Japanese colonial heritage is perceived by South Koreans, indigenous citizens in a post-colonial nation struggling to reconstruct a new national identity. Since I first learnt the history of the Japanese colonial occupation at primary school, I have indirectly but consistently experienced the colonial past in his everyday life for more than 30 years. I grew up in a society holding antagonism towards Japanese nationality based on the colonial history. I also experienced a period when a number of architectural legacies of Japanese colonialism were deliberately removed under the South Korean government’s policies that carried slogans of ‘restoration of the national spirit’ and
‘creation of new Korea’ in the 1990s. The majority of South Koreans including myself are socialised to interpret the colonial past as a shaming past in South Korean society. Public education, sociocultural channels (e.g. mass media, literature etc.) and public commemorations have constantly reinforced and regenerated the memories of the colonial past. Additionally, recent socio-political issues of the representation of Japan’s wartime past in Japanese textbooks, unresolved official apologies for Japanese war crimes (e.g. comfort women, massacre), Japanese politicians’ worship at the Yaskuni shrine where war criminals from the Second World War are commemorated, and disputed islands in the East Sea have revitalised South Koreans’ animosity towards the Japanese.

This anti-Japanese consciousness has led the majority of South Koreans to approach the colonial heritage, built by the Japanese during the occupation, from a Korean nationalism point of view. Unquestionably, for non-South Koreans, who are cultural and political outsiders in Korean society, the colonial heritage is simply architecture built in the early 20th century. However, many South Koreans, who have either directly or indirectly experienced the colonial past, would see the colonial heritage as an undesirable legacy of the colonial past and a symbol of Japanese imperialism. This places a number of colonial buildings and historic places at the centre of intensive social controversy regarding the legitimacy of their preservation for Korean identity. However, fundamental questions about how Japanese colonial heritage actually influences Korean identity, especially in contemporary South Korean society, remain poorly understood.

This research was contextualized in terms of the relationship between colonial heritage and a sense of national identity in the South Korean context. Drawing on the social representation of Japanese colonial heritage in South Korean society, this research started with an assumption that Japanese colonial heritage may be perceived as a source of potential threats that challenge South Koreans’ sense of national identity. I assumed that the physical remains of colonialism still play a part in constructing Korean identity, even long after the end of colonial rule. Moreover,
the colonial heritage would be a reminder of a painful and shameful period that South Koreans prefer to forget. This research, in part, seeks to test that assumption.

This research was designed and conducted by a native Korean, a member of the culture investigated in this research, which was both an advantage and a disadvantage. On the one hand, it could be viewed as advantageous because, as an ‘insider’ regarding the Korean context investigated in this research, the researcher is very familiar with the phenomenon under enquiry in the research. My life experience in South Korean society and experience of Japanese colonial heritage across the life course facilitated the contextualisation of the issues around the heritage in South Korean society. In the data collection process, the shared social experiences, cultural background and cultural context of the researcher and participants helped me to capture the complex nuance of the participants’ expressions about the colonial heritage which would be difficult for the outsiders.

Finlay (2002, p.531) argues that ‘the researcher is a central figure who influences the collection, selection, and interpretation of data’. Seen from this point of view, research by a native researcher, born and educated in South Korean society, could also be of concern. It is obvious that the researcher’s life experience in South Korean society, where strong anti-Japanese sentiment exists, coupled with his engagement with the topic of interest, could affect designing the research and interpreting the data obtained through field studies. Indeed, it is possible that the research instrument designed by the researcher (e.g. pre-specified construct and response modes in the questionnaire study, pre-selected photographs of colonial buildings in the Multiple Sorting Task) played a part in constructing participants’ opinions towards the colonial heritage. Other possible effects on the research include whether participants see the heritage as Japanese and whether they interpreted the heritage in relation to Korean identity prior to the researcher identifying this issue during the study. Moreover, given the possible impact of the researcher’s personal background on the interpretation of the data, it raises doubts whether data obtained through the interviews were entirely those of the participants. It is clear from the above that the outcome of the research would differ according to
the researcher’s experience and personal orientation. This research did not include a measure of the degree to which the researcher’s own background affected the result of the research; this may not be possible. These are methodological matters that inevitably occur in a cultural-specific study conducted by an insider of the culture investigated in the research.

The starting point for addressing these biases is to be aware of them. Moreover, the research began with establishment of an epistemological paradigm that constituted the theoretical and methodological grounding for the research (i.e. social constructionism). In order to maintain an objective analytical and conceptual viewpoint, I elaborated my thoughts on Japanese colonial heritage and Korean identity using the concepts of social and environmental psychology (i.e. Social Identity Theory, Identity Process Theory, the concept of Social Representation, memory construction). In the data collection stage, I designed a multi-method approach, combining different methodological paradigms in order to produce more balanced and comprehensive data (i.e. a combination of a researcher-imposed and a participant-imposed approach). Additionally, to control the manner in which I could have an impact on the research, the whole research process (including the research methods design, the interpretation of data and the discussion of the results) was systematically reviewed by an external professional (i.e. a supervisor), who critically approached the research with less emotional involvement in the research context and the view of an outsider.

Based on my personal background and social experience in South Korean society, I expected South Koreans’ sense of national identity communicated through Japanese colonial heritage would automatically highlight a sense of threat to Korean identity. However, it was revealed that South Koreans construct a complex relationship with the colonial heritage regarding their sense of identity. It was too naive to regard the colonial heritage as a potential threat that automatically challenges the status and pride of South Korea and its citizens, the people of South Korea. The following section discusses the findings in more detail.
11.3 The Empirical Findings and Suggestions

11.3.1 Colonial Heritage and the Construction of National Identity

A first research question of this research was how the historic built environment, particularly colonial architectural heritage, is related to indigenous citizens’ sense of national identity. In contemporary societies, association of cultural heritage with identity has long constituted an important domain of research in heritage study, and few would doubt the powerful role of cultural heritage in fostering a sense of national identity. However, there is surprisingly little literature that confirms how cultural heritage actually generates people’s sense of identity (e.g. Uzzell, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Hawke, 2010). Fundamental questions about how identity is created and changed through cultural heritage, especially negative-natured heritage, and how these links are constructed and maintained remain unresolved. In the light of these considerations, the first research question involved whether and in what way colonial heritage links to a sense of national identity and what elements of identity are related to the perception of colonial heritage and how this is manifested. With respect to the first research question, this research has led to three important findings.

Firstly, colonial heritage and Korean cultural heritage were mutually exclusive with regard to a sense of national identity. In order to conceptualise colonial heritage with respect to a sense of national identity, this research differentiated colonial heritage from Korean cultural heritage. Drawing on Tajfel (1978, 1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory, colonial heritage was theoretically conceptualised as a symbol of a perpetrator’s identity (i.e. Japanese identity) influencing the identity of citizens in a post-colonial nation (i.e. Korean identity). The questionnaire (i.e. Study One) provided empirical evidence to support this conceptualisation. Findings from the questionnaire suggest that people tend to consider Korean cultural heritage as their own national group’s cultural heritage which presents a national history, cultural and national achievement and nationalism. They did not choose cultural heritage that may harm their sense of national identity. Colonial heritage was construed by people as cultural heritage strongly associated with Japanese and the colonial past. Consequently, a lower sense of attachment was
developed towards colonial heritage, in comparison with Korean cultural heritage.

Secondly, cultural heritage, including both Korean cultural heritage and colonial heritage, played a part in individuals’ sense of national identity by giving rise to multiple psychological motivations. One particular and significant aspect of this research rests in its demonstration of the way in which individuals’ sense of national identity is constructed or enhanced through cultural heritage. Within the framework of Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993) Identity Process Theory, identity in this research was defined in terms of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity, rather than a uni-motivational entity. The results of the questionnaire provided empirical evidence to substantiate the applicability of these multiple psychological motivations that construct a sense of identity in this research context. This finding suggests that both Korean cultural heritage and colonial heritage contribute to a sense of national identity by giving rise to a sense of self-esteem, self-efficacy distinctiveness, and continuity. However, the contribution of colonial heritage to multiple motivations of identity was less significant than that of Korean cultural heritage. Additionally, although each identity motivation has been given equivalent importance in managing the identity process (Breakwell, 1993; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996), a sense of self-esteem became the most salient motivation derived from cultural heritage, whereas a sense of self-efficacy appeared to be relatively less salient in comparison with other motivations. This means that people were feeling good and confident about themselves, as well as proud to be South Koreans, through their interaction with cultural heritage.

Lastly, psychological and social components in identity had important implications for individuals’ perceptions and evaluations of colonial heritage with relation to national identity. Many previous heritage literatures have speculated on the importance of understanding characteristics of people or communities in the perception of cultural heritage (e.g. Tunbridge, 1984; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Ashworth, 1998; Hall, 1999; Smith, 2006). However, there appears to be no definitive evidence. In this sense, particular attention in this research was devoted to four key components frequently appearing in social and environmental psychology
literature, which are individuals’ national group affiliation, perception of national group status, emotional attachment to place, and experience of unique social context. This research suggests that individuals’ perceptions of colonial heritage are positively related to the strength of people’s national group affiliation, their attachment to the heritage, and their social experience. In the overall perspective, these components positively correlated with a heightened sense of national identity through cultural heritage. This means that the stronger an individual’s sense of Korean affiliation (i.e. Korean membership), the more they perceive self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity through both Korean cultural heritage and colonial heritage. Individuals’ perceptions or evaluations of colonial heritage differed depending on how much they were attached to the colonial heritage. As might be expected, an increase in a sense of attachment to cultural heritage was strongly associated with an increase in perception of national identity through Korean cultural heritage, as well as a decrease in negative views about colonial heritage in relation to national identity. The generation with a significant amount of direct or indirect negative experience related to the colonial past (i.e. the older generation) were highly apt to perceive a stronger sense of national identity through both types of cultural heritage. The older generation were more likely to feel pride, confidence, and achievement as Koreans from Korean cultural heritage, as well as colonial heritage. Unexpectedly, individuals’ perceptions of cultural heritage were not mediated by their perceptions of their national group status in comparison with Japanese nationalities, which have traditionally been accepted as supportive in social identity literature.

In exploring the relationship between colonial heritage and a sense of national identity, this research focused on four principal motivations of identity originally proposed by Breakwell’s (1986, 1988, 1993, 2001) Identity Process Theory. This enabled the researcher to measure the relationship in a structured manner. However, the salience of identity motivations may vary over time, as well as across situations and social and cultural contexts (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993, 2001b). Some social identity literature provides supportive evidence for this diversity by proposing additional motivations in their research context (e.g. Vignoles et al., 2006; Vignoles
et al., 2008; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2009a, b, 2010a; Jaspal & Coyle, 2009; Droseltis & Vignoles, 2010; Jaspal, 2011b). Therefore, for a further understanding of cultural heritage-national identity relations, additional motivations should be taken into account. It is necessary to develop a customised identity model incorporating further motivations in their research context in any future study of cultural heritage and identity construction.

**11.3.2 Understanding of Colonial Heritage in relation to National Identity**

A second research question concerned the process of meaning construction: how individuals make sense of colonial architectural heritage in relation to their sense of national identity. To answer this question, this research elaborated how individuals formed a sense of colonial heritage in relation to their sense of identity, with emphasis on the process of meaning construction in their everyday life.

Recent heritage studies attempt to move away from treating cultural heritage as a fixed tangible material that can be isolated from the present societal context. Attention has been given to its symbolic features linked to a social or political process of meaning making (e.g. Young, 1989; Harvey, 2001; Bender, 2002; Byrne, 2003; Smith, 2006, 2007; Dolff-Bonekämper, 2008). The Multiple Sorting Procedure provided evidence that, rather than simply appreciating colonial buildings based on architectural properties, people appreciated colonial buildings in many different ways. Some interpretations were more tied to the functions those buildings accommodated in community life today (e.g. community life). These were often linked to personal emotions towards the buildings (e.g. a sense of familiarity, preference, and interest) or socio-historic factors underlying the colonial buildings (e.g. colonial and post-colonial history associated with the buildings). Although many constructs were shared in South Korean society, different generational groups appeared to emphasise different aspects when interpreting colonial buildings. Older generations were more likely to construe colonial buildings based on their perception of historic and social value or meanings associated with the buildings in South Korean society. Therefore, older generations were more likely to attach greater importance to the symbolic meanings associated
with the buildings that were significant in both a personal and social context. The constructs younger generations employed were more likely to be related to physical properties of the buildings, such as style, structure, exterior, location, and scale of the buildings, and the function of the buildings in contemporary society. The meaning associated with colonial buildings for younger generations appeared to be a less important part of their personal or social life.

A sense of national identity communicated through Japanese colonial buildings did not automatically highlight a sense of threat to national identity. Some colonial buildings were viewed in a stereotypical way such that the Japanese colonial legacies were seen to intimidate significantly a sense of national identity, which can be thought of as symbolic colonial heritage. Especially, politically relevant and socially significant buildings in South Korean society, such as the former colonial government and public buildings, were seen in this light. Some colonial buildings, which have supported citizens’ everyday life in post-colonial South Korean society, were experienced as modern historic architecture influencing a sense of national identity (e.g. commercial business buildings, public cultural buildings and educational buildings). Unlike symbolic colonial buildings, the significance of these buildings to a sense of national identity was not always accompanied by the threat to national identity. The Japanese-styled residential and religious buildings considerably differed from former colonial government buildings in that these buildings, politically irrelevant but physically significant, were not experienced as colonial buildings linked to a sense of national identity. Some colonial buildings, socially and physically unremarkable, were not differentiated from ordinary old-fashioned buildings in Korean society.

Given these interpretations, it is too simplistic to regard colonial heritage as simply an architectural manifestation of threatened national identity. An additional aspect that can be drawn from the above is that institutional and political meanings embedded in colonial buildings (e.g. domination of Japanese power, oppression) become a key determinant in appreciating colonial buildings with respect to a sense of national identity. This echoes Tunbridge and Ashworth’s (1996) and Dolff-
Bonekämper’s (2010) notions that the messages and meanings people perceive make a negative-natured historic place a representative of past conflict. Physical features of the buildings (i.e. the style of Japanese traditional architecture) did not solely determine people’s appreciation of typical features and the significance of buildings to national identity, and the representation of threat to feelings of national identity.

In appreciating colonial buildings, similar patterns appeared among three generations in South Korean society. However, in comparison with other generations, older generations appeared to have a sense of attachment to most types of colonial building. They were less likely to accept features of colonial buildings threatening a sense of national identity, in comparison with other generations. Additionally, evidence of people’s complex, multi-strata viewpoints was observable elsewhere in their interpretation of colonial buildings. It was observed that some colonial buildings were simultaneously experienced as colonial buildings that intimidate a sense of national identity and buildings to which they were strongly attached. This overlap provides evidence that not only was colonial heritage experienced from the perspective of the national historical context, but it also was simultaneously experienced from other contexts. This suggests that a consideration of the multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage is necessary in order to understand complex individuals-colonial heritage relationships.

The research explored this issue further by identifying how the meaning of colonial heritage is constructed within personal lives and the broader social context and how the meaning embodied in colonial heritage influences individuals’ sense of identity. Observations on the multidimensional meanings people attach to cultural heritage can be found in some recent literature, such as Kong and Yeoh (1995), Timothy (1997), Graham et al. (2000) and Poria et al. (2006). Attention in their studies was not directed to the role of negative-natured cultural heritage in the construction of multidimensional identity. However, these studies possess a common theme in that the meanings people attach to cultural heritage are interwoven with meanings constructed by different levels of experience. Except for these notable exceptions, heritage studies have often been narrowly restricted by articulating an analysis of the
way cultural heritage is used (e.g. institutional context). In order to overcome shortcomings in previous heritage research, this research employed a life history approach (i.e. Study Three) that enabled the researcher to demonstrate this dynamic understanding of the importance of heritage to a sense of identity in everyday life. Portelli’s (1991, 1992, 1997) multi-dimensional ways of organising meanings (i.e. the institutional mode, the collective mode, and the personal mode) was adopted as a useful theoretical framework to understanding people’s assessment of the importance of colonial heritage with relation to their sense of identity.

The mechanism people employed to make sense of colonial heritage was multidimensional. Due to multi-dimensional aspects of life and the context in which we live, people experienced colonial heritage not only from the perspective of a political, ideological and national historical context but also simultaneously from the perspective of community life and personal life history. Under the personal paradigm, colonial heritage did not always serve as sorrowful reminder of Korea’s history that significantly challenges their identity. Despite being a symbolic place, representing Japanese colonial power and oppression, it was rather associated with positive personal memories leading to their positive self-evaluation in ways that correspond to the four motivations of identity. Therefore, it became a substantial component of their identity. For example, colonial heritage was experienced as a carrier of personal identity, reflecting an individual’s personal identity to others. People actively constructed meanings of colonial heritage that facilitate information about their unique social position in social relationships (e.g. social status, job position, unique generational groups). Therefore, colonial heritage was a symbol of self-concept which people wished to present, rather than a simple physical structure. Colonial heritage was also perceived as not only a personal monument displaying their personal achievement and competence in their life history, but also as a personal memorial evoking their personal and family history and placing them in a story of on-going continuity. Colonial heritage was not restricted to the physical place of the present but it became a repository of nostalgia where people contacted their past life and followed the trail to their past. People’s autobiographies have become closely intertwined with colonial heritage. Under the community paradigm,
colonial heritage in a community setting became a symbolic marker categorising the social community that accentuated a positive community identity. Symbolic qualities of colonial heritage in a community (e.g. a symbol of modernisation past) encouraged people to achieve positive group identity by differentiating themselves from others living locally. Additionally, colonial heritage served as not only a physical reminder of a community’s past, which conjures up a picture of urban landscape past, but also a symbolic reminder that evokes memories of past community lifestyles. In this sense, it was experienced as a symbolic place triggering collectively shared memories, meanings, and emotions in a community. Furthermore, colonial heritage was experienced in terms of the physical quality of their community, fitting into their everyday community life and socio-cultural facilities supporting their everyday social life. Unlike colonial heritage in the personal and community contexts, colonial heritage in the institutional context has been experienced as a source of possible threats that may significantly challenge the power of a nation and Koreans. The threats take various forms. Firstly, colonial heritage has been invoked as a marker of the shaming history of Korea. Through colonial heritage, especially symbolic colonial buildings, people relived a conquered colonial past of Korea, comprising the ethnic suppression and hardships that Koreans experienced under the occupation. Secondly, the heritage was perceived as a symbolic totem that does not fit with Koreans’ desires and values. Moreover, colonial heritage offered a chance for people to compare Koreans to Japanese past, and resulted in negative self-evaluation of Korean past. People were also ashamed of being Korean due to negative stereotypes of Koreans, exemplified through their attitudes to the management of colonial heritage. This negative group involvement undoubtedly generated threats to their feelings of positive identity.

It is important to highlight that meanings constructed at different levels of experience were inextricably interwoven. Therefore, it could perhaps be claimed that meanings of colonial heritage were a product of the combination of an individual’s own understanding of heritage, community perspectives on heritage and political views of heritage, and not a separate experience. Additionally, it could also be suggested that although a negative meaning of colonial heritage was shared in South Korean
society, which echoes Moscovici’s (1984, 1988) ‘hegemonic representation’, individuals constructed their own version of colonial heritage using their identity structure. Consequently, this gave rise to multiple interpretations of colonial heritage in Korean society. Given these multiple understandings, the role of colonial heritage in identity construction also cannot be totally conventional because individuals do not simply experience colonial heritage from the single fixed position of their identity. For some whose personal values are intimately tied up with colonial heritage, the heritage becomes a part of them and accentuates their positive self-evaluation. However, for others who ascribe more to institutional values, the heritage becomes a symbolic icon that represents the dominance of a conquering power threatening their sense of national identity. This provides evidence to suggest that the relationship between colonial heritage and the construction of identity is dynamic. Additionally, it gives supportive evidence to recent heritage literature addressing individuals as self-constructors of meanings of cultural heritage, rather than merely passive receivers of it (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Byrne, 2003; Smith, 2006; Macdonald, 2006a).

Another point to highlight is the way in which people remembered and experienced colonial heritage differed across generations in Korean society. Although Korean society shares a common understanding of colonial heritage, older generations were apt to attach significance to its symbolic meanings for their personal life, whereas younger generations were apt to attach significance to its symbolic meanings in the social and institutional context. For the older generation, colonial heritage was not entirely associated with negative memories based on the colonial past, but positive memories existed about the way life was lived. Although the heritage may be associated with a threat to identity, representing a shaming past in a general sense, that may not be salient for them or particularly harmful to them. Rather, colonial heritage became an important part of the older generation’s identity since they interacted with colonial heritage in ways important to their sense of identity. In this light, the heritage appeared to become subjective and personalised and reflective of their personal values, such as social position, personal achievement, and personal life history. However, interpretation by the younger generation differed from that of the
older generation. Colonial heritage for younger generations appeared to be a less important part of their personal life or form of personal identity. Instead, the heritage appeared to be more significant to their sense of national identity as a possible threat.

Seen from the perspective of memory construction, generational differences were more apparent. For the older generation, the meaning of colonial heritage was mainly constructed on the basis of memories of personal life events experienced directly, which is inextricably linked with autobiographical memory (Halbwachs, 1992) or individual and social memory (Assmann, 2006, 2008). However, for the younger generation, the meaning of colonial heritage was passively constructed through social agencies, which is linked with the construction of historical memory (Halbwachs, 1992) or political and cultural memory (Assmann, 2006, 2008). Meanings embedded in colonial heritage varied for the older generation because their personal memories in their life history were associated with colonial heritage. Conversely, meanings embedded in colonial heritage were fairly uniform (e.g. memory of atrocities) for the younger generation because their memories of colonial heritage have mainly been generated and stimulated through a societal context, including institutional ideologies and everyday communication. This memory transformation in Korean society confirms the claim made by Assmann (2006, 2008) that memory changes from a varied bottom-up memory (e.g. individual and social memory) to a standardised and institutionalised top-down memory (e.g. cultural and political memory) with the passage of time.

Many intergroup relationship studies prove that the intensive the negative experience with an out-group leads people not only to perceive the group as a threat, but also to express hostility towards the group (e.g. Branscombe et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2000b; Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). Additionally, it is widely accepted the higher the exposure to identity threats in a social context, the more negative the effects individuals feel towards the out-group (Crisp et al., 2009). In a South Korean context, it appeared that the acquired negativity comes from the institutionalised top-down memory, and it intensifies the young generation’s
perception of threats and consequently results in their negative attitude towards colonial heritage. However, for the older generation, positive personal memories associated with colonial heritage override the negativit and alleviate the threat posed by colonial heritage.

Lastly, consideration of multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage is crucial to offering a full account of the impact of cultural heritage on national identity, because personal identity cannot be dissociated from society when understanding colonial heritage. During the analysis, it appeared the distinction between the dimensions of identity was difficult to sustain empirically because our identities are inextricably interwoven with other identities and always interactive (Brewer, 1991, 2001; Brewer & Gardner, 1996). However, this research provided evidence that understanding multidimensionality of meaning construction was an important step towards specifying the colonial heritage’s influence on individuals’ identity. This research also identified evidence that people’s perception of threats cannot be understood without taking into account how colonial heritage has played a significant part in their multidimensional identity. Therefore, to reach a fuller understanding of people-cultural heritage relations in terms of a sense of identity, individuals’ multidimensional identity structure and accompanying process of multidimensional meaning construction needs to be taken into account.

11.3.3 Coping Reaction and Evolution of Meaning

Colonial heritage has been experienced as a source of possible identity threats under the institutional paradigm. A third research question of this research was how individuals dealt with threats to their sense of identity if colonial heritage threatened their sense of national identity, as well as why its significance changes over time. When individuals perceive threats to their sense of national identity, they responded with three different ways of coping with threats: the reconstruction of self-identity, re-conceptualisation of colonial heritage and reconstruction of memory. Individuals who perceived threats employed any or all of these self-protection strategies to alleviate perceived threats to their self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity. The reconstruction of self-identity echoes Breakwell’s (1986)
acceptance strategy, which leads individuals who perceived threats to redefine their identity structure with the minimum amount of harm. Rather than directly confronting a source of threats (i.e. colonial heritage), they appeared to prioritise their personal identity, evaluate their present identity comparing past selves, devaluate their national identity or dissociate themselves from the group psychologically. They also attempted to remove threats by re-evaluating Koreans through social comparisons with other ethnic groups, who were seen to be less privileged than Koreans, or by means of the derogation of the Japanese nationality. In contrast to the reconstruction of self-identity, the re-conceptualisation of colonialism led to direct confrontation with the source of threats. Colonial heritage that threatened their sense of identity was re-evaluated in different ways. People sought to find positive meaning of colonial heritage for their sense of identity or they simply adopted alternative social representations of colonial heritage that had less potential to threaten their identity. They also established new images of colonial heritage and the existence of the threat was simply rejected by them.

Individualistic coping reactions and the efforts of people to make evaluative judgements to boost their own sense of identity have been main focuses of social identity literature (e.g. Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1993; Ellemers et al., 2002; Timotijevic, 2000; Petriglieri, 2011). Group communication and social influences, which create multifaceted backgrounds for identity, have not been taken sufficiently into consideration by researchers. This research attempted to move beyond current social identity studies by demonstrating that people in South Korean society engage in the highly politicised process of memory construction as part of coping strategies at the group level. In order not only to diminish the threats posed by history but also to enhance national identity, the institutionalised top-down memory of the colonial history and colonial heritage was constructed through a nationalistic ideology and social communication. Through memory reconstruction, threatened South Koreans constructed sociocultural meanings embodied in colonial heritage that have a cohesive power to bind groups. One particularly important feature in South Korean society was that these group coping strategies were mainly grounded in psychological victimisation, which serves to stimulate group
membership and group cohesion (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Ashworth, 2002).

Secondly, the choice of the coping reaction in response to the threats was determined by the nature of individuals’ identity structures. Especially, the level of people’s sense of national group affiliation was most noticeable in the South Korean context. This echoes previous social identity findings (e.g. Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Branscombe et al., 1999; Ellemers et al., 1997, 2002) that the level of group affiliation led to differential responses to identity threats. The life history interviews demonstrated that people with lower affiliation to Korean membership tended to dissociate themselves from other Koreans, who they evaluated negatively, in order to deal with the stigma attached to national group membership. The younger generation in particular attempted to deal with the potential threat by differentiating themselves from older generations who suffered from the occupation and saw themselves in a disconnected way from the colonial past. In contrast, people with a higher affiliation to Korean membership attempted to diminish the threat to their identity by comparing Koreans with other ethnic groups. In order to enhance positive self-esteem more effectively, some tended to compare themselves to other ethnic groups still under external rule, and others tended to derogate the Japanese nationality.

Lastly, while coping reactions employed both by the older and younger generations were equally self-protective, the choice of a specific coping reaction differed across generations in Korean society. In interpreting colonial heritage, the older generation tended to minimise the threat by giving the heritage greater value for their personal identity, whereas the younger generation tended to minimise the threat by giving it less value to their national identity. Although the negative image of colonial heritage derived from the colonial past was dominant in a social context, the older generation, who were more likely to attach to colonial buildings, redefined the heritage as a crucial part of their personal identity, rather than a threat to their national identity that represented a shaming past. This finding provided empirical justification for a sense of attachment to colonial heritage being a determinant not only in perceptions of colonial buildings that represent a threat to feeling of national
identity, but also in coping reactions that people employed in response to the threat. However, the younger generation engaged in psychological self-defence by rejecting its significance to national identity or the existence of the threat. They attempted to reduce its negative power over their national identity by switching the negative image of the building into a more acceptable image in the community today or constructing new meanings for colonial heritage associated with their everyday life. They also tended to re-evaluate colonial heritage in response to their broadened life experience, which echoes a form of Breakwell’s (1986) self-enhancement through intra-personal comparison.

A large body of recent heritage literature (e.g. Lowenthal, 1997; Harvey, 2001; Graham, 2002; Crouch & Parker, 2003; Gough, 2004; Munasinghe, 2005; Garden, 2006; Smith, 2006; Byrne, 2008; Anico & Peralta, 2009; Uzzell, 2009b; Witcomb, 2009) interpret cultural heritage as a contemporary social product grounded in a social and political frame. In this light, it is widely understood that cultural heritage is not a tangible material that remains static or frozen, but it is a form of socio-cultural process. Not only are the significance and meanings of cultural heritage consistently reconstructed after drawing on people’s own life experiences, but it is also constantly reshaped on the basis of present interests, rather than being taken as a given. However, despite its prominence, this issue has received less rigorous analysis and there is little empirical evidence of how meanings of cultural heritage are transformed and transmitted as a process. This research demonstrated that the meanings and significance of colonial heritage to identity are evolving and changing over time. On this question, emphasis has been given to two key elements in the process of meaning construction, which are the process of memory construction (e.g. Assmann, 2006, 2008) and social representation (e.g. Moscovici, 1984, 1988). The life history interviews demonstrated that colonial heritage does not have a fixed meaning. The significance or value attributed to colonial heritage, which influences a construction of identity, have been consistently reconstructed and transformed by drawing on individuals’ belief systems and values as well as the social environment to which individuals involve. Additionally, the significance of colonial heritage for national identity relies on whether people themselves and the social context add
specific meanings to the heritage. This finding has led to the following observations.

Colonial heritage obtains additional power to threaten national identity through the politicised process of memory work in South Korean society. Billig (2006) emphasises that individuals’ perceptions and evaluations of threats are significantly influenced by the social context to which they belong and the way it is communicated to the public (Slovic, 1987; cited in Billig, 2006). It has been demonstrated here that colonial heritage became a symbolic icon threatening national identity not only by institutional ideologies in Korean society (i.e. Korean nationalism), but also by the process of social influence. The highly politicised memory work (e.g. propaganda, rhetoric, memorials), which is intimately linked to Assmann’s (2006, 2008) notion of political memory, has played a crucial role in appending symbolic meanings to colonial heritage in South Korean society. Institutional ideologies, education and other means of social communication, such as literature, TV, and other public media, constantly reinforce and regenerate political meanings of colonial heritage that threatened Korean identity. This interactive social communication of colonial heritage, combined with nationalistic ideologies, became a basis for construction of a more homogeneous and institutionalised meaning of colonial heritage in a South Korean context. For people who did not directly experience the colonial past, the negative memory of colonial heritage derived from indirect experience of the colonial past intensifies their nationalistic understanding of colonial heritage.

A second point to highlight is that changes in individuals’ life stages and the accompanying changes in evaluation tended to downgrade the significance of colonial heritage to a sense of national identity. For the younger generation, meanings of colonial heritage transformed along with their broadened life experience and the accompanying change in individuals’ belief systems. The change led them to interpret colonial heritage from a nationalistic perspective, based on a commonly shared social representation of colonial heritage in South Korean society to a more moderate one (i.e. cultural heritage less linked to threats to identity). This echoes
Breakwell (1993, 2001b) and Breakwell and Canter’s (1993) idea that the status of individuals’ identity plays a crucial role in understanding, accepting and assimilating social representations. For the older generation, changes in people’s life stages led them to interpret colonial heritage from a cognitive emphasis (i.e. colonial past) to a more emotional one (i.e. personal past). As they got older, colonial heritage located in a position that has the potential to threaten their sense of national identity became an emotional place more closely and positively associated with their personal identity. That is to say, the significance of colonial heritage shifted from their institutional paradigm to their personal paradigm, and their emotional engagement was increased.

What stands out the most from the above is how meaning changes with the passage of time. From the perspective of a broader socio-cultural context, since the politicised process of memory work constructs a more homogenous and institutionalised meaning of colonial heritage in present society, people experience colonial heritage in more cognitive and uniform ways on the basis of the history of modern Korea with the passage of time. This echoes Uzzell’s (1989) argument that a historic place which provides an affective and emotional experience shifts to a historic place which provides a cognitive experience over time. However, from the perspective of personal context, time makes colonial heritage shifts from a historic place located in national history to a historic place located in personal history. This means that, with the passage of time, colonial heritage that provides a cognitive experience (i.e. the colonial history) changes to personal heritage that provide a strong affective and emotional experience (i.e. personal life history), which is opposite to Uzzell’s (1989) argument on the role of time. With the passage of time, individuals’ life becomes closely intertwined with colonial heritage. Accumulation of their life experience intertwined with colonial heritage makes colonial heritage a substantial component of their personal identity as well as a personal memorial where individuals contacted their personal and family history and followed the trail to their past.

Lastly, people’s everyday experiences coloured the symbolic meanings of colonial heritage derived from an inherited understanding of the colonial past and,
consequently, its changed significance for national identity. A significant majority in Korean society have shared social meanings of colonial heritage. However, people, especially the younger generation, developed and shared a new interpretation of colonial heritage based on their present social experience (e.g. public place for cultural events), which echoes Moscovici’s (1984, 1988) process of anchoring that constructs new social representations. Additionally, changes in the physical condition of the heritage have resulted not only in a change of its social meanings and associated social memories but has also led to a decrease in a heritage-related sense of place, familiarity, attachment, and personal memory. Social representation researchers (e.g. Moscovici, 1988; Breakwell, 2001b; Ben-Asher, 2003) emphasise that the transformation of social representations serve as a catalyst for social change and innovation. In the South Korean context, the change in the social representation of a colonial heritage today provides a watershed between the past and the present.

11.4 Implications of the Research

11.4.1 Theoretical Implications of the Research

The major implication of this research is the fact that it has highlighted the relevance and contribution of theoretical concepts derived from social and environmental psychology in investigating the relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of national identity. The association of cultural heritage with national identity has been the subject of study for a number of heritage researchers in recent times. Much heritage literature addresses cultural heritage in terms of socio-cultural places where national and cultural identities are produced. However, the paucity of theoretical frameworks and structured methodologies in current heritage studies has resulted in vague and poorly operationalised studies. This research moved beyond current heritage studies that suffer from a lack of theoretical logic through a synthesis of key identity-related theories, including the Social Identity Theory, Identity Process Theory, Social Representations and the process of memory construction. Taking into account the Social Identity Theory, this research conceptualised colonial heritage in terms of group categorisation and comparison. The Identity Process Theory provided a useful theoretical base from which to explore the ways in which colonial
heritage affects people’s identity and how people deal with their threatened identity, which most previous heritage studies have failed to identify. The concept of Social Representation and the process of memory construction afforded a fruitful way to examine the evolution of the meanings and significance of colonial heritage to a sense of identity that, to the researcher’s knowledge and belief, has not been achieved in previous heritage studies.

Moreover, this research empirically demonstrated the relationship between cultural heritage and identity with structured methods. A multi-method approach, combining a questionnaire, a Multiple Sorting Procedure and life history interviews, provided more comprehensive evidence to answer the research questions. The statistical information obtained through the questionnaire not only enabled the identification of the way in which cultural heritage is linked to a sense of national identity but it also measured the impact of cultural heritage on a sense of national identity in numerical terms. The Multiple Sorting Procedure elicited qualitative information as to how South Koreans make sense of Japanese colonial buildings with regard to a sense of national identity. Life history interviews offer a more nuanced and dynamic understanding of the significance of Japanese colonial heritage in South Korans’ everyday lives. Applying well-developed theories and conducting an empirical study with structured methods offer an insightful approach to enhancing our understanding of the connection between cultural heritage and a sense of identity.

Lastly, by adopting the concepts of social identity outside Europe, this research provided a greater understanding of the role of negative-natured cultural heritage in a sense of national identity in a non-European context. In South Korean society, colonial heritage built in the period of the Japanese occupation, particularly symbolic architectural heritage that evokes the shaming Korean past, has been heavily implicated as a powerful medium contributing to Korean identity. Some Korean heritage studies have focused on its lingering impact on Korean identity. However, this issue has received far less rigorous analysis and there is little empirical evidence showing how Japanese colonial heritage actually impacts on the creation of Korean identity in contemporary South Korean society. This has given rise to poor
theoretical and empirical progress in South Korean heritage studies. Applying well-established social identity theories and conducting empirical study offered a beneficial avenue for broadening understanding of the unique relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of identity in an outer-European context and, particularly, a South Korean context.

11.4.2 Practical Implications of the Research
Since this is a context-specific research, the findings and implications of this research may not be fully transferable across other research contexts. However, the findings in the South Korean context present invaluable messages that can contribute to establishing government policies on colonial heritage management. There are four key points cultural heritage and urban practitioners, who are concerned with the heritage as a mediator of national identity, should consider.

Firstly, the findings of this research suggest the need for heritage professionals and practitioners to consider the multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage in constructing a sense of identity. Despite being a symbolic place, representing Japanese colonial power and oppression, Japanese colonial heritage simultaneously becomes a substantial component of community identity. It was found that the colonial heritage, particularly symbolic architecture in Seoul, serves as a symbolic marker categorising the social community that fosters a positive community identity (e.g. Seoul citizens vs. locals). Additionally, colonial heritage becomes a symbolic totem where citizens contact their past community life and follow the trail to their community past. As a symbolic reminder, it triggers collectively shared memories, meanings, and emotions in a community. Approached from this perspective, it would not be an overstatement to say the absence of the colonial heritage would be harmful to citizens’ sense of community identity. Therefore, it would be erroneous to think that elimination of Japanese colonial heritage would be entirely beneficial for achievement of a positive sense of Korean identity. Consideration of the multidimensional aspects of colonial heritage is crucial in order to manage colonial heritage in contemporary South Korean society.
Another suggestion for heritage managers in South Korea is that Japanese colonial heritage could provide the best opportunities to foster citizens’ sense of Korean identity, rather than a source of potential threats to Korean identity. In contemporary South Korean society, there are many different perspectives on how Korean identity could or should be reconstructed through the colonial heritage, ranging from an elimination of colonial memories to a commemoration of the past. It was found that people achieve their positive Korean identity by stressing didactic values embedded by the colonial heritage. Taking into account this positive value, the colonial heritage could be much more beneficial, especially for future generations in South Korea, if the heritage were to be used as a memorial of the past and used for didactic purposes, such as the Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland or District Six in South Africa. This follows Ashworth’s (2002, p.364) suggestion that atrocity can be “a lesson for the present and hope for the future, as much as a description of the past”.

This research found that although South Korean society shares a common idea of Japanese colonial heritage, society members have somewhat different ideas about colonial heritage. More importantly, the meanings of the colonial heritage are consistently reconstructed and reshaped by drawing on the changes in the society in which people live. This finding suggests to heritage practitioners that understanding meanings of colonial heritage in contemporary South Korean society would be a starting point for understanding the role of colonial heritage in society. This is because the shaming past associated with the heritage becomes conspicuously irrelevant today. The heritage would not speak of cultural imperialism anymore and would become innocuous to a sense of national identity. Instead, colonial heritage would become a new heritage that constructs and enhances a new South Korean identity, community identity and personal identity in South Korean society.

The findings also suggest to urban practitioners that the community or city would not be complete without cultural heritage that represents cultural identity. The colonial heritage contributes to defining the identity of city. Especially given trends in internationalised urban design and architecture today (e.g. identical skyscrapers in
modern cities), it is apparent that, as outstanding architectural landmarks, colonial heritage plays a key role in cultural identity of the community as well as an urban identity. Moreover, the colonial heritage serves as a physical navigator, conjuring up a picture of urban landscape past and present and enabling the history of the community to be visible. As familiar landmarks in a community, the colonial heritage invokes citizens’ own collective past in a rapidly changing world. Ignoring the importance of any type of familiar, long established and landmark architecture would not only harm a city’s identity but would also result in losing the long history of the community.

11.5 Applicability of Research Framework
This context-specific research will undoubtedly give rise to problems in terms of the universality of the findings. As Breakwell (1986, 1988, 1993) acknowledged, it is inevitable that not only salient identity motivations but also salient identity contents might differ according to individuals and social, cultural and historical contexts in which a research is carried out (e.g. individualistic or collectivistic society). Additionally, coping reactions that threatened people engaged in might vary according to research contexts. Even individuals who participated in the research generate different results due to change of their identity with the passage of time. However, a fundamental process of identity construction through cultural heritage and the basic process of coping reactions in response to identity threats remain the same. Therefore, it is suggested that the research framework constructed in this research could be widely applicable across different research contexts in the field of heritage study.

The researcher is convinced the methodological framework and multi-method approach provide a useful approach for future psychology-driven heritage studies. Especially, it is suggested that the life history approach employed in this research could be very useful for future heritage studies concerned with individuals’ meaning construction of cultural heritage. Uzzell (2009b, p.5) states that ‘what is now known as the past was not what anyone experienced as the present’. This means that understanding how individuals remember a cultural heritage past, how they
perceive the cultural heritage in the present, and how it has changed tells us a great deal about the dynamic and complex nature of meaning construction. As demonstrated in this research, this approach enables future heritage studies to uncover the way in which individuals construct the meanings of phenomena, as well as how these have developed and changed across their lifespan, both within their lives and in the broader social context (Uzzell et al., 2010; White et al., 2010). This approach can also provide unique information about the context behind changes over an individuals’ lifetime that traditional psychological approaches, which focus only on individuals’ present day behaviours and attitudes, cannot provide.

### 11.6 Conclusions

Central to this research has been the question of how colonial heritage built in the period of the Japanese occupation impacts national identity in contemporary South Korean society. Particular attention in this research has been given to the issues concerning the process for identity construction and meanings construction that have received little theoretical and empirical attention in heritage studies to date. Using a strong theoretical framework and structured methodology, this research moved beyond the state of the art of many heritage studies that draw on methodologies that do not allow the changed nuances of meaning over time to become apparent. This research also makes a contribution to the theoretical ways we think about place and the past in social and environmental psychology by introducing the dimension of identity.

Due to the symbolic meanings derived from the national history that for many South Koreans has been shaming, Japanese colonial heritage in South Korean society is experienced as a source of potential threat that challenges the status and pride of a nation and its citizens, the people of South Korea. However, colonial heritage does not always serve as a sorrowful aide-mémoire of Korea’s history that threatens individuals’ national identity. Meanings of colonial heritage, which influences a construction of identity, are consistently changed and transformed by personal belief and values, knowledge and experience, as well as social contexts in which people live. Colonial heritage simultaneously becomes an essential part of individuals’
personal identity as well as a substantial component of individuals’ community identity. Although the meanings of colonial heritage are widely shared in South Korean society, colonial heritage was differently remembered and experienced across generations in South Korean society.

The evidence presented in this research suggests that an understanding of the impact of colonial heritage on multiple motivations of identity and its meanings constructed in a multidimensional identity structure is crucial to understanding the complex individual-colonial heritage relationship. It is suggested that a sense of identity is not something simply generated by cultural heritage. Instead, colonial heritage is a highly experiential and social place strongly linked to multiple psychological motivations that contribute to the construction of identity. Colonial heritage is experienced in our multi-dimensional life and the context in which we live, and the meanings of colonial heritage that influence our identity are consistently constructed and transformed across the life course.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaire (Study One)

A QUESTIONNAIRE
INVESTIGATING HERITAGE AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

Seung Ho Youn
School of Psychology
University of Surrey
Guildford Surrey
United Kingdom
GU2 7XH

Study No: [Redacted]
Dear participants

I am a research student studying at the University of Surrey in the UK. I am conducting research into people’s interpretation of colonial heritage and its relationship to their national identity. Specifically, I am interested in colonial buildings built during the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945) in South Korea, and its relationship to Korean identity today.

In this questionnaire, there are several sections asking you about your views on heritage, such as your attachment to heritage, your opinion about heritage in terms of national identity, and your views about national groups and Japanese colonial buildings in South Korea. This questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete, and a summary of the findings will be provided if you are interested in this study.

This study was reviewed and has been given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey's Ethics Committee.

All your answers will remain strictly anonymous and confidential. Additionally, the data collected through this questionnaire will be used only for academic purposes. You have the right to decline to answer any questions and you can withdraw at any time during the questionnaire. If you have any problems, queries or questions, please feel free to tell me as you are answering this questionnaire.

As part of this study, I am looking for people to be interviewed. The interview will last approximately 20 minutes. If you are interested in being interviewed as part of this study, please put your contact address at the end of this questionnaire.

I appreciate you giving your time to help me in this research project.
Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Seung Ho Youn, PhD research student
Department of Psychology
University of Surrey

Contact details
Mobile: 010 3246 5533 (Korea), 07894 340 876 (UK)
Email: s.youn@surrey.ac.uk
Definitions of terminologies used in this study

- **What is the meaning of ‘Japanese colonial’?**
  - Japanese colonial in this study refers to the period of Japanese forced occupation in Korea as part of Japan’s 35 year imperialist expansion (22 August 1910 to 15 August 1945).

- **What is the meaning of ‘heritage’?**
  - Heritage in this study means places, architectural structures, or monuments of historic and academic value (e.g. palaces, fortresses, temples etc.). Heritage has continued over many years and has been passed on from one generation to another. **Japanese colonial heritage** refers to architectural structures of historic and academic value constructed during the period of Japanese forced occupation (1910-1945).

- **What is the meaning of ‘national identity’?**
  - Simply speaking, national identity in this study refers to the distinction of specific features of a national group. In this study, as a South Korean, people feel that they remain the same across time and situations; it includes a sense of personal worth and social values, a sense of confidence, and the desire to maintain personal distinctiveness from other nationalities.
What is Cultural heritage?

- Please complete the two charts below with examples of different heritage that are typical of the culture in South Korea. (e.g. site, buildings, statues, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Examples of Korean cultural heritage</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now choose one of the above that you think is the most typical in South Korean society. Please put a tick beside it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Examples of Japanese colonial heritage in South Korea</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now choose one of the above that you think is the most typical in South Korean society. Please put a tick beside it.
Your attachment to heritage

This section refers to cultural heritage that you have identified as being typical and seeks to determine your attachment to these items. Please read each statement and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement. Then, enter the appropriate number in the box next to it, using the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding Korean Cultural heritage:

1. I feel this heritage is a part of me.                          1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. This heritage is very special to me.                           1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I identify strongly with this heritage.                        1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. This heritage means a lot to me.                               1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I’m very attached to this heritage.                            1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. This heritage says a lot about who I am.                       1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I get more satisfaction out of visiting this heritage (site) than from visiting any other place. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Regarding Japanese colonial heritage:

1. I feel this heritage is a part of me.                          1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. This heritage is very special to me.                           1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I identify strongly with this heritage.                        1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. This heritage means a lot to me.                               1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I’m very attached to this heritage.                            1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. This heritage says a lot about who I am.                       1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I get more satisfaction out of visiting this heritage (site) than from visiting any other place. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Your view about Cultural heritage

Below are some questions about the way you see cultural heritage in general. Please answer each question using the scale next to it.

1. How familiar are you with Korean cultural heritage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unfamiliar</th>
<th>Neither unfamiliar nor familiar</th>
<th>Extremely familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, how familiar are you with Japanese colonial heritage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unfamiliar</th>
<th>Neither unfamiliar nor familiar</th>
<th>Extremely familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much do you see Korean cultural heritage as peripheral or central to your Korean identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much peripheral</th>
<th>Neither peripheral nor central</th>
<th>Very much central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, how much do you see Japanese colonial heritage as peripheral or central to your Korean identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much peripheral</th>
<th>Neither peripheral nor central</th>
<th>Very much central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How much do you see Korean cultural heritage as a positive or negative influence on your Korean identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly negative</th>
<th>Neither positive nor negative</th>
<th>Strongly positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, how much do you see Japanese colonial heritage as a positive or negative influence on your Korean identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly negative</th>
<th>Neither positive nor negative</th>
<th>Strongly positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
◆ The following statements refer to how heritage influences how you feel about yourself in general. Please read each statement and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement. Then, enter the appropriate number in the box next to it, using the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Korean cultural heritage makes me feel that ......**

1. Being Korean makes me feel better than other nationalities.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Being Korean provides me with lots of opportunities.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Being Korean gives me a real sense of my heritage.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Being Korean makes me feel special.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. In general, I am proud to be Korean.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. As a Korean I often feel successful.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Being Korean does not make me feel different from other nationalities.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Overall, I sometimes feel that being Korean gives me confidence.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I feel as though I can achieve my goals in life because I am Korean.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Being Korean, I feel I have much in common with other nationalities.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I don’t feel good about being Korean.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Being Korean gives me a strong belief in the future.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Knowing I am Korean does not make me feel good about myself.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Japanese colonial heritage makes me feel that ......

1. Being Korean makes me feel better than other nationalities.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Being Korean provides me with lots of opportunities.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Being Korean gives me a real sense of my heritage.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Being Korean makes me feel special.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. In general, I am proud to be Korean.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. As a Korean I often feel successful.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Being Korean does not make me feel different from other nationalities.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Overall, I sometimes feel that being Korean gives me confidence.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I feel as though I can achieve my goals in life because I am Korean.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Being Korean gives me a sense of destiny.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Being Korean, I feel I have much in common with other nationalities.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I don't feel good about being Korean.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Being Korean gives me advantages in life.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Being Korean gives me a strong belief in the future.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Knowing I am Korean does not make me feel good about myself.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Your views about Nationality

◆ Below are some questions about the way you see yourself as Korean. Please answer each question using the scale next to it.

1. To what extent do you feel Korean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How proud are you of being Korean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How important is it to you that you are Korean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How do you feel about being Korean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Sad</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Extremely Happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you feel if someone said something bad about Korean people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Sad</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Extremely Happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some questions about the way you see Japanese nationality. Please answer each question using the scale next to it.

1. How familiar are you with Japanese?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you explain why?

2. How much do you like or dislike Japanese?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike them a lot</th>
<th>Neither dislike nor like</th>
<th>Like them a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How much do you feel .......... towards Japanese?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admiration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your views about Japanese colonial buildings

The following statements refer to how you see Japanese colonial buildings. Please read each statement and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement. Then, enter the appropriate number in the box next to it, using the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The history of the building does not affect whether I like the building.

2. The history of the building will affect how I think about the organisation that occupies the building now.

3. I cannot see the building without thinking about its past.

4. I cannot see the building without thinking of its colonial origins.

5. I do not like a building if it has unhappy associations for me.

6. I do not like a building if it has unhappy associations for South Korea.

7. The history of the building will affect whether I use the building.

8. The building is an important part of Korean heritage and should be preserved whatever its associations.

Below are some questions about destruction of colonial heritage and how that affects your sense of identity. Please answer each question using the scale next to it.

1. How important is the destruction of Japanese colonial buildings to your Korean identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How important is the preservation of Japanese colonial buildings to your Korean identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither a lot nor a little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background information

This section asks some personal details about you. All answers will be kept strictly confidential.

Personal and family history

1. Were you born in South Korea? Yes_________ No_________
   If yes, please write where you were born (e.g. Seoul, Pusan, Kwangju)

2. How long have you lived in South Korea? ________year(s)

3. How long have you lived in Seoul (Seoul metropolitan area)? ________year(s)

4. Have you ever lived in Japan? Yes_________ No_________
   If yes, how long have you lived in Japan? ________year(s) ________month(s)
   If no, how many times have you ever been to Japan? ________time(s)

5. What extend did Japanese colonial past affect your family in any way?

   Not at all | Neither a lot nor a little | Very much
   _______ | _______ | _______ | _______ | _______ | _______ | _______ | _______

   Can you describe how?

Memberships

1. Are you a member of any organisations concerned with cultural heritage? (Either governmental or non-governmental organisations) Yes_______ No_______
   If yes, please indicate below what these are: _________________________

2. Are you a member of any organisations concerned with Japanese culture? (Either governmental or non-governmental organisations) Yes_______ No_______
   If yes, please indicate below what these are: _________________________

Demographic information

1. How old will you be on your next birthday? ________________ years

2. Are you? male_________ female_________
3. What is your current job situation? Please indicate your main occupation and tick only one.

Full time paid work __________  Part time paid work __________
Look after the home _________  Retired ______________
Full time student __________   Voluntary work __________
Unemployed ____________  Other _____________

If you are or have been in paid work, what is (was) your job called?

________________________________________________________________________

4. What is the highest level of education that you’ve attained?

No formal qualifications _______ GCSEs/ O-level/ CSEs __________
A-Levels/ BTEC/ NVQs _________ Undergraduate Degree/ HND __________
Postgraduate Degree __________
Professional qualification (Please specify) _____________________________

As part of this study, I am looking for people to be interviewed. The interview will last approximately 20 minutes. If you would be interested in taking part in the interview part of this study, please would you put your contact address below. (e.g. e-mail, telephone)

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.
## Appendix 2: Photographic Cards for the MSP (Study Two)

   - The old Japanese General Government Building

2. [Image of the old Seoul City Hall](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - The old Seoul City Hall

3. [Image of the Seodaemoon Prison History Hall](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - The Seodaemoon Prison History Hall

4. [Image of the old Korean Supreme Court](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - The old Korean Supreme Court

5. [Image of Seoul National University medical school](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - Seoul National University medical school

6. [Image of Seoul National University of Technology](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - Seoul National University of Technology

7. [Image of The old main hall of Seoul National University](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - The old main hall of Seoul National University

8. [Image of Seoul National University of Technology](https://www.panoramio.com/photo/44875966)
   - Seoul National University of Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The old Japanese Residence in Ulleungdo</td>
<td><a href="http://m.blog.daum.net/yadasoto/353">http://m.blog.daum.net/yadasoto/353</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gunsan Dongkuksa Buddhist Temple</td>
<td><a href="http://blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=yohal8&amp;logNo=40158806278">http://blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=yohal8&amp;logNo=40158806278</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mokpo Higashi-Honganji Temple</td>
<td><a href="http://blog.mokpo.go.kr/category/%EC%BB%A4%EB%AE%A4%EB%8B%88%ED%8B%B0%EB%B8%94%EB%A1%9C%EA%B7%B8%20%EB%8B%A4%EB%AA%A8%EC%97%AC%EB%9D%BC?page=7">http://blog.mokpo.go.kr/category/%EC%BB%A4%EB%AE%A4%EB%8B%88%ED%8B%B0%EB%B8%94%EB%A1%9C%EA%B7%B8%20%EB%8B%A4%EB%AA%A8%EC%97%AC%EB%9D%BC?page=7</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The old Sorokdo Japanese Shrine</td>
<td><a href="http://blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=fww600r&amp;logNo=40040780783&amp;parentCategoryNo=2&amp;viewDate=&amp;currentPage=1&amp;listtype=0">http://blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=fww600r&amp;logNo=40040780783&amp;parentCategoryNo=2&amp;viewDate=&amp;currentPage=1&amp;listtype=0</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Card Sorting Schedule and Data Sheets

1. Cart Sorting Instruction

There are photographs of 24 Japanese colonial buildings. This particular set of buildings was selected to cover a broad range of Japanese colonial buildings built during the Japanese occupation. As mentioned to you before, I am interested in finding out how people interpret Japanese colonial buildings and the meanings of the buildings. Therefore, please consider these photographs as representations of actual buildings rather than as photographs.

1.1 Free Sort Instruction

I would also like you to look at the following photographs of buildings and sort them into groups in such a way that all the cards in any group are similar to each other in some important way but different from those in the other groups. You can put the pictures into as many groups as you like and put as many cards into each group as you like. Since, the point of the task is to reveal how you interpret the buildings, there are absolutely no correct or incorrect answers. Please remember that you should sort them into groups according to one and only one criterion at a time. After you have completed the first arrangement, you will have an opportunity to sort using other ways to group the buildings.

After completing the first arrangement, please tell me the reasons for your sort and what it is that the photographs in each group have in common. Next, I would like you to sort these photographs again using any different principles you think appropriate and we will carry on as many times as you feel able to produce different sort categories.

1.2 Structure Sort Instruction

Sort 1: Attachment to Japanese colonial buildings

Now, I will ask you to sort the photographs according to what I am interested in. I would like you to sort these photographs on the basis of how much attachment you feel to the buildings. This time I am going to tell you how many groups to
sort them into, although you can put as many or as few as you want into each group. Thus, there should be three groups, as follows: ‘Very attached’, ‘Quite attached’, ‘Not at all attached’. When you have carried out your sort, please tell me the reasons for your allocation.

**Sort 2: Typical colonial heritage**

Now, I would like you to sort these photographs on the basis of how much these buildings are perceived as typical Japanese colonial heritage. Please use the following three categories: ‘Very typical’, ‘Quite typical’, ‘Not at all typical’. After that, please tell me the reasons for your decisions.

**Sort 3: Significance of the buildings to National Identity**

This time, I would like you to sort these photographs on the basis of how far these buildings are significant to your sense of Korean identity. Please use the following three categories: ‘Very significant’, ‘Quite significant’, ‘Not at all significant’. As you did in the previous sort, you can put as many or as few as you want into each group. When you have carried out your sort, please tell me the reasons for your decisions.

**Sort 4: Threats to national identity**

What I would like you to do for the last sort is to sort these pictures on the basis of how much these buildings are perceived as a threat to a sense of Korean identity. Again, as you did in the previous sort, please sort photographs using the following three categories: ‘Very threatening’, ‘Quite threatening’, ‘Not at all threatening’. After that, please tell me the reasons for your decisions.
2. Data Sheets

Participant number: 

**Free Sort**

*Overall reason for sort:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category labels used &amp; which cards are in each categories</th>
<th>♦ Group 1</th>
<th>♦ Group 2</th>
<th>♦ Group 3</th>
<th>♦ Group 4</th>
<th>♦ Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Group 1</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Group 2</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Group 3</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Group 4</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Group 5</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Structure Sort

1. Attachment to Japanese colonial buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quite attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not at all attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Typicality of colonial buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quite typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Significance of the buildings to national identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Very significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Quite significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Not at all significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Threats to national identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Very threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Quite threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Not at all threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Life History Interview Schedule (Study Three)

Section One: Life histories

1. Preliminary background
   a) Can you tell me your full name? When is your birthday? Where were you born? Are you married? In what year were you married?
   b) How many years did you live in the community where you were born? Was it in the town or the countryside? Where did you live then?

2. Family background
   Firstly, let’s talk about your family.
   a) How many brothers and sisters did you have?
   b) Can we talk about your parents? Where had they lived? (Probe for details of where and when born, any migration story) What was your father/mother main job?
   c) Do you remember your grandparents? (IF YES): Can you tell me about your grandparents ?(Probe for details of where and when born, any migration story)
   d) What memories do you have or what stories did your grandparents / parents tell you about your family life between 1910 and 1945? Can you tell me how this period affects you and your family? (Probe for details of the change of the way their family living: migrant, family break-up, home economy, losing property, poverty, benefit, etc.) What might have brought on these changes? What was your family attitude towards Japanese in that period? How do you feel about that?
   e) Did you or anyone in your family serve in the Japanese army or other Japanese government works in the period? (IF YES): What was it? Did he/she volunteer? Was he/she drafted? How did it affect your family? What feelings were aroused in your family?
3. Home / School life

Now I’d like you to think back now to your memories of your childhood; the time up to when you left school.

a) Can you tell me about the area you lived in when you were a child? Were there any historic places or architecture in your town (including colonial historic places)?

b) Do you have your childhood memories associated with the colonial historic places? (IF YES): Can you tell me about one of your memories of being in such a place? How old you were then? Who were you with? What did you do there? (Prompt: walk, picnic, learning) What were your impressions of the place?

c) When you were a child, what have you most enjoyed doing for pleasure (e.g. watching TV, music, hobbies, sport, out-door activities)? With who? Did your parents or school teachers disapprove of any of your activities? (IF YES): What was it? Why?

d) How old were you when you first went to school? Where did you go to school? What types of schools did you go to (Prompt: private, public, religious; foreign, national)? What did you think of your school? How old were you when you left school?

e) Did you take part in any club activities or youth organisations? (IF YES): What is it? Why did you join it? How long were you in the club /organisation?

f) Did you take an interest in history in your school life? When and where did you learn about modern Korean history? How were you taught about the history? How did you feel on learning about that?

g) Was the class an important influence on your view on Korean historic places (including colonial historic places)?

h) Have you ever been to historic places as a school trip? To where? Can you tell me about your memories of being Korean historic places (including colonial historic places)? How did you enjoy the places?

i) Did your parents take you historic places on day trips? To where? Can you tell me about your memories of being the historic place (including colonial
historic places) with your parents? How old were you then? How did you enjoy the places?

(IF AT UNIVERSITY): ask for details of subjects, new attitudes, influence of tutors, intellectual discussion, club and societies, other activities

IF GRADUATE SCHOOL AND WORK:

4. Life after leaving school & Work

a) Can you tell me about your first full-time job after graduation? What exactly did you do in this job? How did you feel about the work? How long did you do that job for? Did you do any other jobs after that?

b) Have you ever worked with Japanese? (IF YES): What did you do in the job? How did you get on with the Japanese you worked with? How did you feel about them? (IF JAPANESE EMPLOYER): How were you treated by your employer? How did you feel about him? Would you have preferred another job yourself?

c) Can you tell me something of how you spent your free time (e.g. weekend)? Did you often go to historic places? How often? Where have you been to colonial historic places? Can you tell me one of your memories of being in such a place?

IF GOT MARRIED:

5. Marriage & Parenting

a) Can you tell me something about your partner (Prompt: origin, job, personality)? Does your partner take an interest in modern Korean history? What is his/her view? Why does he/she think that?

b) Can you tell me something of how you spent your free time with your partner? Did you ever go to historic places together? (IF YES): Where do you go? What for? Can you tell me of a particular memory of being there?

c) Which modern Korean historic places have you visited (e.g. Japanese colonial buildings and other related places) with partner? What for? How did you enjoy the places? Can you tell me of a particular memory of being there
with your partner? Did the visit make you think about stories your parents told you? Did it make you think about the past, and if so in what way?

d) Do you have any children? (IF YES): Did you take your children to historic places (including places related to colonised history) when they were young? Where and why did you take them to the places? Can you tell me of a particular memory of being there with your children? How did your children like it or dislike it?

6. Present day

a) Thinking to the present now, can you tell me something of how you spent your free time?

b) Do you belong to any local clubs or associations? When and what kind of activities do you do? How long have you been doing that activity for? How do you feel when you are the activity?

c) Do you take an interest in modern Korean history? What is your view? Has your view on the history changed? (IF CHANGE HAS OCCURRED): Can you describe why and how your views have changed?

d) Do you often go to Korean historic places? How often? Where? With whom? What for? Where is your favourite place? Why? Do you think you get more or less enjoyment from visiting the historic places than when you were younger? Why do you think this might be?

e) How often do you visit colonial historic places in your present lives? Where? What for? Did the visit make you think about stories your parents told you? Did it make you think about the past, and if so in what way?

f) How do you feel when you visit the colonial historic places? Do you think your view on the places has changed? (IF CHANGE HAS OCCURRED): Can you describe why and how your views have changed?

g) How important is it to you to have colonial historic places which bring back memories of the past? (IF IMPORTANT): Which places are the most important to you? Why were they considered important?

END OF SECTION ONE
Section Two: Life histories associated with colonial buildings

1. Experience and memory
   a) Where, when and what did you learn about this building?
   b) Does the visit make you think about stories your parents told you? Does it make you think about the past, and if so in what way?
   c) How important is it to you to have the building which brings back memories of the past? (IF IMPORTANT): Why was the building considered important?
   d) Can you tell me any personal memories associated with the building?

IF DEMOLISHED…
   a) How did you feel when you heard about the demolition of this building? Did you say anything about it? Were you sorry about it? Why?
   b) Do you remember any other colonial buildings demolished in your life? (IF YES): Which building was it? Why was the building demolished? How did you feel when you heard about the demolition? Why did you feel that?

2. Present day
   a) How often do you visit this building today? What for? Do you like this building? Why?
   b) Do you think you get more or less enjoyment from seeing historic places now than when you were younger? Why do you think this might be?
   c) How do you feel when you see this building? Do you think your view on this building has changed during your life? (IF CHANGE HAS OCCURRED): Can you describe why and how your views have changed? Do you know what might have brought on these changes?
   d) Preservation or reconstructing colonial historic buildings is a big and complex undertaking. What do you generally feel about the demolition / preservation of colonial buildings? (Probe for details of the sense of Korean identity, based on four identity motivations)

END OF SECTION TWO
END OF THE INTERVIEW
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