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Abstract

Intangible cultural heritage is representative of a community’s cultural authenticity and identity and includes oral traditions, performing arts, festive events or traditional craftsmanship which have been inherited over generations (UNESCO, 2003). Each culturally diverse community possesses its own unique and authentic intangible cultural heritage, which is not only an integral element of the soul of a community, but can be a vital resource for generating tourism at the national and local levels.

There is little argument that intangible cultural heritage can provide a destination and/or community with a unique selling point and competitive advantage in the global marketplace. Intangible cultural heritage is experiential by nature, thus supports tourists in their desire to have a culturally authentic experience. In the process of commodification, however, intangible cultural heritage is transformed and staged too often and to varying degrees, which can lead to a loss of its authenticity (Alivizatou, 2012; Giudici, Melis, Dessi, & Ramos, 2013). Therefore, an approach facilitating intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource is tenuous (WTO, 2012).

Despite the increasing attention to intangible cultural heritage and the advice to adopt sustainable approach in the development of intangible cultural heritage as a tourism resource, little research has explored intangible cultural heritage from sustainability perspectives. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to investigate the extent to which the development of intangible cultural heritage facilitates the development of a sustainable tourism resource. To achieve this, the following three objectives were developed. First, to situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage; second, to analyse public organisations’ documents in order to determine the extent to which they have facilitated the development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource; and third, to establish a framework facilitating intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource.

This study adopted a single case study, with South Korea as a single representative case. A qualitative-dominant, mixed method approach was used in the process of data collection, analysis and interpretation. A total of 131 public documents from six public
organisations were analysed for the second objective. Semi-structured face to face interviews were conducted with a total of 25 intangible cultural heritage practitioners and 22 locals; and questionnaires were given to 255 visitors at National Intangible Heritage Centre in Korea and then collected, to address the third objective.

The critical interpretive analysis of 131 public documents revealed that overall, Korean public organisations’ goals and strategies have shown a propensity toward economic neoliberalism, mainly by regarding intangible cultural heritage tourism resources as economic tools. To a much lesser extent, they focus on social development such as ICH practitioners’ equity to participation in the decision-making process and/or intangible cultural heritage practitioners’ empowerment.

The analysis of 47 interviews with intangible cultural heritage practitioners and locals, and of 255 questionnaires revealed that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and developing its tourism role share a symbiotic relationship. This study presents a framework to facilitate the growth of the symbiotic relationships. The framework suggests, for the symbiotic relationship to be facilitated, a top-down approach blended with a bottom up approach, cooperation between stakeholders, and entrepreneurship are necessary.

This research addresses a gap in the literature and provides the practical understanding of intangible cultural heritage development. The exploratory research on intangible cultural heritage provides a much-needed framework for intangible cultural heritage to be a sustainable tourism resource, which can be groundwork for future academic research. Moreover, the project offers valuable insight into the combination of various intangible cultural heritage development strategies within one destination (i.e., South Korea), in order to reduce overlapping efforts by stakeholders in South Korea and maximise synergies to facilitate a greater range of positive impacts on the development of intangible cultural heritage for communities.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study/Research problem

From the mid-2000s, there has been an increasing interest in intangible cultural heritage [ICH] (Cominelli & Greffe, 2012; Smith & Akagawa, 2008). In particular, the interest has focused on the contribution of cultural authenticity and identity to maintaining cultural diversity around the world as well as its contribution to communities with the provision of unique selling points in the globally competitive tourism market. For example, ICH provides opportunities for tourists to experience cultural authenticity at a destination (Chhabra, Healy, & Sills, 2003; Daniel, 1996; Gonzalez, 2008), which in turn brings economic, social and cultural growth to communities.

While the value of ICH as a tourism resource has been gradually promoted, there is increasing concern that the commodification and transformation of ICH is a threat to its authenticity (Baillie, Chatzoglou, & Taha, 2010; McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). Thus an approach in utilising ICH as a sustainable tourism resource has been strongly advised by the WTO (2012), which enables ICH and its authenticity to be safeguarded while facilitating the use of ICH as a tourism resource (Georgiev & Vasileva, 2012). This research therefore focuses on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

1.2 Intangible Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development

Generally speaking, intangible can relate to feelings, representations and values (Blake, 2009). As a word describing feelings, representations and value, within this research, intangible is not used in isolation but used as a part of a phrase “intangible cultural heritage”. Intangible cultural heritage as a specific noun phrase has been adequately clarified in relation to the study aim, by using the UNESCO definition which is the practices, knowledge and skills that communities recognize as part of their cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2003). ICH is transmitted over generations, thus embodies strong cultural authenticity and identity of communities. In past decades, the cultural and social values of ICH were typically undervalued compared to those of tangible cultural heritage sites (i.e., historical European buildings) mainly due to the dominant European approach regarding only monumental and/or structural elements as the encapsulation of cultural heritage (Cleere, 2001). For example, tourists have, and continue to contribute to the economic development of destinations using world heritage sites and/or structures (Li, Wu, & Cai, 2008) such as the Great Wall of China or the Colosseum, which
have been identified as worthy of preservation by international institutions such as UNESCO (Foley, 2014).

However, recent increasing attention to ICH views the safeguarding of ICH as important in maintaining the cultural identity of communities and cultural diversity in the face of growing globalisation. Globalisation has brought about the intensification of intercultural contacts (Cominelli & Greffe, 2012) and subsequent increase in the development of a generic cultural hegemony and uniformity at the international level (Lenzerini, 2011). Cultural uniformity refers not only to the loss of authenticity but also to the standardisation of diverse cultural identity (Lenzerini, 2011). Moreover, modern mass media, including television and the internet, as impacts of globalisation, may alter and/or replace, traditional forms of oral expression. For example with respect to traditional music, many diverse forms of it may have been standardised to satisfy international audiences. As a result, only little places are allowed for the traditional music and musical practices, which are vital to the cultural continuity of community.

From the development perspectives, the significance of ICH and the need to safeguard it become important when sustainable development has been imperative around the world. Modernisation and dependency theory, which has impacted destinations to varying degrees, regards development as the process of westernisation along the lines of North America or Western Europe (Cetin, 2015; Eldon, 1989; Rostow, 1990), or as a process that normalises social behaviour on the basis of those western countries’ philosophies and organisational structures (Desjeux, 1981). These development paradigms consider traditional cultures as impediments to development (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000) that facilitate the extinction of some traditional cultures (i.e., ICH). However, since the 1980s, a sustainable development paradigm has been imperative, and the role and power of authentic culture has been identified. Sustainable development refers to the “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland et al., 1987, p.43), and strives the holistic and balanced approaches in economic growth, social and cultural well-being and ecological preservation (Liu, 2003). The authentic cultural identity of communities is arguably a vital contributor to the sustainable development of humanity as such identities are not only a driving force for economic development such as through heritage tourism (Throsby, 2017), but importantly, contribute to the fulfilment of the intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual development of members of a community (UNESCO, 2001).
Therefore, there is a growing realisation that increased protection of cultural diversity and identity of communities and safeguarding of authentic ICH is necessary for the protection of the cultural identity of communities (Arizpe, 2004; Bakar, Osman, Bachok, & Ibrahim, 2014; Cominelli & Greffe, 2012).

1.3 Intangible Cultural Heritage and Heritage Tourism

Cultural and heritage tourism have recently become one of the fastest growing tourism trends, and can be identified in the social desire for culture and heritage experiences (WTO, 2015). While heritage tourism is a debatable term being defined based on resource types (Fyall & Garrod, 1997; Hollinshead, 1988), tourists’ motivation (Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2001; Zeppelin & Hall, 1992), and/or experiential approaches (Chen, 2010; Timothy, 1997), it is generally mentioned visiting and enjoying historical and inherited products which has the capacity to stir emotions and enhance national identities (Palmer, 2005; Park, 2011). Of more than 25 million U.S. travellers in 2014, 33% were interested in cultural and cultural heritage experiences (National Travel and Tourism Office, 2014). Moreover, the interests in the past and the awareness of historic and artistic heritage has been increased (Inter-American Development Bank, 2013). According to a study by the InterAmerican Development Bank, if cultural and heritage tourism were a country, it would be the world’s fourth largest economy, would rank ninth in exports of goods and services, and would represent the world’s fourth largest workforce.

Not surprisingly then, ICH which embodies strong cultural authenticity, provides a unique selling point in the global heritage tourism. As a result of cultural standardisation, increasing tourists desire to experience the global variety of performing arts, handicrafts, rituals and cuisines (WTO, 2012). For example, the process of making traditional handicrafts and the handicrafts themselves have been shown and sold by locals in some countries such as Botswana; and ritual masks used in traditional dance performances have been sold in Mali (WTO, 2012). Gastronomic tours have been promoted through food festivals in Croatia and century-old customs have been promoted at well-established festivals in Korea (WTO, 2012). Moreover, as the tourism industry increasingly adapts to the “experience” economy (Oh, Fiore, & Jeoung, 2007), ICH has a competitive advantage over fixed, tangible tourism resources because ICH by nature is experiential (e.g., physical engagement). The promoted ICH in turn enhances local pride and awareness of their ICH, which contributes to the transmission of ICH (Baillie et al.,
Moreover, the adequate utilisation of ICH for tourism development purposes can increase employment opportunities and alleviate poverty, particularly for ICH practitioners (WTO, 2012).

Nevertheless, in the process of commodification, ICH is too easily transformed and modified, so subsequently can lose its authenticity (Bendix, Eggert, & Peselmann, 2016; Cole, 2007). ICH mostly needs to be commodified to make its cultural values understandable to tourists and/or “outsiders” (WTO, 2012). Given that ICH shapes and affects communities’ identities, a rapid transformation may affect community identity, and more importantly, host communities may regard commodification as not an important and significant issue, especially if the process does not take notice of and include communities.

Moreover, a concern exists on unequal power relations among the stakeholders such as ICH practitioners, locals and/or public organisations in the process of commodification and transformation of ICH. The unequal power relations between, and dissatisfaction with certain parties are common in tourism product development. For example, ICH practitioners who experience exploitation of and/or damage to their authority and responsibility for the cultural value of ICH, due to the over focus on tourism development, may not support tourism development. This unequal power relations may subsequently lead to unequal benefit distributions to stakeholders (Adams, 2010).

Not surprisingly then, a sustainable approach to utilise ICH as a tourism resource has been strongly advised (WTO, 2012). ICH as a sustainable tourism resource provides economic and social benefits to communities while its cultural value and authenticity are safeguarded and inherited to next generation (Liu, 2003).

1.4 Research Aims and Objectives

To date, there has been little agreement on the value of ICH as a competitive tourism product and on the need for an approach to facilitate ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Surprisingly however, there has been little research undertaken which focuses on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. For example, while the public organisation’s role is recognised as important in the development of ICH as a tourism resource, little research has explored to what extent public organisation policies and strategies support the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011).
Furthermore, while different stakeholders are involved in promoting ICH for tourism purposes, how different stakeholders perceive ICH as a sustainable tourism resource has not yet explored (WTO, 2015). In particular, ICH practitioners’ and locals’ perspectives are undoubtedly essential in ICH development; however little research has investigated their perspectives in the development of ICH tourism resources. Moreover, only a few researchers (Alberti & Giusti, 2012) have explored the tourists’ perspectives on ICH tourism experiences, and even less study has integrated host communities’ and tourists’ perspectives (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). Accordingly, to address these research gaps, the main purpose of this study is **to investigate the extent to which the development of intangible cultural heritage facilitates the development of sustainable tourism resource**. Specifically, the three objectives of the study are:

1. To situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage
2. To identify and critically analyse public organisations’ documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource
3. To develop a framework to facilitate intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource

### 1.5 Significance of the Research

This exploratory study offers important and fundamental insights into the ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, thus the research has both theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, this study addresses an existing literature gap by locating ICH within the context of sustainable tourism development. Arguably, adopting a sustainable approach to the utilisation of ICH will effectively and appropriately address the range of issues pertaining to the safeguarding of ICH products (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). Several studies (Aas, Ladkin, & Fletcher, 2005; Landorf, 2009; Li et al., 2008; Wager, 1995) have produced development frameworks for tangible cultural heritage and/or cultural heritage sites as a sustainable tourism resource; there is still, however, a paucity of work focusing specifically on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Moreover, there is a lack of research integrating supply (e.g., host communities and governments) and demand (e.g., both international and domestic tourists) in cultural heritage
tourism (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). Therefore, the significance of the research lies in the development of a much-needed framework for ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, which is obtained from the integration of supply (e.g., public organisations, ICH practitioners and locals) and demand (e.g., tourist) perspectives. This framework will make a valuable contribution to the extensive body of knowledge situated within the field of sustainable cultural heritage development.

This study is beneficial to all stakeholders in cultural heritage tourism by providing in-depth knowledge and understanding of ICH management, which is obtained from the four major stakeholders (i.e., public organisations, ICH practitioners, local communities and visitors). The framework facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource will provide fundamental guidance for policy makers, planners and managers in ICH tourism to utilise the resource in a sustainable way.

1.6 Outline of Thesis

This study is composed of six chapters. The first chapter provides insight into the context of ICH, heritage tourism and sustainable tourism resources. The clear gap in the literature regarding ICH is highlighted and justifies the need for this research, which guides the research aim and three research objectives.

Chapter Two examines the existing literature pertaining to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. The comprehensive understandings of ICH, such as the definition and scope of ICH, and ICH authenticity and the associated approaches will be discussed. Moreover, four major development theories which influence the links between tourism, ICH and sustainable development will be explained. The opportunities and challenges of ICH in heritage tourism will be presented, and at the end, Chapter Two will situate ICH within sustainable tourism development and finish with a research framework guiding the study.

Chapter Three explains the process for selecting suitable methodologies for this study in detail. Research paradigms (i.e., social constructivism), research approaches (i.e., a qualitative-dominant mixed method), research design (i.e., case study of South Korea) and research methods (i.e., document analysis, semi-structured face to face interviews and questionnaires) are described and their purpose explained. Moreover, this chapter discusses the
methods of collecting; storing and analysing data, as well as issues such as reliability and validity. The ethical considerations of this study are also mentioned.

Chapters Four and Five present the results and analysis pertaining to the extent to which development of ICH facilitates it as a sustainable tourism resource. Chapter Four focuses on the results from the public organisations’ policies and strategy analysis. Chapter Five presents and discusses the perspectives of three stakeholders: ICH practitioners, local communities and tourists, pertaining to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Chapter Five finishes with a framework of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, created by integrating the results of Chapter Four and Chapter Five.

Chapter Six, the final chapter, not only provides a summary of the study, but also demonstrates the significance of the research and the contribution it makes to the body of knowledge relating to ICH, heritage tourism and sustainable tourism resources. Finally, Chapter Six proposes future research agendas that extrapolate from this study designed to determine the extent to which development of intangible cultural heritage facilitates the development of sustainable tourism resource.
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2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

While there is a substantial cache of research pertaining to the broad field of cultural heritage, there is little doubt as to the need for increased research focusing particularly on ICH and its sustainability. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to examine literature from ICH within the context of sustainability, in order to highlight the significance of such scholarly inquiry. To achieve this, the chapter first provides an overview of definitional issues pertaining to ICH, and also to the notion of authenticity. Second, the chapter explores development paradigms within the context of cultural heritage. Third, the chapter identifies the status and role of ICH in heritage tourism and finally, the chapter explores resource based and community based approaches as the sustainable approaches underpinning ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

2.2 Understanding Intangible Cultural Heritage

Throughout the ages, ICH has been largely ignored over natural and tangible cultural heritage for two reasons. First, the dominant European and Western approach has regarded monumental or structural elements as the encapsulation of cultural heritage (Cleere, 2001). An occidental approach to understanding and identifying cultural heritage was embodied in the tangible products of arts and architecture, and prevented the immaterial portion of culture (i.e., ICH) from being of interest to international and national bodies. Second, the protection of tangible cultural heritage was accentuated more than that of ICH because visible and concrete elements tend to take precedence over immaterial elements (Blake, 2014).

In 1970 however, international bodies such as UNESCO identified and raised awareness of the role of the spiritual, the skills and knowledge in culture (Lenzerini, 2011). Not only has the aesthetic value of historical buildings or craft items been recognised, but also the associated intangible meanings and/or skills have been identified as important in maintaining cultural diversity (Munjeri, 2004). The understanding of ICH in this study is mainly shaped by UNESCO’s approach. While UNESCO has attracted some debate in terms of selecting and listing certain ICH elements (Kurin, 2004b), UNESCO’s role and accomplishment cannot be understated in the development and promotion of cultural heritage.
Therefore, this study follows UNESCO’s definition which emphasises two key features of ICH; living expression of culture and ICH practitioners.

2.2.1 UNESCO Definition

UNESCO held a Convention for the Safeguarding of ICH in 2003 in order to increase awareness of ICH. At the convention, UNESCO defined ICH as “the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage” (UNESCO, 2003, p.2). The domains in which ICH is manifested are: oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the ICH; performing arts; social practices, rituals and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; and traditional craftsmanship. Details pertaining to the five ICH domains are as follows:

**Oral traditions and expressions**, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage, encompass a variety of spoken forms such as tales, nursery rhymes, myths, epic songs, charms and prayers (UNESCO, 2003). Oral traditions and expressions are used to pass knowledge and social values within communities, and thus significantly contribute to the cultural identity of communities. The performance oral traditions and storytelling are a highly specialised occupation in most communities, such as in Africa, Germany and the USA. Because language underpins the ICH of many communities, the death of a language inevitably leads to the permanent loss of oral traditions and expressions.

**The performing arts** include traditional music, dance and theatre, which show numerous cultural expressions reflecting human creativity within communities (UNESCO, 2003). Traditional music is the most common manifestation of the performing arts and is found in every society. Traditional music is created in diverse contexts such as the scared or profane, is closely connected to work or entertainment, or satirised politically powerful persons. Traditional dance shows physical aspects of traditional performance such as the rhythmic movements, steps and gestures of dance, expressing mood or illustrating a specific event or daily act, such as religious dances, those representing fishing or sexual activity. Traditional theatre performances combine acting, dancing, singing, music and narration, and the examples include puppetry or pantomime. The musical
instrument, objects (e.g., customs or masks) and spaces associated with the performing arts practices, are all included in the definition of ICH.

**Social practices, rituals and festive events** are habitual activities that are shared by many of a community’s members. The practice of undertaking those activities as part of a group, reaffirms the identity of the community group member. Social, ritual and festive practices often take place at specific times and places, and remind a community of those practices’ history and worldviews. Distinctive social practices are particularly relevant to a community, and thus enhance community identity and cultural continuity of communities. Social practices, ritual and festive events involve a variety of forms such as worship rites, rites of passages, wedding and/or funeral rituals, traditional games and sports, culinary traditions, practices specific to men or women only, hunting, fishing and gathering practices. They also include a variety of expressions and physical elements such as special gestures and words, songs, dances, special clothing, processions and/or special food.

**Knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe** include knowledge, knowhow and skills developed by communities from interacting with the natural environment (UNESCO, 2003). The knowledge, knowhow and skills include traditional ecological wisdom, indigenous knowledge, traditional healing systems and knowledge about local fauna and flora. The knowledge and skills concerning the universe are expressed through language and oral traditions.

**Traditional craftsmanship** is the tangible manifestation of traditional skills. UNESCO emphasises the skills and knowledge involved in traditional craftsmanship rather than the products themselves, because unless the skills (i.e., ICH) are safeguarded, the products cannot be produced in future. Traditional crafts are expressed in clothing, jewellery, costumes for festivals and performing arts, objects, decorative arts and household utensils for amusement and education. The goal of safeguarding traditional craftsmanship is to ensure the skills associated with the traditional artisanry are passed on to future generations, so that they can continue to produce the craftsmanship within their community. Traditional craftsmanship particularly, needs legal measures such as intellectual property protection and/or copyright registrations, so that a community can benefit from its traditional crafts.
These domains are not mutually exclusive, but are extremely fluid, meaning that the items of ICH are not limited to a single category and many include items in multiple categories (UNESCO, 2013). For example, a shamanistic rite involves traditional music, songs, clothing, ceremonial practices and knowledge of the natural world. Similarly, festivals are integrated in expressions of ICH that include traditional dancing, feasting, storytelling, displays of craftsmanship and culinary traditions.

UNESCO annually updates three lists pertaining to the safeguarding and promotion of ICH, which are 1) a list of intangible cultural heritage items or concepts in need of urgent safeguarding, 2) a representative list of the intangible cultural heritage items of humanity and 3) a register of good safeguarding practices. From 2008 to 2017, 52 elements were included in the urgent safeguarding report (e.g. Mongolian calligraphy in Mongolia), 19 programs and activities have been selected for the best safeguarding practices (e.g. Fandango's Living Museum in Brazil) and 399 elements have been included on the representative list of the ICH of humanity (e.g. Mariachi in Mexico). These reports are of particular significance as issues pertaining to the development and preservation of ICH have traditionally been difficult to record in writing. Therefore, these reports represent a significant and positive step forward in the development of ICH.

Although UNESCO has actively promoted the significance of ICH, there are a few criticisms on the selection of a few ICH items to list (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Kurin, 2004b; Lenzerini, 2011), such as the impacts of listing ICH practices and interdependency between tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Firstly, UNESCO’s efforts to update ICH items have been criticized by numerous authors (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Kurin, 2004b; Lenzerini, 2011) for several reasons. According to UNESCO (2003), listing representative ICH items is to ensure ICH is globally visible and this will increase awareness of its significance around the world. However, Lenzerini (2011) criticises the selection process for ICH resources, claiming it has created a hierarchy that in turn implies that certain ICH resources are better than others. Similarly, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004) argues that making a list can confer value on what is listed, which means that what is not listed can be neglected and may not be protected. Foley (2014) however, is an advocate of the Korean approach to safeguarding ICH. For instance, rather than selecting and listing ICH resources, Korea places more importance on identifying and transmitting ICH. Korea established the Cultural Heritage Protection Act in
1962 (Alivizatou, 2012; Kurin, 2004b) and under this act, ICH practitioners have been identified and designated as *living human treasures*. Moreover, Korea has a structured transmission system which consists of three levels (i.e., *Beginners, Advanced and Assistant Instructors*) for training ICH practitioners. The establishment of this training system has contributed to the improved safeguarding and sustainability of ICH for the next generation (Yim, 2004).

Moreover, there is some criticism for identifying ICH as separated from tangible cultural heritage. UNESCO defines ICH by separating it from tangible cultural heritage; however Kurin (2004b) argues that tangible cultural heritage and ICH cannot be entirely separated. His idea has been supported by others (Bouchenaki, 2003; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Kurin, 2004b; Munjeri, 2004; Zanten, 2004) stating that it is not a simple task to consider ICH independently because tangible cultural heritage and ICH are closely connected. For example, a craft item is tangible but the knowledge and skills to create it are intangible. Moreover, tangible costumes or stage settings are part of the intangible traditional performance (Kurin, 2004b).

The notion of ‘cultural landscape’ also supports the interdependency between tangible cultural heritage and ICH. The term, ‘cultural landscape’ is widely used in the world heritage arena (Jones, 2003) as it suggests a link between the natural and cultural values in a protected landscape (i.e., a link between monuments, structures and objects and the knowledge and meanings residing with that tangible manifestation) (Carter, 2010). For example, the famous red rock known as Uluru in the centre of Australia is a representative landscape, a popular tourist destination and it is internationally recognised as a world heritage area (National Museum of Australia, 2015). While the tangible, commercial value of Uluru was only identified as late as 1987, the traditional owners of the country have acknowledged and valued Uluru’s spiritual and cultural significance over the 60,000-year history of Australia’s First Peoples (Bouchenaki, 2003).

In spite of these critical appraisals in relation to the accomplishments of UNESCO (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Kurin, 2004b; Lenzerini, 2011), we should not underestimate the role nor the accomplishments of UNESCO as its 66 years of existence have developed normative tools on every significant aspect of culture, including ICH (Roders & Oers, 2011). Moreover, international awareness of ICH has increased since the 2003 Convention for
Intangible Cultural Heritage: Living Expression of Culture

According to Kurin (2004b), ICH can be broadly understood as the immaterial culture that people practice in daily life and which is not a tangible cultural object such as a monument or a book. Accordingly, ICH is regarded as the living expression of culture in a community (UNESCO, 2009). As a living expression of culture, ICH is constantly evolving and changing as a result of interaction with the environment in which it occurs (Alivizatou, 2012; Lenzerini, 2011; Munjeri, 2004). Something can only be identified as cultural heritage when it appropriately reflects a characteristic of the culture, changes in response to its environment, and is capable of changing itself in parallel to the transforming culture (Lenzerini, 2011). ICH, as a living expression of a culture which contemporary people practise, has the capacity to change during and/or after interaction with the environment. It is this feature that distinguishes ICH from static, tangible cultural heritage such as cultural monuments.

Due to its living and changeable features, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO] has adopted the term ‘safeguarding’ ICH (Zanten, 2004). Although there are other terms that can be used instead of ‘safeguarding’, such as protecting (Brown, 2005; Kim & Lee, 2011), preserving (Chen, 2014) or conserving (Yuan, 2008), UNESCO considered these other terms to inhibit and discourage ICH to ‘live’ and adapt to changing environments (Huibin, Marzuki, & Razak, 2013). Lenzerini (2011) also warns that safeguarding should not be considered tantamount to protection because safeguarding ICH refers to the creation of proper environments for ICH practitioners to adopt change and be distanced from any interruption from external, dominant sectors. That is, safeguarding ICH should allow it to change as it interacts with the environment, while ensuring authenticity and cultural identity can be transmitted to the next generation.

Intangible Cultural Heritage: Intangible Cultural Heritage Practitioners

Identification and definition of ICH focuses on the people creating cultural artefacts
and/or undertaking cultural/artistic performances. Although ICH has received much attention since the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, there has always been interest in ICH to varying degrees, but in the past it has been referred to as folklore rather than ICH (Aikawa, 2004; Smith, 2007; Smith & Akagawa, 2008). In 1989, folklore was defined by UNESCO as “the totality of tradition-based creations of a cultural community expressed by a group or individuals and recognized as reflecting the expectations of a community in so far as they reflect its cultural and social identity; its standards and values are transmitted orally, by imitation or by other means” (UNESCO, 1989, p. 239). This definition was based more on legal concepts, such as patents or intellectual property rather than on the people creating and/or sharing the folklore (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; UNESCO, 2001). Since then and over several decades of trying to define ICH, there has been an important shift to emphasizing the people who create the cultural artefacts and/or perform the cultural arts (Alivizatou, 2012; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004) because without those people, transmission of ICH to the next generation cannot be accomplished (Bakar et al., 2014; UNESCO, 2003).

The people who have skills or knowledge to produce artefacts and/or perform cultural works of art are identified as ICH masters or carriers (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004) or practitioners (Aikawa, 2004; Arizpe, 2004; Kono, 2009; Nas, 2002). In particular, ICH practitioners are considered as the people who automatically and appropriately preserve and transmit the ICH to the next generation (Lenzerini, 2011). Moreover, the significance of the ‘practitioners’ is another reason why ICH is referred to as living culture: because it can refer immediately to the people practising ICH (Kurin, 2004a; Lenzerini, 2011; Zanten, 2004).

The importance of the practitioners was highlighted in 1993 when UNESCO set up the Living Human Treasures programme (Lenzerini, 2011), which was discontinued until the 2003 Convention entered into play (UNESCO, 2003). The purpose of nominating and designating Living Human Treasures is to increase public awareness and recognition of exceptionally talented tradition bearers and craftspeople, as well as to encourage the transmission of their knowledge, knowhow and skills to the younger generations. ICH practitioners are required to develop their ICH by avoiding the interferences from the dominant sectors of society (e.g., government). Among the systems in existence, different titles have been used in each country, for example Master of Art in France, Bearer of Popular crafts Tradition in Czech Republic, National Living Treasure in the Republic of Korea and Holder of an Important Intangible
Cultural Property (Japan). This study follows the term Living Human Treasures, as it is suggested by international institutions, so thus can be internationally accepted.

2.2.2 Strong Cultural Authenticity and Identity

There is no doubt that the value of heritage is estimated based on its authenticity (Bortolotto, 2007), and ICH embodies strong cultural authenticity (Bortolotto, 2007; Kurin, 2004b; Lenzerini, 2011), however, there is no consistent notion of what constitutes authenticity in the heritage tourism literature. Authenticity has been considered as uniqueness and/or distinctiveness from others (Ashworth, 2013; Bessiere, 1998) and thus provides cultural identity for communities (Macdonald, 2004). Moreover, authenticity involves the traditions, techniques, spirit, feeling, historic and social dimensions of cultural heritage (Munjeri, 2004), all of which provide a sense of historical and cultural continuity (Bortolotto, 2007). Authenticity is also constructed by diverse stakeholders and the social and political situations in which they exist (Zhu, 2012). For example, when tangible cultural heritage (e.g., historical monuments) was deemed valuable by international governments and organisations such as UNESCO, the authenticity of a resource was scientifically interpreted to clearly distinguish the original from the fake and/or the authentic from the spurious (Bortolotto, 2007; Hafstein, 2004). Scientific authenticity was defined by materials, workmanship, design and location of the tangible resources (UNESCO, 1972). However, as intangible values became globally important, scientific authenticity was criticised as being too restrictive to understand the social value of cultural heritage such as craftsmanship or inherited meanings (UNESCO, 1996). Thus it became clear that the adoption of a different approach to understanding authenticity was required (Bortolotto, 2007).

While most research on authenticity follows three dominant approaches, which are objective, constructive and existential (Wang, 1999), a comparatively new approach emerged called theoplacity incorporating the three dominant approaches which have limitations in explaining the value of cultural heritage (Belhassen et al., 2008). The term authenticity and these associated approaches underpin and shape our understanding the authenticity of ICH.

Objective authenticity

Objective authenticity is concerned with the originality and genuineness of a resource. In a tourism context, the notion of objective authenticity was introduced in MacCanell’s seminal study (1976), claiming that a host community provides a limited range of culture to
tourists as ‘staged authenticity’ on a front stage, while ‘genuine authentic culture’ occurs in the backstage, which tourists have limited access to. Thus according to MacCanell, there is staged/fake or genuine/true authenticity (Andriotis, 2011). This links with Cohen’s ‘cool authenticity’ (2012, p. 1298), which suggests that ‘the authenticity of an object, site, custom, role or person is declared to be original, genuine or real, rather than a copy, fake or spurious’. For example, the authenticity of a resource is interpreted, and clearly distinguishes between the original and the fake or the authentic and the spurious (Bortolotto, 2007; Hafstein, 2004).

Objective authenticity then raises the significant question of “Who has the power to determine what will count as authentic?” (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1994, p.459). According to Cohen and Cohen (2012), objective authenticity, or cool authenticity, is generally identified by:

some individuals, recognized as ‘experts’, or in certain highly formalized and institutionalized positions, which thereby gain a high degree of unassailable ‘hegemony’ over their field of competence, such as in the authentication of the genuineness of documents, of the competence of persons or establishments to perform certain professional procedures, of the originality of works of art or of archaeological artifacts or of the genuineness of ethnic customs or events (Cohen & Cohen, 2012, p.1306)

For example, UNESCO is a typical example of an international agency, which has expertise and has achieved a hegemonic position in identifying and determining objective authenticity of intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO established its list of ICH in 2008, with the purpose of increasing awareness of ICH significance and ensuring better protection of ICH. Moreover, national governments have the power to authenticate cultural heritage. For example, the Korean national government designates ICH elements which are regarded as representing authentic Korean culture.

Nevertheless, the designation of ICH by an international agency or a national government is criticised in the literature (Cohen & Cohen, 2012) as having too much of a top-down approach because (1) it is from a western, ‘occidentalist’ perspective, which invariably overrides national and/or local opinion (Hitchcock, King, & Parnwell, 2010) and (2) it is underpinned by political motives and/or interests (Belhassen et al., 2008; Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Wang, 1999). For example, on the one hand, UNESCO has been criticised for its occidentalist approach to defining and designating the authenticity of cultural heritage around
the globe, as the agency purportedly discourages the inclusion of the host nation’s perspectives on authenticity in the ICH identification process (Hitchcock et al., 2010). On the other hand, Bendix (1989, p. 132) criticised national governments for identifying tradition and authenticity “which will accomplish for them what they intend it to accomplish”. That is, when a national government regards ICH as significant for cultural, social and/or economic development, then ICH would be authenticated. Consequently Bruner (2005, p.150) argues that a “fundamental question . . . is not whether an object or site is authentic, but rather who has the authority to authenticate . . . [t]his is a matter of power”.

Constructive authenticity

Constructive authenticity argues that authenticity depends on individual perspectives and interpretations and that there is no absolute originality of toured elements (i.e., tourism resources) (Bruner, 1994). With the rise of postmodernism came the notion that there is no actual, genuine and objective reality, and this links to the perspective of constructive and existential authenticity in tourism resources (Zhu, 2012). From tourists’ perspectives, authenticity is constructed and projected by a tourist’s home culture(s), therefore the authenticity of a toured object is regarded as symbolic authenticity. Consequently, constructive authenticity is “a projection of tourists’ own beliefs, expectations, preferences, stereotyped images, and consciousness onto toured objects, particularly onto toured others” (Wang, 1999, p.355). From host community perspectives, authenticity is a “contemporary understanding of the past culture” (Zhou, Zhang, Zhang, & Ma, 2015, p. 30) as host communities can and do evolve in response to social changes and the changes influence and characterise the feature of authenticity (Chhabra, 2009; Zhou et al., 2015). Therefore, the concept of authenticity, which is underpinned by constructive authenticity, claims that traditional performances (i.e., ICH) which are transformed and based on contemporary understandings are still authentic.

Existential authenticity

Existential authenticity places value on people themselves, such as tourists/locals’ identity (Wang, 1999) and/or their experiences (Pons, 2003) rather than on tourism resources. For example, Wang (1999) argued that the reason tourists choose to be involved in heritage tourism is to identify ‘real’ and true themselves through insights into the places associated with their history (i.e., cultural heritage) (p.351). Moreover, Steiner and Reisinger (2006) stated that “authenticity is a choice that people make” (p. 309). From this perspective, a host communities’
reproduction or alteration of their culture (e.g., traditional culture) is still authentic because it is the host community’s decision and choice regarding how to present their culture to others. Importantly, existential authenticity states that traditional culture is “[being] entitled to change and evolve in response to their changing circumstances; authenticity always is a self-judgment” (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006, p.311).

Zhu (2012) emphasised the dynamic process of being existential authentic status and introduced performative authenticity in reference to the ongoing interaction between the traditional performers (e.g., ICH practitioners) and the external world (e.g., tourists). That is, ICH practitioners come to enhance their cultural identity, through the interaction of the tourists. Similarly, Cohen and Cohen (2012) linked existential authenticity with ‘hot authentication’ referring to “an imminent, reiterative, informal performative process of creating, preserving and reinforcing an object’s, site’s or events’ authenticity” (Cohen & Cohen, 2012, p. 1300). Hot authentication argues that performative reinforcement such as making offerings or practising traditional dance, facilitates tourists’ being able to feel their identity and/or experience cultural authenticity (Cohen & Cohen, 2012).

As the latter two authenticity concepts (i.e., constructive and existential authenticity) are introduced and adopted in tourism research, objective authenticity has been diminished in value because of its apparent lack of ontological perspective and limited capacity to explore tourists’ perspectives and motivations (Reisinger & Steiner, 2006; Wang, 1999). Nevertheless, objective authenticity should continue to carry conceptual value, because abandoning the application of objective authenticity could cause the cultural value of the toured resource to become overweighed by tourists’ motivation, which could subsequently lose the distinctiveness of the toured object (Belhassen & Caton, 2006). For many scholars, objective authenticity remains a common reference point, especially in the context of heritage tourism (Chhabra 2010, 2012; Peterson 2005). Thus, Belhassen et al. (2008) developed a theoplacity approach integrating the three categories (objective, constructive and existential authenticity).

**Theoplacity**

Theoplacity, introduced by Belhassen et al. (2008) is an integrated notion of authenticity combining “the elements of place, belief, action, and self, which exist in dialogue and which act together to produce the complex notion of authenticity” (Belhassen et al., 2008,
That is, theoplacity argues the toured objects and social constructions surrounding tourists’ experience cannot be separated from the experience itself (Belhassen et al., 2008). Given the integrated approach of theoplacity to authenticity, it would appear reasonable that cultural values of ICH and individual social constructions of ICH together influence individual authentic experience. Moreover, theoplacity recognises the issue of political power which influences the evaluation of authenticity (Belhassen et al., 2008). If politically powerful groups (e.g., international or national government) admits to the historical and cultural value of certain ICH, or refuses to identify such, their decisions impact local perceptions of authenticity and tourist authentic experiences.

2.2.4 Summary of Understanding Intangible Cultural Heritage

ICH is a result of cultural reproduction over generations and thus represents cultural authenticity and identity. ICH is oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, knowledge and practices concerning nature and traditional craftsmanship which communities recognise as part of their cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2003). Rather than the cultural product itself, the skills, and more importantly the practitioners bearing those skills, are viewed as significant. ICH not only embodies cultural values, but also enables individuals (e.g., tourists, locals and ICH practitioners) to experience cultural identity, thus is viewed as strongly authentic.

2.3 Intangible Cultural Heritage and Development

The debate in the literature on the development of cultural heritage as a tourism resource has shifted numerous times in the last few decades, possibly as a result of the frequent shifts in global development rhetoric. Following the post-World War II period and the emergence of the modernisation theory in the 1950s, various development theories were proposed which articulated different perspectives on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. These theories included modernisation theory, dependency theory, economic neoliberalism and alternative development (Sharpley, 2000; Telfer, 2002).

Despite cultural heritage and tourism development being comprehensively discussed in various studies (Abruzzese, Greco, & Miccoli, 2011; Arthur & Mensah, 2006; Australian Government, 2004; Butler, 1991; Elnokaly & Elseragy, 2013), relatively few attempts have been made in the cultural heritage literature to draw on development theory. Nevertheless, to appraise the importance of cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource, a review of the
broader developmental context is required.

2.3.1 The Notion of Development

The term of development refers to “a philosophy, a process, the outcome or product of that process and a plan guiding the process towards desired objectives” (Sharpley & Telfer, 2002, p.23). Moreover, development is used to describe a process undertaken to achieve a goal (Sharpley, 2000). For example, sustainability is a goal and sustainable development is a process to achieve sustainability (Diesendorf, 2000). Moreover, Welch (1984) stated that development covers anything from broad and undefined changes to specific events. Consequently, what constitutes development has been the subject of an on-going debate (McKay, 1990).

The principles of development have changed over time (Goulet, 1992). The initial notion of development was referred to as economic growth (Sharpley, 2000) and was later expanded to integrate social, cultural, environmental, moral and ethical considerations (Goldsworthy, 1988; Ingham, 1993). Contemporary debates on development have expanded to consider sustainability (Redclift, 2000). The notion of sustainability evolved in the late 20th century with the realisation that environmental (i.e., economic, social, cultural, biological) resources are limited and thus emerged the idea that there is a need to meet the needs of current generations without compromising future generations (Loening, 1990). Sustainable development thus requires contemporary activities to mitigate the risk of serious degradation of the environment (including natural and socio-cultural resources), in order for present and future generations to have equitable access to them (Garrod & Fyall, 1998).

While the meanings and core principles of development altered over time, the three objectives of development remained. They included: increasing the distribution of goods to satisfy basic human needs (i.e. sustenance); raising the standard of living in areas such as income and education (i.e. self-esteem); and increasing economic, social and political freedom (i.e. freedom) (Todaro, 1994). For the purpose of this study, development involves structural transformation that implies political, cultural, social and economic changes (Hettne, 1995). Importantly, the term ‘development’ and associated theories have the potential to inform research concerned with facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.
2.3.2 Development Paradigms

Four major development theories used to better understand the tourism industry include modernisation theory, dependency theory, economic neoliberalism and alternative development (Sharpley, 2000; Telfer, 2002). They are not mutually exclusive and each development paradigm is addressed within a tourism and ICH context.

*Modernisation Theory*

Modernisation theory is influenced by Keynesian economics advocating a high degree of state involvement (Asimakopulos, 1991) and has been the implicit base for tourism studies in developing countries. The core principle of modernisation theory is economic growth (Rostow, 1990) and development and economic growth have been widely considered as synonymous (Sharpley, 2000). The modernisation paradigm considers the tourism industry as a contributor to economic growth (Sharpley, 2000) and tourism studies underpinned by modernisation theory focus on economic factors such as increased foreign exchange and increased employment (Britton, 1982; Cater, 1991).

Modernisation theory regards development as the process of westernisation such as in North America or Western Europe (Cetin, 2015; Eldon, 1989; Rostow, 1990). For example, the structure of developed countries was considered as that of North America and/or Western Europe. Modernisation theory views traditional ways of life (i.e. ICH) as impediments to development progress (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). An influential United Nations (1951) document titled ‘Measures for the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries’ in the 1950s stated ancient philosophies should be scrapped and traditional social institutions should be disintegrated for development to proceed (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). Moreover, traditional value is seen as the opposite to modern value (Harrison, 1988); thus traditional and modern values are deemed incompatible.

Modernisation is often criticised for not acknowledging the power and influence of culture on the development process. For example, Inglehart and Welzel (2009) disagreed with the notion that there was incompatibility between traditional culture and modernisation (i.e., economic development), and stated that “even if a society’s cultural heritage continues to shape its prevailing values, economic development brings changes that have important consequence” (p.5). Moreover, Desjeux (1981) warned that development fails when tradition is considered as a restraint/ discouragement to introduce universal technological and economic innovations.
Dependency Theory

Dependency theory, underpinned by capitalism, argues that developing countries compared to developed countries, have internal and external political and economic structures, which keep them in a dependent position (Todaro, 1997). In other words, dependency theory argues that development occurs in the developed countries (or central regions within a country) while simultaneously, underdevelopment occurs in developing countries (or periphery regions within a country) (Telfer, 2002). For example, capital/labour surpluses move from the developing to developed countries (or from the periphery to the central regions within a country) (Telfer, 2002). Moreover, dependency theory argues the political elite (e.g., developed countries) are the primary capitalist exploiters (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000) and developed countries benefit from trade whereas developing countries suffer (Sharply, 2000). While the approaches to the dependency theory are diverse, dependency theory is associated with inequalities caused by the development process.

Dependency theory has been one of the dominant development paradigms in tourism industry studies, predominantly focusing on negative impacts such as unequal economic growth among countries and inequality between labour-owner relationships (Chilcote, 1974; Wallerstein, 2004), cultural commodification/ transformation, environmental degradation and social disruption, mostly in developing countries and communities (Brohman, 1996).

Importantly, dependency theory simplifies the role of culture in development and resists exploring the more complex cultural, economic and political boundaries (Bhabha, 1994). For example, dependency theory views culture only in relation to economic growth (Kapoor, 2002). Moreover, dependency theory regards development as a process that normalises social behaviour on the basis of the developed countries’ philosophy and organisational structures (e.g., Western countries) (Desjeux, 1981). Additionally, decisions are made by people who are not living in the culture but in a ‘central’ position (e.g., Western countries) (Desjeux, 1981). For example, UNESCO has achieved a hegemonic position in identifying and evaluating ICH and critics argue that the identification and evaluation processes are based on European and Western perspectives, even when they occur in different cultural contexts such as Africa and/or Asia.
Economic neoliberalism gained popularity in the late 1970s (Schuurman, 1993) and is underpinned by Adam Smith’s principles of laissez-faire capitalism. While some theorists understood economic neoliberalism as an incorporated approach between modernisation and dependency theory, others moved in the direction of neoliberalism (Brohman, 1996). Economic neoliberalism encourages liberalised international trade which fosters positive economic development and advocates a free market with minimum state involvement (Sharply, 2000).

The importance of tourism and the role of culture increased with the global shift towards economic neoliberalism. Economic neoliberalism places emphasis on competitive exports (Telfer, 2002) and cultural heritage provides countries with a unique, competitive tourism resource (Scher, 2011) because cultural heritage embodies cultural authenticity. Moreover, the increased economic value of cultural heritage has the propensity to increase awareness of the need for cultural heritage conservation. For example, the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) under the World Bank Group, implemented a project of cultural heritage protection within the profile of tourism (Telfer, 2002).

The concern, however, is that increased tourism development targeting international visitors may facilitate the homogenisation of local culture (Bendix et al., 2016). Economic neoliberalism regards cultural heritage only as a potential meal ticket to development, which more often than not, results in the devaluation of traditional culture. For example, traditional dance (e.g. ICH) is too easily transformed to attract and satisfy the needs of international visitors, which subsequently can lead to cultural standardisation across countries.

Alternative development

The alternative development paradigm emerged from criticism of the prior development theories (e.g., modernised theory, dependency theory and economic neoliberalism) which, arguably, do not satisfy the ultimate objectives of development (e.g., distribution of goods to satisfy basic human needs and/or to increase economic, social and political freedom) (Telfer, 2002). The previous three development paradigms do not consider ecological, cultural and social dimensions in development (Redclift, 2000). This can lead to a loss of cultural heritage, weakening of cultural identity, inability to solve the problems of inequalities and an overall lack of local involvement in development. In short, there is an overall lack of consideration pertaining to the distribution of basic needs that provide
opportunities for 1) full physical, mental and social development of human personalities (Streeten, 1981); 2) solving the problems of disease, literacy and sanitation of communities (Streeten, 1981); and 3) providing freedom for local involvement in the development process (Alamgir, 1988; Bock, 1989; Haq, 1988). Sustainable development thus was introduced with the purpose of considering ecological, cultural and social dimensions and facilitating the achievement of these development objectives (Telfer, 2002).

**Sustainable development**

Sustainable development is a much debated term (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Sharpley, 2000), but the most cited definition of sustainable development is found in the Brundtland Commission Report which states it is “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland et al., 1987, p.43). Following this report, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 established *Agenda 21*, which declared desired goals and suggested action plans for achieving sustainability based on equity, holistic and long-term oriented approaches (Redclift, 2000; Saarinen, 2006).

First, an equity approach refers to inter and intra generational equity to have opportunities for development (Sharpley, 2000) and to access resources (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). Intra-generational equity is also concerned with a community’s right to be involved in tourism development planning and the decision making process (Garrod & Fyall, 1998) to ensure all development ultimately leads to the distribution of social and financial benefits to the communities (Liu, 2003). Tourism has long been considered a “basis for reaching a greater level of respect and confidence among all the peoples of the world” (WTO, 1980, p.3). In other words, in addition to an economic growth role, tourism development needs to facilitate a more equitable social condition for the world.

Second, an holistic and integrated approach refers to development which considers the balanced improvement between social, economic and environmental dimensions (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Landorf, 2009; Throsby, 2014) and is sometimes referred to as the ‘triple bottom-line’ (Elkington, 1998) or ‘three pillars’ approach (Hansmann, Mieg, & Frischknecht, 2012). Within the tourism context, the triple bottom line advocates the necessity to take consideration not only of making profit through tourism, but also of the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the people and environment. Moreover, an holistic approach also promotes global,
national and regional level collaborations and integrations in the development of tourism products (Garrod & Fyall, 1998; Throsby, 2005). This approach recognises that tourism activities occur nationally and internationally, thus tourism governance has a growing degree of complexity as a vast number of tourism related issues are transboundary (Mahon, 2015). The holistic approach therefore advocates governments collaborate globally, nationally and/or regionally to develop plans and/or strategies associated with tourism product development.

Last, a future-oriented approach suggests that sustainability is long-term oriented, which ensures the longevity of the destination’s environment (Jamieson, 1998). A future-oriented approach encourages a continuous monitoring system to assess any impacts on resources driven by tourism or any changes of stakeholder needs (Garrod & Fyall, 1998).

The initial concept of sustainable development focused on the ecological environment (Liu, 2003) and so, too, did the tourism industry. For example, the term ‘sustainable tourism’ was too often interchangeably used with ‘eco-tourism’, which is generally defined as environmentally responsible travel to protected natural areas (Liu, 2003). However, sustainability is no longer limited to the ecological environment and thus culture has become another dimension of sustainability, because culture is vulnerable and under threat of homogenisation from globalisation (Robinson, 1999). Globalisation has brought about the intensification of intercultural contacts (Cominelli & Greffe, 2012) and the subsequent increase in the development of a generic cultural hegemony and uniformity at the international level (Lenzerini, 2011). Cultural uniformity refers not only to the loss of authenticity but also to the standardization of diverse cultural identities (Lenzerini, 2011). Accordingly, the notion of cultural sustainability evolved from the need for the protection of cultural identities which have been weakened in the globalised world (Arizpe, 1997; Torabi Farsani, Coelho, & Costa, 2012), to now be defined as inter and intra-generational access to the cultural heritage which may distinguish one culture from another (Mowforth & Munt, 2008; WCCD, 1995).

Not surprisingly then, ICH is a significant contributor to sustainable development. ICH contributes to sustainable development by providing economic, social and cultural opportunities for the local host communities through heritage tourism (Roders & Oers, 2011). ICH provides tourists with opportunities to have an authentic cultural experience (Chhabra et al., 2003; Daniel, 1996; Gonzalez, 2008). The popularisation of ICH on a global scale has the potential to enhance local communities’ quality of life by providing economic opportunities to
the host community (Aas et al., 2005), to strengthen pride of culture and in turn, enhance their cultural identity (Baillie et al., 2010; Cole, 2007). Moreover, the utilisation of ICH as a heritage tourism resource can promote the use of ICH, which potentially might be distinguished when not utilised (Hunter, 1997), to support transmission of cultural heritage resources to the next generations.

**2.3.3 Summary of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Development**

To summarise, three of the four key development theories (modernised theory, dependency theory and economic neoliberalism) have a lack cultural consideration in the development process. Moreover, they have facilitated the extinction of some ICH as a result of, among other things, an occidental approach to ICH development in diverse cultures. However, underpinned by alternative development paradigms such as sustainable development, ICH has the potential to facilitate development that is more socially, economically, culturally and environmentally balanced.

**2.4 Intangible Cultural Heritage and Tourism**

While ICH is proving to be a competitive resource in the heritage tourism market, the often-necessary commodification of the resource is not without its challenges. This section will discuss, why tourists desire to experience authentic culture and how ICH satisfies and attracts them to a destination and contributes sustainable development of communities.

**2.4.1 Globalisation and Heritage Tourism**

Globalisation produces, among other things, a proliferation of transnational corporations, and allows for the pervasive influence of mass media and popular cultural trends from the west (Chang, 1999). It also generates the commodification of culture and manipulates consumption for corporate economic interests (Hughes, 1995). For example, in the tourism industry, the multinational chain hotels and standardized holiday packages are evidence of commodification fostered by globalisation. Moreover, too often, globalisation has replaced traditional and localised culture with homogenised and standardised packaged ‘culture’ (MacCannell, 1976) which often leads people to move away from traditional ways of life and lose generations of traditions (Breathnach, 2006). Increased cultural interaction across the globe has also led to a loss of cultural identity (Arizpe, 2004; Cominelli & Greffe, 2012; Tomlinson, 2003).
As a result of the growth of increasing globally homogenised culture, which ultimately results in a loss of cultural identity (McCain & Ray, 2003; Park, 2010), we are witnessing more and more tourists moving towards a desire for the opportunity to experience traditional and authentic culture at destinations (Chhabra, 2010b; Moulin, 1991). In order to satisfy these desires, tourists participate in, among other things, heritage tourism (Jamal & Kim, 2005).

The term ‘heritage tourism’ is sometimes used interchangeably with ‘cultural’ (Rodzi, Zaki, & Subli, 2013), ‘Indigenous’ and/or ‘ethnic’ tourism (Yang & Wall, 2009) because they all incorporate heritage as tourism resources, albeit to varying degrees. This study however, delimits heritage tourism from cultural tourism because while cultural tourism broadly includes cultural manifestations and contemporary arts as tourism attractions (Richards, 2007), heritage tourism places much more value on historical (Timothy & Boyd, 2003) and/or inherited tourism products. Similarly, the study delimits heritage tourism from Indigenous tourism and ethnic tourism. Indigenous tourism specifically involves Indigenous peoples (Butler & Hinch, 2007) while ethnic tourism focuses on socially marginalised groups who are separate from dominant major groups (Yang & Wall, 2009). Heritage tourism however, encompasses national heritage which is something that has the capacity to stir emotions, remind people of national belongings and/or enhance national identities (Palmer, 2005; Park, 2011). Therefore, heritage tourism in this study broadly encompasses national heritage in a destination rather than specifically focusing on Indigenous or ethnic heritage.

Heritage tourism has been defined based on resource types (Fyall & Garrod, 1997; Hollinshead, 1988), tourists’ motivation (Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2001; Zeppel & Hall, 1992), and/or experiential approaches (Chen, 2010; Timothy, 1997). All three perspectives shape the understanding of ICH as a tourism resource. In terms of resource based heritage tourism, Hollinshead (1988) defined heritage tourism as serving local traditions and community heritage such as folkloric traditions, arts and crafts, ethnic history, social customs, and cultural celebrations (i.e., ICH). From the tourist motivations perspectives, Poria et al. (2001) defined heritage tourism as “a phenomenon based on visitors’ motivations and perceptions rather than on specific site attributes” (p. 1047). Additionally, Zeppel and Hall (1992) said heritage tourism is “based on nostalgia for the past and the desire to experience diverse cultural landscapes and forms” (p.49). ICH contains strong cultural authenticity, thus it can satisfy the tourists’ desires to have authentic experiences. Third, an experiential approach places value on the visitors’ experiences during the process of visitation rather than on qualities and services provided by
the heritage (Chen & Chen, 2010). ICH by nature is experiential (e.g., physical engagement) and in experience-based tourism, intangible assets arguably have a competitive advantage over fixed, tangible tourism resources. Therefore, ICH arguably presents a wide range of opportunities for destinations wanting to utilise heritage tourism as a development tool.

2.4.2 Opportunities of Intangible Cultural Heritage as a Tourism Resource

Authentic Experience in Tourism

ICH can provide tourists with opportunities to have cultural authentic experiences (Chhabra et al., 2003; Daniel, 1996; Gonzalez, 2008). An authentic experience in tourism is created by interactions between tourists and tourism products (Bruner, 1994; Cohen, 1988; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 2012). In other words, an authentic experience depends on tourists’ beliefs and perspectives, rather than on the tourism product itself (Bruner, 1994). For example, tourism products are perceived as authentic when they represent socially constructed symbols of authenticity, which tourists expect (Culler, 1981).

According to Breathnach (2006), authentic experiences rely on the sensations and simulations which are designed to focus on ‘real feelings’ rather than the ‘real thing’. Contrary to historical objects preserved in museums, physical engagement as well as social interaction with others encourage tourists to ‘feel’ the authentic past (Breathnach, 2006; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004). According to Urry and Larsen (2011), all senses such as visual, hearing, touch, taste and smell are integrated and they work for tourists to experience authenticity and difference in destinations. Thus ICH, such as traditional performances and oratory and/or handicrafts skills for example, provides tourists with opportunities for participatory experiences, which encourages them to perceive the experience as more authentic. The existing research exploring cultural festivals (Chhabra et al., 2003), traditional dances (Daniel, 1996; Gonzalez, 2008; Xie, 2003) and ritual events (Giudici et al., 2013) supports the idea that ICH provides tourists with authentic cultural experiences with deeper engagement.

However, authenticity and/or an authentic experience, is a socially constructed concept, therefore it is difficult to verify the authenticity of ICH tourism products (Giudici et al., 2013). Moreover, the evaluation of an authentic cultural experience is also fraught with danger as it is living heritage and is changeable according to the interaction with the environment. Therefore, what is more important for tourists than experiencing authenticity is to understand and share
the sensations experienced by the practitioners rather than whether the performance is preserved as a traditional form or not (Hashimoto, 2003).

In summary, tourists are more likely to have an authentic experience when there is physical engagement and social interaction with the tourism product; therefore ICH satisfies them by providing participatory experiences that facilitate a deeper understanding of the culture. As authenticity in tourism is a constructed concept arising from interactions between tourists and tourism products, ICH practitioners’ sensations and their interaction with tourists should be taken into consideration during the evaluation of ICH tourism products.

*Constructing Identity in Heritage tourism*

ICH tourism products provide opportunities for tourists and the practitioners to construct or reaffirm their cultural and/or personal identities. For instance, tourists can gather insights at a destination and create or reaffirm their cultural identity by understanding their own place in time and space (McIntosh & Prentice, 1999; Wang, 1999). Indeed, ICH is a collective memory of a community (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006) and represents the spirit of the community, therefore it facilitates reaffirmation of cultural identity by tourists (Ashworth, 2013; Breathnach, 2006; Lanfant, 1995; Palmer, 2005; Park, 2010). For instance, ICH can remind domestic tourists of their cultural identity and belongingness (Breathnach, 2006; Palmer, 2005), whereas international tourists can reaffirm their cultural identity by experiencing the differences (Lanfant, 1995).

Moreover, tourists’ personal identities can be constructed through experiencing ICH. Personal identity is built through personal experiences (Gonzalez, 2008) and its liaison with locality vanishes as globalisation increases place movement (Mittelman, 1996). In this light, heritage tourists are likely to experience distant cultures to find real selves through experiences (Gonzalez, 2008). ICH tourism resource is experiential (i.e., physical engagement), therefore, it facilitates tourists having deep experience at a destination, which becomes part of their personal identity.

ICH practitioners also reconstruct their personal identity during performances (e.g., traditional dance or ritual performance). According to a study by Zhu (2012), ICH practitioners have interactions with tourists during the performance and the interactions contribute to the
practitioners’ understanding of society which then becomes a part of their identities. For the practitioners, presentation of traditional performances move from economic or social practice to conscious action for identity construction. Given that tracing national (Bond & Falk, 2013) and/or cultural (McCain & Ray, 2003; Park, 2010) identity is one of the major motivations for heritage tourism, the value of ICH is arguably invaluable as it facilitates the construction or reaffirmation of the identities of both tourists and ICH practitioners.

2.4.3 Challenges of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Heritage Tourism

In spite of the positive role of ICH in satisfying the needs of tourists in heritage tourism, there is a fluid debate on the commodification of ICH for tourism products and in particular, on the over-commodification of ICH for tourism purposes which too often, result in a loss of authenticity and cultural identity.

Commodification and transformation of Intangible Cultural Heritage

Commodification has been and continues to be, a significant issue in the development of ICH. First, the commodification of ICH can and arguably has, distorted the past (Baillie et al., 2010). For instance, cultural commodification has been used in a selective process in terms of designation and development, to provide tourists with emotional and memorable experiences (Bailie et al., 2010). Tourists are willing to pay for memorable experience without engaging in the local social or political causes of past or present events/issues (Sturken, 2007). In order to appease their paying, destinations provide tourists with selected heritage products which do not require the visitor’s engagement with or involvement in any local social or political action. Accordingly, this selective process of cultural heritage can distort the past (Bailie et al., 2010) as focusing on providing memorable experiences rather than providing historical fact.

Second, as a result of commodification, the value of cultural heritage is estimated financially which arguably, can conflict with its cultural role (Bailie et al., 2010; WTO, 2012). According to Holtorf (2007), tourists in heritage sites are looking for an interesting experience rather than historical accuracy, which they can access through a book or television (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). For example, a traditional dance that is safeguarded for enhancing a community’s identity, might be modified to attract more tourists and boost revenue.

Third, the processes of commodification can result in a loss of the authenticity of
cultural heritage (Halewood & Hannam, 2001; Taylor, 2001) Traditional music, dance and theatre, among other types of ICH, are particularly promoted to attract tourists and may contribute to reviving traditional performances (UNESCO, 2003). These ICH resources however, are too often and too easily reduced and transformed to meet tourists’ demands (George, 2010; Rodzi et al., 2013; Shin, 2010), and may subsequently result in the creation of new performances (Bendix et al., 2016; Cole, 2007).

Last, the ICH loss of authenticity may lead to a loss of cultural identity not only for local communities but also for tourists (Taylor, 2001). A sense of difference (i.e., between visitor and host local communities) is one of the responses to awareness and affirmation of identity (MacDonald, 2004). If cultural heritage products are standardized and inauthentic in the process of commodification, tourists and local communities cannot experience differences and their identities will be amalgamated.

In spite of the potential negative consequences of commodification, ICH is almost required to commoditize in order for its values to be understandable to tourists (WTO, 2012) through a transformation process (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). When ICH becomes transformed into commercial products for exchange and tourism development, it is common that traditional arts are miniaturized and so performances have become shortened or staged to appeal to tourists (Cole, 2007; George, 2010). Thus, as a result of commodification and a process of transformation, the overt ICH tourism product is often weakened and used for marketing to attract tourists to a destination.

Sustainable approach as an Alternative for the Potential Challenge

Nevertheless, a few authors (Holtorf, 2007; McKercher & Du Cros, 2002) have optimistic perspectives about commodification and believe the negative results caused by the commodification of tourism products can be minimized with appropriate development. MacDonald (1997) argued that commodification and transformation of cultural heritage has been seen as a negative process; however, it can develop local culture and strengthen a pride which intensifies tradition through the involvement of local communities in the development of cultural heritage. For Holtorf (2007) the commodified and transformed ICH is justifiable as it can arouse tourists’ senses and increase their awareness of the culture. The commodification also provides opportunities to popularize cultural heritage on a global scale (Baillie et al., 2010).
Additionally, McKercher and Du Cros (2002) argued that if the rate of ICH exchange is controlled by the community and the content is understandable, adverse effects can be minimised.

2.4.4 Summary of Intangible Cultural Heritage as Tourism Resource

To summarise, heritage tourism increasingly promotes ICH as a tourism product to provide authentic experiences (Chhabra, 2010b; Moulin, 1991) and opportunities to explore cultural identity (Bond & Falk, 2013). In order to market ICH, the tourism industry often commodifies the ICH resource (Mitsche et al., 2013) and in the process, it can lose its authenticity. Arguably then, ICH should be safeguarded for cultural continuity and diversity; thus there is an increasing need for a sustainable approach in the utilisation of ICH to balance between safeguarding its authenticity and satisfying tourists’ interest (WTO, 2012).

2.5 Intangible Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Tourism

Facilitating sustainability has been an imperative in tourism for over two decades, because tourism activities have been deemed to have impact on the ecological and socio-cultural heritage (Garrod & Fyall, 1998). In spite of its importance, there is still no exact definition of sustainable tourism, because sustainable tourism includes a great number of different dimensions, according to the different backgrounds and perceptions of those who are defining it (Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Saarinen, 2006). From a tourism centric approach, sustainable tourism is defined as activities which are “economically viable but do(es) not destroy the resources on which the future of tourism will depend, notably the physical environment and the social fabric of the host community” (Swarbrooke, 1999, p.13) or “tourism which is in a form which can maintain its viability in an area for an indefinite period of time” (Butler, 1993, p.29). This approach however has been criticised as not being holistic but rather, focuses too much on the viability of the tourism industry (Hunter, 1997; Wall, 1997) and evaluates sustainability practices based on the needs of the tourism industry (Hunter, 1997).

To address this limited approach, a more comprehensive and holistic approach to sustainable tourism has been suggested (WTO, 2012) and sustainable tourism has been considered as a contributor to attaining the goals of sustainable development (Butler, 1999; Cronin, 1990; Garrod & Fyall, 1998; Hunter, 1995; Johnston, 2014; Saarinen, 2006). Stabler and Goodall (1996) stated “sustainable tourism should be consistent with the tenets of sustainable development” (p. 170), leading to understandings of sustainable tourism as tourism
which meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunity for the future (WTO, 2001). Similarly, Eber (1992) defined sustainable tourism as “tourism and associated infrastructures that both now and in the future operate within natural capacities for the regeneration and future productivity of natural resources; recognise the contribution that people and communities, customs and lifestyles, make to the tourism experience; accept that these people must have an equitable share in the economic benefits of local people and communities in the host areas” (p.3).

Conversely, the fundamental idea and principles of sustainable development should underpin the goals, principles and guidelines of sustainable tourism. Sustainable tourism is envisaged (1) to meet the needs of the host local communities, (2) satisfy the demands of tourists and (3) safeguard the resources for the next generation’s capacity to access the preceding two aims. (Cater, 1993; Coccossis & Nijkamp, 1995; Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Huibin et al., 2013; Hunter, 1995; Liu, 2003). The dominant perception of sustainable tourism is to achieve a balance between tourism and safeguarding the environment, meaning none of the three aspects can be allowed to dominate (Farrell, 1992).

The major approaches to sustainable tourism in heritage tourism are divided into resource-based (Hassan, 2000; Priskin, 2001; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996) and community-based approaches (Jamal & Getz, 1995; Lee, 2013; Okazaki, 2008). As Tsaur, Lin, and Lin (2006) stated, communities, tourism and resources have a symbiotic relationship, such that these two approaches are not mutually exclusive, but should support each other to be achieved. Both approaches therefore adopted in this study to define and understand ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

2.5.1 Resource Based Approach

The tourism industry has been frequently identified as promoting conflict and contradictions within cultural heritage development, and having negative impacts on cultural heritage resources (McKercher, Ho, Du Cros, & So-Ming, 2005b; Nuryanti, 1996). Therefore, sustainability in cultural heritage tourism has concerns about resources such as the degradation of cultural heritage due to tourism development.

The initial discussion of a resource-based approach in the 1970s and 1980s focused on
the notion of ‘carrying capacity’ (Saarinen, 2006). Carrying capacity is defined as “the maximum number of people who can use a site without any unacceptable alteration in the physical environment and without any unacceptable decline in the quality of the experience gained by tourists” (Saarinen, 2006, p.1125). Mass tourism was seen to be problematic for the resources, for example numbers of visitors to culturally and naturally authentic places causes negative impact on the sites (e.g., environmental problem and degradation of cultural monuments) (Butler, 1999). To minimise the negative consequences on cultural resources (e.g., world heritage sites or historical monument), a limitation on numbers of visitors to sites was argued as a measure to take to protect resources from a negative impacts (Saarinen, 2006).

Carrying capacity however, has been criticised as problematic both in theory and practice (Saarinen, 2006). For example, practically, it is rarely possible to limit the number of visitors in ICH. Although the number of tourists can be limited through price discrimination, it causes equity issues that locals, who are socially and financially marginalised groups, are restricted to access, visit and enjoy ICH (Cohen, 2002). From the theoretical perspective, carrying capacity of a resource needs to be considered from diverse dimensions such as physical, social, economic, ecological and political (Getz, 1989), and it is difficult to differentiate tourism impact from other changes such as social, political and economic changes to the resource (Saarinen, 2006). Moreover, heritage conservation, tourism and economic development have great potential to have a positive and constructive relationship (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011); thus neglecting economic and social dimensions pertaining to cultural heritage may lead to the destruction or decay of ICH.

A limited view of ‘carrying capacity’ for sustainable tourism resources, proposes the need to have a broader and more comprehensive understanding of the sustainability of cultural heritage resources. Development of sustainable tourism resources advocates considerations for not only the physical maintenance of resources, but also for their comprehensive social and cultural relevance (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). In general, sustainability is a holistic and integrated framework interpreting the economic, cultural, social and environmental dimensions together (Throsby, 2003). The neglect of the economic and social dimension of cultural heritage in many cases has led to the irreversible destruction of cultural heritage assets (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011).
Judgements of sustainability tourism resource theory are criticised as somewhat problematic due to the difficulty in reconciling views about economic value over cultural values and individual profit versus communal rights (Graham, Ashworth, & Tunbridge, 2000). Moreover, the value of ICH constitutes contemporary social and cultural values, lifestyles, knowledge and technology (Liu, 2003); thus certain traditional cultures (i.e., ICH) can be proven as valuable for any reasons by the next generation, although these are not yet apparent (Throsby, 2017).

Nevertheless, the broad, comprehensive resource based sustainable approach has gained wide acceptance not only theoretically, but also practically as a set of policies, principles, guidelines or practices in the field of the development of cultural heritage tourism resources (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). For example, Stubbs (2004) proposed a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators to appraise and develop cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource. Social and cultural values of cultural heritage include its contribution to enhancing civic pride and sense of place (e.g., identity), social inclusion (e.g., self-esteem), education and learning in locals and to the promotion of culture based leisure. Economic values of cultural heritage can be evaluated based on the financial resources available to cultural heritage development, employment created by cultural heritage tourism, demand for cultural heritage experience and economic benefits to local and regional economics. A sustainable tourism resource thus has a complex and dynamic nature, advances beyond the safeguarding and conservation of ICH, and involves and balances the consumption, transformation and creation of tourism resources (Liu, 2003) for the transmission of the economic, cultural and social values of ICH.

2.5.2 Community Based Approach: community participation and empowerment

A community-based approach has emerged as a pathway to achieve successful sustainable cultural heritage tourism (Bakar et al., 2014; Ballesteros & Ramírez, 2007; Chirikure, 2008; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006). The purpose of community participation is power redistribution and empowerment, thereby enabling equitable distribution of social and economic benefits and costs to the community (Salazar, 2012). A community based approach then argues community participation and collaboration are necessary to achieve power redistribution, empowerment and equal distribution of benefits (Okazaki, 2008).

Community participation in decision making processes is necessary to represent
community perceptions and interests, which may increase the effectiveness of planning with positive outcomes (Choi & Murray, 2010; Lankford & Howard, 1994). Moreover, given that community groups are the groups most affected by tourism development (Gunn & Var, 2002; Hall & Richards, 2002; Nuryanti, 1996; Robinson, 1999; Swanson & DeVereaux, 2017), community participation provides more opportunity for innovative and effective solutions to regional problems than standardised state solutions (Brohman, 1996).

Community participation in decision making then, arguably contributes to empowerment (Cole, 2006; Okazaki, 2008). Community empowerment is a major social sustainability indicator (Landorf, 2009; Magis, 2010). Empowerment is the capacity of individuals and/or groups to determine their own affairs such as finding solutions to their problems, making decisions, implementing actions and evaluating solutions (Cole, 2006). Empowerment should include processes leading communities to perceive themselves as able and entitled to make decisions (Rowland, 1997), about matters such as community participation and/or learning processes, and as able to understand their situation and the issues confronting them (Peterson & Reid, 2003).

Community participation then increases and enhances a community’s abilities and capacities to control their cultural property (i.e., ICH) (Dyer, Aberdeen, & Schuler, 2003) through their knowledge, values and priorities (Proctor, 1998), which facilitate community empowerment (Brohman, 1996). Connell (1997) argued community participation not only achieves more efficient and equitable distribution, but also is a process of learning and individual/community self-development.

Community participation (i.e., locals and ICH practitioners) is particularly advantageous in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Locals are important in safeguarding ICH, not only because they are the group who can safeguard ICH through their continuous social practice (Kurin, 2004a), but also because ICH cannot be transmitted in a museum as a material object; rather, it must be shared as a ‘living’ performance in a community (Georgiev & Vasileva, 2012). Local participation can be a driving force to increase a community’s ownership and awareness of a cultural resource (Hall, 1999), thus it is necessary for the transmission of ICH. More importantly, ICH practitioner participation is inevitable because the practitioners are the people who have the skills or knowledge to produce artefacts and/or perform cultural works of art (Aikawa, 2004; Arizpe, 2004; Kono, 2009; Nas,
They have the main responsibility for ICH transmission and for safeguarding its authenticity (Lenzerini, 2011) and thus should have authority to make decisions regarding ICH. Therefore, ICH practitioners’ involvement and their empowerment are necessary for ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource.

Despite the importance of community participation, many have doubted the value of community participation (Okazaki, 2008). Some researchers (Getz & Jamal, 1994) often regard community participation as ineffective because of its high transaction costs in getting the program started, then monitoring and maintaining the program. Moreover, community participation assumes that communities are enabled to be ‘actively’ and ‘genuinely’ involved in tourism related decision making (WTO, 2012), however such participation is often constrained due to a lack of education, insufficient financial assistance and/or confliction of stakeholder interests (Addison, 1996). Communities need adequate resources and skills to have capacity to take part in decision making, but the power to obtain resources and skills is often held by governments, which discourages community participation (Gray, 1985).

Collaboration processes may, then, contribute to maximising community participation and benefit distribution (Okazaki, 2008). Collaboration processes enable stakeholders to perceive common problems and create widely accepted, harmonious and effective solutions for all (Okazaki, 2008). Importantly, collaboration enables the resolution of tensions among the stakeholders and allows them to be involved in decision making processes (Jamal & Getz, 1995).

The collaboration process is particularly necessary in cultural heritage tourism development because cultural heritage tourism involves multiple stakeholders (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002) such as local communities living at heritage sites, public or private organisations responsible for conservation of cultural heritage and tourists visiting and enjoying cultural heritage (Aas et al., 2005). Stakeholders exist with different degrees of connectivity to the resources, different levels of legitimacy in being considered as stakeholders, different perspectives about how the resources should be managed and with different levels of power to control cultural heritage (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). For example, while ICH practitioners have the main responsibility for the safeguarding and the transmission of ICH, they have less political power and opportunities to represent and reflect their interests pertaining to ICH development. By contrast, public organisations may have less connectivity
to ICH than ICH practitioners do, but they have stronger political power to reflect public organisations’ interests in ICH development (Du Cros, Bauer, Lo, & Rui, 2005).

2.5.3 Summary of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Tourism

To summarise, ICH as a sustainable tourism resource should facilitate and transmit its economic, social and cultural values. The economic values of ICH can be evaluated through the employment created by ICH tourism, through the financial resources for ICH development and through the distribution of the benefits of having tourists, to local and regional economic development. Social and cultural values of ICH can be evaluated by enhancement of cultural identity, the promotion of education and learning of ICH in the community and the promotion of ICH based leisure programs. Moreover, community participation and empowerment are mandatory to facilitate ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

2.6 Gaps in the Literature

ICH, which is characterised by strong cultural authenticity and identity, has become a useful resource in the increasingly competitive environment of heritage tourism. ICH continues to provide tourists with unique cultural experiences at the destination. Importantly, the associated tourism development emanating from visitor demand for ICH, has been used to not only safeguard ICH but also to stimulate local communities’ pride and self-identity. Thus, ICH should be safeguarded for the sake of local community culture and tradition and recognised as a tool for the continued facilitation of sustainable development through heritage tourism. Accordingly, a sustainable approach to the utilisation of ICH for tourism purposes is needed. Surprisingly however, there has been little previous research undertaken to investigate ICH in sustainable tourism. More specifically, to date, no research has been undertaken to examine the role of public organisations in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, the effectiveness of policies and/or plans, the opportunities and challenges which impact on and/or shape ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, and importantly, no research has been undertaken to examine appropriate and effective models facilitating the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which the development of ICH facilitates the development of a sustainable tourism resource.

The three specific objectives of the study are;
1. To situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage
2. To identify and critically analyse public organisations’ documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource
3. To develop a framework to facilitate intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource

Figure 2.1 below describes the research framework, which guided this study. This study, through the review of existing literature, situates sustainable development literature within the context of ICH. Sustainable tourism resource in heritage tourism is underpinned by resource-based approaches (Hassan, 2000; Priskin, 2001; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996) and community-based approaches (Jamal & Getz, 1995; Lee, 2013; Okazaki, 2008), and aims to provide economic, social and cultural benefits to communities which should be able to be accessed by the next generations (Liu, 2003; Salazar, 2012).

Four different development paradigms have direct/indirect and positive/negative impacts on the capacity of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource (to varying degrees). On the one hand, three different development theories (modernised theory, dependency theory and economic neoliberalism) display a lack of cultural considerations in the development process (Sharpley, 2000; Telfer, 2002), so thus fail to identify cultural, social and economic value of ICH and facilitate the extinction of some ICH.

On the other hand, an alternative development paradigm such as sustainable development finds cultural and social values of cultural heritage (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Landorf, 2009; Throsby, 2014) so thus supports ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. This study has explored the development status of ICH and the extent to which the development of ICH facilitates the development of sustainable tourism resource.

To achieve this, the study identified and critically analysed public organisations documents to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource (Objective 2). Consequently, this study then explored the perspectives of practitioners, locals and tourists, to identify their perspectives toward
development of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, and to develop the framework facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource (Objective 3).
Objective 1. To situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage

Objective 2. To identify and critically analyse public documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource

Objective 3. To develop a framework to facilitate intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource

Research gap 1. A lack of literature exploring ICH within the context of sustainability

Research gap 2. A lack of investigation into public organisations’ role and the effectiveness of policies

Research gap 3. A lack of investigation into ICH practitioners’ and locals’ perspectives on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource

Research gap 4. A lack of a development framework integrating both supply and visitor perspectives
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3. RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology and specific methods used to address the key aim of this study: To investigate the extent to which the development of intangible cultural heritage facilitates the development of a sustainable tourism resource. To address this aim, a qualitative dominant mixed methods approach underpinned by social constructivism was employed. The research design is based on a single case study in Korea, which is presented in this chapter, along with the data collection process and data analysis (e.g., document analysis, semi structured face to face interviews and questionnaire surveys). This chapter finishes with a discussion of ethical issues and the limitations of the study.

3.2 Research Paradigm: Constructivism

The research paradigm underpinning the set of beliefs and philosophical framework of this research (Kuhn, 1970) is constructivism, which is one of four major paradigms (i.e., positivism, post positivism, critical theory and constructivism) (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Adopting a constructivist approach has been deemed most appropriate for this research as positivism for instance, contends that there exists a reality that is being studied and understood (i.e., realism), and human behaviour only has cause and effect relationships, with time- and context free generalisation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Arguably, ICH cannot be fully understood within a positivist paradigm because ICH is steeped in national culture, history, identity, spirit and value, so that it can be neither simply understood as a cause and effect nor time - and context free.

Post positivism argues that a reality can never be fully comprehended, therefore there is a need for as much critical examination as possible, to facilitate some understanding of reality (i.e. critical realism) (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Moreover, post positivism places importance on objective relationships between a researcher and research objects. Arguably, a post positivist approach is not suitable for this study because the researcher identifies as Korean and the researcher’s perspectives influence the process of understanding the phenomenon (e.g. sustainability of ICH), and collecting and analysing data rather than maintaining objectivity.

Critical theory contends that a reality can be comprehended and as an accumulation of
social, political and economic factors, is therefore immutable (i.e. historical realism) (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Although the critical theory approach underpins some features of ICH, such as accumulation of cultural and social factors, the understandings, values and forms of ICH change as the political, cultural and social environment change; therefore, they are not immutable (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002).

Constructivism argues the existence of multiple realities which are socially and experientially constructed by individual persons or groups engaging in the society (i.e. relativism) (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). In other words, understanding of ICH is influenced by culture and the collective knowledge of each individual/group in the culture. Moreover, a constructivist approach places value on the interpretation of culturally and historically situated social phenomena (Crotty, 1998). This approach reflects the feature of ICH and heritage tourism, given that heritage tourism is a social phenomenon promoting socio-cultural assets (Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2003). Therefore, constructivism is best to underpin and guide this study.

3.3 Methodology

3.3.1 Social Constructivism: Ontology and Epistemology

Ontology refers to the nature of reality and constructivism assumes that multiple realities exist and these realities are socially and experientially constructed by individuals/groups (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Multiple realities are a result of conceptualisations by groups sharing culture, language, identity and spirit (Della Porta & Keating, 2008). For example, the concept of the authenticity of ICH and the opportunities and challenges associated with sustainability of ICH, can be different across various groups (e.g., ICH practitioners, locals and tourists) and between individuals, even if they are in the same stakeholder group (McKercher, Ho, & Du Cros, 2005a; Richards & Munsters, 2010).

Epistemology refers to the relationship between a researcher and the objectives of the research; and constructivism assumes that they are interactively linked so that the findings are created during the process of research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This allows a researcher to deeply communicate with respondents and interpret the collected data, so that it is possible to identify underlying meanings which may exist (Mertens, 2014). For example, the researcher of
this study is Korean and the object of this study is Korean ICH, thus the researcher has privilege in the analyses of social, material and spiritual conditions underpinning Korean ICH and its management, as well as in the process of data collection, analysis and interpretation. This assists the researcher in being interactively involved in the process of data collection, analysis and interpreting data.

3.3.2 A Qualitative Mixed Method

Methodological questions refer to how a researcher finds out what he/she believes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and the answer is constrained by the researcher’s ontological and epistemological position. For example, constructivism argues multiple realities are constructed by multiple groups and individuals; thus, a qualitative approach (e.g., semi-structured interviews) is recommended by constructivists for in-depth investigation of each individual/group reality and for creating rich data. In contrast, positivism contends a context and value free single reality; thus, a quantitative approach is suggested by positivists to rely on statistics and numerical data and test a single reality (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

Constructivism, however, is not limited to only using qualitative approaches. Quantitative approaches can be employed to support qualitative data with the goal of more effectively exploring the phenomena and generating more comprehensive results (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). Thus this research has also employed quantitative methods (questionnaire) to collect data (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007).

The qualitative dominant mixed method approach refers to a research approach which relies on the research process being underpinned by qualitative and constructivist views, with the addition of quantitative data bringing benefits to the research (Johnson et al., 2007). This study, under the qualitative dominant approach, placed value on the interactions between the researcher and the data (Creswell, 2013). For example, the researcher had personal interactions with the interview respondents, as well as personal interactions with questionnaire survey respondents during the collection of on-site paper-based surveys. Moreover, this study also utilised quantitative approaches in the analysis of qualitative data (e.g., content analysis) and in the data collection and analysis of quantitative data (e.g. questionnaire surveys). The findings from both the qualitative and quantitative approaches were integrated into the discussion of
Employing a qualitative dominant mixed method resulted in two major benefits for the study: triangulation of results and the facilitation of data collection. Triangulation refers to seeking convergence and corroboration of results from multiple methods and approaches when studying a phenomenon and contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon (Tracy, 2013). Denzin (1978) identified four types of triangulation: data triangulation (i.e. the use of multiple sources), investigator triangulation (i.e. the use of different researchers), theory triangulation (i.e. the use of multiple theories to interpret phenomenon) and methodological triangulation (i.e. the use of multiple methods such as mixed method). The qualitative dominant mixed method used in this study enabled the use of data triangulation and methodological triangulation, which produced rich and multiple data contexts with which to explore the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource (Jick, 1979). Moreover, for data collection, visitors mostly prefer questionnaire surveys, as completing guided questionnaires takes less time than conducting interviews for them (Kajala, 2007). Therefore, the use of a quantitative approach (e.g. questionnaire surveys) facilitated the data collection from visitors.

3.4 Research design: Case study

This study selected a case study strategy as the most appropriate to address the research aim: to investigate the extent to which the development of intangible cultural heritage facilitates the development of sustainable tourism resource. The ‘strategies’ link the researcher’s paradigm with the empirical world by adopting associated methods of collecting and analysing data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

The major qualitative strategies include narratives, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Narrative strategy focuses on individual life, story, experiences, and chronology (Creswell, 2013), rather than on a social phenomenon like development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource; thus the narrative strategy was deemed not suitable for this study. The phenomenology strategy aims to explore a single concept or phenomenon, particularly in psychology (e.g. grief) and human science (e.g. caring relationship) and investigates a group of individuals who have experienced the phenomenon.
Development of ICH and sustainable tourism resources however, are not a single concept. Rather, they are complex notions defined by different industries and communities. Therefore, phenomenology was deemed not suitable for this study.

Ethnography aims to describe patterns of how culture (e.g., language) impacts the social behaviours (e.g., ideas and belief) of a group (Creswell, 2013). This study, however, explores stakeholders’ different perspectives on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, rather than identifies cultural impacts. Grounded theory is suitable when a theory is not available to explain or assist in the understanding of a process (Creswell, 2013); however, this study adopts the ‘sustainability’ framework to examine and understand ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Therefore, both ethnography and grounded theory were also found not suitable for the case study strategy. The following section discusses the research design for this study, which utilises a case study with South Korea as a single representative study.

3.4.1 Case study

Case study uses an empirical and particular person, group or situation to investigate a contemporary phenomenon (Yin, 2013). According to Yin (2013), case study is appropriate under four conditions: when a research question focuses on explaining ‘how’ or ‘why’ questions; when a researcher has little control over the phenomenon; when a research purpose is to explore in-depth descriptions of a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context; and when multiple sources of evidence can be used.

A case study approach is suitable in this study given that the following research questions of the study are mainly ‘how’ questions:

- ‘how’ development of ICH facilitates ICH as a sustainable tourism resource
- ‘how’ and ‘how much’ public organisation facilitates development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource
- ‘how’ diverse stakeholders perceive development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Moreover, ICH as a sustainable tourism resource is a contemporary phenomenon as it is a
form of living heritage which contemporary generations have inherited (Alivizatou, 2012; Lenzerini, 2011). ICH embodies political, cultural and historical value which the researcher cannot control. The research purpose is to investigate the extent to which the development of ICH facilitates the development of a sustainable tourism resource, which is an example of real life context, suggested by Ying (2013). Moreover, multiple sources of evidence about development of intangible cultural heritage are available (i.e. public organisations’ documents, local communities and/or practitioners’ participation) to explore ICH development. Accordingly, this study adopts case study as the best approach to explore development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

A case study approach was useful in the exploratory stage of the investigation as it enabled the researcher to obtain a conceptual insight into events through interpretation and combining theory with the events (Beeton, 2005; Flyvberg, 2011). While substantial studies have investigated other types of cultural heritage from a sustainable development ideology (e.g. historical buildings or world heritage sites) (Aas et al., 2005; Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Landorf, 2009; Moscardo, 1996), research interest in ICH has only emerged since the mid-2000s (Arizpe, 2004; McKercher & Du Cros, 2002; Munjeri, 2004). Thus, a case study is a highly suitable approach as it facilitates a more nuanced understanding of the under-researched phenomenon of ICH.

3.4.2 Single embedded case study

From the four types of case study approaches (single-holistic, single-embedded, multiple-holistic and multiple-embedded, see Figure 3.1), the single-embedded case study was adopted for this study with Korea as the representative single case. Yin (2009) maintained that a single case allows a researcher to explore comprehensive, in-depth information about the social world. Moreover, given the extreme labour, time and cost intensive characteristics of a case study, a single-case multiple embedded design was deemed appropriate.
The single-case embedded design is applied when the case involves more than one unit of analysis, compared to the single-case holistic design which is applied when the research investigates a single unit within the context (e.g. development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource) (Yin, 2009). Compared to a single-holistic case study, a single embedded case study provides more detailed information, as multiple perspectives are analysed in one single case (Yin, 2009). This study investigates the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource from four perspectives: public organisations, locals, ICH practitioners and visitors at National Intangible Heritage Centre (NIHC) (see Figure 3.2).
3.4.3 Korea as a representative case

Korea has been chosen as the representative case for this study for several reasons. First, following China and Japan, Korea has the third highest number of intangible cultural heritage elements registered in the UNESCO registered list of intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2014). Second, because of the efforts of Korea in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage at the national and international level, a UNESCO accredited NGO for safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of the Asia-Pacific Region, ICHCAP, was established in Korea, which fact supports its validity as a representative case. Third, Korea has a reputation for implementing a structured intangible cultural heritage safeguarding system (Yim, 2004). For example, Korea protects ICH under the *Intangible Heritage Safeguarding Act*, which was introduced in 2016. ICH is conveyed and transmitted by human activities, thus it requires a differentiated Act from historical buildings or World Heritage Sites, which more concern tangible resources and materials. Moreover, under the Act, the Cultural Heritage Administration is responsible for designating intangible cultural heritage elements, as well as individuals or groups who practise and contribute to the maintenance of the ICH. Such a person is referred to as a *Living Human Treasure* (Yim, 2004) and there were 170 recognised *Living Human Treasures* up to 2017. Last, Korea was selected as the case study for pragmatic reasons related to data collection. As the researcher is Korean, it minimised potential problems pertaining to language and cultural barriers, misunderstandings and/or mis-interpretation during public documents collection, interviews and data analysis.

The four embedded units of the case study are Korean public organisations, ICH practitioners, the local community in two suburbs and visitors to the National Intangible Heritage Centre. They are the major stakeholders who are linked, to varying degrees, with ICH in Korea (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002) and thus impact on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Therefore, in addition to exploring the range of peer-reviewed literature pertaining to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, the investigation of four embedded units (public organisations, practitioners, the local community and visitors to the National Intangible Heritage Centre) provided detailed and useful data pertaining to the contemporary phenomenon of development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.
3.5 Data Collection: A Multi-method

Multiple data resources were employed to generate rich data with which to explore the sustainability of ICH as a tourism resource. Data resources included document analysis, semi-structured face to face interviews and questionnaire surveys. Table 3.1 presents the summary of the multiple methods and research samples and their applicability to the objectives of this study. Each data collection and analysis process is described in the following sections in detail.

Table 3.1 Research objectives and methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
<th>Research Method</th>
<th>Research Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage</td>
<td>Narratives literature review</td>
<td>Published articles associated with sustainability, heritage tourism and cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To identify and critically analyse public organisations’ documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitated the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource</td>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>Documents produced by the major Korean organisations managing intangible cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To develop a framework to facilitate ICH as a sustainable tourism resource</td>
<td>Semi-structured face to face interviews</td>
<td>- Intangible cultural heritage practitioners - Locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire surveys</td>
<td>- Visitors to the National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Stage 1: Public Organisation Document Analysis

Document analysis refers to the interpretation of printed and/or electronic material to elicit meaning and understanding of a phenomenon (Bowen, 2009; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Document analysis is a valid method in a case study as documents provide rich descriptions of the case (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). Some documents provide background information with historical insights that enable the researcher to understand the historical background of the case and any relationships with the phenomenon (Bowen, 2009). This study employed the following two steps to identify appropriate documents:
Step 1: Selecting organisations

A purposive sampling strategy, also referred as judgemental sampling (Cavana, Delahaye, & Sekaran, 2001), facilitated the selection of six public organisations as the sample organisations for this study. Purposive sampling involves the consideration of the researcher in selecting representatives or typical samples (Briggs & Coleman, 2007), and selecting subjects based on the samples’ expertise in the phenomenon (Cavana et al., 2001). That is, the sample organisations were consciously selected based on their expertise and experience including their responsibilities for ICH management, concerns about sustainability of ICH and utilisation of ICH to attract tourists in Korea. The six selected organisations were: Cultural Heritage Association, Cultural Heritage Foundation, National Intangible Heritage Centre, Korea Tourism Organisations, Ministry of Culture Sport and Tourism, and Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation. In addition to the documents published by the selected sample organisations, the Intangible Heritage Safeguarding Act was analysed. Even though the statute was developed in 2016, ICH has been managed and/or developed under the Cultural Heritage Protection Act for the past forty years, thus the statute was expected to provide insightful perspectives about the Korean government. Details pertaining to the six selected public organisations are as follows:

**Cultural Heritage Association**

The Cultural Heritage Administration is a South Korean government organisation charged with preserving and promoting Korean cultural heritage. Cultural Heritage Administration was established in 1961 to safeguard Korean traditional cultures and enhance the cultural life of Korean people by preserving and promoting the use of cultural heritage (Cultural Heritage Association, 2018). Cultural Heritage Administration’s three major objectives are: (1) To establish a solid foundation of cultural heritage management through policy development and research; (2) To preserve and safeguard cultural heritage to enhance the social, historical and economic value of cultural heritage; and (3) To promote the use of cultural heritage to disseminate the value of cultural heritage.

Cultural Heritage Administration is directly and comprehensively involved in ICH development. For example, Cultural Heritage Administration has nominated national
ICH, and Cultural Heritage Administration directly manages the nationally nominated ICH and master ICH practitioners as well as supports local government in managing the regionally designated ICH and practitioners in regional area. Moreover, Cultural Heritage Administration is in charge of submitting Korean intangible cultural heritage considerations to UNESCO for their registration on the UNESCO list. Cultural Heritage Administration has also established and run the Korean National University of Cultural Heritage for research purposes.

**Cultural Heritage Foundation**

The Cultural Heritage Foundation is a South Korean public organisation under the control of Cultural heritage Administration. Cultural Heritage Foundation was established in 1980 to promote the use of traditional cultures for the Korean people. The five major objectives are: (1) To support transmission of cultural heritage; (2) To safeguard cultural value pertaining to cultural heritage; (3) To establish a sustainable management framework for cultural heritage; (4) To enhance cultural heritage exchange at the international level; and (5) To promote the use of cultural heritage.

Cultural Heritage Foundation is involved in ICH development, particularly in the promotion of ICH. For example, Cultural Heritage Foundation established ‘Korea House’ where national and international visitors can enjoy Korean traditional cuisine and traditional wedding ceremonies. Cultural Heritage Foundation organises various ICH related events such as traditional crafts exhibitions and traditional dance performance. In addition, Cultural Heritage Foundation conducts cultural property surveys such as archaeological investigation and/or academic reports. Moreover, CHF is the UNESCO-accredited NGO for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage since June, 2010, as a result of their effort in ICH management.

**National Intangible Heritage Centre**

The National Intangible Heritage Centre is a Korean national administrative organisation for Korean ICH management. National Intangible Heritage Centre was established in 2013 for the purpose of safeguarding inheritances, exchanges and revitalisation of ICH. National Intangible Heritage Centre consists of various facilities such as permanent/special exhibition galleries, performance halls, international conference rooms and learning spaces, to promote the value and the use of ICH for the
Korean nations and international visitors.

National Intangible Heritage Centre is comprehensively and actively involved in ICH development. For successful ICH transmission, National Intangible Heritage Centre protects successors’ intellectual property rights, develops educational programs, monitors public events about intangible cultural heritage, plans and evaluates transmission programs. National Intangible Heritage Centre also hosts permanent/special purpose exhibitions and develops brands to represent Korean traditional performances. Moreover, National Intangible Heritage Centre collects and manages materials used for intangible cultural heritage performance/crafts (e.g. clothes or tools used for traditional performances), creates digital ICH archive (e.g. video archiving for traditional performances), and popularises research projects (e.g. academic journals, books and newsletters). National Intangible Heritage Centre establishes systemised ICH educational programs such as regular training courses for ICH education, and supports building regional networks to enhance and promote regional ICH.

Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism

The Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism develops policies about culture, arts, sport, tourism, religion and media. The Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism was established in 1990 for the purpose of developing Korea as a culturally inspiring nation. The Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism is involved in ICH management through listening to civil opinion about ICH designation such as recommendations for ICH elements or complaints about ICH designation/management. The Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism has promoted ICH relevant event hosted by other public organisations such as National Intangible Heritage Centre and/or Cultural Heritage Foundation, as well as, reports and informs the Korean public the updated or created ICH relevant policies.

Korea Tourism Organisation

The Korean Tourism Organisation is a Korean public organisation under the Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism. Korean Tourism Organisation was established in 1962 and is responsible for the Korean tourism industry development. The Korean Tourism Organisation’s major mission is the economic growth of the nation and quality life of
the people with tourism development.

The Korean Tourism Organisation is involved in ICH development from the perspective of tourism industry, such as attracting international and domestic tourists to enjoy ICH. For example, the Korean Tourism Organisation creates and develops ICH as a tourism resource, creates a package including enjoying ICH, investigates international visitors’ attitudes to cultural heritage, and explores international cultural heritage trends such as other nations’ status of ICH registration status on the UNESCO list.

**Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation**

The Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation is a Korean public organisation established under the approval of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism. The Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation was established in 2007 to promote traditional art and expand opportunities to enjoy traditions. The three major aims of the Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation are: (1) To promote and popularise traditional performing arts (e.g. traditional dance and ritual ceremony); (2) To nurture the younger generation of practitioners; and (3) To promote international exchanges to disseminate the cultural value of Korean traditional arts.

The Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation is involved in ICH development through reproducing and/or safeguarding traditional arts at the risk of extinguishing or losing authenticity, hosting various traditional performances at each royal palace, developing an information exchange network for university students’ major in traditional arts; and creating and promoting a brand representing Korean traditional art.

These public organisations, which mainly manage Korean ICH, are expected to provide expert data through their accumulated experiences and knowledge about ICH. Each public organisation is involved with the management of ICH to a varying degree, as described in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2 The selected Korean public organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Vision/Purpose</th>
<th>Safeguarding, preservation, transmission</th>
<th>Promotion (Education/Tourists)</th>
<th>Support international cultural exchange</th>
<th>Number of documents (policies and strategies) obtained for this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Administration</td>
<td>To contribute to national culture development by safeguarding cultural heritage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Foundation</td>
<td>To create future values of cultural heritage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
<td>To enhance cultural identity, cultural diversity and societal right to enjoy culture through creative transmission and dissemination of value of ICH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Tourism Organisation</td>
<td>To improve the national economy and quality of life through tourism development</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism</td>
<td>To revitalise the economy and develop the future of Korea through culture</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation</td>
<td>To promote, develop and encourage ICH to be used as a part of daily life.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Intangible Heritage Act</td>
<td>To enhance societal right to enjoy culture through safeguarding, transmitting and promoting ICH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2: Selecting Documents

Firstly, all the documents discussing ICH were reviewed to identify documents which contained at least one section covering the utilisation and/or promotion of ICH, such as exhibitions, festivals, educational programs and media for domestic and/or international tourists. A total of 131 documents containing some or all of these elements was selected for analysis. The types of documents selected included bulletins (n= 101), annual strategic plans (n=19), business strategic plans (n=8) and the Act/Regulations (n=3) (see Appendix A). An exploration of the *Intangible Heritage Protection Act* provides rich information about how the Korean government has organised intangible cultural heritage. Bulletins mostly announce any opportunities where domestic and international tourists can participate, while annual strategic plans and business strategic plans report on the organisation’s goals, and performance. The *National Intangible Heritage Centre*, which is mainly responsible for ICH management, opened in 2013 and this has resulted in the increased number of documents since 2013, as shown in Figure 3.3. All the documents were accessible through organisation websites, which means the public is part of the target audience group. Additionally, the comparison of sequential and annually updated documents will allow the researcher to track policy changes and trace the development process in the management of intangible cultural heritage.

![Figure 3.3 Document samples](image-url)
3.7 Stage 2: Semi-structured Interviews with ICH Practitioners and Locals

Semi-structured face to face interviews were conducted and they brought several advantages to this study. A semi-structured interview requires a set of questions (Appendix B) to ask interview participants, which guide the researcher and the interview participants to focus on the issue explored (Patton, 2015). Importantly, compared to structured interviews which ask the same questions in the same order of all the interview participants, semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to ask further questions and/or change the order of questions if necessary, as this may/can provide fuller data (Patton, 2015).

A total of 47 interviews were conducted: 25 interviews with ICH master practitioners and 22 interviews with local communities. The respondents were invited to read Korean version of a study information sheet with consent form (Appendix C) and provide their signature for consent to participate in the study before starting their interview. All the interviews were digitally recorded and the researcher wrote memos of her reflections and/or comments during the interview and any potential new lines of questioning to help in interpreting data during data analysis (Jennings, 2010).

The recorded data were translated and transcribed from Korean to English by the researcher. As two ICH practitioners did not give consent to having a digital recording made of their interviews, 45 interview transcripts were developed from the interview recordings. For the two ICH practitioners, the researcher took extensive notes during and directly after the interviews and the transcripts were developed based on the notes.

3.7.1 The Interview Guide

A semi structured interview requires a set of interviews. Guided by the literature review of this study, major themes underpinning the interview questions guide were as follows:

To ICH practitioners:
1. Challenges of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, from the social, economic and cultural aspects (Baillie et al., 2010; Halewood & Hannam, 2001; Taylor, 2001)
2. Strategies facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource (Baillie et al., 2010; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Holtorf, 2007)

To local communities:
1. ICH awareness and understanding (Breathnach, 2006; Palmer, 2005)
2. Challenges of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource-social, economic and cultural aspects
3. Strategies facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource (Aas et al., 2005; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Du Cros et al., 2005)

The questions were prepared based on the relevant literature, documents and previous interviews. The interviews with the ICH practitioners started by the interviewer asking the respondents for brief information about the ICH they practise and how they became practitioners (Zhu, 2012). The interviews with local community members started by the interviewer asking them about their awareness of ICH (e.g. have you heard about ICH in this region?). The main body of all the interviews was structured to collect data related to perceptions of promoting and safeguarding ICH, and management of ICH. Respondents were asked to further explain and provide justification for their responses if necessary. This helped the researcher to more precisely interpret the respondents’ perspectives, with a view to facilitating the validity of this study.

3.7.2 Interview Data Collection; ICH Master Practitioners

The 25 interviews with ICH master practitioners took place between June 2016 and July 2016. From various regions in Korea, 25 practitioners participated. Five participants provided brief and summarised responses; thus, the interviews took approximately 30 minutes, and all the remaining 20 participated in in-depth interviews ranging between 30-90 minutes in duration. Data collection followed three key steps:

Step 1: Selecting respondents

Purposive sampling is a process in which a researcher selects potential respondents based on their expertise in the phenomenon (Cavana et al., 2001). This study used purposive sampling to select potential ICH practitioner interview participants. Intangible cultural heritage practitioners are the people “… within or across communities who have distinct skills, knowledge, experience or other characteristics, and thus perform specific roles in the present and future practice, re-creation and/or transmission of their intangible cultural heritage as, for example, cultural custodians, practitioners and, where appropriate, apprentices” (Asia/pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO [ACCU], 2006, p, 9). In Korea, the practitioner training system for the transmission of ICH elements is offered at four levels, Beginners, Advanced, Assistant Instructors and Living Human Treasures (master ICH practitioners).
Beginners: the initial trainees. The best beginners are selected by the Cultural Heritage Administration (based on the recommendations from Living Human Treasures) and are selected for the Korean government scholarship.

Advanced: ‘Beginners’ who passed beginner level. ‘Beginners’ are examined by the Living Human Treasures for their level of functional or artistic skills and only the beginners who pass the examination will be ‘Advanced’.

Assistant instructors: these are the ‘Advanced’ students who have outstanding ability and can assist the Living Human Treasure through training beginners and other advanced students. Assistant instructors receive a fixed stipend (around AUD$600) from the government (Yim, 2004).

Living Human Treasure(s): the designated practitioner(s) or groups who have best contributed to safeguarding ICH according to the Cultural Heritage Administration. Living Human Treasures receive a fixed stipend (around AUD$1500) from the government.

The Korean government (i.e. Cultural Heritage Administration) has designated 138 national ICH elements, a total of 6171 ‘Advanced’ practitioners, a total of 286 ‘Assistant instructors’ and a total of 170 Living Human Treasures, up to 2017, as described in Figure 3.4. Guided by purposive sampling, this study divided ICH practitioners into Assistant instructors and Living Human Treasures, as they are regarded as practising ICH with higher functional and artistic skills than other levels of practitioners.
Step 2: Gaining access to respondents

The researcher developed a sampling frame which is a list of all known categories of the population (i.e. ICH practitioners) (Finn et al., 2000). The sampling frame of this study was completed through online accessing of the ICH practitioners list, managed by the Korean Cultural Heritage Administration. The sampling frame has an ICH element, any associated organisation managing each ICH, the organisation’s contact details such as phone number or email address, and the name of ICH master practitioners. The researcher sent each potential interview participant an invitation email that included the information sheet and consent form (Appendix D). If there was a reply, further contacts with the respondents (e.g., for schedule interviews) were through email. In most cases, however, the replies were delayed or were not given, thus they were contacted via a phone call to inform them of the research project and to personally invite them to participate in an interview. Most of the interviews were organised through email and/or phone calls before the researcher arrived in Korea. Due to the limited amount of time allocated for data collection in Korea (one month), the researcher undertook 2-3 interviews per day. Two interview respondents (4th and 5th) were the regional designated practitioners in Busan in Korea. While they were not national designated practitioners, they were managed by a regional ICH association.

Figure 3.4 The number of practitioners for the last three levels

- Living Human Treasure: 170
- Assistant instructor: 286
- Advanced: 6171

**Legend:**
- ■ the number of practitioners
Step3: Conducting interviews

All the respondents in Appendix E participated in face-to-face interviews. A face-to-face in-depth interview is less convenient than a telephone interview as face-to-face interview takes more time and resources (Shank, 2006). Nevertheless, face-to-face interviews were considered best for collecting data in this study because both verbal and non-verbal languages, such as gestures and facial expressions, assist the researcher in obtaining the maximum amount of information from the respondents (Shank, 2006).

3.7.3 Interview Data Collection: Locals

A total of 22 interviews with local communities took place between June and July 2016. From two suburbs in Korea, 22 practitioners participated. Two interviews took around 15 minutes, 16 interviews around 20-30 minutes, and four interviews took around 40 minutes. The longer interviews tended to have fuller descriptions of the respondents’ opinions, and the shorter interviews tended to provide brief summary of the respondents’ opinion. Data collection followed four key steps:

Step 1: Selecting regions

Purposive sampling is the deliberate choice of samples based on the qualities the sample possesses (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). Through purposive sampling, this study selected the Dongnae and Suyeong districts in Busan city in Korea for local community interviews because they are the suburbs where one of the most intangible of the heritage practices was generated and managed by a regional government. Figure 3.5 shows the Busan regional map, including the Dongnae and Suyeong districts.

Dongnae

Dongnae comprises 13 small towns with a collective population of 31,000 people and is one of the oldest suburbs in Korea. Dongnae was named when the area was first identified in A.C. 757. Although there have been changes in the size of area, the name has been used until today. It has a rich history with various types of cultural heritage. For example,
there are two national designated ICH, such as *Dongnae Yaryu* (No.18 Korean national ICH, traditional dance) and *Daegeumsanjo* (No.45 Korean national ICH, traditional musical instrument). Moreover, there are a total of 8 regional government designated ICH elements, such as traditional dance, musical instrument and ritual events, two national designated historical sites, and a total of 30 state designated historical sites. This suburb promotes cultural heritage to attract tourists by creating regional annual festivals, and uses Social Networking Service to interact with potential heritage tourists.

**Suyeong**

*Suyeong* consists of 10 small towns with a population of 179,324 people. It became one suburb in 1995 and has established its own district office. *Suyeong* was affiliated with the *Dongnae* suburb until 1975, and with the *Namgu* suburb until 1995. Although it is not long since it became one standard suburb, the region has a long history and is rich in cultural heritage. For example, there are 7 historical sites and one ICH designated by regional government, as well as two ICH designated by the national government. In particular, there is an association which is mainly responsible for safeguarding and promoting four ICH in the region, named the ‘*Suyeong Folklore Protection Association*’. The four ICH elements are *Suyeong Yaryu* (No.43 Korean national ICH, traditional dance and performance), *Suyeong fishing playing* (No.62 Korean national ICH, restructuring oral practice), *Suyeong nongcheong nori* (No.2 Busan regional ICH ritual event) and *Jishin balbki* (ritual event).
Step 2: Selecting respondents

This study defined locals with geographical (Johnson, 2000) and social perspectives (Ballesteros & Ramirez, 2007). In the tourism industry, geographical terms of community are most generally used for defining local communities (Aas et al., 2005) and refer to a group people who reside close to archaeological and cultural resources (Johnson, 2000). From a social perspective, the community can be understood as a group of people sharing a common experience and the social values, and is considered as a reference point for creating an identity (Ballesteros & Ramírez, 2007). These social and geographical definitions of community are strongly associated, (Gupta, 1992) as strong collective identity is linked to space (Augé, 1992). Therefore, the local community in this study is a group of people whose sense of cultural identity comes from residing for over 15 years in Dongnae or Suyeoung.
Step 3: Gaining access to respondents

Adopting a random sampling approach means that all people in the research population (i.e. local communities in this research) have an equal opportunity to be selected to participate in the research (Etikan et al., 2016). The researcher accessed potential respondents through randomly asking potential respondents to participate in the study at various locations in the two suburbs (i.e. Dongnae and Suyeoung) (Tracy, 2013). For instance, the researcher visited traditional markets and public parks in each of Dongnae and Suyeong. The researcher approached potential participants in a friendly manner and introduced herself and provided a brief summary of the research project before inviting them to participate. The researcher accessed over 30 potential participants and among them, 22 locals participated in the interviews. When any potential respondent showed interest in research participation, the researcher asked the participant to complete the consent form before starting interviews.

Step 4: Conducting interviews

All the interviews were conducted face-to-face on the spot (e.g., the shops in the traditional markets and the public parks). This allowed the researcher to develop a closer relationship with respondents and this allowed respondents to participate in the interviews more comfortably. There were three couples among the interviewees, but they were recognised as six individuals (i.e. three males and three females) because they showed different perspectives for certain questions. Refer to Appendix F for the list of local community respondents.

3.7.4 Sampling Size for Semi-structured Face to Face Interviews

In terms of the sample size for a qualitative approach, it is often much smaller than that for quantitative research because deep and rich understandings of a single data item is deemed valuable (Sandelowski, 1995). Further, conducting in-depth interviews using a large sample size would be prohibitive in terms of time and resources (Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003) and importantly, conducting in-depth interviews with a small sample permits repeated contact with respondents (Dreher, 1994).

The suggested sample size for interviews is varied in the literature (Creswell, 2013).
For example, a narrative approach requires one or two individuals/respondents, and grounded theory requires 20 to 30 interview respondents (Creswell, 2013). Across the literature, it is generally argued that 20-30 is the most common size for interview respondents (Mason, 2010).

In purposive sampling, the concept of saturation influences decisions on proper sample size, which occurs when new data does not provide new findings on an issue (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) suggested 12 as the minimum number for data saturation in purposive sampling and Green and Thorogood (2009) suggested 20 as a proper sample size for data saturation. Saturation regarding development of ICH as a tourism resource was reached by the 25th and 22nd respondents among ICH practitioners and local communities respectively, at which point no further interviews were conducted.

3.8 Stage 3: Questionnaire Surveys with Visitors at the National Intangible Heritage Centre

3.8.1 Pilot Test

A pilot study was conducted with 30 participants, which is an appropriate number as it is around 10% of the final study size (Lackey & Wingate, 1997). A pilot study is the pretesting of a questionnaire with a small number of participants to test question trimming procedures or to test the ease with which the meaning of an item is conveyed (Van Teijlingen, Rennie, Hundley, & Graham, 2001). An onsite pilot questionnaire was conducted with the researcher’s neighbours in Korea. The participants were assured of their anonymity and response confidentiality. Moreover, since the questions were translated from English to Korean, the understandings of respondents were explored as well. The results of pilot tests showed the need for certain questions to be clearer and easier to understand. Therefore, several questions were updated and revised for clarity.

3.8.2 Population and Samples

This study intended to explore the perspectives and willingness of visitors to safeguard ICH at the National Intangible Heritage Centre. Therefore, the target population for this study was domestic visitors at the National Intangible Heritage Centre. The questionnaire survey participants were selected through random sampling (Tracy, 2013) which proved time and cost efficient (Butcher & Heffernan, 2006).
3.8.3 Data Collection Procedure

Since the sample was the visitors at the National Intangible Heritage Centre, permission to administer the questionnaire in the Centre was sought from the Centre manager. The questionnaire was administered on a Friday and Saturday in July, 2016 as there are regular traditional performances on those days and thus more visitors are expected on these days than on other days of the week.

A paper-based questionnaire survey was used to collect the data from the respondents rather than employing an online survey approach. Although online surveys have been increasingly utilised to collect data because of time and cost effective advantages (Evans & Mathur, 2005), it was deemed too difficult to rely on obtaining the visitors’ email addresses to conduct online surveys. This proved to be a wise choice, as the onsite face-to-face surveys provided several advantages during the process of data collection for this study. For instance, being on site allowed the researcher to explain survey instructions and answer any questions from the respondents. In short, the researcher was able to observe survey participants as they undertook the survey and control the survey environment when and where necessary (Evans & Mathur, 2005; Scholl, Mulders, & Drent, 2002).

The questionnaire included the information sheet, which provided participants with the details about the research, including the research project, its objectives, the participant’s contribution to the research and ethical issues (Appendix G). This was followed by a section that included asking questions about motivations to experience ICH, interests in sustainability of ICH and the survey finished with demographic information including gender, age, visitation and level of education. At the end of the questionnaire, open-ended questions were included which asked if the participants would like to write anything in relation to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. This study used a 5-point Likert scale with 1=strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree. A total of 350 survey questionnaires were distributed and 289 out of 350 were returned. Of these, 34 questionnaires which had missing data and/or had same response for the consecutive items were excluded; accordingly, a total of 255 survey questionnaires were analysed.
3.8.4 Sampling Size for Questionnaire Surveys

The sample size should be determined based on the determined data analysis (Hair et al., 2010). This study used regression analysis using the SPSS 24.0 software program. Green (1991) suggested a formula to determine regression sample size, \( N > 50 + 8m \), meaning that the sample size should exceed the value of 8 times the number of predictors (e.g., five in this study) by at least 50. Therefore, given that this study has five predicting factors for heritage tourist willingness to safeguard ICH (e.g., cultural identity, status of ICH management, significance of ICH management, agree with transformation and interests in ICH), the sample size had to exceed 90. Following the recommendations by Green (1991), this study obtained a sample of 255 questionnaires.

3.9 Stage 4: Data Analysis

3.9.1 Analysis of public organisation documents

The 131 public organisation documents were entered into the QSR NVivo data management program, which has been used for qualitative data analysis, including content and thematic analysis (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011). While the documents were written in Korean, the nodes and themes were developed in English. The analysis process was a combination of content and thematic analysis, as explained by Bowen (2009). Both content and thematic analysis include the process of coding and developing themes and sub-themes (Vaismoradi, 2013). The differences between the two processes are that content analysis is focused on quantitative counts of nodes (Downe Wamboldt, 1992), whereas thematic analysis aims to identify and report the patterns within the data by comparing nodes and themes derived from the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This study considered both quantitative counts of nodes and the patterns and relationships between nodes and themes by adopting the combination of content and thematic analysis. This study follows the thematic analysis guide suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006).

Step 1 Familiarisation with collected data

All the collected documents (e.g., policies and strategies) were transferred to the QSR NVivo data management program. The researcher started to note down initial ideas, such as themes, relevance and respondent characteristics, through repeated reading of the data. This stage is recognised as the ‘interpretative act’, which allows the researcher to interact with the data and meanings understood, interpreted and created (Braun & Clarke, 2006,
Step 2 Generating initial nodes

This is the stage for creating as many nodes and categories as possible. Nvivo 11 software was used for coding the data. The researcher started the coding process by organising the data into meaningful categories (Tuckett, 2005). The researcher started ‘theory-driven’ coding by approaching data and developing nodes based on specific questions (e.g. research question) (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 88). For example, the nodes initially developed were based on the issues associated with development of ICH, such as equity to enjoy ICH (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Garrod & Fyall, 2000), employment opportunities (Liu, 2003), educational programs (Drost, 1996; Landorf, 2009) and funding issues (Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Ghanem & Saad, 2015), as described in Step 2 in Figure 3.6. The researcher created as many nodes as possible across the data that could contribute to the findings.

Step 3 Searching for and creating themes

The researcher then created themes, which are broader levels than nodes (Silverman, 2015), through categorising and sorting the different nodes into potential groups, then collating all the relevant nodes into the created themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). For example, ‘funding issues’ and ‘ICH product development’ were allocated to a created theme, ‘Economic aspect’. The nodes which were not allocated within the created themes were still acceptable and allocated under ‘think about its theme’ as they were thought possibly useful for the later stage. Figure 3.6 shows an example of creating themes (e.g. Social aspect, Economic aspect, Managerial strategies, Transmission and Think about its theme) and allocation of the nodes developed in Step 2.

Step 4 Reviewing, defining and naming themes;

The researcher then reviewed and refined the created theme and sub-themes (e.g. refine ‘Stakeholder collaboration’ to ‘Multi-level and multi-departmental governance’). The researcher considered (1) whether the theme represented the associated research question (e.g. whether equity and transmission represented the sustainability of ICH), (2) whether they appeared to form a coherent pattern, (3) whether the theme clearly covered the allocated node (e.g. whether attraction development is an example of key strategies for
sustainability of ICH) (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Accordingly, at the end of this stage, the researcher had a set of themes and sub-themes which represented summaries of the data.

3.9.2 Analysis of interview data

A similar combination of thematic and content analysis was used to analyse semi-structured face to face interviews with 25 ICH practitioners and 22 local communities. The analysis of the interview data also followed the thematic analysis guide suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006).

Step 1 Familiarisation with collected data

The interviews were digitally recorded with note-taking, and the recorded data were transcribed and translated from Korean into English by the researcher. The transcriptions were entered into the QSR NVivo data management program. The researcher started to note initial ideas, such as themes, relevance and respondent characteristics, through repeated reading of the data.

---

**Figure 3.6 The example of thematic analysis progress in public organisation document analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transmission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social aspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity to enjoy ICH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic aspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICH product development - Museum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free participation fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managerial strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transmission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target – the younger generation/international/local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
Step 2 Generating initial nodes

The researcher started the coding process and created as many nodes as possible in this step. The nodes were developed based on the questions relating to ICH practitioners/local communities’ perspectives pertaining to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. The questions included issues relating to the transmission and promotion of ICH, and participants’ desires to facilitate ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Moreover, based on the notes written during the interviews, the interview respondents’ attitudes were also coded (e.g., Attitude – Positive/ Negative / Emphasise/Concerns). Figure 3.7 and Figure 3.8 show the example nodes developed in Step 2 in the analysis of the interviews with ICH practitioners and local communities respectively.

Step 3 Searching and creating themes

The researcher then created themes by categorising and collating the relevant nodes into the created themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Some initial nodes went to themes, whereas some nodes went to the sub themes. Moreover, the nodes which were not allocated within the created theme were still acceptable as they were thought possibly useful for the later stage. Figure 3.7 and Figure 3.8 show the example of the created themes and nodes allocation completed in Step 3.

Step 4 Reviewing, defining and naming themes

The researcher then reviewed and refined the created theme and sub-themes, by considering whether the themes represented the research questions (e.g., ICH practitioners/local communities’ perspectives toward sustainability of ICH) and whether the nodes were suitably allocated to each theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006). For example, ‘top-down approach’ was redefined as ‘a lack of empowerment for ICH practitioners’. Accordingly, at the end of this stage, the researcher had a set of themes and sub-themes to represent summaries of the data.
Figure 3.7 The example of thematic analysis progress in the interviews with ICH practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude – positive/negative/Emphasised</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other countries</td>
<td>Visiting other countries</td>
<td>Increase awareness of ICH by the younger generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodification – add aesthetic/combine with other performance</td>
<td>Commodification – add aesthetic/combine with other performance</td>
<td>Sufficient funding for ICH practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues</td>
<td>Transmission problems</td>
<td>Safeguarding authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals attitude to ICH</td>
<td>Funding issues</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-down approach</td>
<td>Locals' attitude to ICH</td>
<td>A lack of empowerment for ICH practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major stakeholders – the younger generation, government, enterprises</td>
<td>Top-down approach</td>
<td>A lack of respect of local communities in practicing ICH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding authenticity</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>A lack of financial incentives for the beginner practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of motivation</td>
<td>Importance of motivation – social aspect social/financial</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>Importance of motivation – financial aspect</td>
<td>Financial support by entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Increase employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.8 The example of thematic analysis progress in the interviews with locals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude – positive/negative/concerns</td>
<td>Expected effect</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural identity</td>
<td>Economic effect</td>
<td>Economical opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current promotion</td>
<td>Social effect</td>
<td>Social opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive economic effect</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of local communities</td>
<td>A lack of current promotion</td>
<td>A lack of local interests and pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less people want to be practitioners</td>
<td>Fewer people want to be practitioners</td>
<td>A lack of marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How informed – as living in the region, education, media</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding authenticity</td>
<td>Importance of motivation – social aspect social/financial</td>
<td>Creating interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial strategies – education, importance of marketing</td>
<td>Importance of motivation – financial aspect</td>
<td>Government involvement in ICH management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major stakeholders – government, locals</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9.3 Analysis of Questionnaire Surveys

A total of 289 questionnaires were collected. Any invalid questionnaires, such as those that gave answers of all the same values or that were missing too many values, were excluded from the analysis. In total, 255 valid surveys were used for further analysis. The data from a total of 255 surveys were transferred into SPSS software by the researcher. Before data analysis, rigorous data screening was undertaken to ensure all the data were entered correctly, and then checked for outliers. The quantitative analysis of this study comprised four major steps: descriptive analysis for sample characteristics, frequency analysis comparing visitors’ perspectives about competitiveness of ICH, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to construct factors used for multiple regression analysis, and multiple regression analysis.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to reduce and create a smaller number of factors before multiple regression analysis (Pallant, 2005). EFA is the process exploring the patterns and relationships of each item to identify the latent constructs, with the purpose of determining the appropriate number of factors (Pallant, 2005). The patterns and relationships are measured by ‘factor loading’, showing the figure for the relationship between the constructed factors and each composed item. Little study has been undertaken on, and even less study has used, consistent variables to examine visitors’ willingness to safeguard ICH. Moreover, the same variables are rarely constructed in different empirical research (e.g. different target samples) (Trninić, Jelaska, & Štalec, 2013). Therefore, EFA was used to construct the variables associated with visitors’ willingness to safeguard ICH.

A multiple regression is used to explore the relationship between one dependent variable and multiple independent variables (Pallant, 2005) and is ideal for real-life questions. The purpose of multiple regression is to explore how a variable is able to predict a particular outcome (Pallant, 2005). Therefore, in this study, a regression analysis was undertaken to investigate the prediction factor which most contributes to intention to pay and intention to experience ICH.

3.10 Adherence to Ethical Standards

The present study has a low risk associated with ethical problems. Although face-to-face interview methods can have ethical issues as they involve human interactions (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015), the interviews and discussions centred around general issues regarding
intangible cultural heritage management. Nevertheless, to minimise any ethical issues, the study adhered to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and ethical clearance was sought for conducting interviews according to the policy of Griffith University (GU ref no:2016/465). Moreover, before conducting the face-to-face interviews, all participants were required to read and approve an information sheet and consent sheet. The consent sheet provided specific information about the interviews such as the purpose of the study, the role of participants in the study, the potential risk to participants, how data will be collected, how collected data will be used and how participant’s confidentiality and anonymity would be secured. When the participants were well-informed, they were required to sign a consent sheet, which indicated that they were voluntarily participating in the research. Through this process, this study reduced the potential for any ethical issues occurring that might be potentially harmful to research participants.

3.11 Trustworthiness of the Research

Although there have been debates about the necessity of validity and reliability in qualitative research (Golafshani, 2003), both are important factors which qualitative researchers should be concerned about in order to ensure a quality study (Patton, 2015). While a quantitative case study method considers four tests such as construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability, a qualitative case study is more concerned with confirmability, credibility, transferability and dependability (Riege, 2003). Accordingly, this study deals with the later four factors to enhance the results as summarised in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Validity and reliability in case study research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>How to manage the concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>Whether the data is interpreted without biased view</td>
<td>Retention of raw data (field notes or recordings collected during data collection) for later inspection by the auditor if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Whether the phenomenon is comprehensively interpreted</td>
<td>Data triangulation – use different method in data collection – document analysis and semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>Analytical generalisation whereby to generalise particular results to extend theory</td>
<td>Using a theory (sustainability) to underpin and scaffold investigation and understanding of intangible cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Consistency in procedures and technique used in study</td>
<td>Hold a paradigm (constructivism) over the study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmability is whether the data is interpreted without a biased viewpoint, so that the result
is the most reasonable (Riege, 2003). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), the collected data should be available to reanalyse by others for confirmability, and this study retained raw data for later inspection by an auditor if required. The raw data includes field notes, audio records and the public organisation documents collected during the data collection.

**Credibility** concerns the multiple realities constructed by the people in the context of the study (Riege, 2003). For enhancing credibility, several authors (Burke, 1997; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Golafshani, 2003) recommend the use of data triangulation which assumes that “looking at an object from more than one standpoint provides researchers and theorists with more comprehensive knowledge about the object” (Miller & Fox, 2004, p.36). The present study used data triangulation to ensure the credibility of results, so that the data was collected from three different sources, which are: public organisation documents, semi-structured interviews and questionnaire surveys.

**Transferability** in qualitative research concerns the ability to generalise results to extend a particular theory (Winter, 2000). Transferability can be ensured by using a theory to scaffold the investigation and a phenomenon (e.g., understanding of intangible cultural heritage) (Yin, 2009). This study utilises sustainability as a fundamental scaffolding theory to investigate the utilisation of intangible cultural heritage and the results of the research contributed to broadening the sustainability approach.

**Dependability** tests consistency in procedures and techniques used in the study (Riege, 2003). According to Hirschman (1986), safeguarding the researcher’s theoretical position in conducting research encourages the results to have higher dependability. Therefore, the researcher in this study holds a constructivist position and establishes a research method and design based on the paradigm.

### 3.12 Research Limitations

Time and resource constraints influenced some decisions which may impact on the results of the study. For example, the employment of the sustainability approach to scaffold this research meant that it was also affected by the limitations of a sustainability approach. For example, the notion of sustainability is altered based on industries, cultures and political environment. The research is the most relevant to the current development of ICH as a
sustainable tourism resource in South Korea. It is important to make updates that are relevant to changes in theory and case conditions.

This study has the limitation of subjectivity, which is commonly pointed out for constructivism and a qualitative research approach. In direct contrast to a quantitative research approach regarding objectivity as a goal, the nature of qualitative data (e.g., interviews) and data analysis (e.g., thematic analysis) are grounded in subjectivity (Patton, 2015). For constructivism however, subjectivity is a part of data, which means the position of the researcher is considered as ‘co-constructor of meaning, as integral to the interpretation of the data, and as unapologetically political in purpose’. (Morrow, 2005, p. 254). Nevertheless, to minimise subjectivity and fairly represent participants’ realities, within the data collection process (i.e. semi-structured face to face interviews), the researcher asked for clarification what interview participants meant (Morrow, 2005).

Employing a single case study approach brought several advantages to this study, however it also produced limitations. A conventional view of case study (Abercrombie, Hill, & Turner, 1984) is that a case study is likely to confirm the researcher’s preconceived notions however, it has been discovered that a case study ‘contains a greater bias towards falsification of preconceived notions than towards verification’ (Flyvberg, 2011). Nevertheless, Yin (2014) suggested the reason for the biased view is that the case study may not have followed systematic procedures. To minimise the researcher’s biased view, this study developed a systematic approach to data collection analysis, as described in Sections 3.7.1 and 3.9.

Another major criticism of a single case study is generalisation in a statistical sense, because its usual focus is on a social phenomenon interpretation of a case rather than on using large data sets (Myers, 2000). Nevertheless, a strategic case choice can contribute to generalisability and/or transferability (Flyvberg, 2011). A critical case indicates either a ‘most likely’, ‘most unlikely’ or ‘paradigmatic’ case (Flyvberg, 2004, p. 5) and this study selected South Korea as a paradigmatic case for sustainable management of ICH for several reasons. First, Korea is popular because of its systematic ICH practitioner training programs (see Section 3.4.2 Step 1). Second, Korea manages ICH under the Safeguarding Intangible Heritage Act, which is developed only for intangible cultural heritage. Third, Korea has five UNESCO accredited NGOs for safeguarding ICH, which is the most accredited NGO in Asia.
Accordingly, the choice of South Korea as a paradigmatic case can minimise the criticism about generalisation.

3.13 Summary

This chapter presented the research approach and methods utilised in exploring the extent to which the development of ICH facilitates the development of a sustainable tourism resource. This study employed a qualitative dominant mixed method approach, with some quantitative data, underpinned by a social constructivist approach. The chapter also discussed the selection of South Korea as a single representative case. The study used three different types of research methods for triangulation purposes and the chapter presented and discussed the analysis process employed in the study. Ethical considerations were identified and the trustworthiness of this research was discussed, including any concerns and how they were managed. The following chapter will report the findings from the document analysis of policies and strategies published by the six Korean public organisations mainly responsible for ICH management in Korea.
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4. Results: Public Documents pertaining to development of Intangible Cultural Heritage as Sustainable Tourism Resource

4.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses Objective Two which is to identify and critically analyse public documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. A total of 131 public documents were collected from the six Korean public organisations mainly responsible for ICH development, and the collected data were analysed utilising content and thematic analysis. The chapter begins with the analysis of the types of public documents (e.g. the number of public documents in each organisation, the public documents types, and the public documents development period). It then presents the goals and strategies implemented by the public organisations associated with development of ICH as a tourism resource.

4.2 Public Documents Characteristics

Korean public organisations developed 131 public documents relating to ICH from 2005 to 2016. The results revealed that National Intangible Heritage Centre produced the most public documents even though the centre was the most recently developed (2013), while the Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation produced the least number of public documents in relation to ICH as shown in Figure 4.1.
The results also revealed that overall, the most prominent type of public documents developed by Korean public organisations was bulletins/reports, as shown in Figure 4.2. For example, the Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism announces updates to legislation through bulletins/reports on websites, which the Korean public can easily access; as well as that, the National Intangible Heritage Centre announces ICH related events (e.g., regular performances and ICH festivals) through bulletins/reports on its websites. This finding suggests that public organisations use online bulletins/reports as major communication means with other stakeholders such as the Korean public, locals and/or private organisations.
The most significant time period for publication of ICH documents has been since 2013, when 116 of the 131 documents (86%) were produced, as described in Figure 4.3. The public documents published before 2013 were mostly comprised of the annual strategic plans of the Cultural Heritage Administration. The increasing number of public documents since 2013 can be explained by the fact that the National Intangible Cultural Centre, which has the most responsibility for ICH management, opened in 2013. The public documents increases can also be explained by the fact that the Cultural Heritage Foundation opened ‘Korea House’ in 2009, where ICH (e.g., Korean traditional cuisine and traditional wedding ceremony) was promoted; additionally, the Cultural Heritage Foundation was made a UNESCO-accredited NGO for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2010. The increasing interest in ICH by Korean public organisations can be identified not only through the increased number of public documents since 2013, but through also the coverage of ICH given in the public documents. For example, the 2006 Annual Strategic Plan of the Cultural Heritage Association only contained 2.68% on ICH, whereas the 2016 Annual Strategic Plan contained 5.22%.

Figure 4.3 ICH public documents development period

4.3 Public Organisation Goals and Strategies
ICH, transmitted over generations, embodies strong cultural authenticity and the identity of a community. ICH provides a community with a unique selling point in the globally competitive tourism industry (Georgiev & Vasileva, 2012; Lenzerini, 2011). The popularised ICH in turn, brings benefits to host communities, such as economic development through
heritage tourism and/or strengthening the cultural identity of locals. The process of commodification, however, threatens the authenticity of ICH (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002) and therefore the advice of the WTO (2012) is to utilise ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. For instance, ICH as a sustainable tourism resource should have economic, social and cultural values (Throsby, 2005) that should simultaneously facilitate community empowerment (Bakar et al., 2014; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006).

The international bodies and national government (i.e., Korean public organisations) have intervened to develop ICH and proper government involvement, such as in planning and regulations, is absolutely vital for cultural heritage sustainability (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). In spite of its significance, very few studies have explored governance, policies and regulations in the context of heritage and tourism (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). Therefore, this study explored the extent to which public organisations’ policies facilitate the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. A range of diverse outcomes have been achieved by public organisations, providing valuable insights into the goals and strategies associated with the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, as described in Figure 4.4. The next section presents the results relevant to public organisations’ development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.
Figure 4. Korean public organisations’ goals, strategies and challenges for Korean ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource
4.4 ICH Sustainability Goals of Korean Public Organisations

The six Korean public organisations mainly responsible for ICH development, identified the following goals in 131 documents related to ICH; these were related to ICH and Promotion, ICH and Equity, and ICH and Transmission.

4.3.1 Goal 1: ICH and Promotion

The primary goal of the Korean public organisations is to promote ICH to locals, the Korean public and international tourists, as 78 of 131 documents mentioned this. The promotion of ICH can increase the economic viability of ICH as a tourism resource. For example, the Cultural Heritage Foundation has promoted ICH through a number of ICH performances, exhibitions and festivals related to ICH, which increases the economic viability of ICH. Moreover, the promotion of ICH can increase awareness of and the use of ICH by the Korean public. For example, the increased number of ICH performances, exhibitions and festivals of ICH increase Korean public accessibility to ICH by, which may increase the awareness of ICH.

The promotion of ICH by Korean public organisations has been particularly emphasised since 2009. While the policies and strategies associated with ICH heavily focused on ICH practitioners, such as developing a training system of ICH practitioners between 2005 to 2008, increasingly policies and strategies have mentioned the importance of access to, use and enjoyment of ICH by local communities and Korean public. For example, the Cultural Heritage Association in 2005 placed focus on the transmission of ICH only through ICH practitioners. The Cultural Heritage Association stated in its 2005 Annual Strategic Plan:

Facilitation of ICH transmission
- Improve transmission system of ICH; Develop more specific process of designating the Korean national ICH and the practitioners
- Support ICH transmission activities; increase the number of ‘Assistant practitioners’ and support practitioners who perform the endangered ICH

In the 2009 Annual Strategic Plan, however, the Cultural Heritage Association added a section promoting the value of ICH and increased opportunities for the Korean public to enjoy ICH such as its traditional crafts exhibitions or traditional ritual performances, as well as developing
TV programs covering ICH.

Their goal of promoting ICH can be understood due to the lack of ICH recognition compared to other types of cultural heritage. ICH has been undervalued compared to other types of cultural heritage, such as World Heritage Sites or historical monuments (Cleere, 2001). For example, tourists have, and continue to contribute to the economic development of destinations via visitations to world heritage sites and/or historical structures (Li et al., 2008) such as the Great Wall of China and/or the Colosseum, both of which have been identified as worthy of preservation by UNESCO (Foley, 2014). This in turn leads to a strengthening of the economic and cultural value of world heritage sites and having more awareness of World Heritage Sites, and to having less awareness of ICH. Nevertheless, the interests in and awareness of ICH by Korean public are essential for ICH to protect its longevity and in turn, mitigate the risk of ICH being lost forever (Kurin, 2004b).

4.3.2 Goal 2: ICH and Equity

The Korean public organisations have goals of ensuring intra-generational equity to enjoy ICH, and 57 documents showed evidence of an equity focused approach. The documents are about equal accessibility to ICH through the provision of free learning programs, free performances and/or encouraging visits by ICH practitioners to socially underprivileged groups, such as child- and/or aged-care centres in rural areas. For example, the Cultural Heritage Association has had a goal for ICH practitioners to visit socially underprivileged groups 130 times every year in every Annual Strategic Plan, since 2005. The provision of free learning programs and free performances prevents any restriction of access to cultural heritage practices by locals who are not economically and socially well off (Cohen, 2002). Given that the intra-generational equity to enjoy and access ICH is one of the significant indicators of sustainable tourism resources (Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Throsby, 2017), a goal of intra-generational equity strengthens ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Nevertheless, the goals lack in a comprehensive understanding of equity, such as equal benefit distribution and/or equal power relations among the stakeholders in ICH development.

4.3.3 Goal 3: ICH and Transmission

The Korean public organisations have a goal for the successful transmission of ICH to the next generation, and 24 documents are associated with this objective. The transmission
activities are divided into archiving and ICH practitioner training. The *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage Act (Act 48)* emphasises the importance of collecting and storing audio records, video records, photos and/or written documents associated with ICH by national and regional levels of government, with the purpose of recording the contemporary ICH. Moreover, the National Intangible Heritage Centre has digitally recorded or documented ICH. For example, *Arirang* (UNESCO registered ICH, Korean folk song) and its information such as the movie covering *Arirang*, classic and/or modern literature covering ICH, the example of commodification of *Arirang* (e.g. using Arirang as a name of tobacco) are documented with photos/videos. This is in accord with previous studies arguing that although archiving ICH can be considered as ‘freezing’ living intangible cultural heritage, the appropriate choice of materials would contribute to safeguarding ICH (Bouchenaki, 2003), which is vulnerable and changeable by its nature and according to social conditions (Bortolotto, 2007).

For the ICH practitioners’ training for the transmission of knowledge and skills, the *Safeguarding Intangible Heritage Act (Act 25)* legislates the training of the beginner practitioners as one of the main roles for the master ICH practitioners at the higher level. Given that ICH practitioners are the group who are mainly responsible for transmitting ICH to the next generations (Kurin, 2004a; Yim, 2004), the goal of fostering the practitioners is fundamental to the transmitting and safeguarding ICH.

Overall, public organisations have three goals, which are partly indicative of the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, identified in Chapter Two. The six Korean public organisations’ goals include the promotion of ICH to the public and tourists, which increases tourism markets. Moreover, Korean public organisations aim for intra-generational equity in accessing and enjoying ICH, and the successful transmission of ICH to the next generation. The next section will discuss strategies which the Korean public organisations have implemented to achieve their goals.
4.4 Key Strategies for Goal Achievement

The results of the analysis revealed that the Korean public organisations have mainly implemented nine strategies to achieve their goals, as Figure 4.5 shows. Korean public organisations have implemented five strategies relating to Goal 1, ICH and Promotion. They are: 1a) ICH attraction development, 1b) Combining with modern music/design/material, 1c) National branding, 1d) Multi-level and multi-departmental governance and 1e) International cultural exchange.

4.4.1 Strategy 1a: ICH attraction development

A total of 65 documents indicated ICH attraction development, with the purpose of increasing accessibility to ICH and/or attracting tourists. Most of these products were experiential attractions (28 documents), traditional performances (15 documents), storytelling (13 documents), festivals (7 documents) and traditional crafts exhibitions (6 documents).

Experiential attractions. Experiential attractions are the most common type of ICH attractions which Korean public organisations have provided. For example, ICH resources are used in trying traditional ritual clothes (Cultural Heritage Association), making traditional
food (Korean Tourism Organisation, Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism, National Intangible Heritage Centre), making traditional crafts, and playing traditional musical instruments. The National Intangible Heritage Centre, among the organisations, most actively provides physical involvement attractions, as a total of 20 out of 28 documents indicating experiential attractions were published by the National Intangible Heritage Centre. National Intangible Heritage Centre involves physical experiential attractions in most ICH events. For example, a traditional crafts exhibition involves a session of learning traditional craftsmanship; the traditional food festival involves a session of learning traditional food preparation; the Nongak festival (UNESCO registered ICH, performance derived from rustic entertainments and communal arts) involves a session of playing traditional instruments; and the traditional alcohol exhibition involves a session of trying Korean traditional alcohol. The various experiential attractions provided by Korean public organisations reflect the increasing trend of experiential economy in tourism (Baillie et al., 2010) which contributes to domestic and/or international tourists having a deeper interaction with the local culture so that they can have authentic experience (Kao, Huang, & Wu, 2008; Urry & Larsen, 2011).

Traditional performance/crafts exhibition. The Korean public organisations support and host various traditional performances and traditional crafts exhibitions. The Cultural Heritage Association has increased the number of performances and exhibitions since 2014. Moreover, the National Intangible Heritage Centre increased the number of traditional performances such as Nongak (UNESCO registered ICH, performance derived from rustic entertainments and communal arts), Taephyeongmu (No. 92 Korean national ICH, traditional dance wishing peace to the country) and Jongmyo jerye (No.1 Korean national ICH, traditional ancestral worship rite). Moreover, the National Intangible Heritage Centre, to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Korean independence, hosted a thematic performance of Pansori (UNESCO registered ICH, musical storytelling performance) about Korean independence fighters who sought the independence of Korea from Japan. Moreover, the Korean Tourism Organisation organised performances of Taekwondo (Korean martial art) and Nongak for Chinese tourists in the Korean Traditional Architecture Village.

Storytelling. Korean public organisations promoted ICH with a storytelling approach. For example, one of the slogans of the Korean Tourism Organisation in 2014 was ‘storytelling food tourism’, with the purpose of sharing stories underpinning Korean traditional food, such as the history of the food and/or ingredient. Moreover in 2012, the Cultural Heritage
Foundation hosted a thematic traditional crafts exhibition for the first five Korean *Living Human Treasures* and the exhibition invited their trainees (e.g. current master practitioners) to share relevant stories with each ICH element and the *Living Human Treasures*. The National Intangible Heritage Centre hosted regular workshops for Korean public and local communities, in which the ‘Advanced’ practitioners use storytelling (e.g. historical background of their ICH) to increase awareness and familiarity with ICH. Moreover, the Cultural Heritage Association added curators’ commentaries or explanations to the existing ritual events (e.g. *Jongmyo Jerye*), to ensure better understanding for the audience. This finding endorses the increasing attention to the storytelling approach in heritage tourism (Kidd, 2011; Pera, 2017). Storytelling is a collective creative process which enables social and emotional interactions between storytellers and audiences (Pera, 2017). It enables audiences to be informed and understand the background, situations, thoughts and feelings pertaining to the heritage (Kidd, 2011). From the storyteller perspectives (i.e. ICH practitioners) the process of storytelling weaves “the past events and memory into a contemporary narrative”, so thus contributes to enhancing authentic experiences for both storytellers and audiences.

Festival. Korean public organisations hosted ICH festivals, such as *Kimjang* festival (the traditional process of preparation and making of kimchi), or *Arirang* festival. The Korean Tourism Organisation hosted the ‘Seoul *Kimjang* festival’ in 2014 and 2015, which provides opportunities for both domestic and international visitors to experience making ‘Kimchi’, so that Koreans can enhance their identity through cooperating with one another to make Kimchi, and this Korean culture can be shared with international participants. Moreover, the Cultural Heritage Association hosted the Arirang festival with the purpose of disseminating the value of Arirang worldwide, with invitations to the international media. The Cultural Heritage Festival is often criticised for its impact on the authenticity of cultural heritage as a result of commodifying, staging and transforming cultural heritage (Chhabra et al., 2003). Nevertheless, local cultural festivals have strong power to attract tourists, to showcase the locals’ rich intangible heritage (Getz, 1989; McKercher, Mei, & Tse, 2006), and create both domestic and international visitor interest in cultural heritage, while stimulating economic growth to locals. Given that ICH would degenerate without interest in its utilisation through festivals (Bortolotto, 2007), and despite the debate about the authenticity of cultural heritage resources, festivals contribute to the economic viability and transmission of ICH.

The various types of ICH attractions enhance the economic viability of and the
transmission of ICH. Some attractions, such as ICH festivals have attracted both domestic and international participants, so that strongly facilitates the economic viability of ICH. Moreover, ICH attractions increase interest in and access to ICH by locals and the Korean public, so that contributes to an increase in the social awareness of ICH. Given that interest in and awareness of ICH are the most fundamental factors in the transmission of ICH (Bortolotto, 2007), a diversified ICH increases the use and awareness of ICH by locals, so that contributes to the transmission of ICH.

4.4.2 Strategy 1b: Combining with modern music/design/material

The Korean public organisations promote ICH by combining it with modern elements to increase interest in and daily use of ICH by the current generation. For example, the Korean Tourism Organisation hosted an event in 2016 showing the combined performance of a traditional act and modern music or/and dance (e.g. Bonsan traditional mask dance with modern breakdance). The Cultural Heritage Association and the Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism created modernised Korean traditional clothes by combining them with contemporary design. Moreover, the Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism facilitated the distribution of traditional crafts made with cooperation between ICH practitioners and modern designers. The National Intangible Heritage Centre held an exhibition in 2014 displaying traditional crafts recreated with modern designs and materials for use in daily life.

The Korean public organisations expect the combination or adjustment of ICH to contemporary music, design and material to create demand for the use of ICH in daily life. ICH is a living culture, meaning it changes as the society changes. The needs of the current Korean generation, influenced by modern dependency and economic neoliberalism theories, tends to regard traditional culture as boring and old-fashioned. Moreover, the designs and materials used in the traditional ICH may not be attractive and/or effective for use contemporarily. The combination of ICH with modern music, design and material may influence the objective authenticity of ICH; however, the combination might facilitate use in ICH daily life, thus contributing to the economic value and transmission of ICH.

4.4.3 Strategy 1c: National branding

The Korean public organisations have facilitated national branding through ICH, and 32 documents mentioned this. The governments in several countries such as Mexico and Italy,
have promoted cultural heritage to represent national identity and to promote the destination as cultural heritage destinations (Evan, 1998). Similarly, Korea is undertaking a national branding campaign of ICH to the international market. For example, the Cultural Heritage Association established an ‘Intangible Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific’ (UNESCO centre) in 2009 in Jeonju Korea, to globally promote Korea as a facilitator of ICH development. The centre hosts ICH international symposia, which contribute to building the reputation of Korean ICH development. Moreover, the Cultural Heritage Association has had the purpose of listing Korean ICH on the UNESCO ICH list since 2007 and their effort is evaluated and reported by the number of ICHs registered in UNESCO each year. UNESCO designated cultural heritage contributes to Korea’s national branding as a tourism destination (Fyall & Rakic, 2006; Timothy & Boyd, 2006), because ‘UNESCO designated’ is a brand itself, which promotes visitation to the resource (Li et al., 2008), and triggers tourists’ positive behaviour when experiencing the resource (Kotler & Gertner, 2002). National branding implies the economic viability of ICH by attracting tourists (Soini & Birkeland, 2014). Moreover, Korea’s well-established reputation for ICH development and increasing visitation to ICH, enhances locals’ pride in their culture and at the same time, increases local interest in safeguarding ICH.

4.4.4 Strategy 1d: Multi-level and multi-departmental governance

The Korean public organisations vertically and horizontally cooperated in the development of ICH. A total of 36 documents showed evidence of multi-level and/or multi-departmental collaborations in hosting events, developing programs, or promoting ICH. The multi-level governance, such as the cooperation between national and regional levels of governments, is encouraged by the Safeguarding Intangible Heritage Act (Act 7). Act 7 stated that ‘The head of Cultural Heritage Association should discuss with city level mayors to establish a plan of safeguarding and promoting ICH every five years’. Moreover, the Cultural Heritage Association collaborated with the Seoul city government in hosting musical performances to promote Arirang (Korean lyrical folk song) in 2014. Similarly, the National Intangible Heritage Centre collaborated with the Jonglo regional government, supported by the Seoul city government, to host a traditional food festival in 2014. The Korean Tourism Organisation collaborates with the Jeonlla Bookdo state government in developing regional ICH tourism attractions and promoting domestic and/or international heritage tourists.

In terms of multi-departmental cooperation, the Korean public organisations, which are
mainly responsible of ICH development (e.g. the selected organisations in this study), cooperate with other national level departments such as the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Ministry of Science and ICT. For example, the Cultural Heritage Association, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Jeonju regional government cooperated in using Korean traditional mulberry paper (Hanji) when renovating the reception rooms for the minister of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism cooperated with Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy in transforming and modernising Korean traditional clothes (Hanbok), to increase the use of Korean traditional clothes in modern daily life, as well as to database the process of making Korean traditional mulberry paper (Hanji) to improve making efficiency and to facilitate use of Hanji.

This finding is the empirical evidence supporting the argument that complex multi-level and multi departmental governance has increasingly emerged in many economically developed countries, related to heritage development (Wu, 2002). Multilevel governance, such as cooperation between two levels of government, is necessary to facilitate ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, because it can eliminate some overlap between services, minimise duplication of resources, and thus it can develop effective tourism strategies (Hall, 199). Moreover, such cooperation enables tourism development personnel to address local knowledge, culture and conditions, which is often lacking from the national government (Timothy, 1998). From the local government perspective, local government’s involvement and cooperation with national government encourages the local government to gain financial support from the national government and enables them to reflect on and address the collective interests of the local communities (Bramwell, 2012). Local governments’ cooperation and involvement then, improve equity as they are allowed to participate in decision making (Timothy, 1998).

4.4.5 Strategy 1c: International cultural exchange

Korean public organisations have promoted and exchanged ICH at international levels through visits to other countries’ performances. ICH (i.e. traditional dance), unlike historical monuments, is practised by individuals, so that the performance can be taken to other countries (McCartney & Osti, 2007). For example, Jinju Nongak (No.11 Korean ICH, performance derived from rustic entertainments and communal arts in Jinju area) was staged in France at the International Cultural Heritage Expo. As ICH is able to be performed in other countries,
Korean public organisations actively support ICH practitioners visiting other countries. For example, the Cultural Heritage Association provided funds for a few selected ICH practitioners to visit three East European countries in 2010. Additionally, the Cultural Heritage Foundation planned to host thematic ICH performances in New York and Toronto. The *Ministry of Cultural, Sport and Tourism* attended a food expo in Milan in 2015 (145 countries attended for 6 months) and successfully promoted Korean food by storytelling that focused on healthy Korean food. The international cultural exchange may increase the international awareness of Korean ICH. The increased international awareness of Korean ICH may attract international visitors who desire to experience ICH, thereby supporting the economic viability of ICH.

The following section explores a strategy implemented by Korean public organisations relating to Goal 2, ICH and Equity. They are: 2a) Free ICH activities and visits to underprivileged groups; and 2b) Practitioner employment opportunities.

### 4.4.6 Strategy 2a: Free ICH activities and visits to underprivileged groups

Korean public organisations provide most tourism programs free of charge for visitors. For example, the National Intangible Heritage Centre regularly stages traditional performances and thematic exhibitions for free, and tourists can learn traditional dance and/or learn to play a musical instrument, also free of charge. Moreover, there are regular traditional craft workshops for locals to participate in without paying a fee. The National Intangible Heritage Centre also hosts free ICH learning programs for international tourists. These programs are composed of introducing Korean ICH, visiting an ICH exhibition centre and learning part of a traditional dance. Because charging visitors discourages the public from accessing and enjoying cultural heritage (Garrod & Fyall, 2000), the enormous number of free programs and activities indicates the success of the Korean public organisations’ efforts to increase public accessibility to ICH.

There is also a clear emphasis on ensuring social equity as public organisations organise visits by the ICH practitioners to financially and educationally underprivileged groups. The Cultural Heritage Association has gradually increased the number of these visits between 2011 and 2016 from 120 to 140 and financially supports ICH practitioners’ visits to the financially, educationally and/or socially underprivileged groups. Moreover in 2016, the National Intangible Heritage Centre hosted ICH learning classes in Uzbekistan for the Korean nationals living in that country. This increases opportunities for the underprivileged groups to enjoy and experience ICH, so that it significantly enhances social equity to enjoy cultural heritage, and
thus facilitates ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

4.4.7 Strategy 2b: Practitioner employment opportunities

A total of 13 documents showed the organisations’ attention to employment opportunities for ICH practitioners. The *Intangible Heritage Safeguarding Act* (*Act 14*) states that the public organisations should provide opportunities for ICH practitioners to participate in any ICH festival or event. To follow the *Act*, in 2011 the Cultural Heritage Association aimed to include relevant ICH practitioners in restoring cultural heritage (e.g. involving traditional wooden architectural craftsmanship in restoring ancient palaces). The Cultural Heritage Foundation provided employment opportunities for ICH practitioners by holding free classes for the public and providing financial support such as instruction payment, materials preparation, and the class promotional fees. The National Intangible Heritage Centre provides opportunities for practitioners, particularly for the beginner practitioners; for example, hosting a program in which the beginner practitioners can collaborate with modern designers and produce products. The National Intangible Heritage Centre has also hired beginner practitioners as instructors for training a part of ICH (e.g. a part of traditional performance) for visitors in the National Intangible Heritage Centre. ‘Well paid’ employment to as large a number of communities (i.e. ICH practitioners) as possible, can contribute to economic development and promote social equity through the creation of opportunity (Ryan, 2002). However, only a few policies, regulations and reports, compared to other strategies, cover ICH practitioners’ employment strategies as well, as they rarely cover payment issues to ICH practitioners, which creates doubt about the effect of the current policies in creating employment opportunities.

The following section explores three strategies implemented by Korean public organisations relating to Goal 3, ICH and Transmission. They are: 3a) Education of the younger generation; 3b) Funding for ICH management; and 3c) Monitoring.

4.3.8 Strategy 3a: Education of the younger generation

Various educational programs for locals are promoted by the public organisations, and 17 documents mentioned this. An interesting finding was the programs which are only for teenagers and/or children. For ICH education of teenagers, the Korean public organisations have collaborated with educational institutions (i.e. primary and high schools) to increase educational opportunities for teenagers. For example, since 2014 the Cultural Heritage
Foundation and the National Intangible Heritage Centre have cooperated with a few selected educational institutions and introduced a curriculum in which students learn and experience ICH (i.e. via the creation of vocational programs). Moreover, the National Intangible Heritage Centre provides experiential programs for teenagers only, such as cooking traditional cuisine or taking part in a traditional performance.

The Cultural Heritage Foundation aims to increase opportunities for teenagers to be educated about the value of ICH through learning traditional dance, simplified versions of traditional crafts, and/or ICH festivals mainly for children, adolescents and university students. For example, in 2015, the Cultural Heritage Foundation aimed to facilitate the younger generations’ interest in ICH transmission and thus hosted children’s traditional music festivals and university students’ traditional performance festivals. Moreover, the National Intangible Heritage Centre has annually invited and educated selected juniors and trained them to be junior curators since 2015. The Cultural Heritage Foundation hosted children’s traditional music festivals and university students’ traditional performance festivals, to facilitate the younger generation’s interest in ICH transmission.

The teenager- and children targeted programs reflect the importance of the younger generations in cultural heritage development, because the major tourists market segment is largely comprised of young people (Chhabra et al., 2003; Youn & Uzzell, 2016), and they are the group who have responsibility for the future of ICH (Vecco, 2010). Moreover, the programs that focus on physical involvement, among others, are expected to increase younger generations’ interests in ICH (Chhabra, 2010). Therefore, Korean public organisations’ strategies in providing education for the younger generations, increases interest in and awareness of ICH by the younger generation, which contributes to the transmission of ICH.

4.4.9 Strategy 3b: Funding for ICH development

The public organisations provide financial support for disseminating knowledge and awareness of ICH, and a total of 17 documents report this. As the Intangible Heritage Safeguarding Act states, “the national or regional government can financially support the transmission of ICH….”. Under the ACT, ICH practitioners who are designated by the government, are financially supported with a stipend by the Cultural Heritage Association or National Intangible Heritage Centre. Moreover, (1) the Cultural Heritage Association financially supports individual ICH practitioners or individual ICH associations to host
national and/or international events and to host ICH festivals; (2) the Cultural Heritage Foundation facilitates various ICH workshops (i.e. making traditional crafts), by financially supporting the instructors, who are the practitioners, and by providing promotion and material preparation funding; and (3) the National Intangible Heritage Centre hosts workshops and provides free opportunities for beginner ICH practitioners to learn and share how to safeguard and promote ICH, such as how to expand traditional crafts markets and satisfy current markets through a combination of ICH and the modern context.

One interesting finding was the introduction of entrepreneurship to safeguard and promote ICH with the purpose of addressing inadequate funding issues. The Cultural Heritage Association has constantly suggested that entrepreneurs support ICH development, such that one ICH element should be supported by one entrepreneur, and/or entrepreneurs should provide materials for ICH workshops (e.g. learning craftsmanship). Cultural Heritage Association started planning to attract entrepreneurs to ICH development in 2005, and the plan became more specific in 2009 with it aiming to attract 30 entrepreneurs supporting 30 ICH elements (e.g. one private enterprise for one ICH). Most of the enterprises are involved in ICH development through a working partnership with one ICH and financially support it. A few organisations have more comprehensively and actively participated in ICH development, such as via financial support for more ICH exhibitions and/or performances and/or providing spaces where ICH can have performances and/or practices. Moreover, one medical organisation has provided free health screening for Living Human Treasures since 2009, and provides free flu vaccine for all levels of practitioners.

Entrepreneurship and cultural heritage development were considered as being in an oppositional relationship because entrepreneurship is mainly associated with economic development, thus has much focus on tourists’ experience rather than on safeguarding the authenticity of cultural heritage (Bowitz & Ibenholt, 2009; Corner & Harvey, 1991). The finding however, shows the important role of entrepreneurs in cultural heritage development, such as providing financial support and/or provision of spaces for safeguarding activities, which most of the cultural heritage activities need. This findings support a previous study by Klein (2002) stating that lack of entrepreneurial capacity is a barrier for cultural heritage development. Adopting entrepreneurship can support the economic viability of and the transmission of ICH (Jaafar, Abdul-Aziz, Maideen, & Mohd, 2011).
4.4.10 Strategy 3c: Monitoring

A total of 11 documents mentioned monitoring ICH, for any changes in the number of practitioners or the satisfaction of ICH practitioners. Continuous monitoring is a significant sustainability principle of heritage tourism, as it enables monitoring impacts on the resources, and more importantly monitors changes in stakeholders’ demands (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Garrod & Fyall, 1998; Jamal & Kim, 2005). For cultural impact monitoring, the Safeguarding Intangible Heritage Act clearly states the importance of regularly monitoring ICH, such as for the training and transmission status of each ICH element or/and the number of ICH practitioners nominated by regional and national governments. Additionally, the Cultural Heritage Association has monitored each ICH association in terms of its operating, training, and transmission status since 2011.

The presented monitoring however, rarely investigates from the ICH practitioner perspective, the most significant in the transmission of ICH. Act 7 states that ‘the head of Cultural Heritage Association should listen to the perspectives and opinions of ICH practitioners before establishing a five year plan’. Despite the Act, little strategy has been identified as associated with the Act; as additionally, only one organisation (the Korean Traditional Performing Arts Foundation) has aimed to listen to and address ICH practitioners’ needs through surveys, seminars or workshops. The Cultural Heritage Association has investigated practitioners’ satisfaction with the environment in which they safeguard and transmit ICH, but the investigation has not consistently been completed. For unrevealed reasons, it has only been completed in 2007, 2011 and 2014.

4.5 Objective 2 Synopsis

The collective results of the Korean ICH public documents suggest that Korean public organisations have facilitated the economic viability of ICH and increased social accessibility for enjoyment of ICH; however, there is a lack in the facilitation of ICH practitioners’/locals’ empowerment and participation in decision making.

Although ICH has been mainly managed by six Korean public organisations, there has been a lack of constancy in areas such as the amount of, the source of, the frequency of documents publication and the types of policies and strategies. In essence, three major public organisations (i.e., the Cultural Heritage Association, Cultural Heritage Foundation and
National Intangible Heritage Centre) have displayed a reactive approach to ICH development since 2013. In many instances, their approach tended to be a platform for ICH development.

Consequently, the Korean public organisations’ policies and strategies have mostly focused on the economic viability and the promotion of ICH, such as through ICH attraction development, which has combined ICH with modern music/design/material, national branding and international cultural exchanges. Although the policies and strategies concern the transmission of ICH and have implemented a few strategies such as the education of the younger generation and financial support for ICH practitioners, they are clear differences in the number of policies (i.e., reports, plans and regulations) between the promotion and the transmission of ICH. That is, ICH is viewed by public organisations primarily as a tool to achieve economic growth. While policies set aims for ensuring equity and the transmission of ICH, they tend to mainly focus on the promotion of ICH for the economic viability of ICH, and to a much lesser extent, for concerns about ICH authenticity and/or equal benefit distribution to communities.

Community participation and empowerment is an ideal approach to facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource because it captures communities’ interests in safeguarding and promoting ICH, which can provide equal economic and social benefits to them (Fraser, Dougill, Mabee, Reed, & McAlpine, 2006). Community involvement and empowerment, however, has rarely been discovered at most cultural heritage destinations worldwide (Bakar et al., 2014), and South Korea is not an exception. While a few policies have placed emphasis on regional government participation in the decision-making process, few policies and strategies have given attention to the inclusion of either ICH practitioners’ associations and/or ICH individual practitioners. For example, a total of 17 documents showed evidence of the participation of regional government and their collaboration with public organisations in hosting events, developing programs, or promoting ICH, while few policies discussed ICH practitioners’ participation. Furthermore, while the Act did identify the need to consult and collaborate with ICH practitioners, stated as the inclusion of ICH practitioners in the establishment of a five year plan for ICH development, there was no indication of downward accountability or transparency (Dodson & Smith, 2003). In reality, the policies and strategies demonstrated predominant top-down approaches, rather than provided opportunities for bottom-up approaches to planning and development, which have the advantage of identifying and addressing community needs and priorities (Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). For example,
Cultural Heritage Administration is authorised to nominate national ICH and ICH practitioners over other public organisations and other stakeholder groups. One possible reason for a predominant top-down approach in the development of ICH in South Korea may be a result of Confucian influence and the military authoritarianism of previous governments throughout history (Kim & Park, 2003).

The concept of sustainable tourism resources concerns not only economic growth, but also the social benefit contribution to communities and safeguarding cultural authenticity pertaining to resources (Liu, 2003; Saarinen, 2006; Throsby, 2017). Therefore, to adhere to sustainability principles, policies and strategies should facilitate the integration of economic activity with social concerns, cultural priorities, legal rights and effective governance systems (Dodson & Smith, 2003). Nevertheless, the majority of Korean public organisation policies present limited views, such as facilitating the economic value of ICH, promotion of ICH to locals, and equity to enjoy ICH, with little emphasis on safeguarding authenticity, dealing with unsustainable practices and community participation, which leads to Korean public organisations’ policies and strategies being regarded as superficial rhetoric.

4.4 Summary
The aim of this chapter was to identify and critically analyse public documents pertaining to the sustainable development of intangible cultural heritage. The chapter reveals that Korean public organisations support the sustainability of ICH through the use and awareness of Korean ICH by locals, the Korean public, and international audiences. In spite of their efforts however, there is still lack of a strong social sustainability approach as there are few opportunities for ICH practitioners to be involved in the ICH decision making process. The next chapter presents and discusses the results of interviews with ICH practitioners and local communities and presents visitors’ questionnaire surveys in terms of the sustainability of ICH as a tourism resource.
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5. Results: Stakeholders’ Perspectives on developing Intangible Cultural Heritage as a Sustainable Tourism Resource

This chapter addresses the third objective of this study: To develop a framework which facilitates intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource. Specifically, the chapter will discuss the results of interviews with Korean ICH practitioners and local communities, and the results from surveys undertaken with visitors at National Intangible Heritage Centre. First, the results of interviews with Korean ICH practitioners reveal the opportunities, challenges and strategies associated with developing ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Second, the results of interviews with local communities reveal opportunities, challenges and strategies associated with developing ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Third, the results from surveys undertaken with ICH visitors at National Intangible Heritage Centre reveal the visitors’ willingness to experience and pay for ICH experiences. Finally, the chapter will finish with a synopsis of Objective 3 with a framework facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

5.1 ICH Practitioners’ Perspectives on Developing ICH as a Sustainable Tourism Resource

This section presents the results of semi structured, face-to-face interviews with 25 Korean ICH practitioners. One interesting finding of this study was that overall, the majority of respondents showed a positive attitude towards the commodification and transformation of ICH. ICH practitioners are the people most responsible for safeguarding the authenticity of the resource (Lenzerini, 2011). Thus it is often assumed that they would be opposed to commodification of ICH (Yim, 2004), as purportedly, it is a potential threat to the loss of ICH authenticity (Halewood & Hannam, 2001; Taylor, 2001). The 11 ICH practitioner respondents in this study however, showed a positive attitude towards the commodification and transformation of ICH as a means to increase the interest for tourists. Commodification and transformational changes include shortening presentation times [ICH 3, 5, 17, 18], combining ICH with other modern performances (e.g., modern and contemporary music with traditional dances; modern materials with traditional craftsmanship) [ICH 1, 6, 7] and modifying lyrics or
gestures to increase interaction with audiences [ICH 1, 2, 4, 5]. One respondent [ICH 1] stated that:

There is a regular ‘Eobang’ festival in Gwangan Beach in Busan and we performed in this year’s festival (in 2016). The performance was combined with Busan city musical orchestra instead of using traditional instrument for background music and the combined performance was successful. Audiences were happy with it. We distributed dried anchovies to the audiences at the end of the performance (as the performance is a reproduction of traditional fishing), and they were happy with it. I think adding extra factors to increase audience enjoyment is good for marketing and promoting our ICH. It was the first time to combine our ICH with Busan regional orchestra…and I am really happy with the combination. I would like to make circumstances which domestic tourists are informed that there is ICH and can enjoy ICH, through those kind of regular festivals, so that more audiences coming through word of mouth, to enjoy our performance.

The main reasons for the positive attitudes of ICH practitioners toward the commodification of ICH were because of their concern that the original version of ICH might be boring for audiences [ICH 2, 3, 4, 9, 10] and/or less understandable [ICH 1, 3, 18]. For example, ICH 2 argued that “some degree of transformation is effective for transmitting ICH as it helps understanding of audiences and increase interests in ICH”. Similarly, ICH 10 said that “the original version takes three hours. The whole performance may be too boring for the audiences and too hard to play for us as well”. Moreover, ICH 1 mentioned that “the words in original ICH are very strong dialectal, in which the audiences cannot understand...thus we use easy languages which all the audiences can understand” while ICH 18 mentioned that “our mask dance is mime performance without voices...to ensure the inherited meaning of gestures and performances conveyed to the audiences, we sometimes add voices...ICH changes based on the target audiences ...”. Similarly, ICH 3 said:

We lessen our ICH performance time from 60 minutes to 10 minutes, according to the situation. Moreover, the original form of ICH is wishing to avoid misfortune and pray wellness for a community. However, we sometimes change lyrics and voices for better understanding of the current and younger generations.

For the practitioners, transformation of ICH is a way of disseminating its value and thus they showed positive attitudes towards it. This endorses the partnership between tourism and
ICH developments in which the ICH, transformed to suit the interest of tourists, not only contributes to the dissemination of ICH as a valuable resource, but also attracts more tourists to the region which in turn, contributes to community development.

There can be little argument that ICH as a tourism resource potentially brings socio-cultural and economic contribution to a community. Over commodification and transformation to attract tourists however, can be a threat to ICH, and may subsequently lead to the complete loss of ICH authenticity and identity. Therefore, appropriate development of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource has been strongly advised by the WTO (2012). Such development should ensure inter- and intra-generational equity to enjoy ICH and bring social, cultural and economic benefits to communities. In spite of the WTO suggestion, little study specifically explores the specific opportunities, challenges and strategies identified by ICH practitioners; thus the following sections address these gaps.

5.1.1 Opportunities of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource

ICH practitioners are particularly important stakeholders in ICH development as they are mainly responsible for safeguarding and transmitting ICH. This section discusses the opportunities and challenges for ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, then presents strategies to address the challenges and maximise the opportunities associated with the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, from the practitioners’ perspectives.

Figure 5.1 is a summary of interviews with ICH practitioners and serves as a road map for the ensuing discussion.
Figure 5.1 Opportunities, challenges and strategies associated with development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource from ICH practitioners’ perspectives
**Opportunity 1.1: Increase awareness of ICH in the younger generation**

Around 50% of respondents (12 respondents) indicated the importance of increasing the awareness of ICH, especially in younger generations [ICH 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22]. This result resonates with the goals in Korean public organisation policies. One respondent was adamant that “Increasing the younger generation’s interest in ICH is the most significant issue that ICH is facing now. The individual ICH associations and the government organisations should make an effort to attract their (the younger generation) interest in ICH” [ICH1]. In addition, ICH 22 emphasised the importance of the younger generations’ awareness of ICH by worrying that “when a nation collapse, only culture will remain and define cultural identity as a Korean, so culture is really important. In order to transmit our cultural identity to the next generation, the younger generation should have awareness of our traditional culture and ICH”.

The younger generation, particularly in the nations which had substantial economic growth since 1950 (e.g., South Korea), have a much more ‘secular-rational worldview’ (Inglehart & Baker, 2000) and are less interested in traditional cultures. Nevertheless, in accordance with the present findings, existing studies have also reiterated the importance of increasing ICH awareness in the younger generation (Chhabra, 2010a; Vecco, 2010; Youn & Uzzell, 2016). The younger generation is the group responsible for the future of cultural heritage (Vecco, 2010) therefore, their lack of interest in ICH makes the transmission and safeguarding of ICH difficult (see below Challenge 1.1 for the further discussion). Moreover, from an economic perspective, a lack of interest from the younger generation can decrease the ICH tourist market because they constitute a major proportion of the tourist market (Chhabra, 2010b; Youn & Uzzell, 2016). The result identified in this study for ‘exploring visitors’ intention to experience ICH’, also showed that the more visitors are interested in ICH, the more they have intention to experience ICH and pay for the experience (see Section 5.4.4 and 5.4.5). Increasing the interest among the younger generations therefore, not only contributes to transmission of ICH to the next generations, but also increases the economic viability of ICH.

**Opportunity 2.1: Sufficient funding for ICH practitioners**

Seven respondents emphasised the importance of sufficient funding for the safeguarding and transmitting of ICH [ICH 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 20, 25]. Funding is essential in heritage management for maintaining and/or promoting the resource (Garrod & Fyall, 2000);
however, it is a challenge that most cultural heritage faces (Kurin, 2004a). The master ICH practitioners, who are designated by the Korean government, receive a monthly stipend from the Korean government. The respondents claim however that the stipend (around AUS $2,000) is not enough for the safeguarding and transmission of ICH. Expenses that ICH practitioners face include renting a venue, paying trainees (i.e. beginner ICH practitioners) and master practitioners’ living expenses [ICH 1, 6, 9]. A lack of funding means the master ICH practitioner must work to earn money, rather than spend time studying and training. For example, ICH 10 stated that “There should be better circumstances where ICH practitioners can focus on practicing and transmitting ICH. We [ICH practitioners] are currently too busy making money for our survival; thus there is not enough time to practice transmission”. Accordingly, the practitioners desire sufficient funds so they can focus on safeguarding ICH and transmitting it to the next generation.

Opportunity 3.1: Safeguarding authenticity

The practitioners maintained the importance of safeguarding authenticity for ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. The practitioners’ perspectives on authenticity were divided into two categories: emphasis on maintaining the original version of ICH [ICH 1, 8, 9, 11, 21, 25], emphasis on maintaining/safeguarding the meaning of ICH [ICH 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 22] and emphasis on the practitioners’ identity [ICH 2, 3, 11, 16, 23]. Importantly, the three categories were not mutually exclusive but rather, interactive and they converged into a complex notion of authenticity.

The practitioners who emphasised the need to maintain authentic ICH placed importance on training and mastering the performance of original versions, in order to ensure that commodified and transformed versions of performances maintain certain levels of authenticity [ICH 1, 8, 9, 11, 21, 25]. This understanding of ICH is shaped by objective authenticity, which places importance on customs and objects declared to be original (Cohen, 2012). For example, ICH 11 stated that “Obviously the original process should be safeguarded. Unless we do not master the original process, the commodified version cannot be created”. Similarly, ICH 8 said that:

ICH should keep the original form... the commodified version of ICH is too much focusing on entertainment purpose...in order to minimise the risk of losing authenticity, the practitioners firstly should learn and acquire the original form of ICH. Then, they
can show the transformed ICH by targeting the audiences.

The practitioners advocating safeguarding the original customs, gestures, languages, and performance time were concerned that the transformation of ICH would lead to extinction of ICH, and one [ICH25] stated that “if we follow the audiences wants, ICH at the end will be disappeared ... I think we should follow the tradition and original form, although it is boring”.

In contrast, the practitioners who emphasised the meaning and message of ICH, admitted social changes affect ICH [ICH 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 22]. In other words, socio-cultural shifts in society influence changes in genders practising ICH, languages, the mask and the clothes used in performances and also the needs of audiences. For example, one traditional dance was traditionally performed only by males, but now is performed by both females and males and even with higher numbers of female dancers. Therefore, the meaning of the language and performance is more important to safeguard authenticity than inheriting and performing the original customs, gestures and language. ICH 16 and ICH 22 argued that

*I don’t think there is ‘original version’ of ICH, and although there is, I haven’t seen it. For example, the mask and clothes have been changed. The original version means what we are doing in contemporary culture, founded on what our trainers was teaching [ICH 16]*

*The traditional version of dance was performed by only males. But these days, most of males are too busy to work and earn money, thus not enough males want to participate in practicing this dance. In contrast, females particularly around 40s- 50s, have more time, thus we have more female practitioners than male practitioners. Although the dance is performed by female practitioners unlike tradition, it does not mean the dance is not our ICH [ICH22]*

Similarly, ICH 3 and ICH 5 mentioned that:

*For me, the original version means the root of ICH, and various versions of performances can be recreated within the root. If the root is changed too much, its authenticity and identity will be lost. The root here means the meaning of each mine and the meaning of each lyric, which should be safeguarded [ICH3]*
Our performance may be changed based on the audiences and situations, however, the meaning and message pertaining to ICH should be conveyed in every performance... the meaning and message pertaining to ICH should be transmitted to the next generation for sure [ICH5]

The importance of the meaning of ICH was also emphasised by ICH 6 who said that “in the training of Takkyeon (No. 76 Korean national ICH, martial art), we concern a lot of politeness, toward nations, parents or instructors...without the politeness and spirit, it is just fighting and cannot be material arts”. This understanding of ICH authenticity is shaped by constructive authenticity, suggesting authenticity as “contemporary understanding of the past culture” (Zhou et al., 2015, p. 30), which is influenced by social changes.

Last, some respondents emphasised ICH practitioners’ identity for the authenticity of ICH [ICH 2, 3, 11, 16, 23]. For them, a transformed version is still authentic because they are confirming their identity while practising the transformed version. One respondent [ICH11] mentioned that the “transformed version does not mean it is not my ICH ... although we show the transformed performance we still feel our identity and the performance still shows authenticity”. This understanding of ICH authenticity is in accordance with existential authenticity, suggesting authenticity focuses on individuals’ identities and their performative experiences, which may enhance an object’s authenticity (Cohen & Cohen, 2012).

Although these three categories of authenticity were developed, they are not mutually exclusive. For example, ICH 11 emphasised the need for the transmission of the original version, however he still considers the transformed performances as ICH. ICH11 claimed that “the transformed version does not mean that it is not my ICH ... we still feel cultural identity when performing the transformed version for tourists”. Moreover, although ICH 6 emphasised the meaning and message of ICH, he identified the importance of the original form of ICH, by saying that “the beginner practitioners can realise and acquire the spirit and message of this martial art only through continuous training of the original version of ICH ... when practitioners master the original version of ICH, they can achieve self-realisation”.

The combined categories of authenticity endorse the notion of ‘theoplacity authenticity’. Theoplacity authenticity, as suggested by Belhassen et al. (2008), proposes that authenticity is a complex notion affected by multiple factors such as the place (e.g. the place where traditional
dance is performed), tourists’/practitioners’ beliefs, action and themselves. That is, the authenticity of ICH does not depend on one aspect only, such as gesture or spirit; rather, it is comprehensively affected by the tradition of performances (e.g. gestures and/or custom), the spirits underlying ICH, and the practitioner’s identity.

For the practitioners, safeguarding authenticity is important to protect ICH from being amalgamated with other ICH elements [ICH 6, 14, 22], for economic contribution [ICH3] and for the inheritance of cultural identity by the next generation [ICH 1, 7, 17, 26]. While ICH is encouraged to join contemporary and modern music, material or languages [ICH 1, 6, 7] to increase interest and be understandable for audiences, the respondents maintained that ICH should not be amalgamated with other ICH elements. For example, two different martial arts ask not to be combined, as they have different features. ICH 6 stated that:

*Every martial art is performed by body gestures. Although the principles of every martial art are very similar, such as kicking or throwing down, all of them have different styles, which is so interesting. The differences are ... for example kicking in strong or in smooth, and quickly and slowly. Taekkeyon has slow movement ... by contract, Taekwondo have strong and restrained movement...if a practitioner who do not master Taekkeyon performs Taekwondo, new martial art will be created, which should not happen.*

Moreover, safeguarding authenticity is expected to have economic contribution. For example, ICH 3 said that:

*safeguarding ICH is closely related to our present and future society... In more economic views, the visible economic comparison is required between when we know the significance of ICH and when we do not know it. For example, regional government can attract tourists by promoting ICH...*  

The respondents perceived ICH authenticity as a compound notion which is affected by its transmitted performance, meaning and message underpinning ICH and the practitioners’ identity. The respondents desire to safeguard authenticity to protect ICH from blending with other ICH, so as to ensure transmission of each ICH element.

5.1.2 Challenges of ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource  

While the practitioners proposed three opportunities for ICH to be a sustainable tourism
resource, they identified six challenges which delay ICH from being a sustainable tourism resource.

Figure 5.2 shows six identified challenges and the number of interview participants whose perspectives fall into each challenge. Around 90% of interviewed participants (24 out of 25 participants) indicated social challenges for ICH as a sustainable tourism resource include a lack of interest in ICH by the younger generation, a lack of empowerment for ICH practitioners, a lack of respect from local communities in practising ICH and a lack of employment opportunities for ICH practitioners. A total of 14 respondents suggested economic challenges, including a lack of tourism infrastructure and a lack of incentives for the beginner practitioners.

![Figure 5.2 Challenges to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource and the number of respondents who indicated each challenge](image)

**Challenge 1.1: A lack of interest of young generation in ICH**

The majority of respondents (17 respondents) pointed out a lack of interest from the younger generation in ICH as a major challenge, especially for the transmission of ICH. The respondents criticised the system and social culture in which the younger generation cannot be or are not interested in ICH. One respondent [ICH 5], worried about a lack of interest by the younger generation in ICH, said that “the biggest problem is that the present generation does not wish to learn and transmit ICH ... most of this generation has difficulties in understanding the value, which makes it more difficult in accepting and transmitting it.” Commenting on this,
ICH 1 complained that “although the younger generation learn and are interested in practicing ICH in the primary school, most of them stop learning it when they go to high school, because there are not any benefits learning and practicing ICH”.

Nevertheless, the respondents expressed their wish for the younger generation to have awareness of ICH. For example, ICH 15 insisted that “the younger generation have to change their perceptions towards ICH … cultural identity can be developed only when we understand and know our traditional culture”. Additionally, ICH 5 said that “I cannot force them to be professional ICH practitioners, but I hope they at least feel cultural identity when they watch ICH performance in the future”.

A lack of interest in ICH by the younger generation significantly influences on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, particularly in the transmission of ICH. First, less interest in ICH leads to less interest in becoming ICH practitioners [ICH 1, 15]. Given that ICH practitioners are mainly responsible for safeguarding ICH and transmitting ICH to the next generation (Lenzerini, 2011), a lack of interest in ICH by the younger generation can subsequently lead to failure of ICH transmission. Moreover, a lack of interest can lead to failure to spread the value of ICH. ICH is valuable when the public have awareness of and have desire to experience ICH (Kurin, 2004a; Yim, 2004). A lack of interest, however, will discourage awareness of ICH and learning the value of ICH, which may lead to the extinction of ICH.

**Challenge 2.1: A lack of empowerment for ICH practitioners**

A total of 10 respondents complained about a lack of empowerment for ICH practitioners to manage and transmit ICH. The practitioners’ role in safeguarding and transmitting ICH is significant. Lenzerini (2011) said without the practitioners, ICH cannot be transmitted to the next generation. Despite their importance in safeguarding ICH, eight respondents commented that the prevalent top-down approach lessens the practitioner responsibility for safeguarding and transmitting ICH. For example, ICH 3 said,

*In addition to the responsibility of safeguarding (preserving) the original form of ICH, the government should give us the responsibility of finding ways in which ICH can be transmitted to future generations . . . for example, designating ICH practitioners,**
financial support . . . all are decided by the government, not by each ICH association [ICH3]

The respondents’ desire for empowerment is supported by the literature (Fraser et al., 2006; Greer, 2010; Lyons, 2001) regarding community empowerment and sustainability. Empowerment of community is one of the sustainability indicators, meaning that communities must have capacity to manage their cultural heritage (Fraser et al., 2006). “Empowerment” can be understood as the process of giving the community relevant legal authority (Lyons, 2001), or the transferring of control over decisions on resources to communities (World Bank, 1996). The aim of empowerment is communities’ independence and self-reliance from external government in cultural heritage management; so, for example, they can operate with only minimum funding (Lyons, 2001). This is the Korean ICH practitioners’ desires, as ICH 17 claimed: “we need to have our own power to manage this ICH, safeguarding and promoting ... however, a predominant top-down approach makes empowerment difficult to realise”. Empowering a community can enhance their capacity to control cultural heritage and it enables and supports them in solving problems in the long term (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). Nevertheless, a lack of empowerment caused by the prevalent top-down approach to ICH development by Korean public organisations, challenges ICH practitioners to participate in and to reflect their interests in ICH development. This can ultimately lead to less benefit to ICH practitioners, which is an unsustainable indicator for ICH.

Challenge 3.1: A lack of respect from local communities for practice of ICH

A total of 11 respondents noted a lack of local community respect for practising ICH. ICH 17 stated that “I worry about how people see ICH practitioners. In Japan, practitioners are treated with respect, which is very different to Korea”. Moreover, ICH1 commented that

Seven out of 10 locals do not have a good attitude toward me practicing ICH, which is caused by their stereotypes regarding traditions . . . Sometimes they consider our public performance as noisy. I hope local communities have more interest on this valuable tradition, and then they will not consider it as noisy.

One of the reasons for the unfavourable local community perception is that “they consider safeguarding and practicing ICH as opposing modern culture. The Koreans think that contemporary Korean culture is modernised and trendy, and ICH is too much traditional and ‘outdated practice’” [ICH 4, 14].
Only two ICH practitioners of one ICH (Gangeung Dano festival, No. 13 Korean national ICH, regional spiritual rites) indicated the positive supports by locals in the promotion, utilisation and safeguarding ICH. For example, ICH 19 said that “although it is so crowded and there are traffic jams in the festival season, locals understand it and sometimes seem to feel proud of the festival”. ICH 17 additionally commented that “the festival can become bigger and more popular because the locals support and identity with it”. These practitioners’ statements complement the existing literature, which highlights the importance of local community involvement and support in cultural heritage management to transmit cultural heritage resources (Bakar et al., 2014).

Local communities are the groups who can safeguard intangible cultural heritage through their continuous social practice (Georgiev & Vasileva, 2012). Therefore, a lack of respect on the part of local communities for the practice of ICH can significantly impact the transmission of ICH.

Challenge 4.1: A lack of employment opportunities for ICH practitioners

A total of 11 respondents highlighted insufficient employment opportunities as a major challenge for transmission of ICH and decreasing economic value pertaining to ICH. For example, ICH 19 commented that “although university students complete a major degree in Gagok (No. 30 Korean national ICH, Korean traditional vocal music song), they do not have employment opportunities”. Moreover, the gaps among ICH elements are identified in employment opportunities [ICH 1, 17, 25]. ICH 17 claimed that some practitioners playing popularised ICH, such as Pansori (No. 5 Korean national ICH, Korean traditional storytelling music), have more employment opportunities, such as instructors at universities . . . so more people are interested in those popular ICHs, and fewer people are interested in the not very popular ICHs.

The respondents were concerned that insufficient employment opportunities discourage young generations from becoming practitioners. For example, ICH 15 said that “if the practitioners cannot get a job and earn enough money, who would be interested in maintaining ICH? Even I do not want to let my kids be practitioners”.

A lack of employment opportunities for ICH practitioners neither enhances the economic value of ICH nor contributes to the transmission of ICH. Employment opportunities
are the major economic value which can be generated from cultural heritage (Bowitz & Ibenholt, 2009). Currently in Korea however, ICH provides limited employment opportunities for ICH practitioners, which does not enhance the economic value of ICH. Moreover, it also impacts ICH transmission, because the public will be less interested in becoming ICH practitioners if practitioners have financial hardship.

*Challenge 5.1: A lack of tourism infrastructure*

Seven respondents pointed out a lack of places for ICH performance and insufficient regular performance, which they say are significant in increasing tourist accessibility to, and familiarity with ICH [ICH 3, 10, 13, 15, 16, 22, 25]. ICH needs venues such as museums and art theatres for crafts exhibitions and staging performances. For example, some countries such as China boast traditional folk villages in which traditional performances are regularly staged [ICH 15]. Korea, however, lacks theatres and/or venues in which to regularly perform ICH. A city, *Youngin*, has a Korean folk village; however ICH 15 complained that only a few selected ICH performances have been repeatedly staged. Moreover, while one theatre, for staging only ICH performances is operated by one public organisation (CHF), ICH practitioners have to pay to rent it, even when the performance is free to tourists [ICH 13 and ICH 25]. A lack of infrastructure for ICH performances leads to infrequent presentations and a lack of accessibility for international and domestic tourists. ICH 7 additionally argued that “If a tourism hub or centre is well established, more international tourists will come and see our ICH. Then ICH has potential to make this city to be a popular tourism destination”

In accordance with the present results, increasing studies (Alivizatou, 2012; Ballard, 2008; Yoshida, 2004) maintain the importance of a hub or a centre as a repository for intangible knowledge and/or skills about cultural materials or information, and these repositories can be used to build the future of the culture. For local communities, a cultural centre can be used as an area where the community meets and enhances their identity, learns their traditional culture, and hands it down to the next generation (Yoshida, 2004). Through relationships with curators who are able to identify, preserve and impart intangible knowledge, tourists can learn in-depth information about the culture (Ballard, 2008). However, a lack of tourism infrastructure such as ICH centres or ICH hubs in Korea, have negative influence not only on the economic value of ICH, but also on building social cohesion and cultural identity.
Challenge 6.1: A lack of financial and social incentives for beginner practitioners

Seven respondents [ICH 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12] indicated a lack of incentives for beginner practitioners. The practitioners argued that traditional culture has been diminished and the younger generation has become less interested, thus social and/or financial incentives are needed to motivate them to become ICH practitioners. In Korea however, there is neither sufficient financial incentive for beginner practitioners [ICH 2, 5, 6, 7, 9] and social incentives such as extra benefits to enter university [ICH 1], nor respect in the social environment for practitioners [ICH 12]. ICH 5 said that “beginner practitioners do not receive any incentives and this will discourage them from practicing. Moreover, fewer people will be interested in becoming ICH practitioners”. ICH 9 also indicated that “we have argued that financial incentives should be given to beginner practitioners, so that it will motivate them to keep practicing until they become master practitioners”. Insufficient financial and social incentives for beginner practitioners creates an environment in which safeguarding and transmitting ICH has become more difficult.

5.1.3 Strategies for facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource

The respondents suggested four strategies to overcome the challenges and facilitate the opportunities, as described in Figure 5.3.

![Figure 5.3 Four strategies identified by ICH practitioners and the number of respondents who identified each strategy](image)

*Strategy 1.1: Introduce more educational programs for the younger generation*

The respondents suggested the government introduce more educational programs for the younger generation in order to increase their awareness [ICH 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 17, 25], and create more employment opportunities for practitioners [ICH 4, 10, 15]. For example, ICH 3 maintained:
Another good way is to include the importance of ICH in the pre-school educational program. ... the significance of ICH should be mentioned at the primary educational level, which means we need to create an environment that makes them decide to become ICH practitioners.

Currently in Korea, few schools selected by a city-level government have programs for learning about some parts of ICH, in particular traditional performance and traditional craftsmanship. The respondents argued that these are too limited and need to be increased. ICH 16 stated:

*I think the ICH educational system should be developed. About 30 years ago, it was kind of compulsory to practice it, but now there are no opportunities for the younger generation to learn it. Also, if policies are not supporting it, it will not be transmitted and safeguarded.*

Moreover, introducing a (compulsory) education program can create employment opportunities for ICH practitioners. For example, systemised educational programs, such as ICH departments in high schools or universities, could provide economic opportunities for master practitioners to work as instructors, which could increase the economic viability of ICH resources. ICH 15 said, “*if practitioners can work as instructors, it will give an economic advantage to the practitioners, and then there would be more interest in performing ICH*”.

Systemising ICH learning programs in primary and high schools will facilitate ICH in being a sustainable tourism resource through (1) increasing the awareness of the younger generation in ICH; (2) increasing their interest in becoming ICH practitioners; (3) increasing the heritage tourist market; and (4) creating employment opportunities for ICH practitioners.

*Strategy 2.1: Parallel development*

The respondents suggested the need for separate ICH development according to its purpose (e.g., tourism purpose or safeguarding purpose). They argued that it is important to separate the roles of ICH relevant associations according to its purpose: to safeguard/transmit, or to commodify to satisfy tourists [ICH 6, 8, 9, 11]. For example, ICH6 stated that “*The parties who are responsible for safeguarding ICH have to focus on safeguarding it; on the other hand, the parties who are utilising and promoting it have to focus on that*.”
This strategy can be supported by parallel existence between tourism and cultural heritage management, introduced by McKercher et al. (2005a). Parallel existence advocates having clear distinct roles between cultural heritage development and tourism development; for example, the cultural heritage development sector is responsible for the ownership and day-to-day management of the asset, while the tourism sector assumes accountability for product development and marketing (McKercher et al., 2005a). Parallel relationship is common in mature destinations and adherents argue that two sectors (e.g., cultural heritage development and tourism development) have complementary goals but their roles are different (McKercher et al., 2005a). Parallel relationships can take many forms from exclusive (e.g., no contact each other) to symbiotic (e.g., certain degree of collaboration) between cultural heritage and tourism developments. Although the relationship suggested by ICH practitioners was not identified, this strategy expects to achieve both safeguarding ICH authenticity and promoting it, by focusing on each goal.

**Strategy 3.1: Increase employment opportunities**

The respondents suggested creating more employment opportunities (relevant to Challenges 4 and 6), through regular performances [ICH 10, 17], or teaching in schools [ICH 1, 2, 19]. For example, ICH 10 claimed that “if there is a regular performance, the performance could be a part of the tourists’ journey as well as giving practitioners jobs...” A sustainable tourism resource needs to provide economic benefits and opportunities to host communities (Roders & Oers, 2011), and ICH practitioners are the most crucial stakeholders that need to benefit because they have the most responsibility for the future of ICH (Lenzerini, 2011). Moreover, ICH practitioners’ suggestions for increased employment opportunities is supported by an existing study. Besculides, Lee, and McCormick (2002) argued that employment opportunities for communities are obviously important if their encouragement to develop the resource is needed. Employment opportunities will contribute to the development of an ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, through (1) bringing financial opportunities to raise funds to reinvest in safeguarding ICH (e.g. economic value of ICH); (2) enabling ICH practitioners to more actively participate in transmitting ICH; and (3) motivating the younger generation to becoming ICH practitioners (e.g. transmission of ICH).
Strategy 4.1: Entrepreneurship in ICH development

The respondents desire the increased interests by entrepreneurs in ICH and to provide financial support to transmit ICH [ICH 6, 8, 9, 20]. While tourist payments can be a source of funding used for addressing inadequate financial status in ICH development, heritage managers are wary of charging the participants because the pricing of cultural heritage is associated with its commodification, which can imply contradictory values (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). Moreover, pricing cultural heritage can discourage public access to the cultural heritage, which is contradictory to the notions of the public asset of cultural heritage, and of social equity of access to the resource. Therefore, the practitioners suggest collaboration with private enterprises in ICH development. For example, ICH 20 insisted that “now we need to collaborate with private enterprises not only for financial support but also to disseminate the value of ICH more broadly”. Moreover, private enterprises’ financial support will not only solve the problem of insufficient funding, but also promote the value of ICH broadly, which will contribute to transmission of ICH and enhance social cohesion. ICH 9 stated that:

We are suffered from financial resource to safeguarding and promoting ICH activities. For example, it takes cost to train the beginner practitioners, to rent venues for our performances, for transportation to get the venue and for costume and instrument maintenance. The government subsidies are not enough to financially support to all these costs, and I think it is not reasonable and possible to increase government subsidies. Then there need help and support by enterprises. I mean… small scale of company can support us to develop a product of our ICH and those products will support public interests in and awareness of our ICH.

5.1.4 Summary of ICH practitioners’ perspectives

This section has explored practitioner perspectives on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. The practitioners’ perspective mostly focuses on the transmission of ICH and their empowerment with little concern for the economic value of ICH. The practitioners were mainly concerned about the lack of interest in ICH by the younger generation in the transmission of ICH, followed by the lack of financial support and the inadequate tourism infrastructure, rather than concerned about the process of commodification itself. The practitioners suggested the urgent need for the younger generation to receive education in ICH, the need to create more employment opportunities for practitioners, parallel development
between the promotion and safeguarding of ICH, and financial support by enterprise for the successful transmission of ICH.

5.2 Locals’ Perspectives

This section describes the results of interviews with 22 local communities. It first presents the domestic local communities’ demographic profile, then describes the extent to which local communities are aware of their regional ICH. Next, it describes the opportunities and challenges associated with developing ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, and then provide strategies for facilitating opportunities and overcoming the identified challenges. It finishes with a summary of local community interviews.

5.2.1 The Characteristics of Respondents

A total of 22 local communities participated in the semi structured, face-to-face interviews. All respondents provided data valuable for this researcher to investigate their perspectives on ICH as a sustainable tourism resource; therefore all the interviews were used for the three sections. As Table 5.1 demonstrates, the respondents have a range of demographic characteristics. The interviews were conducted in two different suburbs in Busan in Korea, Suyeong and Dongnae. A total of 16 respondents have lived in Suyeong for more than 20 years, and a total of 6 respondents have lived in Dongnae for more than 20 years. The respondents’ ages ranged from 20 to 70.

Table 5.1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suyeong</td>
<td>16 (72%)</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongnae</td>
<td>6 (28%)</td>
<td>Over 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Awareness of ICH

The study explored the extent to which local communities recognise their regional ICH. While a total of 12 respondents were informed or knew about the regional ICH in the suburb where they lived, six respondents did not recognise either the concept of ICH or the regional ICH. A total of four respondents knew that regional traditional dances exist, but did not know
the concept of, or the term ICH. For example, one respondent [LC 6] mentioned that “I have heard of the ‘fishing song’ (No. 62 Korean national ICH, reproduction of fishing practice and the songs sung during fishing) but didn’t know that is an example of ICH, or managed by the government”. Moreover, while some respondents could present examples of tangible cultural heritage or world heritage sites, they could not present examples of ICH. This suggests that ICH is still undervalued compared to tangible cultural heritage or world heritage sites, as several research studies have described (Cleere, 2001; Foley, 2014).

In terms of being informed about ICH, six respondents remembered that they learnt about ICH in their primary schooling. Indeed, three respondents learned about it through media such as newspapers and three respondents learned about it because they lived in the region. While the 20s and 30s age group respondents mostly comprised of the six respondents who learned about ICH through education, the 50s and 70s age group respondents comprised the three respondents who were informed about ICH by living in the region. For example, LC 1 (20s, female) said “I learned about ICH through text books when I was young”, and LC 17 (70s, female) said “I know about the ICH because I have been living here for over 40 years”. This reflects the practitioners’ opinion that to introduce ICH learning programs in primary school education is a significant step in increasing awareness of ICH.

The following results and discussion present the opportunities for facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, the challenges which impact on ICH being a sustainable tourism resource, and strategies for facilitating the identified opportunities and overcoming the challenges, from locals’ perspectives. Figure 5.4 is the summary of opportunities, challenges and strategies identified by locals.
Figure 5.4 Opportunities, challenges and strategies associated with developing ICH as a sustainable tourism resource from local perspective
5.2.3 Opportunities for ICH to be a Sustainable Tourism Resource

Local participation in cultural heritage and/or tourism development is critical for ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource and locals’ participation is increased when they are benefited from the utilisation and safeguarding ICH. Therefore, this section explores the benefits which locals expect through ICH tourism products and ICH resources. A total of six respondents mentioned cultural opportunities [LC 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 18], while eight respondents expected economic opportunities for the host communities [LC 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 21].

Opportunity 1.2: Socio-cultural benefits

The respondents expected an enhanced cultural identity when more tourists visited and enjoyed their regional ICH. For example, LC 18 stated that “if more visitors come and enjoy ICH … I would feel pride as a local living in a historically valuable region”. Similarly, LC 10 said that “as locals enjoy ICH, we will be familiar with our traditional culture, and this will increase cultural level…such as enhanced cultural identity”.

One respondent [LC 7] showed concern about the over commodification and transformation of ICH as a result of popularising ICH which results from too much focus being placed on the economic value of ICH at the expense of its cultural value. Nevertheless, respondent LC7 also acknowledged the benefits from the popularisation of ICH, such as increased pride and awareness of ICH within Korea. LC 7 maintained that “if ICH becomes too popularised, its role as cultural heritage would be diminished. However there would be more advantages than disadvantages. If ICH becomes popular, more people will know about national and regional ICH, which I hope”.

Moreover, the increased opportunities for locals to practice and experience culture was identified by one respondent [LC 1]. He mentioned that:

*it is common to wear their traditional costumes in Japan, whereas in Korea there is rarely opportunity to wear Korean traditional costumes. If ICH becomes more popular, I think there would be more opportunity to wear it.*

The increased opportunities for locals to experience traditional culture and practices (i.e. ICH) may enhance their cultural identity given that traditional culture influences the construction of cultural identity (Yim, 2002). That is, locals consider ICH tourism resources as
tools for increasing cultural identity, which is in accordance with previous studies (Breathnach, 2006; Palmer, 2005).

**Opportunity 2.2: Economic benefit**

A total of eight respondents [LC 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 18, 20, 22] expected economic benefits as a result of ICH popularisation, caused by the flow of visitors to the region. For example, LC 6 said that “if it becomes popular… economic advantage among others? More tourists will visit us and it will bring economic advantages to our regions”.

One interesting finding is that the local communities expect to promote ICH at the international level through *Hallyu* [LC2, 22]. *Hallyu* is also referred to as the Korean Wave and refers to “the phenomenon of Korean pop culture, such as TV dramas, films, pop music, fashion, and online games being widely embraced and shared among the people of Japan, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and other Asian countries” (Han & Lee, 2010, p.115). *Hallyu* has directly increased sales of Korean drama exports and has indirectly and positively influenced Korean tourism by attracting international tourists (Han & Lee, 2008; Kim, Long, & Robinson, 2009; Kim, Agrusa, Lee, & Chon, 2007) The respondents expect ICH to become one of the *Hallyu* elements, so that it contributes to regional and national economic development. For example, LC 2 claimed:

> now there is limitation on promoting Korea only with shopping with contemporary music. Also, I can see many international visitor interested in wearing Korean traditional clothes (Hanbok). So promoting ICH or combined version of ICH with contemporary culture would be internationally shared and will contribute to the positive economic effect of Hallyu

Moreover, four respondents [LC 3, 4, 6, 8] expected regional economic development, such as increasing visitors, in the suburbs (i.e. Suyeong or Dongnae) and city (i.e. Busan). LC 3 said:

> there is a huge firework festival in Suyeong, and hundreds of visitors from other cities come to see the firework. If our regional ICH becomes as popular as the firework festival, it will increase economic development...

Similarly, LC 7 expected economic development to occur by attracting domestic and international tourists. She stated that:
There is Andong Hahoe folk village in Korea. Both domestic and international visitors consider it as a place must visit in Korea. In last year, Korean government selected three cultural villages in three regions in Korea, and Suyoung is one of the area...hope Suyoung cultural village becomes popularised and attracts more tourists as like Andong Hahoe folk village

These findings reflect the existing literature which clearly argues that the local communities will use their heritage in a sustainable way when cultural heritage brings economic benefits, such as tourism development (Aas et al., 2005). The emphasis on economic value at the expense of cultural value among cultural heritage tourism resources has been cautioned because over commodification and transformation of ICH for economic benefits could cause it to lose its cultural value (Cole, 2007). The finding however, suggests that the economic value of ICH cannot be ignored as it is still one of the most important benefits from ICH tourism resource that locals expect.

5.2.4 Challenges of ICH to be a Sustainable Tourism Resource

While locals expected socio cultural and economic opportunities as a result of ICH popularisation, they indicated both a lack of local interest and/or pride in ICH and a lack of ICH promotion as major challenges for ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Challenge 1.2: A lack of local interest and pride

A total of 10 respondents indicated a lack of local pride and of local interests as major challenges for ICH to become a sustainable tourism resource. This challenge was also identified in the analysis of Korean public organisation policies and the interviews with ICH practitioners. For example, LC13 claimed that “the locals probably feel proud of big international film festivals hosted in the region, but they might not feel pride about a traditional festival”. Moreover, the public lacks interest in ICH [LC 1, 5, 9]. According to Nuryanti (1996), the majority of heritage tourists are domestic due to their identification with their own culture. A lack of local and the public interest in ICH can have negative impacts on the ICH tourism market.

More importantly, a lack of local interest results in a lack of interest in being ICH practitioners and in the transmission of ICH. ICH is transmitted to the next generation only
when people are practising it (Kurin, 2004a); however, a lack of applicants for becoming ICH practitioners will negatively impact transmission of ICH. For example, LC 4 commented that “… rather than a commodification issue, not enough applicants are looking for playing and practicing ICH, which is a more serious problem”. LC8 also worried about scarcity of potential practitioners by stating that “there are not enough people wanting to practice it...”. A lack of local interest and pride then, has a negative influence on the economic value and transmission of ICH.

Challenge 2.2: A lack of marketing

A total of six respondents indicated a lack of marketing, particularly in disseminating the cultural value of ICH, as another challenge for ICH in becoming a sustainable tourism resource [LC 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 17]. Appropriate ICH marketing is essential, among other things, because it needs to reach a wider audience and disseminate closed communities’ cultures (Naguib, 2013). In Korea however, the respondents indicated that insufficient marketing leads to fewer domestic or international tourists being informed. LC 7, who is working in a regional ICH management association, emphasised the importance of promoting performances, by stating that “we spend a lot of time thinking about how to promote our ICH and attract larger audiences”. Moreover, LC 13 also maintained that

*domestic tourists in other cities do not know our regional ICH, and international visitors would not know the schedule of performance because of a lack of marketing. So I think promotions disseminating knowledge and the value of our ICH is the most important.*

Although performances showing a few regional traditional dances are staged (i.e. ICH), people are not informed of its venue or time due to a lack of marketing. For example, LC 17 claimed that “although there performances are staged, most of people accidently drop by rather than intentionally visit and watch the performance. This is because of a lack of marketing, I think”. LC 13 also supports this idea by stating that “the regional fishing song festival is promoted through media such as regional newspaper or radio, so that we know when the festival will be, but visitors from other regions probably will not know about it”. A lack of marketing leads locals not to be exposed to ICH, although the dissemination of the value of ICH contributes to increasing the interest in and the transmission of ICH.
5.2.5 Strategies for facilitating ICH to be a Sustainable Tourism Resource

The respondents suggested four strategies to overcome the identified challenges. The four suggested strategies are: creating interest, enhancing physical accessibility to enjoy, early child education with actual experience, and effective government involvement in ICH management. Figure 5.5 describes the number of respondents who identified each strategy. More than 50% mentioned creating interest as the most important, followed by enhancing physical accessibility, early child education and actual experience, and effective government involvement in ICH management.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 1.2 Create interest to increase awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2.2 Enhance physical accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3.2 Early child education and actual experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 4.2 Effective government involvement in ICH management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.5 Four Strategies identified by locals and the number of respondents who identified each strategy

**Strategy 1.2: Create interest to increase awareness**

Over 60% of respondents (14 respondents) emphasised the importance of creating interest in and adding an entertainment factor to increase local community awareness of ICH [LC 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21] in order to attract more domestic and international tourists [LC 1, 3, 5]. For example, LC 8 claimed that “unless the ICH is recreational and enjoyable, people will not be interested in it”. Another respondent also commented that “the original version is boring and less enjoyable, thus it needs to add entertainment factors for the local communities to be interested” [LC 21]. This comment supports the importance of entertainment and recreational factors in heritage tourism management, as reported by Garrod and Fyall (1998, p.691) who claimed that:

*part of the mission of heritage attractions must be to entertain visitors and provide a recreational opportunity. If they do not enjoy themselves then they will be less likely to make return visits or to recommend the attraction to others.*
The importance of entertainment to local communities explains their agreement and even preference for ICH transformation, and to increase their interest in ICH. A total of 11 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the transformation of ICH and seven indicated the reason for transformation because they perceive the original ICH as boring. For example, LC 3 said that “… some recreational factors should be added to increase the audience’s interest,” and LC 7 mentioned, “I think the ICH needs to be a bit modified to be more interesting and to attract and interact with audiences”. LC 12 also indicated that “to increase the interest for audiences, some degree of transformation is necessary”. The importance of locals’ interest in ICH is consistent with the previous findings (see 5.2.1 and 5.2.2) which state the locals’ awareness of and interests in ICH is one of the most significant principles to enhance transmission of and the economic value of ICH.

To create local interest in ICH, the respondents suggested using mass media such as TV entertainment programs or newspapers [LC 1, 2, 8, 19]. For example, a TV entertainment program covering ICH could create interest for the younger generation in ICH [LC 8, 19]. LC 1 supports this by stating that “if people are informed about its educational purpose, they might regard ICH as ‘boring’ and ‘old’”. Moreover, the respondents suggested combining traditional performance (i.e., ICH) with modern music (i.e., contemporary pop) [LC1, 2]. LC 2 mentioned that “Korean pop music is so popular in East Asian countries; therefore, combining ICH with K-pop can popularise and spread the value of ICH globally”.

One young respondent suggested using SNS to create locals’ interest [LC19], such as hashtag promotion, which could spread the name of ICH. This suggestion broadly supports the work of other studies in this area linking cultural heritage and SNS. Social media, such as Twitter, Facebook, or Instagram, has been used by cultural institutions to engage with community by sharing daily updates of information about restoration projects, and the staging of performances (Gaitan, 2014). Suppliers such as heritage curators could facilitate visitors’ understanding of heritage. For visitors, the use of social media in heritage tourism provides not only opportunity for them to have communal interactions with other visitors, host communities or curators, but also to widen their experience through understanding the central ideas of their cultural heritage experience, and why it is important (Giaccardi, 2012).
Strategy 2.2: Enhance physical accessibility

A total of eight respondents indicated that enhancing physical access to ICH is a significant step to increasing awareness of ICH for locals [LC 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 16, 18], and increases its economic value [LC 4, 6, 18]. Physical accessibility is one of the most important aspects of heritage attractions, because heritage can have meaning as a tourism resource only when it is accessible for potential visitors to experience (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). To increase physical accessibility therefore, the respondents suggested regular performances [LC 16, 17], hosting regional festivals of ICH [LC 6, 7, 15, 16], and development of tourism facilities such as ICH hubs where ICH-related events occur [LC 4, 6, 16]. For example, LC17 mentioned that “we need to have more free performances to facilitate local’s interests”. Moreover, LC 16 suggested that the regional festivals of ICH increase accessibility by stating that “there is annual Eobang festival and there is performance of fishing song (No 62 Korean national ICH, reproduction of fishing practice and the songs sung during fishing) as well as there are food people can enjoy... I think that is one of the way to increase interests of ICH by locals”

Moreover, development of tourism facilities such as cultural heritage hubs or transport systems can increase accessibility and enjoyment ICH [LC1, 4, 6, 16]. This result is in accordance with ICH practitioners’ points in arguing that a lack of tourism infrastructure challenges ICH transmission and enhanced economic viability (see 5.2.1 5.1 A lack of tourism infrastructure). The importance of ICH hubs is supported by one respondent who learned about their regional ICH through visiting a regional hub staging a traditional performance [LC 15]. The cultural heritage centres or hubs, along with transport systems, should be built to increase physical accessibility. For example, LC16 complained that “I am working in a hotel and there are some international visitors asking to visit the regional ICH centre however it is a bit complicated to get there, and more complicated to explain it to the international visitors”. While limitations on tourist access to cultural heritage sites has been argued by some studies as it causes degradation of environmental and cultural values pertaining to the cultural heritage (Halewood & Hannam, 2001), there has been little argument for enhancing physical accessibility so that people can enjoy it. ICH however, needs to spread news of its value widely to increase awareness and enhance its economic viability.

Strategy 3.2: Early childhood experiential education

A total of seven respondents stated the importance of early childhood education (i.e., up to year 6) which provides real world experiences in safeguarding ICH by increasing
awareness of it and facilitating its economic value [LC 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 17, 22]. This result is consistent with a strategy suggested by ICH practitioners maintaining the importance of educational programs for the younger generation in facilitating the successful transmission of ICH (see 5.2.2. 1.1 Introduce more educational programs for the younger generation). Besides the practitioners’ strategy, locals suggested early childhood experiential programs be aware of ICH and identify its value. A few respondents showed evidence of the importance of real experience at a young age because they were aware of ICH and remembered it from their primary schooling [LC 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13]. LC13 explained that “although everybody learnt the value of ICH as part of the primary education process, not all remember it. The most important thing is to have actual experience and ‘playing it’ to feel cultural identity”. LC 3 similarly said that “students have to physically play it to remember it”, and LC 5 added that “I still can remember Ganggangsule [Korean traditional ritual dance registered in UNESCO]. I think that is because I played when I was in primary school”. LC 15 suggested after-school activities could provide opportunities for children to play ICH. Besides the importance of local community education for cultural heritage to be a sustainable tourism resource (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006), actual playing ICH at an early age was identified as significant for safeguarding the resource. The importance of actually playing ICH is reflected in the physical experiential nature of ICH.

Strategy 4.2: Effective government involvement in ICH development

A total of seven respondents stated the importance of the government role in promoting ICH [LC4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12] and increasing accessibility ICH [LC19]. LC 12 argued the importance of government involvement in ICH management by stating that “ICH cannot be promoted only with local community’s power, thus there should be government’s involvement in manage and control ICH”. More specifically, LC19 said that “the government should participate in it. If the government aims to attract tourists to enjoy ICH, they will develop infrastructure, such as transportation, to get there. However, this cannot be done at the local level”. LC6 mentioned that “the government should intervene for example, by policy development or creating a festival using the regional ICH”.

Nevertheless, two respondents [LC 9, 18] noticed the government’s focus on tangible cultural heritage over ICH and they stated there needs to be more focus on ICH. For example, LC 9 mentioned that:
I saw a few news reporting the conservation or repairing work by government on tangible cultural heritage such as Namdaemoon (No 1 Korean national cultural heritage), but never heard about any work on ICH. While tangible cultural heritage is also important but I think government has too much focus on tangible cultural heritage over ICH

While some studies (Mulcahy, 2006; Robertson, 2016; Tweed & Sutherland, 2007) argue the negative impacts of a top-down approach such as a lack of reflecting locals’ interest in cultural heritage management, this result supports the studies (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006) arguing that government policies and regulations are essential in the development of tourism resource and strategy implementation. Given that sustainability is a political concept and thus achieving sustainability depends on the society’s political system (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006), government involvement in promoting and safeguarding ICH is inevitable.

5.2.6 Summary of Local’s Perspectives

The results in this section indicate locals mainly identify the economic value of ICH and recognise ICH as a subject which should be transmitted. However, there was little account of the authenticity of ICH and/or the social value of ICH, such as ICH practitioners’ empowerment and/or employment issues. For example, locals only expected cultural benefits (e.g. enhanced cultural identity and/or more opportunities to experience traditional culture) or economic benefits (e.g. regional and national economic development) pertaining to the development of ICH tourism resources. Moreover, the finding indicates that creating interests, enhancing physical accessibility and early childhood experiential education will facilitate the transmission, promotion, and economic viability of ICH. Interestingly, locals identified the importance of government involvement in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource because the government has power and resources to fund it. The next section moves on to discuss the visitor perspectives on the sustainability of ICH as a tourism resource.

5.3 Visitors’ Perspectives

This section analyses the results of the visitor questionnaire surveys at the National Intangible Heritage Centre [NIHC]. It begins with sample descriptions, followed by frequency analysis to explore the competitiveness of ICH as a tourism resource. It then presents the results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), which developed the seven factors used in this study. It next reports on visitors’ willingness to experience ICH and willingness to pay; and finishes
with a conclusion about visitors’ perspectives.

5.3.1 Sample Characteristics

Table 5.2 summarises the demographic profile of the respondents. Among the 255 respondents, 121 respondents (47.5%) were male and 134 (52.5%) respondents were female. The majority of the visitors were in their 20s (53.3%) and most of them visited with friends.

Table 5.2 Demographic profile of visitors at national intangible heritage centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Visitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121 (47.5)</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>162 (63.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134 (52.5)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>59 (23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>34 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>21 (8.2)</td>
<td>Primary school graduate</td>
<td>10 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>136 (53.3)</td>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>96 (37.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>59 (23.1)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>121 (47.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15 (5.9)</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>24 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>14 (5.5)</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60s</td>
<td>10 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Frequency analysis

The purpose of visiting National Intangible Heritage Centre

The questionnaire participants showed strong positive attitudes toward the entertainment purpose as a reason for visiting NIHC. Figure 5.6 describes the number of participants for each scale (i.e., 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)), and over 80% of participants’ results were neutral to strongly agree with the entertainment purpose of visiting to experience ICH. Moreover, in spite of the slight differences, the mean score for entertainment purpose (mean = 3.64) was slightly higher than the mean score for educational
purposes (mean = 3.45) or for confirming cultural identity (Mean = 3.23). This finding supports the existing studies by placing importance on entertainment factors in heritage tourism experiences (Chhabra, 2010b; Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2004).

Figure 5.6 The number of participants visiting national intangible heritage centre with the purpose of entertainment

Competitiveness of ICH as a tourism resource

This study explored the different cultural identity of three cultural attractions: traditional architecture (i.e. tangible cultural heritage), traditional performance, and making traditional crafts (i.e. physical involvement). Cultural identity was judged by Korean’s degree of belongingness and pride in Korea (Tomlinson, 2003). Both Figures 5.7 and 5.8 compare how strongly they felt cultural identity when they experience three different attractions (gazing traditional architecture, watching traditional performance and making traditional crafts). Interestingly, there are no significant differences in visitors’ cultural identity when they are ‘gazing’ at traditional architecture, watching traditional performances or are physically involved in making traditional crafts. Moreover, as shown in Figure 5.8, more participants had stronger pride in Korea when they were looking at traditional architecture and traditional performances, than when making traditional crafts. One of the major competitive advantages of ICH as a tourism resource, is visitor’s physical involvement, which increases interest (Breathnach, 2006; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004) and enhances visitors’ cultural identity (Ashworth, 2013). The findings however, suggest that visitors have a similar degree of cultural identity in spite of their different levels of physical involvement. This finding suggests ICH
suppliers consider the ultimate goal of providing physical involvement activities associated with ICH (e.g. making traditional crafts).

5.3.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

A total of 21 items out of 29 resulted in seven underlying dimensions. Eight items were omitted due to high cross-loadings between factors and/or communality was lower than 0.5 (Pallant, 2005). The omitted eight items were ‘I experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea while looking at the digitally archived ICH’, ‘I experienced pride as a Korean while looking at the digitally archived ICH’, ‘I experienced a pride as Korean while experiencing ICH (e.g.,

![Figure 5. 7 Comparison of cultural belongingness among three cultural heritage attractions](image_url)

![Figure 5. 8 Comparison of cultural pride among three cultural heritage attractions](image_url)
making traditional crafts’), ‘I agree there exists differences between the original and commercial versions of ICH ‘I agree the differences need to be managed because they can distort the past caused by focusing on providing memorable experiences rather than historical fact’, ‘The Korean government have implemented the supportive policies to generate tourism development with ICH’, ‘There are opportunities for ICH stakeholders (ICH practitioners, local communities, government and tourist) to communicate and collaborate safeguarding ICH while commodify as tourism resource.’ ‘Financial support is important for ICH to be pass on to the next generation.’


### Table 5.3 The result of factor analysis (n=255)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Rotated factor loadings</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Cultural Identity (Mean = 2.02; SD = 0.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.771</td>
<td>21.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea while looking at traditional performances.</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced pride as a Korean while looking at traditional performances</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea while experiencing ICH (e.g., making traditional crafts)</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Status of ICH management (Mean = 2.88; SD = 0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.503</td>
<td>11.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities have opportunities to participate in tourism related decision making processes.</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities have opportunities to participate in safeguarding ICH.</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea has implemented effective management to pass on ICH to the next generation</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Korean government has implemented supportive policies in safeguarding ICH</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Significance of ICH management (Mean = 1.75; SD = 0.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>8.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the Korean government is important for ICH to be pass on to the next generation.</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder collaboration and</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
integration is important for ICH to be passed on to the next generation. Local communities are important for ICH to be passed on to the next generation. I agree the differences need to be managed because the commercial version of ICH can be standardised to satisfy major consumer group, which lead to a loss of cultural authenticity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F4 Agree with transformation (Mean = 2.80 ; SD = 1.18)</th>
<th>1.654</th>
<th>7.519</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree that differences naturally occur to provide tourists an enjoyable experience.</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>-.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that differences naturally occur in order for ICH value to be understood by tourists.</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>-.906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F5 Interest in ICH (Mean = 2.56; SD = 0.98)</th>
<th>1.289</th>
<th>5.861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My purpose in visiting the National Intangible Heritage Centre is to learn and be educated about the value of ICH.</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My purpose in visiting the National Intangible Heritage Centre is to reaffirm my Korean identity</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My purpose in visiting the National Intangible Heritage Centre is to have an authentic and memorable experience through physical engagement (e.g. making traditional crafts).</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F6 Intention to experience ICH (Mean = 1.74; SD = 0.83)</th>
<th>1.217</th>
<th>5.530</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will visit here again if more knowledge about Korean ICH can attract more tourists</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will visit here again if more experiential activities can attract more tourists because experiential activities increases enjoyment</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will visit here again if there provide more experiential activities because experiential activities provide opportunities to enhance Korean cultural identity (e.g. learn some traditional dances)</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F7 Intention to pay for ICH (Mean = 2.79; SD = 1.08)</th>
<th>1.040</th>
<th>4.725</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will visit NIHC again even though it charges</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to pay to participate in traditional craftsmanship classes</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total variance explained 65.177
The results identified seven factors and explained 65.18% of the variance. Factor loadings for all 21 items ranged from .577 to .927. The higher rotated factor loadings indicate the closer relationship between the factor and individual item.

The first factor of ‘cultural identity’ (eigenvalue=4.771) consisted of three items and is interpreted as the degree of visitor cultural identity. The second factor of ‘status of ICH management’ (eigenvalue=2.503) contained five items and is interpreted as a participant’s perception of current ICH management in Korea. The third factor of ‘significance of ICH management’ (eigenvalue=1.865) included four items and is interpreted as a participant’s concern on ICH management such as transmission. The fourth factor of ‘agree with transformation’ (eigenvalue = 1.654) comprised two items and is interpreted as the degree of agreement with ICH transformation such as adding entertaining factors. The fifth factor of ‘interest in ICH’ (eigenvalue =1.289) consisted of three items and is interpreted as the degree of awareness and interest in ICH. The sixth factor of ‘intention to experience ICH’ (eigenvalue= 1.217) comprised three items and is interpreted as the participants’ willingness to visit NIHC to experience ICH such as exhibitions, performances or making traditional crafts. The last factor of ‘intention to pay for ICH experience’ (eigenvalue=1.040) consisted of two items and is interpreted as the participants’ willingness to pay for ICH experience.

The purpose of the survey was first, to investigate the visitors’ willingness to experience ICH, because if no one is looking for ICH experience, ICH cannot be a tourism resource. The second purpose was to examine the visitors’ willingness to pay for ICH experience because ‘user pays’ is one of the most effective ways to raise funds which can be reinvested in ICH (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). Therefore, the last two factors (i.e. ‘Intention to experience ICH’ and ‘Intention to pay for ICH experience’) were selected as the factors which are affected by the first five factors (i.e., ‘Cultural identity’, ‘Status of ICH management’, ‘Significance of ICH management’, ‘Agree with transformation’ and ‘Interest in ICH’).

5.3.4 Visitors’ Willingness to visit NIHC

A multiple regression analysis was performed to explore the most influential factor on willingness to visit NIHC and experience ICH from among the following: ‘cultural identity’, ‘current ICH management’, ‘significance of ICH’, ‘agree with transformation’ and ‘interest in ICH’. Cultural identity, interest in ICH, awareness of significance of ICH and agree with transformation, were the significant predictors of willingness to visit NIHC and experience ICH (Sig .000, .005, .000 and .021) as shown in Table 5.4. Moreover, the confidence interval...
shows that the effects of cultural identity, interest in ICH, significance of ICH and agreement with transformation are .177 - .437, .042 - .240, .175 - .460 and .014 - .169, which are all positive effects. This concluded the 95% confidence in that visitors are more willing to visit NIHC and experience ICH when they have higher cultural identity, when they are more interested in ICH, when they perceive ICH management as being significant, and when they agree more with the idea of transformation. Among the predictors, the visitors’ cultural identity contributed the most strongly to willingness to visit NIHC (Beta = .289), followed by significance of ICH (Beta = .251), interest in ICH (Beta = .167) and agree with transformation (Beta = .130). Visitors’ cultural identity and the significance of ICH similarly contribute to intention to visit NICH (Unstandardised Beta = .307 and .318 for each). Their contributions are three times higher than agree with transformation (Unstandardised Beta = .091), and two times higher than interest in ICH (Unstandardised Beta = .141).

While the four factors significantly contributed to visitors’ intention to experience ICH, visitors’ perspectives about current ICH management in Korea did not significantly affect willingness to experience ICH (Sig. .491). It can be concluded that no significant effect from visitors’ perspectives in ICH management were detected in their decision to experience ICH. This, however, does not mean, the status of ICH management perceived by visitors does not contribute to their intention to experience ICH, but the model might need to be refined with, for example, more deliberate questions about ‘status of ICH management’.

A significant regression equation was found (F (5,248) = 19.593, p <000) with an R² of .283. This means that cultural identity, interest in ICH, perception of current ICH management, significance of ICH management and agree with transformation together explain only 28.3% of the variation in willingness to experience ICH. It can be concluded that these 5 variables do explain willingness to experience ICH to some extent (F=20, P<0.0005); however, there is need to examine more complex models by adding more variables, for example.

Table 5.4 Willingness to experience ICH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>-.365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.5 Willingness to Pay for ICH Attraction

Funding is essential in heritage tourism and “user pays” is one of the ways to raise funds for investing in heritage management (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). Therefore, this study explored the factors that impact visitors’ willingness to pay for ICH attraction. A multiple regression analysis was performed to predict willingness to pay based on five variables: ‘cultural identity’, ‘status of ICH management’, ‘significance of ICH management’, ‘agree with transformation’ and ‘interests in ICH’. A significant regression equation was found (F (5,249) = 3.861, p <000) with an R² of .072. This means that cultural identity, status of ICH management, significance of ICH management, agree with transformation and interest in ICH together explain only 7.2% of the variations in willingness to pay, which suggests that more exploration of variables contributing to intention to pay needs to be made.

More specifically, only status of current management significantly contributes to willingness to pay for ICH attraction (Sig .021) as shown in Table 5.5. This means that visitors who have a positive perception of the current status of ICH management in Korea are more likely to pay for ICH attractions. For cultural identity and interest in ICH, since the confidence interval of both factors for willingness to pay for ICH attraction are mostly positive (-.057 to .329 and -.031 to .263), it can be predicted that the increasing visitors’ interest in ICH and increased visitors’ cultural identity are associated with an increasing willingness to pay for ICH attraction, in spite of little size. Interest in ICH is predicted to contribute to willingness to pay with the half size of the visitors’ perception of current ICH management (Standardised Beta .216 vs .116).
Table 5.5 Willingness to pay for ICH experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients B</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>4.654</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>2.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural identity</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of ICH management</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>2.319</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of ICH management</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with transformation</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.424</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>-.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in ICH a. Dependent Variable: IntentiontoP</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.6 Summary of Visitors at NIHC

The results in this section indicate that visitors’ cultural identity, interests in ICH, perception of the significance of ICH management and agree with transformation elements, significantly contribute to visitor willingness to experience ICH. Moreover, status of current ICH management significantly affects visitors’ willingness to pay for ICH experiences, while their cultural identity and interest in ICH only slightly contributed to it. The examined five factors partially explain visitors’ willingness to experience ICH and willingness to pay for ICH experience in particular; therefore it is necessary to explore the effects of other variables on them.

5.4 Objective 3 Synopsis

Objective three was to develop a framework which facilitates ICH becoming a sustainable tourism resource, from all the results combined that is, from the analysis of public documents; the analysis of interviews with ICH practitioners and local communities; and the questionnaire for visitors at NIHC. This section discusses the shared and different goals and opportunities of the stakeholders, then presents a framework facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource.

5.4.1 Agreements and Gaps Among the Stakeholders

All the stakeholders commonly pointed out the importance of increasing the awareness
of and interest in ICH among locals, particularly the younger generation, because the current generation have a lack of awareness of cultural heritage (Inglehart & Baker, 2000; Nas, 2002). ICH practitioners have serious concern about a lack of interest, pride and respect for ICH from local communities, which discourages locals from looking for traditional performances or not becoming ICH practitioners. The locals recognise a lack of local interest in ICH is a problem. Moreover, the result of the questionnaire for tourists showed domestic tourists’ interests in ICH have a positive relationship with experiencing ICH and willingness to pay for the experience. The Korean public organisations have goals of promoting the value of ICH and have implemented the relevant strategies such as ICH attraction development and combining ICH with modern music/design/materials. Local awareness and interest are important because ICH will be extinguished unless locals practise and are interested in it (Bortolotto, 2007). More importantly, the younger generation’s awareness of ICH is important as they are the group who has responsibility to safeguard ICH in the future. Nevertheless, a lack of locals’ and the younger generations’ awareness and interest in ICH threatens the transmission of the economic and social values of ICH.

Not surprisingly however, gaps are more visibly identified in the perspectives on ICH tourism resources from the four different stakeholders. The first gap was identified in the response to the question on the perceptions of the role of ICH tourism resources. While public organisations and locals mainly viewed the ICH tourism resource as an economic growth tool for regional and national economic development, ICH practitioners regarded the ICH tourism resource as a way of disseminating the cultural value of ICH and/or a way of empowering ICH practitioners. For example, Korean public organisations have utilised ICH to facilitate national branding and attract tourists, and have vigorously added Korean ICH to UNESCO ICH lists because the UNESCO cultural heritage list has competitiveness as a tourism resource (Li et al., 2008). Moreover, locals expected the utilisation of ICH to bring economic growth to Korea through promoting ICH at international levels through Hallyu and attracting more tourist interest [LC 2, 22] or through hosting regional ICH festivals and attracting domestic and/or international visitors [LC6, 7]. In contrast, ICH practitioners consider ICH not as a tool for economic development, but as a way of disseminating the value of ICH to the broader communities. More importantly, ICH practitioners desire and strongly argue for the development of ICH as a tourism resource to facilitate ICH practitioners’ empowerment and enable themselves or each ICH safeguarding association to have political and economic power in safeguarding and promoting ICH activities.
The second gap was identified among the stakeholders’ perceptions of the importance of ICH authenticity. While ICH practitioners emphasised the transmission of and safeguarding of ICH authenticity, public documents and locals rarely expressed their concern about authenticity issues, which is not surprising. The difference regarding ICH authenticity may result from the three different stakeholders’ (public organisations, locals and ICH practitioners) perceptions of ICH tourism resources. As the Korean public organisation mainly regarded ICH tourism resource as a tool for economic growth, they pay little attention to the authenticity issues pertaining to ICH, such as the regulation of unsustainable practices influencing ICH authenticity. In contrast, ICH practitioners are mainly responsible for the transmission of ICH (Lenzerini, 2011), thus showed concerns for the transmission of authentic ICH. ICH practitioners advocate for and are concerned about safeguarding authenticity to protect ICH from being amalgamated with other similar ICH elements (e.g., two masked mime dances developed in two different regions) [ICH 6, 14, 22] and about the next generation’s inheritance of cultural identity [ICH 1, 7, 17, 26].

Gaps between stakeholders commonly exist in heritage tourism because different stakeholders exist with different degrees of connectivity to the resources, have different levels of legitimacy as stakeholders, and also different perspectives on how the resource should be managed (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). Nevertheless, stakeholder collaboration, and community interests (i.e., ICH practitioners) are major issues in cultural heritage development, so communication between the public organisations and ICH practitioners is expected to reduce the interest gaps between the two groups.

5.4.2 A Blend of Top-down Approach with ICH Practitioner Involvement

Interestingly, a top-down approach such as the Korean government involvement, controls and policy development was identified as a facilitator when it blends with a bottom-up approach in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. For example, the suggested strategies by ICH practitioners (e.g., introduce more education programs in primary and high schools and financial support from enterprises) require the Korean government’s involvement and policies to be implemented. Moreover, local communities strongly desire government policies focusing on development of ICH (e.g., tourism infrastructure establishment), because locals lack the ability to implement some strategies such as building tourism attractions.
A top-down approach, in which policies and strategy are initiated from the national government, has been regarded as a major barrier for sustainable cultural heritage development because it fails to recognise the interests of stakeholders such as local communities (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). To address this, a bottom-up approach has been strongly advised in the existing literature (Chambers, 1997; Din, 1993; Timothy, 1999) because the goal of the bottom-up approach is to involve various stakeholders and it represents their interests in the decision making process (Chiabai, Paskaleva, & Lombardi, 2013), which may lead to having capacity for community self-reliance (e.g., ICH practitioners) (Sharpley, 2000). The respondents in this study criticised the Korean policies for ICH as not very effective [ICH 4] and not very organised [ICH 10], because “the current system for intangible cultural heritage . . . does not consider the people who practice and transmit ICH” [ICH 10]. Nevertheless, they did recognise the importance of government control and involvement in ICH development. For example, ICH2 said that “Unless the Korean government has designated ICH, a lot more ICH elements have been extinguished”. ICH 7 added that “The national government regulations and policies are important to increase the awareness of ICH by the Korean nations”.

The bottom up approach facilitates development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource as it encourages community groups to speak up and show their interest. Nevertheless, there are limited social and financial resources for the bottom-level stakeholder to implement strategies and decisions, such as controlling various public debates or economic costs around issues (Blake, 2009). Therefore, a top down approach can be a facilitator for cultural heritage development when it blends with a bottom-up approach.

5.4.3 Entrepreneurship in Heritage Tourism

This study revealed that entrepreneurship is a facilitator in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Entrepreneurship is a complex notion that involves diverse entrepreneurial behaviour (Landstrom, 2010). For example, entrepreneurship involves someone who creates, organises and operates a new business, and indicates the innovator who transforms inventions into economically viable entities (Baumol, 2004). Within the tourism context, (Kensbock & Jennings, 2011) identified the tourism entrepreneur as “an individual who creates a business with some component of originality in provision of a product, service, or experience for tourists”.
Entrepreneurs are the major instigators of business in the tourism industry (Chang, 1999; Kensbock & Jennings, 2011). These tourism entrepreneurs provide significant contributions to tourism development such as tourism facilities development, which may lead to a huge growth in the tourism industry (Kensbock & Jennings, 2011). The growth of the tourism industry, however, has negative impacts on the environmental and cultural resources. Therefore, the worth of entrepreneurs has been a subject of debate in sustainable tourism development (Buckley, 2002; Chapman, 2000; Thompson, 2004).

Not surprisingly then, entrepreneurs have been considered as having a confrontational relationship with cultural heritage development because they focus too much on tourists’ experiences and tourism product development re cultural heritage than on safeguarding the authenticity of cultural heritage (Bowitz & Ibenholt, 2009; Corner & Harvey, 1991). The finding, however, shows the important role of entrepreneurs in cultural heritage development, such as financial supporters and/or providers of spaces for safeguarding activities, which most cultural heritage activities need. The Cultural Heritage Association, which mainly manages and controls ICH, has continuously attracted entrepreneurs to support ICH transmission and promotion activities. ICH practitioners also suggested the potential power of entrepreneurs to provide financial resources for ICH practitioners who are suffering from insufficient funding. Moreover, ICH practitioners expect entrepreneurs’ power in the development of ICH products for tourism and/or daily experience as they can increase awareness of ICH. According to Cole (2004), peripheral areas with narrow economic bases need an entrepreneurial approach for financial assistance to the communities (i.e., ICH practitioners), so that community capacity will be enhanced for safeguarding and promoting ICH (Klein, 2003).

5.4.4 A Framework Facilitating ICH to be a Sustainable Tourism Resource

By integrating the results of analyses of policies and strategies, interviews with ICH practitioners and locals, and a questionnaire with visitors, this study developed a framework which facilitates ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, as described in Figure 5.9.

Development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource requires a complex and holistic approach which integrates the transmission of authentic ICH, ICH tourism attraction development, promotion of ICH to locals and ICH practitioners’ benefit distribution. The transmission of authentic ICH is arguably ensured for intra generational equity for accessing
and utilising ICH. The authenticity of ICH does not only refer to the cultural values of ICH but includes its power enabling individuals (e.g., locals, ICH practitioners and tourists) to experience cultural identity. This leads to the importance of the promotion of ICH to locals. The promotion of ICH to locals will increase the daily use of, accessibility to and awareness of ICH, and thus it will support the transmission of ICH. The increased awareness of and interest in ICH by locals, increases the economic viability of ICH as well. Importantly, ICH as a sustainable tourism resource should provide equal benefit distribution to ICH practitioners, such as employment opportunities and more importantly, ICH practitioners’ empowerment.

To facilitate this, a top-down approach blend with a bottom-up approach is necessary. On the one hand, the bottom-up approach requires national-regional government cooperation, cooperation and collaboration among the different stakeholders (e.g. public organisations, ICH practitioners and locals), ICH practitioners’ participation in the decision making process, and/or ICH practitioner empowerment. On the other hand, the top-down approach requires the establishment and implementation of policies and strategies which reflect ICH practitioners’ and locals’ interests, such as facilitating entrepreneurship in ICH development, financial support for ICH practitioners and introducing educational programs. Public organisations’ power and involvement are inevitable in the development of ICH, a sustainable tourism resource, due to their capacity to introduce policies and regulations, but their involvement, policies and regulations should be more supportive and reflect ICH practitioners’ interests and perspectives, rather than public organisations’ arbitrary decisions.
Figure 5.9 A framework facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource
5.5 Summary

This chapter has firstly presented the results and discussion of 25 interviews with practitioners, 22 interviews with local communities, and 255 surveys of visitors at the National Intangible Heritage Centre, then developed a framework for ICH as a sustainable tourism resource by combining all the results, including the results from the public organisation policies and strategies analysis presented in the previous chapter. This chapter demonstrates the diversity in stakeholders’ viewpoints toward development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. A significant finding is that the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource is a complex process which integrates ICH transmission, ICH promotion, ICH tourism resource development and ICH practitioners’ empowerment. Some gaps still exist between ICH practitioners, local communities and public organisations in the promotion of ICH, which needs to be addressed through collaboration. The next chapter will summarise the main findings across the thesis in regard to the initial aim and objectives of the research.
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6. Conclusion

The overall purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which the development of ICH facilitates the development of a sustainable tourism resource. Cultural authenticity and community identity provide ICH with unique selling points in a competitive tourism industry and thus there is an increasing global interest in ICH. Yet ICH is fragile and vulnerable and the potential for the commodification of ICH is a real threat as tourism interest in ICH continues to increase. Therefore, a sustainable approach is being adopted around the globe with the goal of safeguarding cultural heritage to ensure future generations have an opportunity to experience ICH. In spite of increased international interest in, and awareness of, the need for facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, little research has been undertaken pertaining to the specific development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. For example, to date, no research has been undertaken to examine the role of public organisations in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, the effectiveness of policies and plans, the opportunities and challenges that impact and/or shape ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, and importantly, appropriate and effective models facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. This research has responded to this significant gap in the literature.

To achieve the purpose of this study, three objectives were developed. The first objective was to situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of ICH. The second objective was to identify and critically analyse public organisations’ documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource, and the third objective was to establish a framework facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. This chapter will first present the implications and conclusions relating to each of these three objectives. Second, the chapter will present the significance and contribution of the research and in particular, its contribution to the body of knowledge regarding sustainability, ICH and cultural heritage tourism. Finally, the chapter will reiterate the limitations experienced throughout the research process and then propose a future research agenda pertaining to the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.
6.1 Objective One: To situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage

As interest in ICH is a relatively new phenomenon, not surprisingly, the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource is an unexplored area of the cache of research that focuses on issues pertaining to cultural heritage (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002; Roders & Oers, 2011). While previous studies on sustainable development in heritage tourism comprehensively explore tangible cultural heritage such as historical monuments and/or world heritage sites (Aas et al., 2005; Landorf, 2009; Wager, 1995), there is still a paucity of work focusing specifically on ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. To address these research gaps, Objective One aimed to situate the sustainable tourism development literature within the context of intangible cultural heritage. The review of the literature undertaken for this study revealed that ICH as a sustainable tourism resource contributes to community empowerment and enhances the economic, social and cultural value of ICH. Figure 6.1 presents a conceptual framework that situates sustainable development literature within the context of ICH.
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**Figure 6.1 A conceptual framework situating intangible cultural heritage and sustainable tourism development**

Four major development theories (dependency theory, modernisation theory, economic neoliberalism and alternative development) impact to varying degrees on the degradation and/or the promotion of ICH. Modernisation and dependency theories regard development as Westernised and/or economic focused growth, and view traditional culture (i.e., ICH) as a potential meal ticket to development, which more often than not, results in the devaluation of
traditional culture. Thus, when countries adopted economic neoliberalism and viewed tourism as an economic activity designed to increase foreign exchange, interest in and the importance of, traditional culture increased as its potential for increasing economic receipts was recognised over and above any concerns for the cultural and social values of ICH. While modernisation, dependency and economic neoliberalism have facilitated positive impacts such as economic growth around the world, the negative impacts include degradation of cultural heritage, unequal development and a lack of political and economic freedom for certain communities. Sustainable development evolved in response to such negative impacts and advocated balanced growth between social, economic, ecological and cultural dimensions, with a view to achieving quality standard of living and economic, social and political freedom across communities around the world. The facilitation of sustainable development that integrates the cultural, social and economic values of ICH has been identified as an imperative in most countries and industries.

ICH is transmitted over generations and it embodies strong cultural authenticity and identity. It is this strong authenticity which provides tourists with opportunities to have an authentic experience. The popularised ICH in turn brings economic growth to communities, strengthens pride of culture and cultural identity of communities. Nevertheless, the staging and presentation of cultural heritage tourism experiences can cause conflict in the development of tourism resources. For example, ICH (e.g. traditional performance and/or traditional crafts) is too often staged and transformed to satisfy the needs of tourists and subsequently threaten the authenticity of ICH. Arguably, ICH authenticity should be safeguarded, not only for its long-term capacity as a competitive tourism resource, but more importantly to ensure the cultural continuity of communities and more broadly, cultural diversity around the world. Therefore, an approach which develops ICH as a sustainable tourism resource is strongly advised.

ICH as a sustainable tourism resource is underpinned by resource-based and community-based sustainability. They are not mutually exclusive and should support each other to be achieved. On the one hand, the resource-based approach argues that economic, social and cultural values of ICH should be promoted and all the values (i.e., cultural authenticity, economic values, social values) should be transmitted to the next generation. On the other hand, the community-based approach argues that ICH should positively contribute to the future of communities, not only in the distribution of equal economic and social benefits to communities, but more importantly to community empowerment. In the context of ICH, ICH
practitioners and locals are the significant community groups because without them, ICH cannot be transmitted to future generations. While economic and political power inequality (e.g. between public organisations and ICH practitioners/locals) commonly exists in cultural heritage development, community collaboration and participation is necessary to realise community empowerment (Okazaki, 2008). Consequently, ICH as a sustainable tourism resource is not only concerned with the transmission of the economic, cultural and social value of ICH, but also facilitates equal benefit distribution and community empowerment.

6.1.2 Significance of the research in relation to Objective One

This study has expanded the literature base pertaining to ICH and consequently, facilitates more informed academic debate on ICH within a sustainability context. This research has established that ICH, as a sustainable tourism resource, is a complex, multi-disciplinary phenomenon that encompasses economic, cultural and social aspects associated with ICH and communities. The multi-disciplinary nature of ICH opens up opportunities to utilise ICH as a sustainable tourism resource which can be used to address multiple aspects of sustainability. Therefore, as a result of this study, future academic, and/or industry, and/or government debate pertaining to ICH will be better informed to utilise and promote the resource for community.

6.2 Objective Two: To identify and analyse public organisations’ documents in order to determine the extent to which they facilitate the development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource

Objective Two sought to identify and critically analyse the extent to which public policies facilitate the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. It has been shown throughout this study that to varying degrees, public organisations’ policies and strategies have shown a propensity to economic neoliberalism mainly by regarding ICH tourism resources as economic tools. The policies mainly focus on the promotion of ICH with the purpose of either economic development and/or increased awareness of ICH by the Korean public, and to a much lesser extent, it focuses on social development, such as ICH practitioners’ equity in participating in the decision-making process and/or ICH practitioners’ empowerment.

While ICH has been mainly managed by six Korean public organisations, three major public organisations (i.e., Cultural Heritage Association, Cultural Heritage Foundation and National Intangible Heritage Centre) have mostly been involved in ICH development since 2013. The policies and strategies analysed in this study mostly focused on the economic aspects
of ICH, such as ICH attraction development, combined with modern music/design/material and international cultural exchange. Although there were a few policies and strategies concerned with the transmission of ICH, such as education of the younger generation and funding to ICH practitioners, there were significantly more strategies facilitating the economic aspects of ICH. As well, the lack of monitoring of the effectiveness of these strategies and the impacts of any unsustainable practices on authenticity, suggested that these policies are superficial. For ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource, not only its economic viability, but also its social concerns and cultural values should be enhanced and transmitted. Nevertheless, the policies and strategies are limited and mainly focused on the promotion of ICH, which suggests they are too superficial to facilitate ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Moreover, particularly from community-based sustainability perspectives, there are still challenges for public organisations to overcome, such as reversing a predominantly top-down approach to ICH practitioners’ empowerment. A top-down approach, which is a result of Confucian influence and the military authoritarianism of previous governments throughout history (Kim & Park, 2003), does not facilitate equity for the ICH practitioners and locals involved in the decision making process as it fails to recognise the interest of ICH practitioners and their empowerment for developing their own ICH.

These approaches are surely not conducive to development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. For example, they do not adequately include ICH practitioner participants in policy development and/or the planning process, nor do they encourage ICH practitioners and/or the ICH associations’ empowerment. When policies and strategies follow sustainable tourism resource development, community empowerment occurs as a result of increased education, skills and power to make decisions and in turn, this bring benefits to ICH practitioners (Salazar, 2012). Overall however, the policies analysed in this study do not facilitate such an endogenous process (Lavergne, 2004), in which ICH practitioners achieve empowerment and self-reliance with the development of ICH.

6.2.1 Significance of the research in relation to Objective Two

This research offers important insights into the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource from a public organisation’s perspective. There is little argument that public organisations are primarily responsible for the promotion and preservation of cultural heritage and their part in the development of ICH (Jansen-Verbeke & Lievois, 1999). However to date,
there has been a paucity of research that has dealt with the sustainability of ICH from a public organisation’s perspective (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). This study has uncovered in-depth insights regarding public organisations’ roles and the significance of the role of public policies in facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. For example, this study provided the empirical evidence of policies and strategies which lack empowerment for ICH practitioners; and future policy makers of ICH will be aware of the importance of ICH practitioner empowerment in developing policies associated with ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Therefore, the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource discussed in this research has the potential to inform and benefit public organisations that are interested in utilising ICH for sustainable tourism purposes.

6.3 Objective Three: To develop a framework facilitating intangible cultural heritage to be a sustainable tourism resource

Objective Three was to develop a framework facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource by critically evaluating (1) ICH practitioners’ perspectives of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource, (2) local communities’ perspectives of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource and (3) tourists’ willingness to experience and pay for an ICH experience, and then combining this with the results in Chapter 4. By integrating the four major stakeholders’ perspectives, a development framework facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource was established, as shown in Figure 6.2.

This framework was established by combining all the results. In Chapter 4, the study presented goals and strategies implemented by Korean public organisations. In Chapter 5, the study presented opportunities, challenges and strategies identified by ICH practitioners and locals, and also presented tourists’ willingness to experience and pay for ICH experiences. While Chapter 5 presented each result and discussion individually, the assertion here is that when combined with Chapter 4’s findings, the development of ICH according to the framework presented in this study, will promote the ongoing development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

The framework argues overall, that transmission of ICH, tourism development of ICH, ICH empowerment and promotion of ICH to locals share symbiotic relationships. To facilitate this, cooperation among the stakeholders, a blend of top-down and bottom-up approaches and
entrepreneurship in ICH development are necessary. Importantly, the study does not claim that the development framework, shown in Figure 6.2 is capable of interpreting all the complex dynamics of sustainability and ICH development (Barthel-Bouchier, 2013), but it does provide a foundation for future intangible cultural heritage development as a sustainable tourism resource. Moreover, the framework integrates major stakeholders’ perspectives and guarantees long-term, holistic and equity planning through being able to “reconcile competing demands, avoid wasteful investments and duplication of efforts, guide necessary investment, research and develop markets for best results, establish financial and strategic interdependence between heritage and tourism activities, and implement locally grounded policy for the long-term” (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011, p.856).
Figure 6. 2 A framework facilitating ICH as a sustainable tourism resource
Symbiotic relationship between ICH transmission, tourism development and promotion to locals: It has been shown throughout this study that safeguarding ICH, the promotion of ICH to locals and the tourism attraction development of ICH have a symbiotic relationship and support each other to achieve each goal. Moreover, in spite of not having been facilitated yet, ICH practitioners’ empowerment and equal benefit distribution are necessary to facilitate ICH transmission and tourism development. The historical monuments or world heritage sites have experienced physical degradation due to the number of visitors to the sites exceeding the carrying capacity of the resources (Butler, 1996). For ICH however, spreading its value to as many people as possible is the most important principle (Naguib, 2013), because unless people are aware of it, it will be extinguished. Unlike tangible cultural heritage, which exists regardless of peoples’ awareness, when the current generation is not aware of the value of ICH, it will be hard to transmit it to the next generation.

Cooperation between stakeholders: The public organisations mainly regarded ICH as an economic development tool and had little concern for safeguarding the authenticity of ICH, while ICH practitioners were mostly concerned with the transmission of and safeguarding of ICH, which is not surprising. Meanwhile, locals and visitors reasonably considered ICH as an economic tool while simultaneously identifying the significant cultural value of ICH. The different perspectives on ICH strongly suggest coordination and collaboration among the stakeholders in planning (Aas et al., 2005), so that effective ICH strategies which are reflected by social and cultural circumstances and bring benefits to all the stakeholders, will be developed (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Hall, 1999).

A blend of top-down and bottom-up approaches with ICH practitioners’ empowerment: Interestingly, top-down approaches such as the Korean public organisation’s controls on ICH development and policy development, were identified as facilitators to ICH development as a sustainable tourism resource when blended with bottom-up approaches. For example, the suggested strategies by ICH practitioners require Korean public organisation involvement, regulations and policies to be implemented. Moreover, locals strongly suggest government policies and regulations in ICH development because public organisation involvement can facilitate the promotion and safeguarding of ICH. Undoubtedly, the prevalent top-down approach which leads to unequal benefit distribution among stakeholders, particularly for the less powerful groups, has long been regarded as a barrier for sustainable development (Kurin,
Nevertheless, public organisations’ involvement is inevitable and they are one of a few groups which have political power and resources that can facilitate promotion and/or safeguarding of ICH. Given this, the public organisations’ controls, blended with bottom-up approaches, facilitate and encourage development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Entrepreneurship in ICH development: Entrepreneurship, considered as contradictory to cultural heritage development (Bowitz & Ibenholt, 2009; Corner & Harvey, 1991), was identified as a facilitator for ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. Entrepreneurship can provide financial support to ICH practitioners who suffer from insufficient financial resources in their safeguarding and promotion activities for ICH. Moreover, entrepreneurship may create and develop ICH tourism products (e.g., performative events and festivals) and/or ICH daily use products, which can support and disseminate news of the use and value of ICH.

6.3.1 Significance of the research in relation to Objective Three

The findings of Objective Three made several contributions to the current literature and/or cultural heritage space in the tourism industry. First, there is a lack of holistic approaches linking locals, tourists and industry (Loulanski & Loulanski, 2011). This study, exploring public organisational policies and the perspectives of local communities and visitors, will prove useful in expanding the understanding of sustainability and intangible cultural heritage tourism.

Second, while previous studies identify key stakeholders in cultural heritage tourism as public organisations (Cros, Bauer, Lo & Rui, 2008), local communities (Hall & Richards, 2002) and/or visitors (McIntosh & Prentice, 1999), little research emphasises the role of private enterprise and entrepreneurship in facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource. This study identified the importance of entrepreneurship in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. The adoption of entrepreneurship in ICH development (i.e. involvement of private profit sectors) can foster the promotion of ICH and increase interest in and awareness of ICH by the public. This new understanding should help to improve the understanding of entrepreneurship in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Third, this study establishes a framework for the development of a sustainable ICH tourism resource. There needs to be a development framework which suits the differentiated features of ICH, such as living culture and difficulty in physical identification of changes.
Therefore, the study will contribute to expanding the sustainable cultural heritage development paradigm. The approach to promote, educate and safeguard the resource should be adopted as society changes.

Last, this study explored Korean ICH. Korea has a well established reputation for its ICH safeguarding systems (Yim, 2004). Therefore, the framework for facilitating ICH to be a sustainable tourism resource can be adapted by other cultural heritage destinations to develop their own ICH. For example, there need to be modern and contemporary strategies (e.g. using social networks or TV entertainment programs) for the younger generations to increase their awareness of and interest in ICH. Moreover, ICH is experiential by nature, so young generations’ actual physical experiences at an early age would enhance their awareness of ICH. These findings will assist the ICH industry (public or private sector responsible for safeguarding ICH) in understanding how to increase both locals’ and the younger generation’s awareness of ICH to successfully transmit it.

6.4 Recommendations for Further Research

This study has provided the foundations for further research to be conducted in relation to ICH management and sustainable development. Further research is required to fully understand development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

First, comparative studies could be undertaken between Korea and other Asian/Western countries to establish their perspectives on the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource. Each country has different cultural, political and historical backgrounds to establish ICH development legislation and/or strategies. Therefore, the comparative research would be able to both describe and explain development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource by various cultural backgrounds, and thus provide greater and fuller insight into public organisational strategies in the development of ICH as a sustainable tourism resource.

Second, future studies are required to focus on each ICH category, such as traditional dance, ritual events, festivals or traditional craftsmanship. ICH in this study is holistic and covers all the elements of ICH. However there exist differences among the elements, such as tourism activity development and the way to educate local communities. Therefore, the focused research on each ICH element will provide more explicit and specific findings which can
contribute to the sustainable management of the ICH debate.

Last, future studies can explore potential private enterprises’ perspectives on their involvement in ICH management. This study identifies the important role of private enterprises in the development of ICH. Their desires, goals and challenges in relation to the promotion and transmission of ICH now need further exploration.
## Appendixes

### Appendix A: The list of documents selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Title [Korean]</th>
<th>Title [English]</th>
<th>Type of documents</th>
<th>Year issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts/Regulations</td>
<td>1. 무형문화재 보전 및 진흥에 관한 법률 시행령</td>
<td>Laws and enforcement on the safeguarding and promotion of Intangible Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Acts/Regulations</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 무형문화재보호법</td>
<td>Act on Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Acts/Regulations</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 시행규칙</td>
<td>Enforcement regulations</td>
<td>Acts/Regulations</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Administration</td>
<td>4. 2005 년도 주요업무계획</td>
<td>2005 Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 2007 년 주요업무계획</td>
<td>2007 Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 2009 년 주요업무계획</td>
<td>2009 Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. 2010 년 주요업무계획</td>
<td>2010 Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. 2013 년 주요업무계획</td>
<td>2013 Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. 2015 주요업무계획</td>
<td>2015 Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - the 34th exhibition of the masterpieces of traditional crafts</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Performance announcement - Ritual music performance at Jongmyo Shrine with its special exhibition</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Experiential event announcement - An experiential event of food and clothes used for ritual ceremony of Jongmyo Royal Ancestral Rite</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Announcement - the first public ICH event in 2015</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Event announcement - night ritual music performances</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Heritage Foundation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2013 Annual Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>2014 Annual Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2015 Annual Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Annual strategic Plan</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Business strategic plan for initiating the partnerships with entrepreneurs to facilitate ICH utilisation</td>
<td>Business strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016년 중요무형문화재 기예능공개행사 지원안</td>
<td>A plan to support and provide financial support for ICH practitioners/associations (craftsmanship and artistic) in hosting public events in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016 년 국제문화 행사 「종묘대제」자원봉사자 모집 공고</td>
<td>Volunteer recruitment- recruiting volunteers in an international cultural event, royal ancestral ritual in the Jongmyo Shrine, in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015년 무형문화재 전승자 주관전승활동 지원사업안</td>
<td>A plan to support ICH practitioners to safeguard and transmit ICH in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015 년 중요무형문화재 기예능공개행사 지원 안</td>
<td>Announcement - providing financial support to ICH practitioners/associations (craftsmanship and artistic) in hosting public events in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015 인천국제공항전통문화추진계획서</td>
<td>A plan to promote traditional culture at Incheon International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015 고궁역사관광자원화목록</td>
<td>A list of Gogung (Ancient Palace)-related historical tourism resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014 년도 중요무형문화재공예강습지원사업 신청공고</td>
<td>Announcement – an application open for ICH practitioners to apply to be supported in hosting and running crafts class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012 무형문화재초대전</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - the exhibition of ICH (crafts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 한국관광공사. 중국 서북지역 관광객 유치 위해 실크로드 국제여유박람회 참가</td>
<td>Report - the Korea Tourism Organization participated in the China silk road international tourism expo, to attract northern west Chinese.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. K-Style Hub에서 전통과 현대가 어우러진 팽진 공연을 만나보세요</td>
<td>Performance event announcement - traditional artistic performances combined with modern features</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 외국인 관광객 2,500 여명, 서울광장에서 김장담근다</td>
<td>Report - more than 2,500 foreign tourists participate in making Kimchi event at Seoul Plaza</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. 한국관광공사-전라북도 국내외 관광객 공동유치 업무협약 체결</td>
<td>Report - Korea Tourism Organization concluded a business agreement to attract domestic and international tourists to Jeollabuk-do.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 서울 김장문화제 외국인 관광객 3천명 참가</td>
<td>Report - 3,000 foreign tourists participated in the Seoul Kimjang (making kimchi) Festival</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. 유네스코 인류무형유산 예비후보 김치와 김장문화, 한국관광홍보대사로 뛴다</td>
<td>Report - The potential UNESCO ICH Kimchi and Kimjang plays the role of ambassadors for Korean Tourism.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 달빛 아래 즐기는 창덕궁의 아름다움</td>
<td>Event announcement – traditional arts performance at Changdeok Palace</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. 무형문화유산 분야 남북 교류협력 방안에 대한 공개토론</td>
<td>Report - public discussion hosts about ICH exchanges between south- and north Korea</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. 2014 년주요업무계획</td>
<td>2014 Annual strategic plan</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. 2015 년주요업무계획</td>
<td>2015 Annual strategic plan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. 2016 년주요업무계획</td>
<td>2016 Annual strategic plan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
<td>47. 국립무형유산원 무형유산지기 모집</td>
<td>Recruit announcement – Recruiting locals interested in managing and safeguarding regional ICH</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. 궁에서 만나는 전통 가무악(歌舞樂)의 향연</td>
<td>Festival event announcement - the feast of traditional music, dance and sing at a palace</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. 2013 년 중요무형문화재 공개행사 달력 안내</td>
<td>Announcement – the distribution of ICH public events calendar in 2013</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. 전승자 주관 전승활동 지원 안내</td>
<td>Announcement – providing supports for ICH practitioners on their transmission activities in 2013</td>
<td>Business strategic plan 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. 2013 년 중요무형문화재 기예능 공개행사 지원 안내</td>
<td>Announcement – providing financial supports for ICH practitioners/associations on hosting public events of crafts and artistic ICH in 2014</td>
<td>Business strategic plan 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. 2013 이수자 전승활동 지원 사업 참가자 공모</td>
<td>Recruitment - recruiting entrepreneurs interested in supporting ‘Advanced’ practitioners’ transmission activities in 2013</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. 국립무형유산원 출범 기념 ‘무형유산원 맛보기’ 시범행사 개최</td>
<td>Event announcement – an event for visitors to national intangible heritage centres to experience various activities</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. 국립무형유산원, 해설이 있는 무형유산 공연 개최</td>
<td>Event announcement – traditional art performances (ICH) with storytelling</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. 2013 중요무형문화재 보유자 작품전 개최</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - crafts exhibition, made by Living Human Treasures</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Bulletin/ Report</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Event announcement and recruiting – application opens for participants interested in Gimjang (making Kimchi) and recruiting event volunteers showing Gimjang (making Kimchi) culture</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs recruitment - recruiting entrepreneurs supporting and facilitating traditional crafts distribution</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Recruitment announcement - recruiting volunteer curators in the National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - The National Intangible Heritage Center hosts a special exhibition of traditional musical instruments</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Festival announcement - International ICH film Festival</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Application announcement – looking for participants (Korean citizens) interested in ICH workshops in 2014</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>‘2014 조선 시대 궁중음식전’ 개최</td>
<td>Festival announcement - 2014 Royal Cuisine of the Joseon Dynasty festival</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>‘무형유산마켓 - 대대손손’ 개최</td>
<td>Event announcement – open market of traditional crafts and the recreated crafts in modern context</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2014 중요무형문화재(공예) 전승활성화 사업 공고</td>
<td>A entrepreneurial projects facilitating the transmission of ICH (craftsmanship)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>무형유산 기업초대전 - 무형유산, 기업의 꽃이 되다’ 개최</td>
<td>Event announcement – inviting entrepreneurs and shows ICH entitled ‘Intangible Heritage, Flowers for Companies’ is heled.</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>국립무형유산원, 개원 맞아 각종 공연과 전시 개최</td>
<td>Report - The National Intangible Heritage Centre hosts various performances and exhibitions for opening ceremony</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>무형문화유산과 함께하는 현충사</td>
<td>Event announcement – ritual event and traditional performance will be performed at Hyeonchungsa Shrine</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>제 39 회 대한민국전승공예대전 개최</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - The 39th Korea Annual Traditional Handicraft Art Exhibition</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2014 무형유산 체험 강좌 안내 - 서안만들기-</td>
<td>Free class announcement – traditional crafts making courses in 2014; making traditional bookracks</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - The exhibition of crafts made by National Living Treasures, entitled “Beautiful Life, Exhibition of Crafts by Human Cultural Assets” is held.</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Performance announcement – The first performance event by ‘Advanced’ practitioners</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Event announcement - The National Intangible Heritage Center holds a special exhibition on Nongak (performing arts) entitled “Nongak, The Ecstatic Excitement of Humanity”.</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Event announcement - Year-end events consisting ICH performance</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - The exhibition ‘2014 Gyul’ showing the crafts created by ‘Advanced’ practitioners</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Report - the National Intangible Heritage Centre have facilitated transmission and promotion of ICH together with the traditional handcrafts practitioners in 2014</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Announcement - Distribution of national maps showing ICH education, training and transmission centres</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Recruitment – recruiting ICH practitioners interested in teaching ICH to locals in National Intangible Heritage Centre in 2015</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>2015년 무형문화재 기획공연 전문 역량 강화(예능개인) I 교육안내</td>
<td>Program announcement – The basic career development programs for ICH practitioners in directing performances and events</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>국립무형유산원 2015 이수자만(傳) 공모 실시</td>
<td>Application announcement - National Intangible Heritage Centre is looking for ‘Advanced’ practitioners interested in exhibiting their crafts and show performances</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>청소년 창의체험 나의 무형유산 체험기</td>
<td>Announcement – looking for the young generations interested in learning ICH</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>어린이 전시 협설사가 들려주는 무형문화유산에 귀가 쫓고</td>
<td>Announcement – clever kid curators are ready to be a storytellers for visitors</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>무형의 가치를 이야기 전통술 이야기</td>
<td>Event announcement - A storytelling event about traditional authentic alcohol</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>2015년 무형유산 창의공방 참여자 공모</td>
<td>Application announcement – looking for participants (Korean citizens) interested in ICH workshops (making crafts)</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>전통공예 장인(匠人), 그 숯써를 빼내다</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement – an exhibition showing crafts by ICH practitioners</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>판소리! 전통과 현대의 만남, 그 창조적 미래의 실마리</td>
<td>Performance event announcement of Pansori (Korean musical storytelling)</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>남쪽 땅에서 꼬쳐지는 북녘 전통예술의 향연!</td>
<td>Event announcement - The feast of North Korean traditional performing arts in South Korea</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>무형문화재 명인, 그들을 추억하다!</td>
<td>Event announcement – events over the four weekends for the purpose of homage to National Living Treasures</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>2015 년 중요무형문화재 전승자 주관 기획공연. 기획전시 전문역량 강화 과정Ⅱ 교육 안내</td>
<td>Program announcement – Advanced level career development programs for ICH practitioners in directing and planning performances and/or exhibitions</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>전통공예와 현대 디자인이 만나는 새로운 미래</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement – an exhibition of recreated traditional crafts with contemporary designs</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>무형문화재 ‘이수자’의 활약상, 무대로 만난다</td>
<td>Performance announcement – traditional performing arts performed by ‘Advanced’ practitioners</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>즐거운 여름방학, 무형유산 체험으로 더욱 신나게!</td>
<td>Program announcement – programs for teenagers interested in making crafts and learning traditional performing arts while their summer vacation</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>시음회 안내 공고</td>
<td>Event announcement - traditional alcohol tasting events at National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>재외동포, 고국에서 무형문화재와 보름간의 행복한 만남</td>
<td>Report - Overseas Koreans enjoyed Korean ICH in their home country</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>무형유산의 새로운 가치, 광복 70 년의 빛을 밝히다</td>
<td>Event announcement – event composed of academic conference and traditional performing arts to celebrate the 70 years of Korean liberation</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>전통문화 체험교육 시연행사 안내</td>
<td>Experiential program announcement – a trial free courses for Korean citizens learning traditional performance and making traditional crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td></td>
<td>광복 70 년 기념 특별공연 다시 찾은 빛</td>
<td>Event announcement - a special events commemorating 70 years after the liberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td></td>
<td>국립무형유산원 무형유산 시민공방 강좌 안내</td>
<td>Public course announcement – public workshops opens for Korean citizens interested in making traditional crafts at National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td></td>
<td>무형문화재 전수교육관 DAY !! 무형유산 체험교육</td>
<td>Experiential program announcement – Event entitled ‘the day of ICH transmission and training centre’ provides young generations experiential program to educate the value of ICH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td></td>
<td>무형문화유산의 생생한 감동, 안방에서 만난다</td>
<td>Announcement - It is available to experience the vivid impression of ICH in your home (through television programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td></td>
<td>무형유산 콘텐츠 개발 및 활용 교육</td>
<td>Educational program application announcement for film maker and/or writers interested in learning how to utilise and promote ICH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td></td>
<td>광복 70 년 기념, 「굿 GOOD 보러 가자」 연해주 특별공연 개최</td>
<td>Event announcement - A special performance is held in Maritime Province in Russia to commemorate 70 years after the liberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Report – the public – private profit organisations collaborate and develop a ICH learning centre</td>
<td>Festival announcement - The whole country will be excited by the cheerful Nongak (traditional performing arts) on October 9th</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>Festival announcement - The whole country will be excited by the cheerful Nongak (traditional performing arts) on October 9th</td>
<td>Performance and exhibition announcement – performance and exhibition of Flamembo and Fado (Spain and Portuguese traditional arts) in Korea</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>Performance and exhibition announcement – performance and exhibition of Flamembo and Fado (Spain and Portuguese traditional arts) in Korea</td>
<td>ICH educational event announcement targeting international visitors (learning traditional performance and traditional crafts)</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Announcement – the public – private profit organisations collaboration makes a strong step toward Korean ICH globalisation</td>
<td>Announcement - The feast of Korean ICH lights up the night in Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Announcement - The feast of Korean ICH lights up the night in Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement – the exhibition of traditional crafts recreated in modern context</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement – the exhibition of traditional crafts recreated in modern context</td>
<td>Educational program announcement for people interested in directing ICH performances and events.</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Bulletin/Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Educational program announcement - The National Intangible Heritage Centre host 15 basic and advanced educational courses for Korean publics and ICH practitioners to attend.</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Announcement - the National Intangible Heritage Centre provides storytelling programs to visitors</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Application announcement – a crafts making workshop is waiting participants (Korean citizens) interested in</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Program announcement – National Intangible Heritage Centre encourages ICH practitioners to visit rural regions to share their story and traditional performances</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement – Special exhibition to homage National Living Treasure ‘Choi Yoo-hyun’ in traditional embroidery for 70 years</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Report – Koreans in Central Asia have opportunities of learning making quilted clothes</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin/Report</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Publication Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. 국립무형유산원,장인이 피워 낸 꽃,특별전 개최</td>
<td>Exhibition announcement - The National Intangible Heritage Centre holds a special exhibition of flower related ICH, entitled “Flowers Bloom in the Hands of Artisans”.</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. 무형문화재대전 참가신청안내</td>
<td>Festival participants recruitment – recruiting individuals and/or groups skilled in traditional arts.</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. 국립무형유산원 2016 무형유산 체험교육 안내 4 월~11 월</td>
<td>Educational program announcement – various ICH learning courses are ready from April to November 2016, hosted by the National Intangible Heritage Centre</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. 무형유산 시민공방(사기장) 교육 안내</td>
<td>Crafts learning course announcement – a course is ready for Korean citizens to learn traditional crafts (Sagijang; Ceramic bowls)</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. 국외초청공연 자원봉사자</td>
<td>Volunteer recruitment – recruiting volunteers supporting an event of international performances in Korea</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. 대한민국 다명인 김동곤과 함께</td>
<td>Experiential program announcement – a traditional tea making program with Kim Donggon, a master of tea in Korea</td>
<td>Bulletins/ Reports 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Korea Traditional Performing Arts Foundation**
  - 129. 사업범위: Business scope
  - 130. 재단연혁: Foundation history
  - 131. 주요사업: Major business
Appendix B: A set of interview questions
[In English]

Develop sustainable management framework
Intangible Cultural Heritage Practitioners (*Living Human Treasure*)

### A. Commodification and its impact on authenticity and identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Compared to other types of cultural heritage) What aspects of ICH attract international and/or domestic visitors? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea during displaying ICH to visitors? If yes, how do they affect you to feel the belongingness?</td>
<td>(Breathnach, 2006; Palmer, 2005; Zhu, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any differences between the original and the commercial versions of ICH? If yes, can you give me an example?</td>
<td>(MacCannell, 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(If yes to previous question)</em> Do you think there exist differences between original and commercial versions of ICH in creating a feeling of belonging to Korea? Why?</td>
<td>(Halewood &amp; Hannam, 2001; Taylor, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the differences need to be managed or do they occur naturally, why?</td>
<td>(Baillie et al., 2010; Holtorf, 2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Sustainable management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think Korea is good example of ICH management? Why do you think so?</td>
<td>(Foley, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the management do you think are good? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What kind of supportive government policies there are? (e.g., financial support or training system)</td>
<td>(Du Cros et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-To what extent local communities involve in safeguarding and promoting ICH? (e.g., local communities participate in safeguarding, tourism-related decision making)</td>
<td>(Kurin, 2004b; Soini &amp; Birkeland, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What kind of financial supports there are for safeguarding and promoting ICH? (e.g., use tourism revenue for safeguarding ICH)</td>
<td>(Aas et al., 2005; Garrod &amp; Fyall, 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Safeguarding and inheriting ICH to the next generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any differences what you’ve trained and what you are training to the next generation? Why do the difference exist?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the next generation can experience cultural (Korean) identity through ICH? Why or Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order for the next generation to be able to experience (Korean) cultural identity through ICH, which aspects of ICH should be safeguarded and transmitted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can we do to transmit the aspects (the answers of previous question) to the next generation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop sustainable management framework  
**Local communities**

### A. Commodification and its impact on authenticity and identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Compared to other types of cultural heritage) What aspects of ICH attract international and/or domestic visitors? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea through ICH (i.e., making traditional crafts or a cultural festival)? If yes, how does it affect your to feelings of belonging?</td>
<td>(Breathnach, 2006; Palmer, 2005; Zhu, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any differences between the original and the commercial versions of ICH? If yes, can you give me an example?</td>
<td>(MacCannell, 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(If yes to previous question)</em> Do you think differences exist between original and commercial versions of ICH in creating a feeling of belonging to Korea? Why?</td>
<td>(Halewood &amp; Hannam, 2001; Taylor, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the differences need to be managed or do they occur naturally, why?</td>
<td>(Baillie et al., 2010; Holtorf, 2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Sustainable management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think Korea is a good example of ICH management? Why do you think so?</td>
<td>(Foley, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the management do you think are good? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What kind of supportive government policies are there? (e.g., financial support or training system)</td>
<td>(Du Cros et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-To what extent are local communities involved in the safeguarding and utilisation of ICH? (e.g., local communities participate in safeguarding, tourism-related decision making)</td>
<td>(Kurin, 2004b; Soini &amp; Birkeland, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What kind of financial supports are there for safeguarding and promoting ICH? (e.g., use tourism revenue for safeguarding ICH)</td>
<td>(Aas et al., 2005; Garrod &amp; Fyall, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent are multiple stakeholder groups’ attitudes and opinions been integrated towards ICH management? (e.g., active communication among governments at local and national levels, ICH practitioners and ICH committees to integrate their opinions)</td>
<td>(Aas et al., 2005; Choi &amp; Sirakaya, 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Safeguarding and inheriting ICH to the next generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the next generation can experience cultural (Korean) identity through ICH? Why or Why not?</td>
<td>(Soini &amp; Birkeland, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order for the next generation to be able to experience (Korean) cultural identity through ICH, which aspects of ICH should be safeguarded and transmitted?</td>
<td>(Hashimoto, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can we do to transmit the aspects (the answers of previous question) to the next generation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
관광자원으로서 무형문화재의 지속성을 촉진시키기 위한 관리 방안

가. 관객을 위한 무형문화재와 고유성에 기치는 영향

1. 인간문화재(전수조교)로서 언제 한국인의 자긍심 혹은 한국에 대한 소속감을 느끼십니까?
2. 다른 문화재에 비해 무형문화재의 어떤 부분이 관객을 끌어들인다고 생각하십니까? 그 이유는 무엇입니까?
3. 원래의 무형문화재와 관객을 위한 무형문화재에 차이점이 있습니까? 혹시 있다면 차이점이 생기는 이유와 예시를 부탁드립니다.
4. 관객을 위하여 변형된 무형문화재를 연출하실 때에도 한국인의로서 자긍심 혹은 한국에 대한 소속감을 느끼십니까?
5. 관객을 위하여 약간의 변형된 무형문화재를 연출하시는 것에 대하여 어떻게 생각하십니까? (변형된 문화재를 연출하는 이유, 적절한 관리 필요?)
6. 관객을 위하여 약간의 변형된 무형문화재를 연출하는 것이 다음세대에의 전승에 어떤 영향을 끼친다고 생각하십니까?
7. 혹시 부정적인 영향이 있다면, 그 부분을 최소화하기 위하여 우리가 할 수 있는 일이 무엇이 있을까요?

나. 지속가능한 발전을 위한 관리방안

1. 무형문화재 전승의 한 방법으로, 타지 혹은 외국에서 오는 분들에게 무형문화재를 잘 보여주고 있다고 생각하십니까?
2. 특히 어느 부분에서 그렇게 생각하십니까? (어떤 부분이 개선되었으면 하십니까?)
   - 무형문화재 보호를 위한 정부의 정책 이나 시스템
   - 무형문화재 전승에 시민의 참여
   - 무형문화재 보존을 위한 탄탄한 경제적 기반 (예를 들면, 관광 수입의 문화재 보존 활용, 전수를 위한 경제적 뒷받침)
   - 무형문화재 관계자들의 의견 통합 (예를 들면, 정부, 시민 그리고 무형문화단체의 적극적인 의견 소통)

다. 무형문화재의 미래

1. 무형문화재를 전수 받으신 형태와 전수해주시는 형태에 차이점이 있습니까?
2. 우리 다음세대 들이 무형문화재를 통해 문화적 정체성을 느낄 수 있다고 생각하십니까? 그 이유는 무엇입니까?
3. 우리 다음세대들이 무형문화재를 통하여 문화적 정체성을 느낄 수 있도록 하려면, 무형문화재의 어떤 부분이 보존, 전승되어야 한다고 생각하십니까?

관광자원으로서 지속가능한 무형문화재를 위한 관리 방안 (지역주민)

가. 무형문화재의 의미
1. 무형문화재와 관련하여 언제 한국인의 자긍심 혹은 한국에 대한 소속감을 느끼셨습니까? (예를 들면 무형문화재를 찾는 관객이 많아 질 때 등)
2. 지 역의 전통 행사, 축제 기술 등이 무형문화재로 등록된 것에 대하여 어떻게 생각하십니까?
3. 무형문화재가 왜 전승되어야 한다고 생각하십니까?

나. 무형문화재의 관광상품으로서 활용과 고유성에 끼치는 영향
8. 다른 문화재에 비해 무형문화재의 어떤 부분이 관람객을 끌어들인다고 생각하십니까?
9. 무형문화재가 널리 알려지는 것에 따라 생기는 장, 단점이 어떠한 것이 있습니까? (ex. 경제적 발전, 문화적 정체성 강화 등)
10. 관객을 위하여 약간의 변형된 무형문화재를 연출하시는 것에 대하여 어떻게 생각하십니까? (변형된 문화재를 연출하는 이유)
11. 관객을 위하여 약간의 변형된 무형문화재를 연출하는 것이 다음세대에의 전승에 어떤 영향을 끼친다고 생각하십니까?
12. 혹시 부정적인 영향이 있다면, 그 부분을 최소화 하기 위하여 우리가 할 수 있는 일이 무엇이 있을까요?
13. 이러한 단점을 최소화하고 장점을 최대화하는 방법이 무엇이 있을까요?

다. 지속가능한 발전을 위한 관리방안
3. 한국이 좋은 무형문화재 관리의 적절한 예시라고 생각하십니까?
4. 특히 어느 부분에서 그렇게 생각하십니까? (특히 중요하거나 부족한 부분)
   - 무형문화재 보호를 위한 정부의 정책 이나 시스템
   - 무형문화재 보존과 촉진에 시민의 참여 (예를 들면 일반시민의 관광 상품개발에 참여, 정책 결정 참여 등)
   - 무형 문화재 보존을 위한 탄탄한 경제적 기반 (예를 들면, 관광 수입의 문화재 보존 활용, 전수를 위한 경제적 뒷받침)
   - 무형 문화재 관계자들의 의견 통합 (예를 들면, 정부, 시민 그리고 인간문화재의 적극적인 의견 소통)

라. 무형문화재의 미래
1. 우리 다음세대 또한 본 지역의 무형문화재를 통하여 지역에 대한 문화적 정체성 또는 한국인의 자긍심을 느낄 수 있다고 생각하십니까? 그 이유는 무엇 입니까?
2. 우리 다음세대들이 무형문화재를 통하여 문화적 정체성을 느낄 수 있도록 하려면, 무형문화재의 어떤 부분이 보존, 전승되어야 한다고 생각하십니까? (예를 들면 원형보존 혹은 영
혼과 을의 전승)  
3. 그 부분이 보존, 전승되기 위해서 우리가 할 수 있는 일이 무엇이 있을까요?
Appendix C: Information sheet and Consent form of Semi-structured face to face interviews
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INFORMATION SHEET -Semi-structured face-to-face interview

This study is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Philosophy at Griffith University. The main purpose of the study is to investigate the extent to which the management of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) facilitates the development as a sustainable ICH tourism resource. ICH is representative of a community’s cultural authenticity and identity, therefore it is not only an integral element of the soul of a community but it can be a vital resource for generating tourism at the national and local levels. Its cultural authenticity and identity needs to be safeguarded for cultural continuity and diversity across the globe, as well as for tourism development at destinations and in local communities. Issues associated with the commodification of ICH however, increasingly threaten the authenticity of the product thus there is a continued need to develop sustainable management measures to ensure the longevity of ICH at destinations across the globe.

The research team

This project (GU ref no: 2016/465) is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Philosophy. The team consists of:

Chief Investigator: Ms Soojung Kim
Supervisors: Associate Professor Charles Arcodia and Dr Michelle Whitford

What does this research involve?

This project is a case study of South Korea (Korea hereafter). This study will analyse the written documents (policies, guidelines or strategies) of four Korean public organisations to explore to what extent they support cultural sustainability of intangible cultural heritage as a tourism resource. Additionally, this study will conduct semi-structured face-to-face interviews with local communities and ICH practitioners in Korea, as well as conducting a survey with domestic visitors at the National Intangible Heritage Centre, to explore their priorities and perceptions pertaining to the sustainable management of ICH.

An aim of the research is to develop a sustainable management framework of ICH to facilitate the sustainable utilisation of ICH. There is a growing need to ensure ICH and its authenticity are safeguarded not only to maintain and preserve cultural continuity and diversity but to also facilitate the use of ICH as a sustainable resource for tourism development. The development of a much-needed theoretical framework will make a valuable contribution to the extensive body of knowledge situated within the field of sustainable cultural heritage management. From a practical perspective, this theoretical framework will provide guidance for planners and managers of intangible cultural heritage tourism to utilise the resource in a sustainable way.

Do I have to participate? What if I change my mind?

Your participation in this study (for approximately 30 minutes) is voluntary. The research does not involve any foreseeable risks to you. You may share as much or as little information with
us as you want, and you can also withdraw your participation at any time.

**Confidentiality**

The researcher will be taking notes and will obtain your permission to audio-record your interview. If you wish, you will be emailed a copy of the transcript and you can delete or change anything you have said. Everything you say will be kept confidential. Nobody except the research team will have access to it. Your name and identity will not be disclosed at any time. All potential identifying information will be removed from the transcript (e.g., all names will be changed). The transcripts of your interviews will be stored electronically in a dedicated research folder that is only accessible by the research team. As required by Griffith University, all research data (survey responses and analysis) will be retained in a locked cabinet and/or a password protected electronic file at Griffith University for a period of five years before being destroyed.

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/ or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone +61 7 3735 4375.

**What will happen afterwards**

Information collected will be used to develop a sustainable management framework of ICH. Articles or conference papers may also be prepared from this research, but most of the information will be reported as group data. Quotes from your transcribed interview may be used within these publications, with any potentially identifying information removed. Should you wish to receive the project results, an electronic version which summarises findings and practical recommendations will be sent to your email upon the completion of the project (expected to be in 2017).

**Inquiries**

If at any stage you have concerns, questions or require further information about the research please do not hesitate to contact:

Chief Investigator:
Ms Soojung Kim on +61 7 3735 5491 or email: soojung.kim@griffithuni.edu.au

Primary Supervisor:
Associate Professor Charles Arcodia on +61 7 3735 4183 or email: c.arcodia@griffith.edu.au

Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical
Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics to 07 3735 4375 or researchethics@griffith.edu.au. All information is confidential and will be handled as soon as possible.
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CONSENT FORM
Please tick the box that applies, sign and date and give to the researcher

I have been provided with information about the purpose, methods, risks, and possible outcomes of this research. I understand this information. Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to be interviewed by the researcher for approximately 30 minutes. Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to the interview being digitally-recorded. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that my participation is voluntary. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that I can refuse to answer any question or stop the recording whenever I wish to. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that I can choose not to participate in part or all of this research at any time, without consequence, in which case recorded material will not be used. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that any information that may identify me, will be de-identified at the time of analysis of any data. Therefore, I, or any information I have provided cannot be linked to myself/ my organisation (Privacy Act 1988 Cth) Yes ☐ No ☐

I am aware that I can contact the researchers at any time with any queries. Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s name:
Participant’s signature:
Date:

I would like to receive a copy of my interview transcript
Yes ☐ No ☐

I would like to receive a copy of the results of this research (GU ref no: 2016/465)
Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide an email or postal address to receive the interview transcript/research results:

Thank you for your time!
인터뷰 요청서 (Information Sheet)

우선 본 인터뷰는 호주 그리피스 대학교 (Griffith University) 박사 과정 연구를 위한 것임을 알 려드립니다. 본 연구의 주 목적은 관광자원으로서 지속 가능한 무형문화재를 위한 방안을 설립하는 것 입니다. 무형문화재는 민족의 귀중한 전통문화로서, 한 문화의 고유성과 우리 민족의 정체성을 지니고 있는 음악, 연극, 전통공예기술 및 무용을 가리킵니다. 이러한 무형문화재는 공동체의 혼과 정신을 뿌리에 뿤

주 연구원: 김수정 (본인)

지도교수: Associate Professor Charles Arcodia and Dr Michelle Whitford

로 이루어져 있습니다.

연구방법

본 연구는 한국을 대상으로 하는 사례연구입니다. 한국은 체계적인 무형문화재 전적제도의 명성을 가지고 있기 때문에 본 연구의 대표사례로 채택되었습니다. 또한 한국 무형문화재의 대표단체인 인간문화재, 전수 조교님, 그리고 지역주민과 인터뷰를 실시하게 되었습니다.

문서 분석과 인터뷰 분석을 통하여 관광자원으로서 지속가능한 무형문화재를 위한 관리방안 구축이 본 연구의 구체적인 목표입니다. 본 연구를 통하여 완성된 지속가능한 관리방안 구축은 세계적으로 무형문화재를 관광자원화로 사용하는 관계자들에게 귀중한 지침이 될 것입니다. 또한 이는 무형문화재의 최근 학계에서도 관심 있는 분야이기에, 귀하의 연구 참여는 학술적인 기여도로 높을것으로 판단됩니다.

인터넷의 자율성

30분내외의 본 인터뷰는 자율적인 참여로 이루어집니다. 본 연구는 잠재된 위험이 없는 것으로 판단됩니다. 귀하가 제공하시는 최대한 또는 최소한의 정보는 모두 귀중한 자료가 될 것이며, 원하시는 시 언제든지 인터뷰 중단이 가능합니다.

인터넷의 기밀성
좀 더 정확하고 신용 있는 연구를 위해 인터뷰는 녹취될 것입니다. 원하시면 녹취록을 제공해 드리며, 녹취된 정보는 언제든지 수정, 삭제 가능합니다. 녹취된 인터뷰는 기밀성을 보장합니다. 녹취된 자료는 이 논문 이외에 어떠한 목적으로도 쓰이지 않을 것이며, 논문에 또한 익명으로 기재될 것임을 보장합니다. 녹취된 인터뷰는 요약되어 영어로 쓰인 논문을 위해 번역될 것입니다. 그리피스대학교의 정책에 따라 인터뷰 자료는 전자파일로 5년간 보관될 것이며 그 후에 삭제될 것입니다.


수집된 정보의 활용

수집된 정보는 무형문화재의 지속적인 관리 방안 설립에 유용하게 쓰일 것 입니다. 또한 본 연구와 관련하여 학술지 또는 학회 논문으로 쓰일 수도 있으며, 대부분의 자료는 단체 자료로 쓰일 것 입니다. 귀하의 인터뷰가 관련 논문에 인용 될 수는 있으나, 어떠한 개인정보는 유출되지 않을 것입니다. 귀하께서 연구의 결과를 원하신다면, 연구 완료시 이메일로 보내드리겠습니다 (2017년 말 예정)

문의사항

본 연구에 대해 문의사항이 있으시다면 언제든지 연락주시길 바랍니다

주 연구원: 김수정

+61 425 198 837 or Email: soojung.kim@griffithuni.edu.au

주 지도교수: Associate Professor Charles Arcodia

+61 7 3735 4183 or email: c.arcodia@griffith.edu.au

그리피스 대학교는 국립 연구 윤리 강령 (National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans)에 준거하여 연구를 실시하고 있습니다. 본 연구의 윤리적인 문제에 대한 문의사항이 있으시다면, 연구 윤리 담당 +61 7 3735 4375 혹은 researchethics@griffith.edu.au로 문의주시기 바랍니다.

인터넷 동의서(Consent Form)
아래조항을 읽으시고 동의하시는 부분에 체크하신뒤, 사인후 돌려주시기 바랍니다.

나는 이 연구의 목표, 연구방법 그리고 위험성에 대하여 정보를 받았으며 이해하였습니다.

나는 연구자와 30분간의 인터뷰에 동의합니다

나는 인터뷰가 녹취되는 것에 동의합니다.

나는 인터뷰 참여가 자율적이라는 것에 동의합니다.

나는 언제는 내가 원할때 답변을 거절하거나 녹취를 멈출 수 있는것을 이해하였습니다

나는 다른 증거자료 제출 없이 연구에 부분적, 혹은 전체적 참여 거부를 할수 있음을 이해합니다.

나는 나의 개인신상이 어떠한 자료분석과정에서 나타나지 않으며, 나의 의견이 개인적 또는 소속기관에 어떠한 영향을 끼치지 않는다는 것을 이해합니다

나는 언제든지 연구자에게 어떠한 문의로도 연락할 수 있다는것을 숙지하였습니다

참여자 이름:
참여자 사인:
날짜

나의 인터뷰 녹취록 사본을 받기 희망합니다
나는 연구결과사본을 희망합니다

 녹취록 혹은 연구결과 사본을 받으실 이메일 주소 부탁드립니다

참여하여 주셔서 대단히 감사합니다
Appendix D: Invitation email for interviews

Participant group 1 - Intangible cultural heritage practitioners

Title: Seeking participants for a research study about intangible cultural heritage

Hello

I am Soojung Kim studying a PhD at Griffith University in Australia. You are receiving this email because you are nominated by the Korean government as a Living Human Treasure. Your email address was obtained from the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea.

I am writing to ask if you will agree to be interviewed for a research project called “Intangible cultural heritage and its sustainability”. This research aims to develop a sustainable management framework of intangible cultural heritage to enable us to utilise intangible cultural heritage in a sustainable way.

Your role in this research is to share your perceptions about the sustainable management of intangible cultural heritage via a 30-minute face-to-face interview. During the interview, you will be asked questions about:

1. Commodification of intangible cultural heritage and the effect on its authenticity
2. Managerial strategies for sustainability of intangible cultural heritage (e.g., local community participation, financing and education)

The attachment provides an explanation of this project and your role as an interview participant of this study.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Soojung Kim
1. 귀관의 무궁한 발전을 기원합니다.

2. 저는 호주 골드코스트에 있는 그리피스 대학교(Griffith University)에서 관광학 박사를 하고 있는 김수정이라고 합니다. 퀸즐랜드주에 5개의 캠퍼스에 있는 그리피스 대학교는 특히 호텔, 관광학과가 유명하며, 저는 본 대학에서 학사로 호텔경영을, 석사로 관광경영을 공부하였습니다. 지금은 관광학 박사를 공부중이며, 특히 무형문화재와 관광자원으로서의 지속성에 대하여 연구중 입니다.

3. 무형문화재는 민족의 귀중한 전통문화로서 문화적 고유성과 정체성을 지니고 있습니다. 그렇기에 문화적 다양성과 지속성을 위하여 필히 다음세대로 전승되어야 하는 문화유산 입니다. 있는 그대로를 보존해야하는 유형유산과는 다르게, 적극적으로 활용하는 것이 무형문화재의 전승에 기여하는 것이라, 한국 뿐만 아니라 세계적으로 무형문화재를 관광자원으로서 활용중입니다. 하지만 지나친 관광자원화는 그 고유성을 잃는 부정적인 측면을 보유하고 있습니다. 그러므로 지속가능한 관리에 대한 노력을 다우고있습니다.

5. 이런 바탕에 근거하여, 본 연구의 목표는 무형문화재의 지속성을 위한 관리제도를 구축하는 것 입니다. 전수교육교코님께 30분의 인터뷰에 참여하시여 본 연구에 중요한 기여를 해주셨으면 합니다. 다음은 인터뷰에서 다를 세가지 내용 입니다.
   - 무형문화재의 관광자원으로서의 활용
   - 지속가능한 발전을 위한 관리방안
   - 무형문화재의 미래

6. 인터뷰와 이 연구에 대한 좀 더 자세한 사항은 첨부파일 인터뷰 요청서(Information sheet)와 인터뷰 동의서(consent sheet)를 참고하여 주시키 바랍니다. 본 인터뷰는 6월말-7월초 전수교육교코님의 편의한 시간에 직접 찾아봐이루어질 예정입니다. 인터뷰 계획을 위하여 인터뷰 참가여부 (참가자 성함과 연락처) 를 6월 3일까지 보내주시면 감사하겠습니다.

첨부파일
인터넷 요청서 (Information Sheet)와 인터뷰 동의서 (Consent Form) 1부
인터넷 질문지 1부

2016년 5월 24일
# Appendix E: ICH practitioners respondents sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICH</th>
<th>Labelled in Result</th>
<th>Positions/Levels</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description (UNESCO, 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICH1</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No.62</td>
<td>Jwasuyeong eobang nori</td>
<td>Reproduction of fishing performance in Jwasuyeong village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH2</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 18</td>
<td>Dongnae yaryu</td>
<td>Masked dance in Dongnae village, satirizing higher social group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH3</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No.43</td>
<td>Suyeong yaryu</td>
<td>Masked dance in Suyoung village, satirizing higher social group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH4</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>Regional ICH</td>
<td>Suyeong jisin balki,</td>
<td>Ritual event wishing communities health and wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH5</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>Regional ICH</td>
<td>Suyeoung nong chung nori</td>
<td>Reproduction of farming performance in Suyeoung area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH6</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 76</td>
<td>Taekkyeon</td>
<td>Korean traditional martial art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH7</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 76</td>
<td>Taekkyeon</td>
<td>Korean traditional martial art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH8</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No3.</td>
<td>Namsadang nori</td>
<td>All male composed folk performance which have been practicing by travelling in Korea, and have been kept by professional troupes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH 9</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 34</td>
<td>Gangnyeong talchum</td>
<td>Masked dance in Gangnyeong region, which has more singing than other mask dance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH10</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>Bongsan Talchum</td>
<td>Masked dance handed down from the Bongsan region, Hwanghae Province in North Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH11</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 104</td>
<td>Seoul Saenam gut</td>
<td>Reproduction of exorcism by shaman performers especially for the dead who was higher social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH12</td>
<td>Assistant instructors</td>
<td>No.1</td>
<td>Jongmyo jeryeak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH13</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 79</td>
<td>Baltal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH14</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 79</td>
<td>Baltal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH15</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>Bongsan talchum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH16</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>Bongsan talchum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH17</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 13</td>
<td>Gangneung Dano festival- Ritul ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH18</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 13</td>
<td>Gangneung Dano festival- Puppet theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH19</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 13</td>
<td>Gangneung Danoje – Puppet theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH20</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 30</td>
<td>Gagok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH21</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure</td>
<td>No. 40</td>
<td>Hagyeon hwadae hapseolmu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH22</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 99</td>
<td>Sobanjang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH23</td>
<td>Assistant instructor</td>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>Gatiljang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

class, in Seoul city. A royal ancestral Confucian ceremony practices which bring together song, dance and music. Puppet placed on and manipulated by the foot Masked dance handed down from the Bongsanregion, Hwanghae Province in North Korea Masked dance handed down from the Bongsanregion, Hwanghae Province in North Korea A festival in the Gangneung region, including a shamanistic ritual, mask drama, oral and narrative poetry. A festival in the Gangneung region, including a shamanistic ritual, mask drama, oral and narrative poetry. A festival in the Gangneung region, including a shamanistic ritual, mask drama, oral and narrative poetry. Korean traditional lyric song Royal dance composed of bird- and flower-dances Korean traditional wooden tray-table carpentry Making Korean traditional hat for higher social class in Joseon dynasty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICH24</th>
<th>Living Human Treasure No. 34</th>
<th>Gangnyeong talchum</th>
<th>Masked dance in Gangnyeong region, which has more singing than other mast dance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICH25</td>
<td>Living Human Treasure No3.</td>
<td>Namsadang nori</td>
<td>All male composed folk performance which have been practicing by travelling in Korea, and have been kept by professional troupes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F: Local communities respondents sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labelled in Result</th>
<th>Gender/Age</th>
<th>Living area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>Female/20s</td>
<td>Dongnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>Female/20s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Female/20s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>Female/20s</td>
<td>Dongnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC5</td>
<td>Male/20s</td>
<td>Dongnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC6</td>
<td>Female/30s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC7</td>
<td>Female/30s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC8</td>
<td>Male/30s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC9</td>
<td>Male/40s</td>
<td>Dongnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC10</td>
<td>Male/50s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC11</td>
<td>Female/50s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC12</td>
<td>Male/50s</td>
<td>Dongnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC13</td>
<td>Male/50s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC14</td>
<td>Female/60s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC15</td>
<td>Female/60s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC16</td>
<td>Male/70s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC17</td>
<td>Male/70s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC18</td>
<td>Female/40s</td>
<td>Dongnae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC19</td>
<td>Male/30s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC20</td>
<td>Female/30s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC21</td>
<td>Male/50s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC22</td>
<td>Female/50s</td>
<td>Suyeong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Surveys questions including information sheet
[in English]

Survey of domestic tourists visiting National Intangible Centre in Korea

Information Sheet
Thank you for taking the time to fill in the survey again. This study is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Philosophy at Griffith University in Australia. The main purpose of the study is to investigate the extent to which the management of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) facilitates the development as a sustainable ICH tourism resource. ICH is representative of a community’s cultural authenticity and identity, therefore it is not only an integral element of the soul of a community but it can be a vital resource for generating tourism at the national and local levels. Its cultural authenticity and identity needs to be safeguarded for cultural continuity and diversity across the globe, as well as for tourism development at destinations and in local communities. Issues associated with the commodification of ICH however, increasingly threaten the authenticity of the product thus there is a continued need to develop sustainable management measures to ensure the longevity of ICH at destinations across the globe.

The research team
This project (GU ref no:2016/465) is being conducted as part of a Doctor of Philosophy. The team consists of:
Chief Investigator: Ms Soojung Kim
Supervisors: Associate Professor Charles Arcodia and Dr Michelle Whitford

What does this research involve?
This project is a case study of South Korea (Korea hereafter). This study will conduct survey with domestic visitors in National Intangible Heritage Centre, to explore their priorities and perceptions pertaining to the sustainable management of ICH.

An aim of the research is to develop a sustainable management framework of ICH to facilitate the sustainable utilisation of ICH. There is a growing need to ensure ICH and its authenticity are safeguarded not only to maintain and preserve cultural continuity and diversity but to also facilitate the use of ICH as a sustainable resource for tourism development. The development of a much-needed theoretical framework will make a valuable contribution to the extensive body of knowledge situated within the field of sustainable cultural heritage management. From a practical perspective, this theoretical framework will provide guidance for planners and managers of intangible cultural heritage tourism to utilise the resource in a sustainable way.

Do I have to participate? What if I change my mind?
Your participation in this study (for approximately 5-10 minutes) is voluntary. The research does not involve any foreseeable risks to you. You may share as much or as little information with us as you want, and you can also withdraw your participation at any time. The return of a completed questionnaire will be accepted as an expression of consent to participate in the research.

Confidentiality
The survey data will be collected anonymously and all data will be kept confidential. No one except the research team will have access to it. The survey data will be stored electronically in a dedicated research folder that is only accessible by the research team. As required by Griffith University, all research data (survey responses and analysis) will be retained in a locked cabinet and/or a password
protected electronic file at Griffith University for a period of five years before being destroyed.

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone +61 7 3735 4375.

What will happen afterwards
Information collected will be used to develop a sustainable management framework of ICH. Articles or conference papers may also be prepared from this research, but most of the information will be reported as group data. Should you wish to receive the project results, an electronic version which summarises findings and practical recommendations will be sent to your email upon the completion of the project (expected to be in 2017).

Inquiries
If at any stage you have concerns, questions or require further information about the research please do not hesitate to contact:

Chief Investigator:
Ms Soojung Kim on +61 7 3735 5491 or email: soojung.kim@griffithuni.edu.au or local contact on +82 10 2552 7542

Primary Supervisor:
Associate Professor Charles Arcodia on +61 7 3735 4183 or email: c.arcodia@griffith.edu.au

Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics to +61 7 3735 4375 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au. All information is confidential and will be handled as soon as possible.
A. Please indicate the level of agreement for the following statements about Intangible Cultural Heritage as a tourism resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/No opinion</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My purpose in visiting the National Intangible Heritage Centre is to learn and be educated about the value of ICH.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My purpose in visiting the National Intangible Heritage Centre is to reaffirm my Korean identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My purpose in visiting the National Intangible Heritage Centre is to have an authentic and memorable experience through physical engagement (e.g., making traditional crafts).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea while looking at the digitally archived ICH.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea while looking at traditional performances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I experienced a feeling of belonging to Korea while experiencing ICH (e.g., making traditional crafts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I experienced pride as a Korean while looking at the digitally archived ICH.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I experienced pride as a Korean while looking at traditional performances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I experienced pride as a Korean while experiencing ICH (e.g., making traditional crafts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I will visit here again if there provide more knowledge about Korean ICH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I will visit here again if there provide more experiential activities because it increases enjoyment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I will visit here again if there provide more experiential activities because it provides opportunities to enhance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Korean cultural identity (e.g., learn some traditional dances)

| 13. I agree differences exist between the original and commercial versions of intangible cultural heritage. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I agree that differences (above) naturally occur to provide tourists an enjoyable experience. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I agree that differences naturally occur in order for ICH value to be understood by tourists. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I agree the differences need to be managed because they can distort the past by focusing on providing memorable experiences rather than historical fact. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. I agree the differences need to be managed because the commercial version of ICH can be standardised to satisfy major consumer group, which lead to a loss of cultural authenticity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I will visit National Intangible Heritage Centre again even though it charges | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I am happy to pay for the traditional craftsmanship learning classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

B. Please indicate the level of agreement for the following statements about sustainable management of ICH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/No opinion</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Korea has implemented effective management to pass on ICH to the next generation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Korean government has implemented supportive policies in safeguarding ICH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Korean government has implemented supportive policies to generate tourism development with ICH.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The role of the Korean government is important for ICH to be passed on to the next generation.
5. Local communities have opportunities to participate in tourism related decision making processes.
6. Local communities have opportunities to participate in safeguarding ICH.
7. Local communities are important for ICH to be passed on to the next generation.
8. There are opportunities for ICH stakeholders (ICH practitioners, local communities, government and tourist) to communicate and collaborate safeguarding ICH while commodify as tourism resource.
9. Stakeholder collaboration and integration is important for ICH to be passed on to the next generation.
10. Financial support is important for ICH to be passed on to the next generation.

C. Please indicate your demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>① Male</th>
<th>② Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>① 10-19</td>
<td>② 20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companion</td>
<td>① Alone</td>
<td>② Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level education</td>
<td>① Primary school graduate</td>
<td>② High school graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Any comments, feedback or suggestions about safeguarding and utilisation of ICH?

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire!
설문조사 안내문 (Information Sheet)

우선 본 설문지는 호주 그리피스 대학 (Griffith University) 박사 과정 연구를 위한 것임을 알려 드립니다. 본 연구의 주 목적은 관광자원으로서 지속가능한 무형문화재를 위한 방안을 설립하는 것입니다. 무형문화재는 민족의 귀중한 전통문화로서, 한 문화의 고유성과 우리 민족의 정체성을 지니고 있는 음악, 연극, 전통공예기술 및 무용을 가리킵니다. 이러한 무형문화재는 공동체의 혼과 정신을 지니고 있는 음악, 연극, 전통공예기술 및 무용으로서 지속가능한 무형문화재를 위한 관리 방안을 설립할 것입니다.

연구방법
본 연구는 한국을 대상으로 하는 사례 연구입니다. 한국은 체계적인 무형문화재 전승제도 명성 을 가지고 있기 때문에 본 연구의 대표 사례로 채택되었습니다. 무형문화재가 경쟁력 있는 관광자원이 되기 위해서, 무형문화재를 이용하는 관람객의 의견이 중요하므로 본 설문조사를 실시합니다.

본 연구를 통하여 구축된 무형문화재의 관리방안은 세계적으로 무형문화재를 관광자원화로 사용하는 관계자들에게 귀중한 지침이 될 것입니다. 뿐만 아니라, 무형문화재는 최근 학계에서도 관심 있는 분야이기에, 귀하의 연구 참여는 학술적인 기여도도 높을 것으로 판단됩니다.

문의사항
본 연구에 대해 문의사항이 있으시다면 언제든지 연락주시길 바랍니다.
주 연구원: 김수정 +61 425 198 837 or email: soojung.kim@griffithuni.edu.au
주 지도교수: Associate Professor Charles Arcodia +61 7 3735 4183 or email: c.arcodia@griffith.edu.au

문의사항
본 연구에 대해 문의사항이 있으시다면 언제든지 연락주시길 바랍니다.
주 연구원: 김수정 +61 425 198 837 or email: soojung.kim@griffithuni.edu.au
주 지도교수: Associate Professor Charles Arcodia +61 7 3735 4183 or email: c.arcodia@griffith.edu.au
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그리피스 대학교는 국립 연구 윤리 강령 (National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans)에 준거하여 연구를 실시하고 있습니다. 본 연구의 윤리적인 문제에 대한 문 의사항이 있으시다면, 연구 윤리 담당 +61 7 3735 4375 혹은 research-ethics@griffith.edu.au로 문의주시기 바랍니다.
A. 무형문화재의 관광상품화에 대한 설문입니다. 동의하시는 정도에 체크 바랍니다.
1-매우동의 2-동의 3-보통 4-동의하지않음 5-매우동의하지않음

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 나는 한국 무형문화재의 가치를 배우고 느끼기 위하여 무형유산원을 방문하였다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 나는 한국인으로서 정체성을 재확인하기 위하여 무형유산원을 방문하였다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 나는 새롭고 기억에 남는 경험이(예를 들면 전통공예 만들기)을 하기 위하여 무형유산원을 방문하였다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 나는 디지털로 기록되어 있는 무형문화재(동영상)를 보며 한민족 공동체에 소속감을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 나는 전통 공연을 보며 한민족 공동체에 소속감을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 나는 무형문화재를 몸소 체험하며(예. 전통공예 만들기)한민족 공동체에 소속감을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 나는 디지털로 기록되어 있는 무형문화재(동영상)를 보며 한국인으로서 자부심을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 나는 전통 공연을 보며 한국인으로서 자부심을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 나는 무형문화재를 직접 체험하며(예. 전통공예 만들기)한국인으로서 자부심을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 무형문화재에 대한 설명이 더해지면 더욱 많은 사람들이 무형유산원을 찾을 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 직접 체험하는 기회가 더 많다면(예. 전통 춤 배우기), 관람객들은 즐거움을 느끼기에도, 더 많은 관람객이 올 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 직접 체험하는 기회가 더 많다면(예. 전통 춤 배우기), 정체성을 느낄 기회가 더 많기에, 더 많은 관람객이 올 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 나는 본래의 무형문화재와 관람객이 위한 무형문화재에 다른 부분이 있다고 생각한다. (공연 시간, 공연 내용 등)</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. 나는 관람객의 즐거움을 위해 무형문화재를 변형하는 것은 당연한 것이라고 생각한다.

15. 나는 관람객의 이해를 돕기 위하여 무형문화재를 어느정도 변형하는 것은 당연한 것이라고 생각한다.

16. 나는 무형문화재 변형에 대하여, 역사적 사실 보다는 관람객들의 즐거움을 위해 역사를 왜곡시켜 수정될 수도 있기에 적절한 관리방안이 필요하다고 생각한다.

17. 나는 무형문화재 변형에 대하여, 무형문화재가 지닌 정체성을 잃을 수 있기 때문에 적절한 관리방안이 필요하다고 생각한다.

18. 나는 무형유산원이 유료입장이 되더라도 흔쾌히 방문할 것이다.

19. 나는 전통 공예 또는 전통 춤사위를 배우는 것이 유료가 되더라도 흔쾌히 참여할 것이다.

B. 무형문화재 관리에 대한 설문입니다. 동의하시는 정도에 체크 바랍니다

1. 매우동의 2. 동의 3. 보통 4. 동의하지않음 5. 매우동의하지않음

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>우리 나라의 무형문화재 전승을 위하여 효과적인 관리철하고 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>한국 정부는 무형문화재의 전승을 위하여 효과적인 정책을 펼치고 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>한국 정부는 무형문화재를 통해 관광객을 유지하기 위하여 효과적인 정책을 펼치고 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>무형문화재가 지속 가능한 관광자원이 되기 위하여 정부의 역할이 중요하다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>지역 주민들은 무형문화재의 전승에 활발하게 참여하고 있다 (자원봉사 등).</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>지역 주민들은 무형문화재로 관광객을 유지하기 위한 활동에 활발하게 참여하고 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. 무형문화재가 지속 가능한 관광자원이 되기 위하여 지역 주민들의 역할(무형문화재 보존, 관광상품 개발 참여하는 것)이 중요하다.

27. 무형문화재를 관광자원화 시키면서 고유성을 보호하기 위하여 무형문화재 관련 단체, 즉 무형문화재 보유자, 지역주민, 정부 그리고 관광객들의 활발한 의사소통을 위한 기회가 있다.

28. 무형문화재가 지속 가능한 관광자원이 되기 위하여 무형문화재 관련 단체들의 (무형문화재 보유자, 지역주민, 정부 그리고 관광객) 의견통합이 중요하다.

29. 무형문화재의 전승을 위하여 경제적인 지원이 중요하다.

C. 개인 인적에 관한 질문입니다. 해당 랜에 체크 부탁드립니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>성별</th>
<th>①남</th>
<th>②여</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>나이</th>
<th>①10-19</th>
<th>②20-29</th>
<th>③30-39</th>
<th>④40-49</th>
<th>⑤50-59</th>
<th>⑥60세 이상</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>방문단위</th>
<th>①혼자</th>
<th>②친구</th>
<th>③가족단위</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>학력</th>
<th>①초등학교 졸</th>
<th>②중고등학교 졸</th>
<th>③대학교 졸</th>
<th>④대학원 졸</th>
<th>⑤그 외</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

참여하여 주셔서 감사합니다! 무형문화재의 전승과 관광자원으로서 활용에 대하여 하고 싶은 신 말씀은 없나요?
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