

THE MEANING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN KAZAN

A RESIDENT'S PERSPECTIVE



ANASTASIA JURITSJEVA

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH CENTRE

MASTER PROGRAM LEISURE, TOURISM AND ENVIRONMENT

OCTOBER 2011

The photographs on the front cover show plural cultural heritage objects of Kazan
(source: author)

THE MEANING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN KAZAN

A RESIDENT'S PERSPECTIVE

MASTER THESIS

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH CENTRE

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES SOCIO SPECIAL ANALYSIS

MASTER PROGRAM LEISURE, TOURISM AND ENVIRONMENT

THESIS CODE: SAL- 80433
STUDENT NAME: ANASTASIA JURITSJEVA
REGISTRATION NR: 850707414050
1ST EXAMINER: DR. IR. MARTIJN DUINEVELD
2ND EXAMINER: IR. KARIN PETERS

WAGENINGEN, OCTOBER 2011



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Glancing back at the most educational and enriching years of my life I realise that it is coming to an end and new challenges are coming to my way. In order to complete my master program Leisure, Tourism and Environment I have done research on the meaning of cultural heritage in Kazan. To obtain empirical data I have travelled to the most welcoming city Kazan, which is a capital city of the Republic of Tatarstan. Already soon after my return I was offered a job at Saxion University of Applied Sciences and decided to combine both my job and my master thesis. Doing so, I did not know that a year full of challenges was ahead of me.

At this moment, I am able to write not the most theoretical, but most pleasant piece of my thesis and here for I owe a lot of gratitude to people that have been of a great support to me. First of all I would like to express my thankfulness to my supervisor Martijn Duineveld for his valuable advises, expertise, a lot of inspirational conversations and great support during the whole period. Martijn, thank you for your enthusiasm in my research, your patience and time! I would like to thank my second examiner Karin Peters for examining my thesis. Furthermore, I would like to thank Eleonora van Nieuwburg, for opening her network in Kazan for me and providing me the needed insights. In addition, I would like to thank my respondents for their time and great conversations. Especially I want to thank the director and his colleagues of the *Republican Scientific Centre of Folklore and Cultural-Educational Work* in Kazan for a warm welcome.

Last but not least, lots of thanks go to my colleagues Michiel Flooren and Gijs Theunissen for reviewing parts of my report, long conversations and great support. Of course, it would be difficult to complete this work without unconditional support of my parents, sister and partner, thank you for being there for me! Also thanks to all the others, I forgot to mention.

Anastasia Juritsjeva, Zutphen 2 October 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Focus of the study	2
1.2 Research Objectives and Questions	2
1.3 Character of the Study	3
1.4 Research Strategy.....	3
1.5 Structure of the Report	4
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	5
2.1 Post-modernism	5
2.2 Cultural Heritage	6
2.3 Discourse Analysis	8
2.4 Cultural Heritage in Plural Societies	10
3. METHODOLOGY	14
3.1 Research Design	14
3.2 Data Collection	15
3.3 Data Analysis	16
3.4 Researcher’s Positionality	17
4. EMPIRICAL CONTEXT	18
4.1 Kazan’s History	18
4.2 Kazan’s Plural Society	20
4.3 Cultural Resources of Kazan	21
5. CULTURAL HERITAGE IN KAZAN	23
5.1 Identified Cultural Heritage.....	23
5.2 The Meaning of Cultural Heritage	27
5.3 The Preservation of Cultural Heritage.....	33
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
6.1 Conclusions	38

6.2 Recommendations 40

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 42

APPENDIX: A 48

APPENDIX: B 51

PHOTOGRAPHS

PHOTOGRAPHS 1, 2: Street names written in Russian and Latin alphabets 27

PHOTOGRAPHS 3, 4: The monumental residence of the family Apanaev 36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In recent years cultural heritage is seen as very important by the policy makers, scientists and civilians. The attention that has been paid to cultural heritage is often related to the coverage and preservation of cultural heritage, but also to disputes and conflicts about cultural heritage. Heritage studies show that preventing the past lives within societies. This study investigates what meaning people give to cultural heritage in their daily life and the way they treat heritage. Moreover, an attempt is made to indicate ways, in which people create meanings, discuss, talk about and assess heritage issues. The current research is focusing on the meaning of cultural heritage within one of the oldest Russian cities called Kazan, a capital city of the Russian Republic of Tatarstan. Kazan can be characterised as a complex ethnic, cultural and religious society, with a growing discontent within the society on how cultural heritage is treated.

The meaning of cultural heritage is often studied within anthropological discipline and interpretive social-science paradigm, in which reality is assumed to be socially constructed. This study is clearly situated in the antirealist tradition and uses Foucauldian discourse analysis to identify what discourse positions are held towards heritage in Kazan and the way they shape various meanings which are attached to heritage.

The analysis of the empirical data has shown that there is no sufficient dissimilarity in the ways groups of different ethnic, religious and cultural appliance identify cultural heritage and give it meaning. Respondents appear to have mutual respect and acceptance of different ethnical heritages, which are present in the plural society of the Republic of Tatarstan. The residents of Kazan argue that the presence of plural heritages is the evidence of the tolerance of Tatar folk and on the other hand, plural heritages help to sustain and develop this tolerance. No respondents can imagine their existence without being surrounded by the valuable historical objects, which, in their opinion, enrich their life and make Kazan a distinctive city. Why then does the process of restoration and preservation of cultural heritage proceed so slowly and tentatively and the process of its destruction so fast and steadily in Kazan? The analysis illustrates a discontent between the way people want to treat cultural heritage and the destruction of it. One of the dominant discourses advocates for the preservation of cultural heritage and speaks of its great importance. The destruction of cultural heritage on the other hand points out to another discourse where cultural heritage is not seen as important enough.

1. INTRODUCTION

The central topic of this study is cultural heritage, which is seen as very important in the recent years. Different European treaties and national policies are developed in order to preserve cultural heritage. UNESCO has been initiated in order to encourage the identification and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world (UNESCO, 2010). The heritage studies show that preventing the past lives within civilians, politicians and among scientists. This attention is so great that some speak of a 'historical culture' (Samuel, 1994), more negatively about the heritage industry (Hewison, 1987), or the heritage crusade (Lowenthal, 1998). Klamer (2010) illustrates the importance of cultural heritage for the humanity as follows:

'It may be a bridge, a piece of wood. Or a temple, a windmill, a painting, a piece of furniture, a mask, a jewel, or a bead. Whatever it is, it is a good that is different from other goods. It is different because people treat it differently. They may consider it a symbol of something—a nation, a community, a tradition, a religion, a cultural episode, and endow it with all kinds of meanings over and beyond its usefulness. They may attribute to it artistic, aesthetic, sacred or other special qualities. They may draw inspiration from it, and may find that it irritates or abhors others. In other words, the good has cultural values.'

Klamer, 2001

The attention that has been paid to cultural heritage is often related to the coverage and preservation of cultural heritage, but also to disputes and conflicts about cultural heritage (Klamer, 2001). According to many researchers (Duineveld, 2006; van Assche, 2004; Avrami & Mason, 2000; Scott, 1998), heritage is valued by different groups in society, politics and science. Each group has different perspectives and different ideas about dealing with heritage. These many ideas about dealing with heritage lead to many different and often conflicting ways of doing so. This study sets out to investigate what meaning people give to heritage in their daily life and the way they treat heritage. Moreover, the researcher will make an attempt to indicate ways, in which people create meanings, discuss, talk about and assess heritage issues. Current research will focus on the meaning of cultural heritage within one of the oldest Russian cities called Kazan (capital city of the Russian Republic of Tatarstan). In the year 2000 Kazan's Kremlin is recognized as world heritage with an inscription on UNESCO's World Heritage list.

This introductory chapter will further elaborate on the research focus and, additionally, will provide the reader a description of how the investigator plans to achieve the research objectives and in which context.

1.1 FOCUS OF THE STUDY

This study will attempt to provide an insight on the meaning that residents attach to cultural heritage and show whether and how different discourses exist within cultural heritage debate in Kazan.

Kazan was chosen as a case study because of its appropriateness for this research. According to Ministry of Culture of Tatarstan (2010), Russian society is returning to its traditional, spiritual and moral values to a big extend. This, as ministry claims, results in increasing awareness of the importance of cultural heritage by the residents and a bigger responsibility of the state for cultural and historical environment. In many centuries of co-existence and interaction of Christian and Islamic civilizations numerous unique cultural monuments were created, but unfortunately their substantial part was lost or even brought into demolished state (Ministry of Culture of Tatarstan, 2010). However, the ministry states, to have paid special attention to revitalisation and protection of historical relics in the last decade and especially in the period of preparation for the celebration of 1000 years old existence of Kazan. Moreover, Kazan can be characterised as a complex ethnic, cultural and religious society, with a growing discontent within the society on how cultural heritage is treated. These developments and the lack of academic research on the meaning of cultural heritage in Kazan make this case rich to investigate.

1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

This study aims to achieve an exploration on how residents of Kazan identify and give meaning to cultural heritage and how they define its role and relevance for the society. Moreover, the objective of this study is to identify how individuals want cultural heritage to be treated and dealt with. To meet this research objective three research questions are formulated. These questions will give further direction to the current study and will be leading in the analysis of the empirical data:

- ❖ What do the residents identify in Kazan as cultural heritage?
- ❖ What meaning, role and relevance do the residents of Kazan give to cultural heritage?
- ❖ How do residents of Kazan want cultural heritage to be treated and dealt with?

1.3 CHARACTER OF THE STUDY

Human behaviour, variations among different groups, social organizations and culture are the most studied objects within anthropology (Ember & Ember, 1999). The aspects studied within this discipline in the debate of cultural heritage include; experiences, valuation and constructed meanings of cultural heritage. Current explorative case study on the way people identify cultural heritage, give it meaning, determine its role and relevance and wish to treat it, fits a lot in the anthropological discipline and interpretative paradigm. Within the interpretative research paradigm, social beings construct meanings and constantly make sense of their worlds. Interpretative paradigm according to Guba and Lincoln (1994) ontologically views the world as *"...complex, dynamic and constructed, interpreted and experienced by people, giving fluid definitions of a situation created by human interaction"*. In particular, the use of language defines the constructed reality; herein reality that one can get closer to is subjective. Epistemologically interpretative paradigm defines knowledge as based not only on observable phenomena, but also on subjective beliefs, values, reasons, and understandings (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). This presumes that knowledge is constructed and is about the way in which people make meaning in their lives, and what meaning they make.

The defined discipline, paradigm, ontology and epistemology which are central to this study predetermine to a big extend the way in which the research objective will be approached and researched.

1.4 RESEARCH STRATEGY

In order to be able to answer the formulated research questions logic of how to gain empirical data and new knowledge is set out. The starting point of the current research strategy is the investigation of social actors within their social world. The aim is to discover the ways in which they construct and give meaning to their social world (Blaikie, 2000). Foucault, according to Hall (2001) believed: *"...that nothing can have meaning outside of discourse, outside the ways they are represented in discourse, produced in knowledge and regulated by the discursive practices in a particular time."* Referring to cultural heritage it can be stated that *"physical objects and actions do exist, but they only take on meaning and become objects of knowledge within discourse"* (Hall, 2001). These meanings can only be discovered through the knowledge social actors use in giving meaning to the social phenomena under investigation. According to Blaikie (2000): *"...their reality, the way they have constructed and interpreted their activities, is embedded in their language"*. Therefore, the researcher will need to use qualitative research techniques

penetrating the social world of the researched, in order to discover their motives and reasons. The knowledge gained by the researcher will not only be based on observable phenomena, but also on the value systems in the chosen discipline and paradigm that structure the observations (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). According to Blaikie (2000): "...after investigation the task is to re-interpret these motives and actions, and the situations in which they occur, in the technical language of social scientific discourse". In order to do so, the researcher will make use of the Foucauldian discourse analysis that attempts to reveal how discourses 'as a group of statements...provide a language for talking about a particular topic at a particular historical moment' (Hall, 2001).

The use of this research strategy does not intend to construct new theories. However, the theories in this research are used to explain and analyse the findings, such as empirical phenomena and mechanisms.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This paragraph generally reveals the outline of this report and the structure of the following chapters.

The next chapter "*Theoretical Framework*" will define the core concepts of this study and give a theoretical basis that has influenced the content of this work and the collection, interpretation and the analysis of the empirical data. The third chapter "*Methodology*" will provide an insight in the methodology used. The research design will be explained and the data collection method presented. Furthermore, the data analysis method will be delineated and finally this chapter covers researcher's position within this research. The fourth chapter "*Empirical Context*" will elaborate more on the empirical context of this study, which is Kazan. Insights in the Kazan's history, its plural society and cultural resources will be given. The fifth chapter "*Cultural Heritage in Kazan*" will provide an analysis of the findings based on qualitative empirical research, conducted in Kazan. The findings will be presented and discussed in the background of the scientific objective. The analysis and discussion will be structured accordingly to the formulated research questions. The final chapter "*Conclusions and Recommendations*" will integrate and discuss the results of this study. The research objective and questions will be central to this chapter. Furthermore, recommendations for the further research on this topic will be provided.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter defines the core concepts of this study and gives a theoretical basis that has influenced the content of this work and the collection, interpretation and the analysis of the empirical data that underpins it. First of all this chapter will elaborate on the paradigm and the post-modern thought within which this study is situated. After that a definition of the concept 'cultural heritage' and the meaning and appliance of the discourse analysis in perspective to this study will be given. Finally, the positionality of cultural heritage within plural societies will be explained.

2.1 POST-MODERNISM

The meaning of cultural heritage is often studied within anthropological discipline and interpretive social-science paradigm, in which reality is assumed to be socially constructed (Denzin, 1997; Lorenz, 1998). According to Graham and Howard (2008) heritage represents the meanings and representations conveyed in the present days upon artefacts, landscapes, mythologies, memories and traditions from the past. Hall (1997) argues: *"It is us – in society, within human cultures – who make things mean, who signify. Meanings, consequently, will always change, from one culture or period to another."* These assumptions can be called post-modern, where is believed that constructed knowledge depends on way of giving meaning and being in the world (Harvey, 1990).

'The fate of an epoch that has eaten from the tree of knowledge is that it must...recognise that general views of life and the universe can never be the products of increasing empirical knowledge, and that the highest ideals, which move us most forcefully, are always formed only in the struggle with other ideals which are just as sacred to others as ours are to us.'

Max Weber, in Harvey 1990

The way people interpret, give meaning to- and construct (Duineveld & van Assche, 2011) an object is determined not only by the object itself. The way people give meaning to their environment depends on their cultural and social backgrounds, influenced by the dominant discourses (Potter, 1996). This theoretical position where is considered that things are constructed rather than discovered is in

epistemology generally called 'antirealism'. Antirealism implies that knowledge is a construction that is produced within practices where knowledge and power are inextricably linked (Duineveld, 2006; van Assche, 2004). This study is clearly situated in the antirealist tradition and uses this theoretical position as a lens through which will be analysed what meaning is given to cultural heritage by the residents of Kazan. In the next paragraphs, more attention will be paid to the definition of cultural heritage and the theories that will be used in order to interpret and analyse the empirical data.

2.2 CULTURAL HERITAGE

Cultural heritage is a complex term having no univocal and one correct meaning. Recent the term cultural heritage is used to describe everything that is old (Lowenthal, 1996; Frijhoff, 2007). Cultural heritage has been categorised and described as tangible, intangible and natural (Bosma, 2008; Grijzenhout, 2007; Ahmad, 2006, UNESCO, 2010). According to Ashworth et al. (2007): *"Cultural heritage is assembled from a wide and varied mixture of past events, personalities, folk memories, mythologies, literary associations, survived physical relics, together with the places – whether sites, towns, or landscapes – with which they can be symbolically associated"*. To be able to bring structure to the scientific debate on cultural heritage, it is useful to describe the perspectives from which and in what ways heritage is studied in practice. There are two ways of viewing cultural history and heritage; historicist and constructivist (Lorenz, 1998; Gibson & Pendlebury, 2009; Duineveld & Kolen, 2009). In historicist view the origin and the value of heritage is located in the past. Herein the emphasis lays on the historical origin of cultural heritage, its historical functions, meanings and contexts, whether it is material or immaterial (Frijhoff, 2007). This view on heritage is called an essentialist approach.

In the constructivist approach cultural heritage is rather viewed as contemporary social construct. This view assumes that the study of heritage does not involve a direct engagement with the study of the past (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). Instead, the contents, interpretations and representations of cultural heritage are selected according to the present social demands. That way, heritage is constantly selected, given meaning to and appreciated which makes it dynamic rather than fixed entity. In constructivist approach, according to Ashworth et al. (2007): *"...heritage is less about tangible material artefacts or the intangible form of the past, but is more about the meanings placed upon them and the representations which are created from them"*. What is perceived as heritage is strongly influenced

by political ambitions, social ideals and economic strategies (Duineveld & Kolen, 2009). Moreover cultural heritage can be seen and defined as a social construct because it is a key factor in the process of how people remember their pasts, how they interpret the past and its significance and use this to create their own sense of place and time, and eventually transform it into place and regional identities (Flooren & Juritsjeva, 2010; Van der Zande & During, 2009; Duineveld & Lengkeek 2002).

'Cultural, heritage does not correspond with what was found important in the past, or with a faithful reconstruction of the past, no matter how important it is for the appropriation of the past, but is determined by everyone's vision of the past that is seen useful for the future.'

Frijhoff, 2007

Above conception of Frijhoff (2007) makes evident, that cultural heritage has to do with the transformation of values and identities through the ages. In this process heritage becomes self-evident only when a group of people recognise it as such and appreciate it (Frijhoff, 2007). Bosma (2008) supports this view by stating that: *"...cultural heritage is a living file to which each generation adds new layers of vitality"*. Current study, using the view and the methodology of anthropological discipline and interpretive social-science paradigm, is approaching the debate of cultural heritage in own constructivist way.

According to Van Assche and Weijschedé (2009), three dominant and influential discourses are present in the debate of cultural heritage, which are; scientific, political and social. Various scientific disciplines are concerned with cultural history. In common they try to cover different time layers, but they do so from different methodology, worldviews, cultural and sometimes even political backgrounds (Duineveld and Lengkeek, 2004; Assche and Weijschedé, 2009). The government has traditionally sought to describe and value cultural heritage in an objectifying and reproducible way (Duineveld, Koedoot and Lengkeek, 2004; Assche and Weijschedé, 2009; Scott, 1998). Ideally, an exhaustive inventory of valuable cultural and historical objects can be made this way. Residents have many different ways of giving meaning to cultural heritage. Lowenthal (1985) subsumes the following importance of cultural heritage to humanity: familiarity and recognition; reaffirmation and validation; individual and group identity and belonging; guidance; enrichment and escape. Ashworth et al. (2007) refers here to the intrinsic value, where cultural heritage is essential to both: *"...individual and communal representations of identity and their*

connotations of providing human existence with meaning, purpose and value". Using such socio-political and cultural traits of heritage, it can help to make the past beneficial to people (Lowenthal, 1985; Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). Moreover Ashworth et al. (2007) identify an extrinsic value of heritage, where places can be defined as places of consumption and are arranged and managed to encounter consumption. Selected cultural resources are converted into cultural and/or economic products through interpretation and packaging (Nuryanti, 1996). There is little empirical evidence to confirm that extrinsic value of heritage is anyhow beneficial to individual and group welfare (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007).

The meaning and appreciation of cultural creations of the past varies both socially and individually in ways that have been little examined (Lowenthal, 1985). Heritage has fragments of meaning and fragments of consumption. It is suggested here, that in order to develop understandings of heritage, and to gain insights into its meaning and relevance for the society, the focus ought to be upon how individuals identify heritage and want to use it in their own terms. Such an approach stresses how people want use and treat heritage as a resource, addressing their perceptions as individual and as a group. As Foucault believed according to Hall (2001) nothing can have meaning outside of discourse. Referring here to cultural heritage it can be stated that it exists, but it only take on meaning and become object of knowledge within a discourse (Hall, 2001). The following paragraph will elaborate more on the appropriateness of discourse analyses within cultural heritage studies.

2.3 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

As already discussed the term 'cultural heritage' has, in recent times, increased in popularity within three dominant and influential authorised discourses, which are; scientific, political and social. Despite the increasing usage of the term, it is still unclear what the term might mean and what work the discourses actually do (Waterton, Smith & Campbell, 2006). There for it is important to find ways by which people construct meanings, discuss, talk about and assess heritage issues. In order to do so, current study will make use of the Michel Foucault's notion of discourse and the discourse analysis, which will be delineated in this paragraph.

Michel Foucault has played a central role in the development of discourse analysis and studied discourses as a system of representation (Hall, 2001; Jørgensen & Philips, 2002). According to Hall (2001): *"Especially, Foucault was interested in rules and practices that produced meaningful statements and regulated discourse in different historical periods"*. Moreover, Foucault studied the knowledge and power

relations, which produce reality through discourses. Foucault defines a discourse as follows:

'We shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation...Discourse is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form... it is, from beginning to end, historical – a fragment of history...posing its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality.'

Foucault, 1972

Van Assche (2004) argues that Foucauldian discourse is not the sum of what is said or done, rather it represents a frame of: *"...collectively conscious and subconscious elements present in a certain culture at a certain time, which determine interpretation of things there and then"*. What a person says, thinks and writes cannot be thought apart from the world of discourses (van Assche, 2004). People derive knowledge from their discursive surroundings (Jäger & Maier, 2009). This 'knowledge' refers to all kinds of meanings that people use to interpret and shape their environment (Jäger & Maier, 2009). According to Foucault (1972): *'Nothing has any meaning outside of discourse'*. At the heart of the constructionist theory of meaning and representation, it is believed that physical things and actions only take on meaning within a discourse (Hall, 2001). There for, discourse analysis not only aims to identify the knowledges enclosed in discourses but also how these knowledges come to its existence (Jäger & Maier, 2009). In order to do so, discourse analysis seeks to understand how knowledge is connected to power relations in power/knowledge complexes (Jäger & Maier, 2009).

In relation to power, a discourse can be defined according to Link (1983) as: *"...an institutionalised way of talking, thinking and acting that regulates and reinforces action and thereby exerts power"* (in Jäger & Maier, 2009; Duineveld, 2006). According to Jäger and Maier (2009), there is power of discourse and over discourse. The *power of discourse* lies in the fact that discourses form individual and mass consciousness. Since consciousness determines action, discourses determine action. With regard to *power over discourse*, different individuals and groups have different chances of influence. Certain groups and individuals have more power over discourse than others, for example because of privileged access to the media or financial resources (Jäger & Maier, 2009). Summarised:

'Discourses exert power because they transport knowledge on which collective and individual consciousness feeds. This knowledge is the basis for individual and collective, discursive and non-discursive action, which in turn shapes reality.'

Jäger & Maier, 2009

Waterton et al. (2006) confirms that cultural heritage is: *"...about the meanings placed upon it and the representations which are created from it"*. Discourse analysis can be used as a method that assists in talking about how people express themselves about cultural heritage and give it meaning (Waterton, Smith & Campbell, 2006).

In the present study this method will be used in order to identify what discourse positions are held towards heritage in Kazan and the way they shape various meanings which are attached to heritage. Here for, the researcher will work with what has been said and written about cultural heritage in Kazan, exploring patterns in and across the statements. Doing so according to Jørgensen and Philips (2002), the researcher will be able to: *"...identify the consequences of different discursive representation of reality"*. In the analysis of the empirical data the researcher will seek for different discourses within the debate of cultural heritage in Kazan and attempt to identify where these discourses origin from. As Waterton et al. (2006) argue: *"This kind of analysis entails a number of useful consequences; not only does it prompt a critical discussion of what heritage is but it can also facilitate the development of more equitable dialogue between a range of stakeholders"*.

Within the context of this study, we have to deal with plural heritages and identities because of the multiethnic society in Kazan. How this heterogeneity can be reflected in heritage, selection, interpretation and management will be discussed in the next section.

2.4 CULTURAL HERITAGE IN PLURAL SOCIETIES

Ashworth et al. (2007) and Frijhoff (2007) argue that cultural heritage must be seen as plural in the growing cultural and social diversity and fragmentation of societies. This raises issues as to how this heterogeneity should be reflected in heritage selection, interpretation and management (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). According to Ashworth et al. plural societies described in the broadest sense are marked by cultural diversity, ethnicity, race, language, class and religion. Pluralism

opposed to multiculturalism invokes the idea of multiple cultures and 'standing alone', rather than insistence on the assimilation (Turnbridge, 2008). Heritages that people create are equally related to identities, both of individual and collective level. Ashworth et al. (2007) have examined pluralism with respect to its heritage significance and have identified five plural scenarios, ranging from the least to the most accepting of minority identity. The typology of models presented, are only an aid to understand the complexity of plural societies and the way cultural heritage is managed within this societies. These theoretical conceptions can be relevant in understanding the plural society and its policy towards cultural heritage in Kazan. The five scenarios are called; assimilation model, melting pot model, core-plus model, pillar model and salad bowl model and will be further delineated below.

ASSIMILATION MODEL

In this scenario, the minor identity is not acknowledged and only one set of common values, social norms, practices and ethnic cultural characteristics legitimately determine the place identity (Turnbridge, 2008). The role of heritage in this model is to act as an instrument of assimilation of the outsiders into the dominant culture. Heritage exercises an educational and socialisation role as excluder and includer (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). Ashworth et al. (2007) identify three different heritage policies for managing this model. The first one incorporates a deviant society within the core society, effecting social change among deviant groups. Second policy tolerates deviant groups when these are regarded as non-threatening. This heritage policy is simply denial, which may take the form of the alteration, suppression or destruction of non-conforming heritage (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007).

MELTING POT MODEL

Melting pot model is similar to the assimilation model because the desired end product of each is a culture with shared values, norms and identity. Opposite to the assimilation model, melting pot uses new cultural features of deviant groups and fuses it into a new 'core' (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). However, Ashworth et al. (2007) argue that the end products created by the melting pot policy will vary according to the nature of the ingredients added. New migrants learn that historical events, personalities and associations that predate the migration by many centuries, are his or her heritage (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007).

CORE-PLUS MODEL

Central to the Core-plus model is the existence of a leading culture to which a number of distinctive minority cultural groups are added (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). In this case, minority add-on identities are tolerated, where the majority feels its values secure and the minority identity to be a more or less beneficial addition, either to its political profile or its tourism economy (Turnbridge, 2008). According to Ashworth et al. (2007) heritage has a multiple role in Core-plus model, one of which is the social inclusion role: *"It may be used as the instrument for creating and sustaining the leading culture. It can adopt a defensive position whose task is to preserve the integrity of the core... Simultaneously, it can be used to promote the values and norms of the core among peripheral add-ons thus preventing society fragmenting into non communicating cells."* The core enhancement role, conversely, promotes heritage of the peripheral minorities to the core populations, using diversity as both strength and embellishment (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007).

PILLAR MODEL

According to Ashworth et al. (2007) in this model: *"...society is conceived as being a set of 'pillars', each self-contained and having little connection with each other"*. In practice all the 'pillars' support the structure of the unified state, hereby each group is allowed to manage its own cultural, social, educational, political and economic institutions. Within pillar model the separation and minimal contact between the groups is maintained, without privileging any particular group (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). According to Ashworth et al. (2007), each group manages and consumes its own heritage for its own exclusive reasons.

SALAD BOWL MODEL

This model represents a coreless society composed of diverse elements that retain their distinctive identities, sustained by distinctive heritages (Turnbridge, 2008). Two different heritage policies are typical for this scenario. The first one, inclusivist policy, includes every possible social group and invites all to be part of such heritages (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). The focus is on openness, making all heritages widely known and widely accessible. The second, exclusivist heritage policy, recognises and empowers each distinctive group with selection and management of its own heritage (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). Exclusivist approach is difficult to distinguish from the 'pillar' model and the one may evolve into the other.

The presented models by Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge (2007) show considerable overlap between each other. Different models may be adopted at various times in the same country in response to change in the composition of society and variations of governmental policies (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). The typology of models, as already mentioned, is only an aid to understand the complexity of plural societies and is described in this paragraph in order to understand the plural society and the position of Kazan' cultural heritage within it.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter is providing an insight in the methodology used for this study. First of all the research design is explained. Secondly, the data collection method is presented. Finally, the data analysis method is delineated and researcher's positionality within this study is discussed.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design taken for the current study is the explorative single case study, which according to Yin (2008) is: *"An empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident"*. Case studies are prime examples of qualitative research, which adopt an interpretative approach to data and investigate phenomena within its context and consider the subjectivity people bring to their interpretations (De Vaus, 2001). The aim of this research design is not to construct new theories, nor to test one. As mentioned earlier the theoretical position of this study is one where is considered that things are constructed within discourses rather than discovered and implies that knowledge is a construction that is produced within practices where knowledge and power are inextricably linked. There for it is essential to build on the gained empirical data, instead of on theories. The provided theoretical framework is therefore not an unambiguously defined methodological framework, rather it serves as a starting point of this research and a way of looking at the data.

The case study approach is essential for the present research because the construction of meanings towards cultural heritage is as already pictured, always happening within a particular society. The chosen case for this research is Kazan, the capital city of the Republic of Tatarstan of the Russian Federation. The appropriateness of this case is already pictured in the introduction of this report. Next chapter will elaborate more in detail on this empirical context and its characteristics as discussed within dominant discourses.

As Yin (2008) pictures: *"Case study's unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence: documents, artefacts, interviews and observations"*. The following paragraph will discuss which methods for data collection are applied to this study.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION

An anthropologic and interpretative approach to data collection is applied to this study. Such approaches are grounded in a commitment to the first-hand experience and exploration of individual and social-cultural phenomena, based on unstructured observations and interviews in a field research setting (Mason, 2002). Here in, as the primary data source are seen individuals, their interpretations, meanings and understandings. According to Foucauldian discourse analysis tradition there is an interest in discursive practices which blend together text, talk and practice.

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

In order to get knowledge on how Kazan's residents identify cultural heritage, give meaning to it and wish to treat it, sixteen semi-structured interviews are held with the residents of Kazan, in the period between 5 September 2010 and 22 October 2010. Difference is made in the way people might be connected to cultural heritage discourses, by interviewing authorities (4) in the field of heritage, culture and tourism; scientists (6) in the same field and residents (6) not having a professional or educational connection to heritage. In order to gain perspectives of different ethnical groups, the following groups were represented: Tatar (6), Russian (4), Ukraine (2), Mari (1), Jewish (1), German-Tatar (1) and Udmurt (1). Respondents had the following age; between 20-30 years (3), 30-40 years (5), 40-50 (7) and 50-60 (1). This sampling method has been chosen in order to be able to hold interviews with more or less representative population of Kazan society. Interviews were held in the Russian language conform the interview protocol and were voice recorded (see appendix: A and B). Interview protocol was created in order to systemise interview instructions and interview transcriptions. The form of semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions was considered the most appropriate for this study because it allowed respondents to identify noteworthy issues and ideas themselves. A loose interview structure is best suited to serve this intention (Kvale, 2007). As Kvale (2007) suggests: *"At the same time there is openness to changes of sequence and question forms in order to follow up the answers given and stories told by the interviewees"*.

OBSERVATIONS

To complement empirical data different observations took place. The researcher has been at the celebration of 115 years anniversary of the National Tatar Museum (16 September 2010). Different people spoke here about the importance of cultural heritage, including the minister of Culture of the Republic of Tatarstan. Moreover, a documentary on the Russian channel (Russia 1) is viewed; its central topic was

“Moscow Self-Liquidation” (19 September 2010). This documentary brought insights, from political and civilian perspectives, in the heritage preservation issues in Moscow and Russia. Additionally, different conversations are held with the residents of Kazan, concerning cultural heritage. The researcher has also observed the appearance of cultural heritage in Kazan and took pictures of remarkable objects. During the observations, researcher took notes.

TEXTUAL REVIEW

In addition, obtained empirical data was triangulated with the analysis of several regional press articles concerning cultural issues and local researches on Tatar plural society, cultural heritage and leisure. This complimentary data is used to support the results of semi-structured interviews and observations in order to answer the research questions as comprehensive as possible.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

Once data was generated, transcription and an interpretative reading of the data were applied. Interpretative reading involved researcher in constructing and documenting a version of what she thinks the data represents and means. Such an approach is appropriate to studies where special attention is given to implicit norms or values with which interviewees are operating, or discourses by which they are influenced (Mason, 2002). Moreover, such an approach is suitable for the studies concerned with studied objects’ interpretations and understandings, or their versions and accounts of how they make sense of social phenomena. According to earlier descriptions of the current study, this method of reading the data is best appropriate.

Semi-structured interview transcripts appeared less ordered and sometimes disorganised, incoherent in places and sometimes did not take the form of sequential narrative. The used ordering method of the data is called contextual or case study data organisation (Mason, 2002). According to Mason (2002) such an approach involves ways of seeing and sorting the data which do not necessarily use the same lens across the whole in this way. The task in this one was to identify and represent the key elements of the particular and holistic part of the data. This method helped the researcher to understand complex interwoven parts of the data, social processes and complex narratives of practises. Here in, the research questions are used as topics, within which the analysis took place.

3.4 RESEARCHER'S POSITIONALITY

Due to the character of the thesis and the chosen research strategy and design, it was important for the researcher to be immersed in the social situation of the researched and to use the insider and personal experiences as a basis for understanding the researched (Blaikie, 2000). Such an approach allows researcher not only to be biased but also to influence the researched. Here for, researcher is required to have a critical review of own role. In fact researcher plays a role of a co-creator and brings own subjective experience, and according to Blaikie (2000): *"...tries to develop an understanding of the whole and a deep understanding of how each part relates and is connected to the whole"*. Herein it is important to realise that researcher's position is a result of a particular discursive process. While reading and analysing the data the researcher of this study adopted a reflexive position.

The researcher of the current study has both Dutch and Russian nationalities, which helped to find respondents and interest them for participation. Residents of Kazan appeared to be proud of their city, its history and cultural heritage and were willing to talk about it with someone from Europe. Respondents were proud about the fact that a student from Dutch University was interested in studying the way they give meaning to cultural heritage. In the eyes of the respondents, researcher was a Dutch student with a Russians background. The possibility to hold interviews in Russian has made it easy to have meaningful conversations. Respondents wanted also to show their hospitality and made their networks available for the researcher.

4. EMPIRICAL CONTEXT

This chapter will elaborate more on the empirical context of this study, which is Kazan. Information that will be provided will be seen as a part of historical and political discourses and not as the single truth. Insights in the Kazan's history, its plural society and cultural treasures will be given. This information is important for the further understanding of the empirical data, discussed in the next chapter.

4.1 KAZAN'S HISTORY

'Kazan-Governor's Town is located at confluence of two rivers Kazanka and Volga. Thanks to its past and spiritual domination in the vast Volga-Kama edge, Kazan has deserved greater fame since long time. In the chronicles Kazan was mentioned for the first time by the year 1164.'

Poltaratsky & Lustritsky, 1892

VOLGA BULGARIA & KAZAN KHANATE

Kazan is the capital city of the sovereign Republic of Tatarstan in the Russian Federation. The population of the territory of the modern Tatar Republic began about thousand years ago. The first feudal state in the Middle Volga region became Volga Bulgaria, formed on the boundary of 9th and 10th centuries (Bukharaev, 1995). The main population existed of Bulgars, immigrants from Azov region, who conquered the native Finno-Ugrians and Turkish-speaking tribes. The capital of Volga Bulgaria was Bolgar and was built of stone and brick between 10th and 14th centuries (Bukharaev, 1995). Bulgars were pagans, however in 922 they established Islam as state religion. The ancient Turkish written language was substituted by the Arabic oneⁱ (Rybakov, 1981; Kazan State University, 2011). Bulgaria remained a long time as only one developed state. According to Tatar historians in the 13th century Volga Bulgaria suffered from Mongol attacker Batu-Khan (Kazan State University, 2011). According to Bukharaev (1995): *"In 1236 Bulgaria was conquered and annexed to Golden Horde. Golden Horde was the largest medieval state of Eurasia, the heart of rich civilisation where masterpieces of medieval Tatar literature were created."*

After the downfall of Golden Horde in 1437, its vast area was transformed into separate Tatar states, they included Kazan Khanate with its capital city Kazan. The

ⁱ In 1928 the Arabic alphabet was substituted by the Latin one; in 1938 the contemporary Tatar alphabet on the basis of Cyrillic alphabet was adopted.

15th century and the first half of the 16th century was the period of prosperity of Kazan Khanate and its capital (Kazan State University, 2011). As a result of armed conflicts, fires and rebuilding, among architectural constructions of Kazan Khanate epoch only Suyumbike Tower (Khan's Mosque) and Nuraliev Mosque reserved on Kremlin territory (Kazan State University, 2011).

On the 2nd October of 1552, Tsar Ivan the Terrible conquered Kazan and annexed Kazan Khanate to the Russian State (Poltaratsky & Lustritsky, 1892). The Christianisation of Tatar folk began. Tatar population, which did not excepted Christianity, was ousted to the suburbs. Close to the end of the 16th century, Tatar Settlement became the place where Tatar people with Muslim confession lived. According to some historians, Muslim Tatars were forced to live there and were completely excluded from the other part the city (Bukharaev, 1995; Rybakov, 1981). Katherine II eliminated the prohibition to build mosques, and the first stone Mosque arose in the Tatar Settlement in 1770, it was named after Mardzhani - the scientist-orientalist, philosopher and educator (Kazan State University, 2011).

SOVIET SOCIALIST & SOVEREIGN REPUBLIC

Significant step in the reestablishment of statehood of Tatar people became the proclamation of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in 1920 (Rorlich, 1999). In 1989, 63,4% of the Tatar population became urban residents, while only 5,2% lived in the cities in early 1920s. This radical social change is due to the Soviet regime's commitment to fast economic development and to the educational and occupational advancement (Giuliano, 2000). While Tatar remained the main language in the republic's rural areas, in Kazan Russian was clearly dominant. Tatar language was given a secondary status and many called it unscientific and unnecessary (Giuliano, 2000). Yet, in the Soviet ethno cultural understandings language encompasses a central component of ethnicity. Urban Tatars maintained a strong sense of ethnic consciousness, many equated loss of Tatar language with the cultural death of the nation (Giuliano, 2000).

In 1988, the nationalist Tatar Public Centre was formed as the champion of Tatar culture and heritage (Rorlich, 1999). Giuliano (2000) states that: *"The fear of losing cultural distinctiveness arose among Tatar intellectuals in the cities who had already lost Tatar language"*. Tatar citizens began by calling for the protection of Tatar culture and ended up championing full independence of Tatarstan (Giuliano, 2000; Rorlich, 1999). According to Veinguer and Davis (2007): *"Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the republic of Tatarstan in the Russian Federation has been experiencing a significant renaissance of Tatar ethnicity and culture"*. Insofar as many of the founders of the nationalist organisations were Russified Tatars

concerned with saving their nation and language, revival became a critical nationalist goal. Apart from nationalists willingness for Tatar independence, the future president of Tatar Republic, Shaymiyev, promoted the issues of sovereignty as public goods benefiting all ethnic groups (Giuliano, 2000; Frombgen, 2002). It seemed difficult to accomplish total Tatar independence for the following reasons: Tatars constitute 48% of the Republic population while Russians make up 43%; approximately 75% of Tatars live outside of Tatarstan; the history of coexistence between Russians and Tatars since 1552; Tatarstan's relative high socioeconomic development in Russia and the central location of Tatarstan in Russia, making secession virtually impossible (Frombgen; 2002). In 1992, a majority of the population, 61.4% with a voter turnout of 81.6%, supported sovereignty (Rorlich, 1999). Although more Tatars than Russians supported sovereignty, many Russians also voted in favour (Giuliano, 2000). The 1992 constitution defined Tatarstan as a multiethnic sovereign Republic within Russian Federation, with two official languages, Russian and Tatar. The largest ethnic groups are Tatars and Russians, and they correspond approximately to the two main confessions, Islam and Orthodoxyⁱⁱ (Veinguer & Davis, 2007).

4.2 KAZAN'S PLURAL SOCIETY

According to Veinguer and Davis (2007): *"Tatarstan promotes itself as an example of interethnic stability and is widely recognized as such"*. According to Veinguer and Davis (2007) this comes from the centuries-old experience of cultural contact between two largest Tatar and Russian ethnic groups in the presence of numerous national minorities. Moreover, only in the Volga region existed mixed communities and indigenous people never fought against each other (Poltaratsky & Lustritsky, 1892). Also nowadays Tatar society has many prominent bi-cultural features. As former president of Russia, Vladimir Putin, confirmed in the book named 'Tatarstan our common home':

'I like the Kazan Kremlin...not only for its beauty, but for a very good example of coexistence of various cultures and confessions which is not only simply peaceful, but fraternal...'

Vladimir Putin, ex-president of the Russian Federation
in Kruchina, 2007

ⁱⁱ Along with Islam and Orthodoxy Christianity there are other religious communities present in Tatarstan: Catholic Church, Old-believers, Protestants, Adventists of the 7th day, Evangelic and Lutheran, Judaic, Krishna propagation Center, etc.

It is important to mention multi-ethnic characteristics of the case studied because this way many pasts become transformed through many heritages into many identities. That makes same heritage objects been interpreted and given meaning to differently by various dominant political, social, religious or ethnic discourses. While studying what meaning Kazan society gives to cultural heritage, many different views can be revealed.

The Republic of Tatarstan represents 3 million and 800 thousands residents who are considered to 115 ethnic communities (Nigmatullina, 2007). According to the statistics in 2002 biggest two nations in the Republic of Tatarstan are represented by Tatars 52.9% and Russians 39,5%. The third place took Chuvash population with 3.3%. The number of Udmurt, Ukrainian, Mordovians, Mari and Bashkir residents of Tatarstan exceeds 10,000 people (Nikiforow, 2007). Since 1989 to a big extend grew Tajik, Armenians, Azerbaydzhan, Uzbek and Georgian diasporas. In the last years also Vietnam and Turkish people came to live in Tatarstan (Nikiforow, 2007). According to Nigmatullina (2007), a Tatar scientist, important for Tatar society is the inter-ethnic agreement, based on the principles of mutual respect, understanding, tolerance and creation of conditions for cultural diversity, preservation and development of national cultures of the Republic of Tatarstan. In order to preserve the identity of national cultures ethno cultural communal organisations started formation in the beginning of 1990. The aim of these organisations is to revival national cultures and support closeness of nations (Gabrahrmanov, 2007). In 1992 the Association of National and Cultural Unions of the Republic of Tatarstan was founded. The association focuses mainly on the revival and development of the languages, cultures and traditions of the nations living in Tatarstan. Undertaken activities must harmonise international and inter-confessional relations, and in the long run, the preservation of socio and political stability in the Republic (Kruchina, 2007).

4.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES OF KAZAN

According to the Ministry of Culture of Tatarstan more than five thousand objects of historical, scientific, artistic and other cultural value are revealed in the Republic of Tatarstan (Valeev, 2004). Today, approximately 2,500 cultural heritage sites of federal, republican and local importance, is protected by the State. According to Valeev (2004), in 1959 only 459 historical objects were protected by the State and in 1989, 835 object. In the last 20 years, work was done on identification, registration, examination and certification of cultural heritage in the Republic.

'Without cultural heritage of the past centuries it is impossible to imagine our life today, apparently technically advanced, but to a big extent associated with the past by invisible threads and ancestors of the culture.'

Rafael Valeev, Vice Minister of Culture
in Tarunov, 2004

Thirteen cities and settlements of Tatarstan are declared as historic, one of which is Kazan. Within Kazan and other territories, objects of historical and cultural heritage are situated. They include mosques, churches and monasteries, public housing, mansions and manor houses, bridges, mills, warehouses, sites of archaeological cultural layers, elements of historic buildings, as well as other cultural values created by the past (Tarunov, 2004). According to Valeev (2004), in the name of Ministry of Culture of Tatarstan, a lot valued are objects related to the life and activities of public figures, such as Derzhavin, Pushkin, Tukay, Dzhilil, Tolstoy, Kamal, Mardzhani, Labochevski, Butlerov, Fooks and other. On the basis of the most valuable historical, cultural and natural sites protected areas are created, such as the Old Tatar Settlement in Kazan. Kazan's Kremlin is inscribed on the world heritage list of UNESCO. In recent years more attention is paid by the state and the residents to old and reinvented tradition, folk art, family rituals, customs and folk games (Salahutdinov, 2005). National traditions are visible when the residents of Tatarstan celebrate Tatar 'Sabantuy', Russian 'Karavon', Chuvash 'Uyava', Mari 'Semyka', Udmurt 'Gyron bydton', and other holidays. In 2003 UNESCO inscribed Sabantuy as Tatar living tradition on the list of immaterial world heritage (Kruchina, 2007). According to Salahutdinov (2005) such holidays, show poly-ethnic character of the republic and become a place of get-togethers and mutual cultural enrichment.

Different historical, scientific and political references were used in order to picture the history, society and cultural resources of Kazan. These references show that Tatarstan and its capital city Kazan represent a plural society, with two dominant cultures (Tatar and Russian) and religions (Islam and Orthodoxy). The historical references speak of a centuries old tolerance on the territory of Tatarstan and Kazan. However, in the period of the downfall of the Soviet Union, a part of Tatar society strived for a full independence of Tatarstan, ending up with a majority of the citizens who did not supported this opposition. Political and scientific references speak of a greater importance and meaning of cultural heritage for the residents and a bigger responsibility for heritage of the state. The following chapter will focus more on these statements and analyse empirical data collected in Kazan.

5. CULTURAL HERITAGE IN KAZAN

In this chapter the analysis of findings based on qualitative empirical research, conducted in Kazan, will be provided. The findings will be presented and discussed in the background of the following scientific objective: *“This study aims to achieve an exploration on how residents of Kazan identify and give meaning to cultural heritage and how they define its role and relevance for the society. Moreover the objective of this study is to identify how individuals want cultural heritage to be treated and dealt with.”* The analysis and discussion will be structured accordingly to the formulated research questions, as presented in the introduction of this report. First of all in paragraph 5.1 an insight will be given in what respondents have identified as cultural heritage in Kazan. In the paragraph 5.2, the meaning, role and relevance that respondents give to cultural heritage in Kazan will be analysed. Finally, paragraph 5.3 will discuss the way people want cultural heritage to be treated and dealt with.

The chosen theoretical position will be used in order to identify what discourse positions are held towards heritage in Kazan and the way they shape various meanings, which are attached to heritage. Moreover, the theoretical positions of the researcher will be used in order to interpret, analyse and understand the data. The researcher will work with what has been said and written about cultural heritage in Kazan. Different aspects of the data will be supported with scientific concepts where possible.

5.1 IDENTIFIED CULTURAL HERITAGE

Prior to the empirical investigation, researcher presumed that the term *‘cultural heritage’* and its meaning will not be known by every resident of Kazan. Practise demonstrated that every person the researcher spoke to, knew the meaning of cultural heritage and gave it own practical interpretation. This paragraph will give a broad overview of what sixteen respondents identified in Kazan as cultural heritage. Hereby the researcher will additionally use own observations.

In order to investigate how cultural heritage in Kazan is identified, sixteen residents of Kazan were interviewed. The respondents represented different ethnic and religious groups, social strata and cultural development. Moreover interviewees were connected to the field of cultural heritage differently, conversations were held with authorities (4) in the fields of heritage, culture and tourism, scientists (6) in the same fields and residents (6) not having a professional connection to heritage. Additionally different scientific papers and researches conducted in Tatarstan were analysed.

Respondents independently of their ethnic, religious and cultural appliance spoke about the definition of cultural heritage in the same way. Different vocabulary and formulations were used, as determent by different educational and cultural levels. While identifying cultural heritage some respondents gave examples such as: *“the wooden houses”*; *“residences of famous, important people, hero’s lived and worked in Kazan”*; *“mosques and churches”*, *“Tatar language”* etc. Other respondents gave more general descriptions of cultural heritage, such as *“historical objects”*, *“folklore and traditions”* etc. For all the respondents cultural heritage consists of: *historical objects and districts, religious objects, folklore and traditions, national languages and cultivated natural objects*. These components correspond with the categories tangible, intangible and natural heritage, as often used in the science (Bosma, 2008; Grijsenhout, 2007; Ahmad, 2006, UNESCO, 2010). Most interviewees answered the questions with high interest and emotions: *“When living in such big city as Kazan, there is a lot to be proud of. Talking about culture there are much valuable historical objects”*; *“...in Kazan you would find a lot interesting (cultural heritage) objects. The way cultures and different layers of population are mixed in Kazan is insanely interesting.”* The answers formed a broad overview of the way individuals identify different objects as cultural heritage in Kazan, based on which the researcher made next analysis.

HISTORICAL OBJECTS AND DISTRICTS

Out of sixteen respondents, 93,8% consider historical objects and districts a part of cultural heritage. According to respondents historical objects and districts entail; fortifications, buildings, objects related to the life, activities and housing of public figures, religious objects representing art and having a historical value, streets and districts of the city associated with historical events and architectural buildings having a status of artworks. According to respondents, Kazan has streets and settlements that are witnesses of historic architecture and epochs of historical development of Tatar folks. To many respondents the ancient walls of Kremlin are eyewitnesses of the downfall of the Kazan Khanate. The Old Tatar Settlement is the district where Tatars, refusing to adopt Orthodoxy, were evicted. As was mentioned in the introduction to empirical context Old Tatar Settlement is protected by the state. Respondents referred also to the streets of traditional wooden houses. The most named street is Mushtari dating back to the 19th century. Interviewees named also the building of the State University where Lenin has studied, hotel Bulgar where national poet Gabdulla Tukay has lived and died, the residence of Fooks and the building of the hotel Kazan dating back to the 19th century.

RELIGIOUS OBJECTS

According to some respondents, the religious ideology seems to be deeply embedded in the consciousness of many Kazan citizens. Various respondents associate religion with cultural heritage. Therefore, 31,3% interviewees considered religious objects as cultural heritage. Most often as example were given mosques Kul-Sharif, Mardzhani and Saltan, Blagoveschenskii cathedral, Bogoroditsky convent, Raifskii monastery and Lutheran church. Remarkable is that, representatives of various religious confessions (Christian, Muslim, Jews, Lutherans and pagans) referred to both Christian and Muslim religious objects. An interesting observation is that religious objects which are considered as cultural heritage are been visited by all representatives of the listed confessions. Such respect for different religions goes according to historical references, back to epochs of Chengis Khan (Karamzin, 1816). Mongol tribes belonged to different religious faiths. There for, religious objects were not plundered or destroyed and the servants of different religious cults were left untouched. The empire of Chengis Khan and his descendants Khan Batu and Khan Mangu did not persecuted by religious ideologies (Karamzin, 1816; Tatishev, 1768).

FOLKLORE AND TRADITIONS

Along with latter illustrated components of cultural heritage, 63% of all respondents added national folklore and traditions to cultural heritage. In this category of cultural heritage, the respondents referred to folklore as national music, dances, stories, tales, legends, national costumes and decorations. According to respondents, traditions involve holidays, rituals and national cuisine. Based on researchers' observations during the celebrations and ceremonies, can be concluded that national traditions are clearly respected. However, there are elements representing the mixture of different cultures and contemporary trends.

Based on the analysis (Galeeva, 2003) of the ethno sociological research of Tatar cultures, processed by the academy of socio-economic sciences at the State University of Kazan, interesting additions to the current data can be made. The answers to question: *"In traditions of what culture would you like to bring up your children?"* the following insights were given: 30% of Tatars answered that they would like to grow up their children in Tatar traditions, using Russian and other cultures. 33,5% Russians and 28,6% representatives of other ethnicities prefer to grow up children within general Russian traditions, using knowledge of world culture. Somewhat less respondents, 24,5% Russians and 18,4% representatives of other ethnicities, want to grow up their children in Russian traditions, using Tatar and other traditions (Galeeva, 2003). These figures speak expressively about the

presence of tolerance among folks of Tatarstan and a greater commitment of Russians rather than Tatars to the knowledge of world culture.

On the question: *“Do you stick to traditions of your own ethnicity?”* most of the respondents of all vast ethnic groups (85% Tatars, 74,1% Russians, 71,4% other ethnic groups) answered affirmatively. The most celebrated holidays in Tatar families occur to be religious, 49,4%. In addition, 56,5% of Tatars, 13,2 of Russians and 18,4% of respondents of other nations note to celebrate in their family Tatar holiday Sabantuy. Easter is celebrated by 67,3% Russians, 7,3% Tatars and 66,3% representatives of other ethnic groups. In addition, this analysis speaks of mutual respect and acceptance of ethnical traditions, which are present in the Republic of Tatarstan.

Based on personal observations and experience can be concluded that national Tatar cuisine undoubtedly dominates in Kazan. During the conversations, interviewees and other local people demonstrated their proud of national cuisine: *“Our national cuisine is a part of cultural heritage, which is at the same time one of the most pleasant forms of heritage”*. Not for nothing is the legendary master of cuisine Yunus Akhmetzyanov honoured as a national hero. The basis of this cuisine is a range of meat and pastry dishes such as; achpochmak, belish, chak-chak, gubadiya, kosh-tele, kazilik, kystibiy, tokmach and talkish-khalave. All these dishes are very accessible in the city restaurants, cafes and local shops and are used in the daily lives of the respondents. Despite the fact that Tatar cuisine dominates in Kazan, according to respondents also Russian cuisine is well represented and is very usual to Tatar families.

LANGUAGE

12,5% of all respondents referred to national language as cultural heritage. The term language entails also national literature. As earlier in this document was explained, Tatar written language has been changed three times. The Arabic written language substituted the ancient Turkish and in 1928, Latin substituted the Arabic alphabet. Finally, in 1938 the contemporary Tatar alphabet based on Cyrillic alphabet was adopted. According to one of the respondents: *“This change has led to the loss of literature”*. In the streets of Kazan researcher came across street names that are still written whether in Latin or Cyrillic alphabets (see photographs on the next page).

At this moment, the official languages in the Republic of Tatarstan are Russian and Tatar. However, according to the respondents each ethnic group actively tries to preserve and use own language.

Ethno sociological research of Tatar cultures (Gareeva, 2003) shows interesting figures in relation to language as a part of national cultural heritage. On the question: “Creations of which writers is most closely to you?” almost 50% of Tatar respondents prefer Russian classics in Russian language. As many Tatars, especially middle aged and youth, do not speak Tatar or master it only on a domestic level. Tatars are more interested in Russian literature, than Russians in Tatar. Only 3,4% of all Russian respondents named national Tatar poet Tukay, however 20,8% Tatars named Russian poet Pushkin. Furthermore, 44,9% respondents of other ethnic groups named Pushkin, 4,1% Tukay and 15-18% of them preferred writers of own culture (Gareeva, 2003).



PHOTOGRAPHS 1, 2: STREET NAMES WRITTEN IN RUSSIAN AND LATIN ALPHABETS (SOURCE: AUTHOR)

CULTIVATED NATURAL OBJECTS

Cultivated natural objects are referred to as cultural heritage by 25% of the respondents. Specifically were named city park Gorkogo and lake Kaban. City Park Gorkogo was founded in the 19th century, when the professors and students of Kazan State University planted trees in this park. Some trees were not usual for Kazan and even for Tatarstan. This park was named by the respondents because of its partial disappearance. Lake Kaban is the subject of many legends. The legends hold that khans' treasures were thrown to the bottom of the Kaban during its capture. Another legend holds that the great snake Azhdakha from the Zilantov hill hid in the lake and occasionally takes revenge on the Kazan residents. In ancient times, the Kazan khans' fields and gardens were located around the lake. These legends and history make the lake Kaban special to Kazan residents. For some respondents the legends of this lake are a part of their childhood: “Kaban is a mysterious lake, in my childhood I have believed in all legends told me about Kaban. This is important for me.”

The description of cultural heritage as pictured by Ashworth et al. (2007) in the theoretical framework, summarises the identification of cultural heritage in Kazan by its residents as follows:

“Cultural heritage is assembled from a wide and varied mixture of past events, personalities, folk memories, mythologies, literary associations, survived physical relics, together with the places – whether sites, towns, or landscapes – with which they can be symbolically associated”.

5.2 THE MEANING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

The second aim of this study is to identify what meaning, role and relevance the residents of Kazan attach to cultural heritage. While analysing the data researcher interpreted different meanings, and clustered them in eight different categories. However, the empirical data has been leading in this analysis, already soon researcher found similarities in the meanings as attached to cultural heritage by the respondents and the conceptualisation of the meaning of cultural heritage as formulated by the Russian professor Likhachev and Britain professor Lowenthal. In order to be able to reflect the analysis of the data against these conceptualisations, they will be presented firstly, after that, the analysis of the empirical data will be provided.

In 1984, Likhachev wrote about the importance of the cultural environment in the following way:

‘Preservation of cultural environment- a task no less significant than the preservation of the natural environment! If the nature of man is necessary for its biological life, the cultural environment is as necessary for their spiritual, moral life, for his ‘spiritual residence, for his attachment to his native land, for his morality, discipline and sociality.’

Dmitry Likhachev, 1984

In this citation Likhachev represents his own conceptualisation of the meaning that cultural heritage might have for the society. Cultural heritage is according to him meaningful for the aspects such as spiritual and moral life, discipline, sociality and attachment to native land. Lowenthal also formulated interesting conceptualisations of the benefits of cultural heritage for the society in his work “The past is as a foreign country” (1985). Herein the writer explains that people can only perceive objects that are accustomed to them, calling this *familiarity*. Moreover, according to

Lowenthal (1985) the past validates present attitudes and actions by affirming their similarity to former ones, which is called *reaffirmation and validation*. Lowenthal argues that history and its material and immaterial evidence enhances the sureness of *individual and national identity* legitimating people in their own eye. In addition, is the past most characteristically invoked for the lessons it teaches and provides *guidance* to contemporary and future lives. Other benefit of the cultural heritage as pictured by Lowenthal is the *enrichment* of the world surrounding humanities, which can be literally as well as figuratively enriching. Finally, the treasures of the past can, accordingly to Lowenthal (1985) provide alternatives to an unacceptable present, when there is a desire to escape for a time from the modern world. Lowenthal summarises the meaning of cultural heritage in his own terms as follows:

“More than for any functional use, we treasure the old things in our homes for the pastness inherent in them; they reflect ancestral inheritance, recall former friends and occasions, and link past with future generations.

David Lowenthal, 1985

While analysing the answers of the respondents, researcher has identified the following aspects of the meaning that is given to the cultural heritage by the residents of Kazan:

INDIVIDUAL & NATIONAL IDENTITY

62,5% of all respondents found cultural heritage necessary for the understanding and development of the individual and national identity. Without knowing theoretical backgrounds of the professor Lowenthal (1985) and Likhachev (1984), respondents expressed themselves almost with the same words. One of the respondents articulated his opinion in the following way: *“Cultural heritage objects are part of my life, without them I would not know where I stem from... I find that traditions and folklore play a role in getting aware of whom you are and where you belong. Also it has a binding role, where individual feels what is inherent and what is foreign...”* Herein, the respondent explains that cultural heritage objects, traditions and folklore help him to understand his background and where he belongs. As Likhachev (1984) pointed, also for this respondent cultural heritage plays a role in filling the attachment to his native land. The respondent calls it a: *“binding role of cultural heritage”*. Many respondents spoke about being proud of their native land and its history, cultural heritage plays here a major role as evidence of the history.

Some respondents wanted to contribute to the development of the national identity by passing by national history and traditions to their children. Other respondents gave meaning to cultural heritage with reference to the identity in the following way: *“Without history we are rootless”*; *“The most important I think is the feeling of belonging”*; *“Historical objects help me to identify myself, who am I? What is my background?”*

From the foregoing and the analysis of the data, it follows that the meaning given to cultural heritage in favour of understanding and development of the individual and national identity is dominating. This is regardless of the individual, ethnic and social position of the respondents.

MORAL & AESTHETIC VALUE

While giving meaning to cultural heritage, 43,8% of the respondents have referred to its moral and aesthetic value. One of the interviewees gave it the following interpretation: *“...our cultural heritage is beautiful and plays also aesthetical role. When our historical objects will be maintained and saved, the city will look authentic and beautiful.”* Other respondents said: *“It has a very important...moral role. We are not allowed to lose this material cultural heritage.”* Remained respondents consider cultural heritage to represent their national richness and being able to shape the inner world of individuals.

Above quotes, clearly express the importance of such aspects as beauty, wealth, enrichment of life and development of morality. In this case, the respondents claimed, that they are obliged to preserve cultural heritage that is of a big importance for them. In addition, in this case respondents used terminology and formulations, which are corresponding with ones of the professor Likhachev (1984). In his work, he confirms that cultural heritage is needed for the spiritual and moral life of the humans.

TOLERANCE

Since ancient times, on the territory of Tatarstan lived Fino-Ungry tribes (Cheremis, Mordovians, Perm, Murom and Ves). In the 7th century, Bulgars settled on this territory and in the 13th century Tatar Mongol tribes. In the 15th century, Khan Mahmed founded Kazan state. In the 16th century Kazan was conquered by Ivan the Terrible and Russians came to live on the same territory. Within many discourses related to history and ethnicity it is stressed that ever since, the representatives of these ethnicities still live in Tatarstan and they have never been persecuted based on ethnic and religious ideologies (Rybakov, 1981, 1982; Grekov, Artamanov, 1951; Ilovaiski, 2008; Zabylin, 1880).

Also 43,8% of the respondents attached great importance to cultural heritage, referring to the tolerance. One respondent in this regard expressed as follows: *“Tatarstan positions itself as a tolerant country. In Kazan, you will see a synagogue near a mosque and cathedral. People are really friendly and respectful to each other, only for the prayers they visit different religious centres.”* In regard to the role of religious centres in the development of tolerance one of the respondents said: *“I believe that the existence of different confessional centres brings our different ethnical groups together. Because in that way we get to know each other.”*

Some respondents indicated that the presence of cultural heritage of different ethnic groups enriches their lives and their histories are entangled: *“...different ethnic groups and their history and culture are located on the Tatar territory. That is why I see them as one of us. Their history is somehow entangled with ours.”* Other respondent mentioned: *“...The presence of different nations, cultures and confessions in Kazan, enriches my life, my worldview.”*

The respondents found the importance of saving national heritage, despite of its ethnic background very important. One respondent expressed this in the following way: *“Each ethnic group needs to be saved and needs to develop. That is why they also need their own cultural and historical objects. We need to learn each other’s cultures and cannot let the small ethnic groups disappear. In Tatarstan and Kazan, some generations do not know different, than living within a multi ethnical community, surrounded by cultural heritage belonging to different cultures. To take me as an example, I do not know how it is to live differently.”*

Referring back to discourses related to history and ethnicity already in 1880 Zabylin (a Russian scientist) wrote about traditions of different ethnic groups on the territory of Tatarstan as if it is a part of Russian folk. His scientific work shows that cultures of these groups retain their sovereign identity, however they are mixing up in the process of interaction. According to Zabylin (1880), the development of tolerance seems to be very important for the Tatar folk and has a tendency to progress.

GUIDANCE

31,3% of all respondents said that cultural heritage provides lessons from the past about the creation of contemporary and future culture: *“The history and the heroes from the past, learn how to live now and give good examples.”* During interviews, on the question: *“Where do you need cultural heritage for?”* other respondents noted the following: *“It is impossible to plan future not knowing the past.”; “Traditions, folklore, folktales and culture are very important in life of a human being. It gives people direction in life.”; “...it is difficult to live in present without knowing the*

wisdom and culture of the past.” Moreover, respondents were surprised by this question and even expressed amusement, because for them it was obvious where they need cultural heritage for.

MEMORIES & ASSOCIATIONS

Interesting answers were given by 25% of the respondents, by which cultural heritage evokes memories and associations connected with their childhood and youth and takes place in their hearts throughout their lives. The following quote of a respondent underpins this: *“Our heritage has direct link with our youth, take for example the (Kazan State) University. I have a nice example of how pleasant it is when environment stays pretty the same. When I was going to the State University, I took a road through a park and there, on the ground, was a hatch which moved when I stepped on in, making a particular noise. Up until these days when I am going or passing the University, I am looking for this hatch to hear the same sound and feel the way it moves. It gives me a nice feeling of things staying intact.”*

Other respondents gave it the following meaning: *“Particular places of the city remember me about pleasant moments spent there.”*; *“Objects which I value have a particular energy and are the memory of my childhood.”*

FAMILIARITY

Familiarity as explained by Lowenthal (1985) makes people perceive and give meaning to their surroundings. Also 12,5% of the respondents find that cultural heritage plays a particular role in it: *“Because of our extraordinary historical objects I recognise where I am. It is sort of orientation tool.”*; *“...been around old buildings it makes me been conscious of place and time.”*

EVIDENCE OF HISTORY

For 12,5% of respondents cultural heritage represents material and immaterial evidence of the history. The following quotes illustrate that: *“Historical monuments are evidence of our history; it gives a possibility to touch, smell and see the history.”*; *“...it is also important to have material prove of it (history). Something where people can go to, to experience the past, to smell it.”*

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

12,5% of respondents determined that cultural heritage is of a great importance for the development of tourism in Kazan: *“When our historical objects will be cared for and saved, the city will look authentic and beautiful. This makes the city also attractive for tourists.”*; *“Cultural heritage is also important for the development of*

tourism, because that is where most tourists come for.” According to respondents, Kazan’s cultural heritage is authentic and worth of showing tourists.

Above analysis shows that there is no sufficient dissimilarity in the ways different ethnic groups and people which are connected to cultural heritage in diverse ways give meaning to cultural heritage. Remarkable is that different historical, political and social discourses emphasize a big importance of cultural heritage for the tolerance of Tatar society. On the other hand, tolerance seems to be very important for the acceptance and preservation of cultural heritage of different ethnicities. Moreover, cultural heritage plays according to the respondents a major role in the understanding and development of the individual and national identity. Many of the respondents seemed to be proud of their historical city and their native land. To a big extend cultural heritage represents a moral and aesthetic value, contributing to such aspects as beauty, wealth, enrichment of life and development of morality. Furthermore, respondents indicated that cultural heritage is significant for such things as memories and associations with the childhood and past events; familiarity with the surroundings; material and immaterial evidence of history and tourism development.

5.3 THE PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

The third aim of this study is to investigate how residents of Kazan want to treat and deal with cultural heritage. Analysing the responses of Kazan residents, representing different ethnic, cultural, religious and social groups, it is worthy of note that problems related to the preservation of cultural heritage in Kazan seem to be acute within particular discourses. At the same time, there are discourses where this is not seen as a problem. In order to understand the severity of the preservation problem, some respondents referred to historical background, the researcher added to that additional references.

Kazan did not know any historical or natural calamities since its capture by the Russian troops until today. Even after Kazan was captured by Ivan the Terrible’s Russians troops reconstructed the destruction carried out by assault (Karamzin, 1816). Before the establishment of the Soviet regime, Kazan fully preserved everything being created since the foundation of the town (Poltaratsky, Lustritsky, 1892; Ilovaiki, 2008). This has ensured that Kazan has many cultural objects dating back centuries ago. The advent of Soviet power had a big impact on cultural heritage. The wish of communist’s was *“to destroy the old world and build a new one”* (words of the communist song ‘International’), as one of the respondents said: *“Before I came to work here, which was in 1989, there was no exhaustive list of*

protected cultural heritage objects. As it went in those years, many objects were forgotten based on ideological reasons.” The destruction of cultural heritage began with religious objects. Remaining churches, mosques and synagogues have been converted to other uses. Culture became unimportant, the motto of the communist youth was expressed in the catch phrase: *Культура, Дура!* (Culture is a silly woman!). Not only churches, but also historical monuments and monuments of architecture stopped being objects of culture and were used for business purposes. Literature and art were placed under much tighter control. Only cultural objects and activities representing political ideology of these days were accepted (Pikhoya & Sokolov, 2008).

Due to the Soviet practice, the fear of losing cultural distinctiveness arose among Tatar intellectuals (Giuliano, 2000). As already was described in this study, it all began by calling for the protection of Tatar culture and language and ended up championing full independence of Tatarstan (Giuliano, 2000; Rorlich, 1999). According to the Ministry of Culture of Tatarstan at the present time the results of actions taken in order to protect cultural heritage are clearly notable (Valeev, 2004). The destruction of historical and cultural monuments became occasional, also the preservation of immaterial heritages got very important. One of the respondents confirmed that by saying the following: *“(since 1989) The University of Culture and History and the University of Literature have researched every region of Kazan and made a comprehensive list of cultural heritage objects. We have been doing this for last 20 years, and have at this moment twice as much objects under state protection as we had before.”* According to Galeeva (2003), the number of folkloristic ensembles and national schools is growing. In addition, old folk traditions are being kept up and national holidays are observed (Galeeva, 2003).

In spite of such developments, during the interviews respondents expressed dissatisfaction towards contemporary heritage preservation in Kazan. Respondents explained that most historical and cultural objects of Kazan are situated in the central area and occupy very expensive pieces of ground. According to this one of the respondents said: *“Of course it is easier to build new comfortable houses; the ground is expensive in the centre of Kazan. But by doing this, the history of the city is getting erased.”* According to many respondents, the developing business circles are interested in the appropriation of those grounds by demolishing historical and cultural objects and building office blocks and residential compounds on them. Respondents referred to barbarous destruction of historic streets, park areas and historical buildings in the following way: *“Heritage related to history and individuals is disappearing. Take for example our poet Tukay, hotel Bulgar where he lived is*

destroyed. Memorial of this history remains in our memory, but on the place of its tangible evidence new buildings arise. Then the fires started. In our street (Mushtari) wooden houses were set on fire in the nights, while people slept.”; “Kazan has no natural parks. The one we had is now built up with hotel...and sport facilities, it is Park Gorkogo. It is not possible to save cultural heritage by destroying it. It is just not possible.”

Such facts take place on the national scale of the entire Russian Federation. On 19 September 2010, a television program (on Russian channel, Russia 1) was dedicated to this issue. The program named “Moscow Self-Liquidation” made evident that out of 8500 historical objects present in Moscow, 1000 objects were disappeared. This happened despite the fact that these objects were protected. Two respondents referred to this program in respect to Kazan as follows: *“You must have seen what happens in Moscow? A lot of money is being spent on demolition of the heritage. The same happens here. Heritage related to history and individuals is disappearing.”; “...are you following nowadays our local television? Have you seen what happens in Moscow with Luzhkov and his practices on liquidation of cultural objects? The same happens here, in Kazan.”* On 28 September 2010, the mayor of Moscow, Luzhkov was fired from his post, due to such practices. Since then, according to media and news, in the Russian Federation, an ambitious campaign on the preservation of cultural heritage in towns is carried out and it started in the capital city of Russia where the city area of Moscow will be expanded. The idea is to transplant governmental and administrative facilities to the new districts of the capital city. In that way the government wants to preserve the historical city.

Analysing the data, it must be concluded that all respondents consider the preservation of cultural heritage to be an important objective of Kazan residents. All of them find modern urban development of the city positive. However, in their opinion these developments must not destruct cultural heritage objects present in the city. It is also popularly believed that it is not allowed to construct new buildings by destructing a historical architectural ensemble. The quotation of one of respondents is eloquent: *“The new architecture that is applied in Kazan is called Attika. But it is almost the same as you put a string on a grandmother. It looks old and authentic but at the same time, it is none of this. You should look at our ministry of agriculture. It does not match at all with its environment.”* Another respondent added to that the following: *“We need new residential areas, but we must try to make it fit in the historical context and style of the city.”*

Approximately 50% of all respondents expressed their concern according to the restoration plans of the government. According to respondents now, the authorities

of Tatarstan pay a lot attention to restoration and revitalisation work in the cities Sviyazhsk and Bulgar, which are parts of historical ensemble of Kazan. Doing this a lot of financial support is focused on these projects. They believe that those actions will slow down the restoration of the heritage in Kazan. In addition, respondents are apprehensive about the quality of restoration of those places. Most likely, this is due to the fact that the government of Tatarstan and of Kazan do not clarify their plans and volumes concerning the execution of the above work. The citizens of Kazan want the government plans concerning the preservation of cultural heritage to be transparent. One of the respondents pictured this issue as follows: *“Of course the time came to revitalize these places. Up till now both places were kept up, just not to lose what is in it. Sviyazhsk and Bulgar do not have any infrastructural facilities, no accommodation for tourists etc. But it has a lot potential, so I find it positive that these places are taken care of now. On the other hand, people who care about historical and archaeological objects are worried about the results. All administrative resources are involved and we just hope that these historical objects will be preserved and not destroyed due to these reconstructions.”*

Many respondents are worried about the fact that many historical objects in Kazan are in a bad condition, even if the Tatar government protects them. Old Tatar Settlement is often given as an example of that. The whole district is protected and many buildings there are marked as monumental. However, most of them are almost demolished (see the photographs below). One of the residents expressed her concern as follows: *“...the biggest problem is the preservation of Old Tatar Settlement. There were several projects, which did not succeeded and there is a certain preservation policy active on this object. But for the residents of the city and especially of the Old Tatar Settlement, this represents a bigger problem, because the object is in a very bad condition.”*



PHOTOGRAPHS 3, 4: THE MONUMENTAL RESIDENCE OF THE FAMILY APANAEV (SOURCE: AUTHOR)

Several respondents expressed themselves in favour of preservation of cultural heritage by giving it different functions. Moreover, Kazan residents do not accept the remakes of the original historical buildings, arguing that the historical soul and spirit of such object disappears and will not be that valuable.

The analysis of the way people want to treat and deal with cultural heritage in Kazan, shows that residents of Kazan find themselves obliged to preserve cultural heritage and are not content with the way it happens recently. The same is expressed by the scientists and politicians. All interviewees have been very positive about the modern development of the city, which allow Kazan to be a third capital of Russian Federation. But doing so, they advocate for developments which are not happening at the expenses of cultural heritage. Notably is that, respondents which are representing different ethnic and religious groups have not only spoken in favour of their own cultural heritage, but in favour of cultural heritages of all folks of Kazan. Still, this analysis shows a discrepancy between the way Kazan residents' wish to treat cultural heritage and the way it happens in the really. One of the dominant discourses advocates for the preservation of cultural heritage and speaks of its great importance. The destruction of cultural heritage on the other hand points out to another discourse where cultural heritage is not seen as important enough.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, the results of this study will be integrated and discussed. The research objective and questions will be central to this conclusion. Furthermore, this section will provide recommendations for the further research on this topic.

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

As discussed in the theoretical framework of this study: in constructivist approach heritage is less about tangible material artefacts or the intangible form of the past, but is more about the meanings placed upon them and the representations which are created from them (Ashworth, Graham & Turnbridge, 2007). During the interviews, all respondents managed to identify what cultural heritage is from their perspective, mainly describing it as tangible material artefacts and the intangible form of the past. Most respondents identified heritage as historical objects and districts, providing different examples of it. Furthermore, cultural heritage is identified as; religious objects, folklore and traditions, national languages and cultivated natural objects. The analysis showed that respondents have mutual respect and acceptance of different ethnical heritages, which are present in the plural society of the Republic of Tatarstan. In addition, respondents have spoken about the meaning they attach to this cultural heritage. According to respondents, these cultural heritages appear to be significant and beneficial for the following aspects: individual & national identity, moral & aesthetic value, tolerance, guidance, memories & associations, familiarity, evidence of history and tourism development. Most respondents believe that the nation could not exist and develop without cultural heritage and will not be able to build an independent modern state. Most respondents confirm that the presence of plural heritages is the evidence of the tolerance of Tatar folk and on the other hand, plural heritages help to sustain and develop this tolerance. Interviewees cannot imagine their existence without being surrounded by valuable historical objects, which enriches their life and make Kazan a characteristic city. Therefore, respondents consider the duty of the nation to preserve cultural heritage and to hand it over to the next generation.

As already pictured in the theoretical framework of this research “...*heritage is less about tangible material artefacts or the intangible form of the past, but is more about the meanings placed upon them and the representations which are created from them*” (Ashworth et al., 2007). According to Duineveld and Kolen, (2009) what

is perceived as heritage is strongly influenced by political ambitions, social ideals and economic strategies. Based on the empirical data and the dominant historical discourses of the past the following conclusion can be drawn.

In nineties and the years of the fall down of the Soviet Union and the destabilisation in the country, the cultural heritage was perceived by the inhabitants of Tatarstan overwhelmingly as a nutritional medium for nationalist sentiments (Giuliano, 2000). Against the background of the fall down of the Soviet Union and the economic depression, Tatar autonomous republic looked on economic performances much better than the other subjects of the Russian Federation and Russia itself did. These developments created a trend to separate Tatarstan from the Russian Federation as an independent state (Frombgen, 2002). However, the multi-ethnic inhabitants of Tatarstan, in the course of resolute political struggle, did not support the nationalist movements of the senior officials of the country (Frombgen, 2002). It was set a course for the unification of the Tatar nation with nations of Russia and the building of a new multi-ethnic democratic state within a framework of the Russian Federation. Based on new political views a new perception of the cultural heritage of Tatarstan took shape as a confirmation of centuries-long tolerance in religion, culture and the issue of inter-ethnic relations. Promoting Tatarstan as a tolerant and multi-ethnic society (Kruchina, 2007).

In the above analysis and respondents' comments, concerning questions such as the preservation of cultural heritage there were no contradictions in the respondents' opinion. Following the above mentioned, a favoured picture of universal love of cultural heritage by the ethnic groups living within Tatarstan and its capital Kazan is formed. All respondents uniformly define what the cultural heritage is, highly appreciate it and underline its significance in the contemporary life. It should seem there are no contradictions. Why then does the process of restoration and preservation of cultural heritage, according to respondents proceed so slowly and tentatively and the process of its destruction so fast and steadily? According to the respondents, it must be obvious that such acts of vandalism would be impossible without knowledge of the government and senior officials of the city. It could be expected that, no respondents will be talking in opposition to the preservation of cultural heritage. Still the interviewees point out to the networks of people who are engaged in the demolition of cultural objects in order to carry out constructions on the expansive grounds of the city, gaining considerable financial profits. The analysis of the empirical data shows a discrepancy between the way people want to treat heritage and the destruction of the heritage. Within one of the dominant discourses,

people advocate for the preservation of cultural heritage and in the other, this seems not to be an issue.

Moreover, this analysis revealed another dominant discourse where people believe that their cultural heritage is extremely important for the individual and national identity and the tolerance towards different ethnic groups. People within this discourse find themselves obliged to preserve cultural heritage in order to pass it on to the next generations.

In order to apply discourse analysis to the investigation of the cultural heritage in the Russian Federation, Tatarstan and Kazan it should be taken into account that the historical economic development of those states in many respects differs from the European states. Over a period of almost 100 years a society without big social differences has existed in the Soviet Union. Differences among the social groups were levelled out by force and the vast majority of the people was accustomed to be like-minded and to have the same opinion. Kazan has a plural society, where different national cultures live next to each, being surrounded by cultural heritage formed during many centuries in, according to historical discourses and respondents, a tolerant climate. As appears in this study heritages of different societies are represented and valued by different ethnic groups of Kazan. According to Tatar scientific researches on ethnologies, all ethnic groups in Tatarstan attempt to retain their distinctive identities and heritages, but they do not exclude other social and ethnic groups. Rather, they invite them to be part of their heritage, by making their heritages known and accessible. This description of Kazan society corresponds with the *salad bowl model* as pictured by Ashworth, Graham and Turnbridge (2007). In spite of national identity, social groups, cultural and different political ideologies there are no mutual contradictions in terms of expression of the identification of cultural heritage, its meaning and preservation. In all comments on the cultural heritage, there is an expression of pride in its original folk history, culture and its material and spiritual proofs. Perhaps, on the basis of an expanded response the differences would be revealed, but on the basis of sixteen interviews, observations and the analysis of scientific and other papers the contradictions have not been evident.

Referring back to the analysis of empirical data and the historical background of Kazan as described in the empirical context of this study, different hypotheses to explain this like-mindedness and tolerance can be supposed. As have been mentioned by the respondents and historical references after difficult times in the 1990s Tatarstan promotes itself as a tolerant and multi ethnic society. Many scientific papers are written in Kazan on this topic. In 1992 the Association of

National and Cultural Unions of the Republic of Tatarstan was founded by the Ministry of Culture of Tatarstan in order to revival and develop national languages, cultures and traditions of the nations living in Tatarstan. Moreover, the association undertakes activities that must harmonise international and inter-confessional relations, and in the end, the preservation of socio and political stability in the Republic. Another reason for the existence of tolerance in Tatar society could be explained by the fact that a lot ethnic groups are interwoven with each other. In Tatarstan a lot mixed marriages are present, making people feel them being a part of more than one culture. Also historical references show that on the territory of Tatarstan different ethnicities lived next to each other without any prosecution based on religious or ethnical ideologies. Some respondents have also indicated just not to know differently than live together with different ethnic groups and feel to be a part of this society. In the scope of this study, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive explanation of how different discourses come to its existence, but this study provides an overview of different discourses that exist within the cultural heritage discourse in Kazan. Moreover, this study gives an indication of possible origins of the discourses analysed. The following paragraph will elaborate more on the recommendations for the future research on these topics.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

To obtain more evidence on what meaning people attach to cultural heritage in Kazan and the way they wish cultural heritage to be treated the research can be expanded with a larger sample. Moreover, the results in the present research reveal the criticism of citizens of Kazan against the existing situation on the preservation of cultural heritage. There is a discrepancy between the way people want to deal with cultural heritage and the way it happens in practice. Interesting would be to do further research on how this discrepancy occurred. Is it possible that people give socially desirable answers or do people love heritage but even more the short term money? Could that be the culture that is rooted in the Russian and Tatar society or is it the policy of the state? Other questions that arose during this study are related to the dominant discourse of the tolerance of Tatar folks and the openness to each other's heritage. Where this vast openness does comes from? Is it really what people think, or do respondents provide socially desirable answers? May it be the fear of losing the relative autonomy? Or could it be again the policy of the state? These are the questions which might be interesting for the future research, and may provide a more comprehensive picture of the way people attach meanings to cultural heritage and with what reasons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apostolakis, A. (2003). The Convergence Process in Heritage Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(4), 795-812.

Ashworth, G., Graham, B. & Tunbridge, J. (2007). *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, identity, and place in multicultural societies*. Pluto Press, London.

Assche, K. van (2004). *Signs in time: An interpretive account of urban planning and design, the people and their histories*. Thesis (Phd). Wageningen: Mansholt Graduate School.

Assche, K. van & Weijsschedé, T. (2009). *Over de productiviteit van versplinterde kennis: discursieve constructies van het verleden in de ruimtelijke ordening*. In Zande, A. van der & During, R. (2009). *Erfgoed en Ruimtelijke Planning*. Sdu Uitgevers: Den Haag.

Avrami, E. & Mason, R. (2000). *Values and Heritage Conservation Research Report The Getty Conservation Institute*. The J. Paul Getty Trust: Los Angeles.

Bosma, K. (2008). *Het post- Belvédèretijdperk: Cultuurhistorisch beleid verankerd in de ruimtelijke ordening en in de ontwerpogave*. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: Amsterdam.

Bukharaev, R. (1995). *Kazan: The Enchanted Capital*. Flint River Press Ltd.: London.

Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N.K. (1997). *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century*. Sage Publications: California.

Department of Foreign Affairs of Tatar President. Website: http://www.tatar.ru/index.php?node_id=199, visited on 5 August 2010.

Duineveld, M. & Lengkeek, J. (2002). *Het Beleefde Land: Over beleving & meervoudig ruimtegebruik*. Leerstoelgroep sociaal-ruimtelijke analyse: Wageningen.

Duineveld, M. & Lengkeek, J. (2004). *Biografieën van het Landschap*. In Duineveld, M., Koedoot, M. & Lengkeek, J. (2004). *Constructies van beton & iemand die tegen zijn hond zegt: 'vlieg'*. Leerstoelgroep sociaal-ruimtelijke analyse: Wageningen.

- Duineveld, M., Koedoot, M. & Lengkeek, J. (2004). *Constructies van beton & Iemand die tegen zijn hond zegt: 'vlieg'*. Leerstoelgroep sociaal-ruimtelijke analyse: Wageningen.
- Duineveld, M. (2006). *Van oude dingen, de mensen, die voorbij gaan: Over de voorwaarden meer recht te kunnen doen aan de door burgers gewaardeerde cultuurhistories*. Thesis (PhD). Eburon: Delft.
- Duineveld, M. & Kolen, J.C.A. (2009). *Het sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek van erfgoed*. In Zande, A. van der & During, R. (2009). *Erfgoed en Ruimtelijke Planning*. Sdu Uitgevers: Den Haag.
- Duineveld, M & Asshce, K. van (2011). The Power of Tulips: Constructing Nature and Heritage in a Contested Landscape. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 13(2), 79–98.
- Driel, H. (1993). *De Semiosis. De semiotiek van C.S. Peirce in verband gebracht met het verschijnsel 'film'*. Tilburg: Katholieke Universiteit Brabant.
- Ember, C. R., & Ember, M (1999). *Anthropology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Flooren, M. & Juritsjeva, A. (2010). The meaning of cultural heritage: exploration of a hidden future. EUROCHRIE 2010.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Travistock: London.
- Frombgen, E. (2002). *A model of secession, ethnic conflict and political violence in Tatarstan and Chechnya: The role of the state*. Thesis (PhD): Purdue University, Political Science.
- Gabdrahmanov, G.A. (2007). *Development and interaction of ethnic cultures in the Republic of Tatarstan: Proceedings of the Republican Roundtable*. Express-Pluss: Kazan.
- Galeeva, L. (2003). Development and Interaction of Ethnic Cultures. ANKO 8, 7-17.
- Gibson, L. & Pendlebury, J. (2009). *Valuing Historic Environments*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd: England.
- Giuliano, E. (2000). Who Determines the Self in the Politics of Self-Determination? Identity and Preference Formation in Tatarstan's Nationalist Mobilization. *Comparative Politics* 32(3), 295-316.

- Graham, B. & Howard, P. (2008). *Heritage and Identity*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd: Engeland.
- Grekov, B.D & Artamanov, M.I. (1951). *History of culture in ancient Russia. Pre-Mongol period, material culture*. Part I. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy of Science SSSR.
- Grijzenhout, F. (2007). *Erfgoed: De Geschiedenis van een Begrip*. University Press: Amsterdam.
- Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In, *Major Paradigms and Perspectives* (pp. 110).
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Sage/Open University: London.
- Hall, S. (2001). *Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse*. In Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S. (2001). *Discourse Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications: London.
- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Hewison, R. (1987). *Culture and consensus: England, art and politics since 1940*. Methuen: London.
- Jäger, S. & Maier, F. (2009). *Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis*. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Sage Publications: London.
- Jørgensen, M. & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis. As Theory and Method*. Sage Publications: London.
- Ilovajski, D. (2008). *Tsarist Russia*. Eksimo: Moscow.
- Karamzin, N.M. (1816). *History of the Russian Government*. Moscow.
- Kazan State University. Website: http://www.kcn.ru/tat_en/history/index.htm, visited on 28 April 2011.
- Klamer, A. (2001). *Social, cultural and economic values of cultural goods*. In Rao, V. & Walton, M. (2004), *Culture and Public Action*. Stanford University Press.
- Kruchina (2007). *Kazan our common home*. Idel-press: Kazan.
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing Interviews*. Sage Publications: London.
- Laarse, R. van der (2005). *Erfgoed en de constructie van vroeger*. Het Spinhuis: Amsterdam.

Lorenz, C. (1998). *De Constructie van het Verleden. Een inleiding in de theorie van de geschiedenis*. Boom: Amsterdam Meppel.

Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, D. (1996). *Possessed by the past: the heritage crusade and the spoils of history*. Free Press: New York/London.

Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history*. Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, D. (2005). Natural and cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(1), 81-92.

Likhachev, D.S. (1980). *Monuments of the Fatherland* 2, 10-16.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. Sage Publications Ltd: London.

Ministry of Culture of Tatar Republic. Website: <http://culture.tatar.ru/nasledie>, visited on 5 August 2010.

Nigmatullina, G.R. (2007). *Introduction*. In Gabdrahmanov, G.A. (2007). *Development and interaction of ethnic cultures in the Republic of Tatarstan: Proceedings of the Republican Roundtable*. Express-Pluss: Kazan.

Nikiforow, W.W (2007). *Interaction executive authorities of the government of the Republic of Tatarstan and the national-cultural organizations*. In Gabdrahmanov, G.A. (2007). *Development and interaction of ethnic cultures in the Republic of Tatarstan: Proceedings of the Republican Roundtable*. Express-Pluss: Kazan.

Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and Postmodern Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23(2), 249-260.

Poltaratsky, P.A. & Lustritsky, W.F. (1892). *Volga towns and villages in the Kazan province*. Edition of the Statistical Committee: Kazan.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. Sage Publications: London.

Pikhoya, R.T. & Sokolov A.K. (2008). *History of modern Russia. The crisis of the communist regime in the USSR and the emergence of a new Russia: the end of the 1970s-1991*. ROSSPEN: Moscow

Representative of the President in Volga Region. Website: <http://www.pfo.ru/?id=23412>, visited on 5 August 2010.

- Rorlich, A.A. (1999). History, collective memory and identity: the Tatars of sovereign Tatarstan. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 32, 379–396.
- Rybakov, B.A. (1981). Paganism of the ancient Slavs. Science: Moscow.
- Rybakov, B.A. (1982). Kievan Russia and the Russian principalities XII-XIII centuries. Science: Moscow
- Samuel, R. (1994). *Theaters of memory*. Verso: London.
- Salahutdinov, R.G. (2005). *Traditional folks culture: Teaching and recreational technology*. Media-Product: Kazan.
- Selwyn, T. (1996). *The tourist image: myths and myth making in tourism*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Scott, J.C. (1998). Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed. Yale University Press: New Haven and London.
- Tatishev, V.M. (1768). *Russian history of ancient times*. Moscow.
- Tarunov, A.M. (2004). *Cultural Treasures of Tatarstan*. NIICentr: Moscow.
- Turnbridge, J. E. (2008). *Plural and Multicultural Heritages*. In Graham, B. & Howard, P. (2008). *Heritage and Identity*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd: Engeland.
- Valeev, R. (2004). *Past is a part of the present*. In Tarunov, A.M. (2004). *Cultural Treasures of Tatarstan*. NIICentr: Moscow.
- Vaus, D. A. de (2001). *Research Design in Social Research*. SAGE publications: London.
- Veinguer, A. & Davis, H. (2007). Building a Tatar elite: Language and national schooling in Kazan. *Ethnicities* 7(2), 186–207.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. Sage Publications: London.
- UNESCO. Website: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>, visited on 19 July, 2010.
- Waterton, E., Smith, L. & Campbell, G. (2006). The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 14(4), 339-355.
- Yin, R. (2008). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods (Applied Social Research Methods)*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks.
- Zande, A. van der & During, R. (2009). *Erfgoed en Ruimtelijke Planning*. Sdu Uitgevers: Den Haag.

Zabylin, M. (1880). *Russian folk. Its customs, rituals, legends, superstition and poetry.*
Berezin: Moscow.

APPENDIX: A

This interview protocol is adapted from: Jacobs, M.H. (2009). *Measuring Emotional Experiences in Tourists: Interview protocol for semi-structured interviews*. Wageningen: Wageningen University.

INTERVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

PROCEDURAL

- Take your student card with you when approaching potential interviewees, just in case people ask for confirmation you're a student from Wageningen University;
- Make notes of day, time, place (city), location (e.g. home of interviewee, campus, etc.) and length of the interview;
- Record the interview and keep the sound file.

INTERVIEWER ATTITUDE

- Always be gentle and polite;
- Always be interested, e.g. make occasional eye contact according to social rules;
- Make the interviewee feel comfortable;
- Don't speed up the interviewee;
- Don't judge upon anything the interviewee says;
- Don't steer the answers of the interviewee;
- Encourage the interviewee to continue talking by e.g. nodding or repeating phrases of the interviewee in a question format (probing techniques);
- If applicable, reassure that there are no right or wrong answers;
- Leave room for the unexpected, e.g. anecdotes that might be interesting but are not directly asked for in the interview format;
- Gently help the interviewee to focus on the questions.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERVIEW

Good morning/afternoon/evening. Thanks a lot for co-operating in my study, your contribution is very helpful for my study on the meaning of cultural heritage in Kazan. I estimate the interview would last approximately one hour. The information you provide will be treated confidentially and anonymously.

My questions will be about what cultural heritage means for you individually. I have a list of questions for you about the way you give meaning to heritage. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. It is no problem if you can't answer a question; please feel free to indicate that and we'll move on to the next question.

For concise analysis of the interviews, it would greatly help to record the interview. Can I have your permission to record the interview? [If yes, put recorder on.] Do you have any questions at this point? Shall we start the interview?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The research questions were leading in formulating the interview topics. The formulated interview questions serve mainly as guidelines for the conversation and it is possible to adjust new questions or replace the formulated by the new one according to the way conversation goes.

Identified cultural heritage in Kazan

- What does Kazan mean to you and what role does it play in your life?
- What do you find of the changes Kazan is going through?
- What do you identify as cultural heritage in Kazan?
- What cultural heritage objects are valued and visited by you?
- Do creations such as legends, myths, folktales, music, dances, songs, paintings, different trades of Tatar, Russian etc. people interest you?
- ...

Meaning, role and relevance of cultural heritage in Kazan

- Where for do you need these historical-cultural objects for?
- How do you use cultural heritage present in Kazan?
- How have Tatar, Russian etc. legends, myths, folktales, music, dances, songs, paintings, different trades influenced your childhood and entire life?
- What do material and spiritual monuments, histories and cultures of your nation mean for you?
- Do you value and appreciate historical-cultural, material and spiritual monuments, created by different ethnic population groups during thousand year history of your city?
- ...

How to treat and deal with cultural heritage in Kazan?

- How do you appreciate the policy of the government of Tatarstan regarding the protection of the cultural heritage of the capital city?

- What do you think of the use of your cultural heritage for the economic development of the city, for example in the tourism industry?
- Don't you mind that tourists visit performing religious centres?
- ...

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW

General instructions

- Transcribe the interviews *ad verbatim* (literally) as much as possible (but you don't have to include the uh's and ah's);
- Try to translate expressions that are not in English into English literally;
- Use the standard-format (see below) for your transcripts – analysis is much more convenient if all transcripts have the same format;
- Do not erase the sound file after you've completed the transcript.

STANDARD-FORMAT

- State the name of the interviewer;
- State the date, place and length of the interview;
- State the sex, age (categories: 1: 20-30, 2: 30-40, 3: 40-50, 4: 50-60) and nationality of the interviewee;
- State the answers on the questions as much as possible in the same order as the questions in the interview format (also, include the questions in your transcript);
- State your reflective notes about the interview.

APPENDIX: B

The interview transcripts and the sound files are enclosed in this report on a CD.