HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Creating 'Heritage' in Theme Parks : The Case of Newly Constructed Ancient Towns in China [an abstract of dissertation and a summary of dissertation review]
Author(s)	,
Citation	. ( ) 15338
Issue Date	2023-03-23
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/89366
Rights(URL)	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
Type	theses (doctoral - abstract and summary of review)
Additional Information	There are other files related to this item in HUSCAP. Check the above URL.
File Information	Wang_Chujun_review.pdf ( )

Instructions for use

<div align="center">学位論文審査の要旨</div>

博士の専攻分野の名称：博士（観光学）　　　　　氏名：王　楚君

	主査　教授	エデルヘイム　ヨハン　リチャード
審査委員	副査　教授	西川　克之
	副査　教授	岡本　亮輔
	副査　講師	Cecilia de Bernardi （Uppsala 大学）

<div align="center">学位論文題名</div>

<div align="center">

Creating 'Heritage' in Theme Parks:
The Case of Newly Constructed Ancient Towns in China
(テーマパークにおける「遺産」の創造：中国の新築古鎮を例に)

</div>

The examination of Wang Chujun's thesis was held shortly after New Year on the first day back at work, but attracted despite this a large number of peers and academics who all were treated to an engaging and intellectually high quality examination. The examination was conducted in a hybrid flexible mode, the candidate and two examiners were present in classroom 407 together with a dozen in the audience, two of the other examiners were participating online, and so were another dozen of audience members. Questions were asked in both Japanese and English, and the candidate showed her fluency in both languages by answering each question in the language it was asked.

Dr de Bernardi of Uppsala University participated from Italy, and focused in her questions on the chosen paradigm of the thesis (critical realism – CR), and on questions relating to discourse: 1) How do you see discourse in relation to structure and agency? Can we "see behind" or escape discourse or are we unable to do so as argued by Foucault? 2) How is axiology treated in the dissertation from a CR viewpoint and why isn't there a deeper discussion of a concept that is related to the dissertation's main aim? In her questions Dr de Bernardi commented that the dissertation was long, and that it would be preferable to mention the acronyms in their full form again, especially when the terms have not been mentioned for a while. She also mentioned that the methods section being in need of revision. Concepts such as "saturation" were not defined and there was no clear presentation of the data analyzed. The table of respondents did not match the number of respondents given and there was also confusion around how many blogs were

analyzed/presented. The appendix was also missing from the document delivered to the examiners.

Professor Okamoto focused on questions connected to heritage and considerations for residents at the case site. He asked for example about 1) the concept of authenticity used: the top-down material mode, the top-down discursive mode and how the top-down material mode and the bottom-up material mode were related to the affordance theory that recognizes agency in objects. 2) About the relationship between Chinese political thought and cultural heritage and whether the dominant ideology on which judgments are based changed over time? He also highlighted the partial blindness to spiritual dimensions and values in 3) In this paper, the analysis of blogs mainly focuses on how tourists perceive the historicity of the shrine. On the other hand, what do tourists think about the religiosity or sanctity of the place? And finally, about how locals were defined in the context of the case study 4) but what is the newly acquired identity that is being referred to here? Identity as employees from other regions?

Professor Nishikawa structured his questions around methodology, generational issues, and determining what a social wrong is in a digital society: 1) Could you give some explanation or interpretation of the phenomenological approach in tourism studies? And why do you think phenomenological approaches are not very useful in your study? 2) Should more attention have been paid to the difference in opinion about the NCATs among various age groups. Or didn't you notice any differences at all between the younger respondents and the older ones? 3) In terms of cultural and historical heritage as well, VR may cause huger "social wrong" than the material NCATs in so far as the former is much cheaper to create and may soon abound in our daily world. What kind of social wrong, if any, you think would be caused by VR and how do we redress it?

Finally, Professor Edelheim looked at 1) technical details of the thesis, and pointed out that several different research questions were asked at different parts of the thesis, but that no conclusive answers were presented in the work. 2) He asked about Worldmaking and simulacra as concepts necessary for tourism researcher to take in consideration. 3) The final question related to goodness in the axiological part of the thesis and queried why only commercial, political, and cultural goodness were examined, and not social goodness as it could have been an aspect explaining different actors decisions.

All questions asked were sufficiently answered, the candidate was well prepared for the event, and knew quite evidently the work by being able to go from section to section answering the questions and justifying the results written. At the end of the examination the four examiners convened and could unanimously judge the thesis to be worthy of the award of a doctoral degree (tourism studies) and judged it to be acceptable.