

Safeguarding the 'Pride of Jeju': The Framing of Jeju Haenyeo Protection in Regional Media

Author: Mariana Coelho
Supervisor: Astrid Norén-Nilsson



Abstract

This research focused on the media framing of the issue of protection and safeguarding of the *Haenyeo* community in Jeju Island, South Korea. The *Haenyeo* are a community of fisherwomen who free dive to harvest sea life and are representative of the matriarchal cultural tradition of Jeju Island. This study aimed to analyze how the issue is framed in regional media and explored the reasons portrayed for the protection of the community, the strategies suggested for safeguarding and their significance for intangible cultural heritage protection in Jeju. Through the framing analysis of newspapers articles, this research highlighted the importance of *Haenyeo* for Jeju's identity and appraised the existing policies. The findings suggested that while the community is framed as being widely celebrated and promoted domestically and internationally, the current measures may not effectively resolve the challenges faced by *Haenyeo*. This study contributed to the field of heritage studies by focusing on the media's framing of the management of intangible cultural heritage. Further research is recommended to examine the perspectives of the community itself and to consider a broader sample size for a more comprehensive understanding of the topic.

Keywords: Cultural heritage management, Framing analysis, Intangible cultural heritage, Jeju Haenyeo, News framing, South Korea

Acknowledgments

Writing a thesis is said to be never easy, and working on mine was no exception. Since day one that I have been surrounded by a community of supportive, kind and encouraging people that made this process a little bit easier on my nervous system.

Firstly, thank you to all the professors and staff at Lund's University Center for East and Southeast Asian Studies. I remember looking through the programme's page about a year before I applied and dreaming about what would be my life if I could go study what I love the most in Sweden. I have learned so much and I am forever thankful. I would like to thank my supervisor Astrid, who went above and beyond to help (and ease) in any way she could this anxious student. From the first meetings in January trying to pin down the topic, to the regular and detailed feedback for every chapter I submitted and the final comments on the thesis— I do not believe I would have been capable if I did not have such an attentive supervisor. Thank you so much for all your insight, care, and time this semester.

I want to give thanks to all my friends in Portugal (and the Portuguese diaspora!), Sweden, South Korea, and a little bit around the world. Whether it was through text-message, video-calls, everyday writing sessions in the library or going for *fika* when I could not keep my mouth shut about the thesis; your constant support, (tough) love and faith in myself eased my doubts. I am so lucky to have you all in my life.

Thank you to my sister, mother, grandmother, stepfather, uncle, and aunts for your unconditional love. We might be 3500 kilometers away, but I feel close to you as if we were next to each other. If I can chase my dreams (wherever far they may be), its all thanks to you. Special thanks to my sister who is the most supportive, funniest, and sweetest younger sibling anyone could ask for. You are my rock, and I don't know what I would do without you.

Lastly, thank you to my father. There is nothing I wished more than for you to be able to read this. The thought of you was what gave me strength in the most difficult times. I love you.

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	2
<i>Keywords:</i>	2
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	3
1. Introduction	6
1.1. <i>Background</i>	6
1.2. <i>Research problem, aim and purpose</i>	7
1.3. <i>Research question</i>	7
1.4. <i>Academic Contribution</i>	8
1.5. <i>Disposition of the Thesis</i>	8
2. Literature Review	9
2.1. <i>The Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage</i>	9
2.2. <i>Theorizations on Safeguarding Cultural Heritage Practices</i>	11
2.3. <i>South Korea and the Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage</i>	14
2.4. <i>Protecting and Safeguarding Haenyeo Culture</i>	16
2.5. <i>The Inclusion of Haenyeo Culture on the UNESCO Intangible Heritage of Humanity List</i>	18
3. Theoretical Framework	20
3.1. <i>The Concept of Framing</i>	20
3.2. <i>Approaches to Framing Analysis</i>	23
4. Methodology	25
4.1. <i>Data Collection Method</i>	26
4.2. <i>Framing Analysis</i>	27
4.3. <i>Limitations, Ethical Considerations and Self-Reflexivity</i>	29
5. Analysis	32
5.1. <i>Cultural identity</i>	33
5.1.1 <i>Haenyeo as representative of Jeju’s identity and culture</i>	33
5.1.2. <i>Haenyeo as symbols of Korea and its nationalism</i>	33
5.1.3. <i>Haenyeo as possessing unique characteristics</i>	34
5.1.4. <i>Haenyeo as representative of a ‘community culture’</i>	34
5.1.5. <i>Haenyeo as a valuable representative of world culture</i>	35
5.2. <i>Policy prescription and evaluation</i>	35
5.2.1. <i>Educational and cultural promotion policies</i>	35
5.2.2. <i>New Haenyeo support policies</i>	36

5.2.3. Fisheries and fishing villages management policies	37
5.3. <i>External relations and reputation</i>	37
5.3.1. Haenyeo as part of UNESCO’S Intangible Heritage List	38
5.3.2. Haenyeo as an international model example of ICH management, research, and sustainability .38	
5.3.3. Haenyeo and other international recognitions	38
5.3.4. Haenyeo and comparisons to other intangible heritage.....	39
5.4. <i>Economic</i>	39
5.4.1. Tourism promotion and risk of commodification.....	39
5.4.2. Haenyeo as essential for Jeju’s economy	40
5.4.3. Investment or divestment (in won) in the protection of the Haenyeo community	40
5.5. <i>Health and safety</i>	41
5.5.1. Accident prevention	41
5.5.2. Healthcare support	41
5.6. <i>Quality of life</i>	41
5.6.1. Improving the quality of life of older Haenyeo.....	42
5.6.2. Improving the quality of life of new Haenyeo	42
5.6.3. Improving the state of working facilities and working conditions	43
5.7. <i>Capacity and resources</i>	43
5.7.1. Poor budget allocation, planning and management.....	43
5.7.2. Measures to protect and safeguard Haenyeo fall short.....	43
5.8. <i>Discussion</i>	44
6. Conclusion	48
7. References	50

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The term *Haenyeo* refers to a community of fisherwomen who free dive to harvest a variety of sea life around the island of Jeju, South Korea. Their ancient and unique livelihood, communal traditions and folklore are representative of Jeju's traditional matriarchal culture and an important symbol of the island (Encyclopedia of Korean Folk Culture, 2023).

While there is an earlier reference in the *Samguksagi* (the historical record of the Three Kingdoms of Korea) in the year 506 to the harvest of pearls and shellfish in Jeju Island, it is only during the Joseon Dynasty in 1629 that the term synonym of *Haenyeo* (*Jamnyeo*, meaning 'a woman working in the water') is introduced. It was meant as the act of 'going into the water and digging for seaweed naked', which was done at the time by both men and women. In a document written by the governor of the old county of *Jeongui* it is declared that after 1620 the number of men picking abalone has almost disappeared, and there were the women responsible for this task: to this day, only women are known to be divers in Jeju, and still famous for harvesting abalone. After the 1900s, a high number of Jeju *Haenyeo* left their homes to work outside Jeju in Northeast Asia, however many stayed in the island, and many came back (Encyclopedia of Korean Folk Culture, 2023).

In the 20th century, not only were *Haenyeo* responsible for the breadwinning in their families, but they also had a profound influence in the society and economy of modern Jeju. Their knowledge and skills, shamanic beliefs, folklore expressions and a culture characterized by mutual respect and care and coexistence with the natural environment puts them as a unique and significant cultural heritage of South Korea (Encyclopedia of Korean Folk Culture, 2023). However, after the 1960s there has been a constant decrease in the number of active *Haenyeo*. This has been due to the change in the economic policy of the Jeju province, which resulted in the shift from agriculture and fishing to tourism. Since the 1980s, the numbers have been stabilized to minus one thousand divers working per decade, and over 50% of them are older than 70 years old. (Dronjić, 2021, p. 65-66)

Since the 1970s that there has been regional recognition of the importance of the culture of Jeju *Haenyeo* (Dronjić, 2021, p. 66) followed later by national and then

international in 2016 with its inscription in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (hereafter referred to as UNESCO) Intangible Heritage List (UNESCO, 2023b). This renewed interest in the protection of the *Haenyeo* community has translated into scholarship that writes on the issue of their protection, most notably their relationship with sustainable development, commodification, and regional and international interests. These topics are part of the field of heritage studies, where the issue of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage meets globalization, commodification, sustainable development and the relationships between cultural bearers, regional, national, and international stakeholders. While there is a general scholarship that writes on specific intangible heritage from South Korea and, for example, their touristification (Saeji, 2019) or the evolution of the country's intangible heritage protection system (Park, 2019), there seems to be a lack of studies that are able to connect the larger issues debated in heritage studies in relation to *Haenyeo*.

1.2. Research problem, aim and purpose

This study aims to analyze how the issue of protecting the *Haenyeo* community is represented in the media of Jeju Island. By engaging with debates on intangible heritage protection in South Korea and abroad, as well as the scholarship on the safeguarding and protection of *Haenyeo* to grasp how the issue has been understood and addressed in practical terms by the people of Jeju Island. Through the analysis of contemporary media framings of the efforts towards heritage preservation, it aims to present an example of why intangible cultural heritage should be protected, how it should or *not* be safeguarded and what it can tell us of the media framing of the state of intangible cultural heritage protection in Jeju.

1.3. Research question

For the purpose of this study, the following research question is employed: How is the issue of protecting and safeguarding *Haenyeo* framed in regional media?' In order to allow for further specificity and a detailed analysis, three sub-research questions are thus raised:

1. What are the reasons for the protection of *Haenyeo*?
2. How are *Haenyeo* to be protected?
3. How can this inform our understanding of the media framing of the state of intangible cultural heritage protection in Jeju?

1.4. Academic Contribution

The scholarship on the portrayal of *Haenyeo* in media is not extensive, and it relates to the representation of the community in newspapers during Japanese occupation; as symbols of empowerment (Lee & Myong, 2018) or the nature of their livelihood during colonial times (Jin, 2019). These studies were historical in nature and do not address the contemporary period in which *Haenyeo* are understood as intangible cultural heritage. Heritage studies scholars have written on the role of media and its use for the protection and dissemination of intangible heritage, but have focused mostly on new media, and especially social media (Giaccardi, 2012; Kalay et al., 2008; Liang et al., 2021; Logan et al., 2016). Given that the use of online media in Korea has emerged as a powerful journalistic field domain (Chang, 2005), through the analysis of newspapers articles from regional media, this study aims to fill this gap in scholarship by presenting a study of the contemporary media framing of the efforts towards the preservation of *Haenyeo*.

1.5. Disposition of the Thesis

This thesis starts with an exploration of the evolution of intangible heritage protection, the theoretical foundations in heritage studies, the efforts towards the safeguarding of the *Haenyeo* community and their inclusion in UNESCO's Representative List. The theoretical framework engages with framing analysis, exploring its multiple definitions and approaches. The methodology chapter clarifies how the chosen approach (Boydston et al., 2014) was adapted to the present study. Lastly, the analysis and discussion section critically examine the research findings, paving the way for the concluding chapter.

2. Literature Review

This chapter reviews relevant concepts, definitions, and debates in the realm of heritage studies. It will situate the topic of safeguarding *Haenyeo* culture within the broader academic field of cultural heritage, provide the necessary context for the analysis to follow and identify the research gap the thesis seeks to fill.

2.1. The Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage

The need to promote, protect and revitalize cultural expressions and practices of communities, groups and individuals around the world is widely recognized and holds great importance at the international and national levels. The contribution of culture to strengthening the livelihoods of people, along with how it promotes their power of agency within broader social, economic, political, and environmental contexts, is important in our globalized world (Stefano et al., 2012, p. 1). The discussion on the initiatives that have taken place to safeguard intangible cultural heritage (hereafter referred to as ICH) has necessarily to UNESCO's decade-long efforts in its protection, diffusion, and regeneration at an international level, within which countries operate their safeguarding policies.

In 1972, UNESCO initiated the formal protection of cultural heritage through the adoption of the *Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (The World Heritage Convention) focusing primarily on tangible heritage— monuments, buildings, sites (Kurin, 2004, p. 68). However, in 1982, the *World Conference on Cultural Policies* expanded the definition of culture to encompass intangible aspects such as traditions, modes of life, beliefs, and value systems of living communities. This marked the first official recognition of 'intangible heritage.' In 1989, UNESCO issued the *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, the first legal instrument dedicated to the protection of intangible heritage (Ortiz & de Madariaga, 2021, p. 328).

However, it was only in the late 1990s that renewed attention to the issue of local, national, and regional cultural survival resulted in a series of UNESCO-sponsored conferences that culminated in a global conference at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington in 1999. In its aftermath, the participants called for a more dynamic view of cultural traditions as 'living' and envisioned a community-involved and participatory approach to safeguarding efforts. Later in 2001, UNESCO instituted a program,

Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage, that brought immediate and important impacts such as public attention to and validation for traditions and encouraged governments to develop programs to safeguard them (Kurin, 2004, p. 68-9).

After the institution of this program, the Member States requested UNESCO to draft a regulatory instrument to complement it that could be used as an effective tool for protection of ICH. Thus, from 2001 onwards, numerous meetings were held between intergovernmental experts to prepare the preliminary draft of what would become the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* adopted in 2003 (Ortiz & de Madariaga, 2021, p. 328). The convention aimed to fill the gap left by the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* in regards to the protection of an aspect of cultural heritage that although not ‘tangible’, is equally as important as a representative of cultural diversity and a guarantee of sustainable development (Scovazzi, 2019, p. 3-4).

The ICH Convention defines intangible cultural heritage as ‘the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills (oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe and traditional craftsmanship) – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts, and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity’ (Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003, p. 5-6).

The ICH Convention was critical in introducing a broader understanding in the international field of the definition and meaning of cultural heritage. It expanded the more traditional view of heritage to also take into consideration anthropological and sociological points of view, and it is credited to making possible for ICH to be recognized today as a valuable and significant part of people’s cultural heritage (Duvelle, 2014, p. 28). It further aimed to ensure respect for the ICH of the communities concerned, to raise awareness at the local, national, and international levels of the importance of ICH and to provide international cooperation and assistance. At the international level, the ICH Convention called for the establishment of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity to ensure better visibility of the ICH and awareness of its

meaning, and to encourage dialogue which respects cultural diversity (Scovazzi, 2019, p. 5). Accordingly, the commitments that countries who have signed it adhere to respect these goals, such as working closely with local communities, groups, and individual practitioners in safeguarding these traditions, conducting research, documentation, education, and transmission efforts, establish appropriate legal protection and means of public recognition and support of ICH (Kurin, 2004, p. 71). Nations have also established national institutions for ICH safeguarding and local authorities and municipalities are in the forefront of fostering and safeguarding ICH (Blake, 2014, p. 294-5).

The national and local policymaking associated with ICH safeguarding often includes the integration of ICH into other areas of government policy, most notably development-oriented areas (Blake, 2014, p. 295-6). The relationship between ICH and goals such as inclusive social and economic development, environmental sustainability, and peace showcase how the new understanding of intangible cultural heritage involves fundamental values beyond the cultural and has a far-reaching potential in many areas (Scovazzi, 2019, p. 4).

Nonetheless, UNESCO's efforts in safeguarding cultural heritage are not without its shortcomings. Due to the homogenizing aspects of globalization, and the rise of one mass culture, a great number of cultural expressions are considered to be threatened and require measures to counteract their potential degradation and disappearance (Stefano et al., 2012, p. 1). While the need for communities to be thoroughly involved in the safeguarding of their culture is highlighted by UNESCO, the member states are still the ones who dominate the management processes that can fall short in respecting the wishes of communities, groups, and individual bearers of intangible heritage (Ortiz & de Madariaga, 2021, p. 338).

2.2. Theorizations on Safeguarding Cultural Heritage Practices

The topic of cultural heritage safeguarding practices within the field of heritage studies has been debated since the 1980s, when the field is credited to have been first created (Carman & Sørensen, 2009). Debates during this time have centered on the relationship between globalization, sustainable development and the implication for cultural bearers and their communities.

Given that cultural heritage crosses national boundaries, is subject to legal and illegal international trade, is an essential part of the world tourism industry, and is

subjected to destruction in conflicts, among other reasons, it has been recognized by scholars as a global issue. As discussed in the previous section, since the establishment of the World Heritage System that UNESCO has played an important role in defining this perspective. Recently, phenomena such as climate change, concerns about loss of cultural diversity, poverty and sustainable development have reinforced the relationship between cultural heritage and globalization (Long&Labadi, 2010, p. 2).

Intangible cultural heritage plays a vital role in discourses on human rights and climate change, it is integrated in tourism and other economic development strategies or seen as a way of making these more socially and environmentally sustainable and it is portrayed in media as the victim of political instability, wars, and poverty (Long&Labadi, 2010, p. 2). Long and Labadi (2010, p. 12) emphasize specifically the relationship between sustainable development and cultural heritage by discussing its importance in the struggle against poverty and in the protection of the environment, and as a source of capital for local populations as well as a source of pride, social cohesion, and collective identity.

Scholars of heritage studies have debated the social and ethical implications of the recognition and protection of cultural heritage. Long and Labadi have also raised the ethical implications of dealing with heritage at both local and international levels, along with how the actions of the multiple stakeholders – such as international and regional organizations, local authorities and local populations – weigh into safeguarding cultural heritage (Long&Labadi, 2010, p. 12). As the 2003 Convention suggests, community participation is a crucial issue within heritage management and effective community participation is a process that is essential to enhance long-term sustainable heritage management. Since community participation is recognized as fundamental in heritage management practices, public participation is recommended to mediate conflicts between stakeholders, including residents, visitors, developers, experts, and governments. It is thus necessary to include of a variety of stakeholders in heritage identification, protection, and preservation as a worldwide strategic policy. Most importantly, in this way local communities' needs are at the forefront (Li & al., 2020, p. 1).

However, this is not always that simple. Ireland and Schofield (2015) bring up the complexity of stakeholders and vested interests within the field. Whether heritage work is paid, or creates revenue, for private or public interests, is in compliance with laws and regulations, requires the consent of indigenous or other groups, or merely because it

relates to things or concepts that people feel strongly about, it is always entangled in local to global forms of geopolitics, cultural diplomacy, investment and economics that intersect in complex ways with public memory and the politics of identity and recognition. The authors consider heritage an inherently ethico-political problem since it is one of the means in which societies actively shape the meaning of the past in the present and in that way construct a vision of their collective future.

Constantine Sandis (2014) contributes to the debate by mentioning how top-down models of safeguarding cultural heritage can commodify a certain culture; the tendency of ‘managing’ a certain collective expression may include a degree of objectification that can threaten culture’s inherent fluidity. Furthermore, Arantes (2007) explains how in safeguarding ICH, there is an inherent value attributed to what is considered to be worthy of official protection and the positions of the actors involved (local or not), particularly the role played by local communities in the identification of what should officially become heritage and how this heritage should be officially protected. The abstract idea of ‘intangible heritage’ often understood by the professionals, experts, governmental agencies, regional and multilateral organizations that seek to protect it is not abstract at all, but the local social reality of often popular and indigenous communities. These groups’ political commitments and economic priorities can be in conflict with the community’s wishes in the protection or not of their traditions, skills, and practices. Akagawa and Smith (2019) discuss, with reference to specific examples, the impact that the 2003 Convention had on knowledge bearers and their communities; the implications of the experiences under the ICHC for developing policies and practices in relation to the safeguarding of ICH; and the ways in which the convention has framed and limited this debate within national contexts. The issue of commodification, community ownership, authenticity, conflict among stakeholders and competition between different ICH elements is extensively covered by the authors. In Arante’s words (2007, p. 293), safeguarding is a public policy—therefore it interferes with social processes that take place in the present, not in the past; and are developed by real and particular human communities, not by nations in abstract.

The relationship between the international, national, and subnational approaches is punctuated by negotiation, contestation, cooperation, different and/or intersecting agendas, and it is thoroughly highlighted in current scholarship on cultural heritage. The creation of institutions and the designing of safeguarding policies tend to respond to local

needs, constraints, and timing, and these often vary greatly from one part of the world to another. National or regional differences are realities that come to the forefront when discussing safeguarding at an international level. However, it is also obvious that a world-wide agenda, due to UNESCO, is being consolidated and that national or local institutions are progressively being challenged to respond to those internationally negotiated parameters (Arantes, 2007, p. 291).

Current scholarship also highlights that there are thus multiple ways that safeguarding can be framed, understood, and addressed. How best to safeguard intangible heritage elements will inevitably depend on the nature and meaning of the element, the desires and aspirations of knowledge bearers and the individuals and/or communities who practice, own, or engage with the intangible cultural element. This uncertainty requires a sense of flexibility of engagement that will encourage new ways of engaging, thinking about and practicing heritage management and conservation of ICH from all parties involved (Akagawa & Smith, 2019, p. 11).

This subsection has highlighted multiple debates in the heritage studies field in regards to intangible heritage protection, some of which this study will touch upon in relation to why and how the protection of a specific case of ICH is framed in the media. The addressed debates include: the role of intangible cultural protection to collective identity and pride, the importance of a community-based approach and the issue of commodification and objectification.

2.3. South Korea and the Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage

South Korea has a well-established reputation for developing and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, being one of the pioneering countries that have recognized the value and meaning of ICH for communities within its boundaries. South Korea's efforts in the international field are rooted in a history of recognizing and protecting ICH within the Korean legal system at a national level: since the year 1962 that the government has cared for its national cultural heritage according to the promulgated Cultural Heritage Protection Act. When the international discussion about intangible heritage was rapidly gaining interest, the country suggested the 'Living Human Treasure System' to UNESCO in 1993 to raise international awareness of ICH (Kim et al., 2019, p. 4). Later in 1997, South Korea asked the agency to expand the scope of the program that would be named

‘Proclamation of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity’, that had previously been limited to oral heritage (Aikawa-Faure, 2016, p. 84).

In more recent years, the government established in 2013 of the National Intangible Heritage Centre, an institution responsible for safeguarding, inheritances, exchanges, and revitalization of intangible cultural heritage. This was preceded in 1999 by the officialization of the Cultural Heritage Administration, that is, among other duties, responsible for designating intangible heritage elements in the country (Kim et al., 2019, p. 5). Furthermore, between 2007 and 2014, the Republic of Korea provided around 600,000 dollars to UNESCO as a financial contribution in the domain of ICH (Aikawa-Faure, 2016, p. 89). Due to these efforts, Korea has the third-highest number of registered elements with UNESCO among all member states and has promoted them both to domestic and international tourists (Kim et al., 2019, p. 5). Most specifically, since 2008 that various elements of South Korean culture have been added to the UNESCO List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, amounting to twenty-two in the present day (UNESCO, 2023a).

Despite the clear and fruitful endeavors of the Korean government in this field, scholarship has identified several problematic areas of concern. Criticism particularly centers on the South Korean government’s need of conducting a sustainable development of ICH and community empowerment, in alignment with the international tendency. Yong-goo Kim (2016) argues that sustainable development in Korea should be conducted along with social and human development – these are included in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by the United Nations as a goal of the international community, and the later revision by UNESCO of their Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Kim, 2016, p. 268). Kim and colleagues (2018, pp. 10-11) have interviewed multiple Korean intangible cultural heritage practitioners on the governmental efforts in protecting ICH and concluded that despite the success of Korea in protecting intangible cultural heritage, culture bearers complain of a top-down development approach from the Cultural Heritage Administration that leads to a lack of empowerment in safeguarding and promoting their cultural heritage. This has further hindered the chance for them to transmit their cultural heritage to the next generations, which is, along with community empowerment, a crucial point highlighted in the 2003 Convention.

The lack of awareness of, and respect for, practicing intangible cultural heritage among younger generation South Koreans – that results in a lower desire to be practitioners and threatens the longevity of cultural practices – is therefore an important topic of concern identified by practitioners (Kim et al., 2019, p. 9). Scholars have also emphasized the need of public engagement in safeguarding ICH and suggest, for instance, the use of digital technologies to encourage public involvement with and learning about cultural practices (Kim et al., 2019). The promotion of cultural heritage contributes to its economic, social, and cultural value, thus aligning with a more sustainable development approach that has been called for in recent years, which is in turn reflected in scholars concerns about the future of Korean cultural heritage (Kim et al., 2019, p. 10). This thesis will contribute to this topic by its detailed analysis of the efforts towards the protection of the *Haenyeo* community, a particular intangible heritage of Korea, and the main criticisms present in regional media in regards to the effectiveness of the safeguarding measures, such as the use of a top-down approach, the focus on community empowerment and the need for public engagement in ICH protection.

2.4. Protecting and Safeguarding *Haenyeo* Culture

The issue of how to preserve and safeguard the *Haenyeo* community and its culture has been debated among scholars prior to its designation as an UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2016. Four years previous to the nomination, Sang-mi Kim and Kyung-soo Hwang (2012) conducted research to assess the desires of *Haenyeo* for public welfare services that impact their quality of life in three provinces in South Korea. In Jeju Island, the community wished for more economic, educational, and cultural support from the government that reflect their desire for protection and dissemination of their unique lifestyle and culture. A later interview with *Haenyeo* in 2018 on their awareness of own their community and their designation as UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage deduced that younger generations of *Haenyeo* are less aware of the significance of the nomination for their community than their elders and calls for an improvement in fostering this group consciousness to ensure its preservation in the future (You et al., 2018). Although two studies can hardly account for a complete picture of this question, they do showcase the importance attributed to the preservation of *Haenyeo* culture by the elders, and the part the whole community should take in the safeguarding efforts.

Korean academics have reflected on how to maintain and preserve the culture of Jeju *Haenyeo* using multiple manners and methods that range from practical government

initiatives (Choe, 2017) to the development of an emotional connection between the Korean people and the symbols of the community (Jwa, 2019). Scholars have argued for taking measures to ensure the community's longevity in light of the dwindling number of *Haenyeo* throughout the years and the danger of the possible disappearance of such 'living heritage', as Yujong Jwa (2019) defines it. The scholar suggested a creation of an umbrella, as a cultural tourism product, based on the flotation device used by the divers (*tewak*) that will foster the public's awareness about the community (Jwa, 2019, pp. 89-91). A similar approach that also relates to cultural identity is suggested by Sun-hwa Lee (2016). The author seeks to brand Jeju *Haenyeo* as a unique cultural heritage of South Korea to foster support for their preservation. Lee argues that the diffusion of *Haenyeo* culture is also meaningful because it is representative of the country itself, the values of Jeju people and the passion and enthusiasm of Korean women (Lee, 2016, pp. x-xi).

The preservation of *Haenyeo* Culture has also been studied in more practical terms, such as in Jae-ho Yoo and Yeon-kye Jung's call for the use of ICT (Information and Communication Technology) or IoT (Internet of Things) technology for *Haenyeo* both at work and at home in order to help support their health and safety (Yoo & Jung, 2017, pp. 1228-1231). The protection of the community is seen as a cooperative effort among citizens, governments, industries, colleges, institutions, and groups to establish the multiple related ordinances for the preservation of the culture of Jeju *Haenyeo*, as described by Jong-ho Choe (2017, p. 72). The author mentions ordinances related to the fisheries, medical treatment, or the establishment of the *Haenyeo* Museum as steps in enhancing the viability of the *Haenyeo* community (Choe, 2017, p. 73).

These reflections on the possible or existing measures on protecting the *Haenyeo* culture are an example of the varying lenses the problem of preserving such aging culture can be portrayed and deal with. By analyzing newspapers articles that report on safeguarding this culture, this study will assess how the debates brought up in this section are framed in the media, including the active part *Haenyeo* partake in the protection of their community, the idea of *Haenyeo* as regional and national symbols and the cultural, technological, environmental, and health-related measures that have been proposed.

2.5. The Inclusion of *Haenyeo* Culture on the UNESCO Intangible Heritage of Humanity List

Prior to its inclusion in UNESCO's Representative List in 2016, various elements of *Haenyeo* culture were already recognized on Korean regional and national lists of intangible cultural heritage. In 1971, *Haenyeo* songs were the first to be admitted on the Intangible Cultural Heritage List of Jeju Province. The ritual *Yeongdeunggut*, held to pray calm seas, abundant harvest, and a plentiful sea catch (UNESCO, 2023c) was included in the Korean National Intangible Cultural Heritage List in 1980 and later entered the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. In 2008, the wetsuits and accessories used by *Haenyeo* were protected as regional folklore heritage. Interestingly, national recognition of *Haenyeo* culture came in 2017, a year after its addition to the UNESCO Representative List (Dronjić, 2021, p. 66-67).

According to Mi-jeong An (2020), a discourse of the uniqueness of *Haenyeo* culture has been prevalent in Korean society since the 1990s. In the 2000s, both Korea and Japan started to discuss their aspirations of a possible inclusion of female divers in the UNESCO Humanity Cultural Heritage List. Similar to *Haenyeo*, female divers in Japan, known as *Ama*, are famous for collecting pearls. Although originally planned as a joint initiative, the process became somewhat of a competition between the two countries, and in 2013 the Jeju provincial government announced their single application of Jeju *Haenyeo* culture to UNESCO. An (2020, p. 200) puts this down to the history of Japanese colonial rule and a desire of South Korea to assert the uniqueness of *Haenyeo* culture as representative of their own national culture.

Nationalism was not the only driving force behind the submission for inscription of *Haenyeo* in the UNESCO Representative List. Min-eui Jung and Woong-kyu Lee (2017) relate the initiative mainly to marine tourism possibilities in Jeju. The authors list *Haenyeo* culture as a symbol of the cultural identity of the island, the importance of their support of a sustainable marine environment and their communal spirit and the transmission of knowledge and technology as crucial points for their registration as a UNESCO Humanity Intangible Cultural Heritage. Accordingly, the UNESCO website declares that the provincial government considers *Haenyeo* culture as representing the island's character and people's spirit, their contribution to the advancement of women's status in the community and promotion of environmental sustainability with eco-friendly

methods and community involvement in management of fishing practices (UNESCOb, 2023).

This chapter aimed to contextualize the issue of protecting and safeguarding *Haenyeo* in national and international terms, referring to debates about how to conduct intangible heritage management in general, as well as what and how these efforts have been studied by scholars in regards to South Korea and the *Haenyeo* community. The findings in this thesis contribute to the debates highlighted at the each of each subsection by expanding on them through the example of *Haenyeo*, confirming or contradicting their main points, and raising related questions.

3.Theoretical Framework

An extensive body of literature in framing studies has emerged from a range of different disciplines and academic fields over the last decades. Conceptually, framing has two broad foundations: sociological and psychological. Framing research that emerged from sociological foundations refers to the ‘frames in communication’. In general, this research tends to focus on the ‘words, images, phrases, and presentation styles’ that are used to construct news stories and the processes that form this construction (Borah, 2011, p. 247), and it is the line of research that is pursued in this thesis.

Nowadays, the term has also come to be used in several areas beyond sociology and psychology, such as linguistics and linguistic anthropology, journalism, and mass communication (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014, p. 182), economics, political science (Borah, 2011, p. 246) and policy studies (Noakes & Johnston 2005, p. 9), among others. The variety of applicability of framing has resulted in multiple variations of its definition that will be discussed in this chapter. The main aspects of this theory, the existing approaches to it and the final chosen method for this thesis will also be addressed.

3.1. The Concept of Framing

The concept of framing was first proposed by Burke (1937) and Bateson (1955/1972), and later popularized by Erving Goffman (1974), (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014, p. 182) who employed the concept to help explain the microsociology of everyday interactions and communicative acts (Noakes & Johnston 2005, p. 9). Goffman argues that we all actively classify, organize, and interpret our life experiences to make sense of them. The ‘schemata of interpretation’, that are labeled, ‘frames’ enable individuals to ‘locate, perceive, identify, and label’ (Goffman, 1974, p. 21). Pan and Kosicki (1993, p. 56) relate his definition of frames with Gitlin’s (1980): ‘persistent selection, emphasis, and exclusion’ of reality. The author links the concept to the production of news discourse by affirming that frames ‘enable journalists to process large amounts of information quickly and routinely and to package the information for efficient relay to their audiences’ (Gitlin, 1980, p. 7).

Framing does not have a single definition that is agreed upon and used by most scholars, and Goffman’s is only but one of many. As D’Angelo (2019, p. 2) put it, a truly integrative concept will yield neither a single set of theoretical principles nor a single

conceptual definition. I will limit the below discussion to certain definitions that make sense to understand the methodology used in this thesis.

In communication studies, a frame is often described as organizing everyday reality by providing a meaning to an unfolding sequence of events and promoting certain definitions and interpretations of issues. Scholars track them to identify trends in issue definitions, compare coverage across media outlets, and examine variations across types of media (Chong & Druckman, 2007, p. 106). Furthermore, in this discipline, authors often mention how framing events and issues in particular ways is one influential way that the media shapes public opinion (De Vreese, 2005). It can often be seen as a strategy to manipulate and deceive individuals, or merely a learning process in which people acquire common beliefs (Chong & Druckman, 2007, p. 120). Similarly, Tewksbury and Scheufele (2020, p. 54) address that framing effects can superficially resemble agenda setting effects. Agenda setting is the process by which audience exposure to news about an issue raised its accessibility. Thus, when people consider the issues that face a country, they may recall problems that have received attention in the news, and issues that have received the most attention may be perceived as the most important. Although this thesis does not address the influence of media on the topic at hand, it is a prevalent theme in the field and should be mentioned.

A different definition of framing deals with the notion of a ‘package’. For instance, Gamson and Modigliani refer to frames as ‘interpretative packages’ that give meaning to an issue. At the core of this package is a central organizing idea – a frame – that helps making sense of relevant events (De Vreese, 2005, p. 53). This ‘package’ also contains various policy positions that may be derived from the frame as well as a set of ‘symbolic devices’ (metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images) that signify the presence of frames and policy positions (Pan & Kosicki, 1993, p. 56).

However, I find this definition unnecessary complicated to understand and apply the concept of framing. De Vreese (2005, p. 53) put it in an extremely simple sentence, defining framing as an ‘emphasis in salience of different aspects of a topic’. Robert M. Entman explains how ‘to frame is to select some aspects of perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in hopes to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described’ (Borah, 2011, p. 248). This idea of ‘salience’ and ‘selection’ is crucial for the understanding of framing employed in this thesis, since it is this definition by

Entman the one employed by the scholars who proposed the methodological approach to be used in this thesis. The frames can be thus examined and identified by the presence or absence of certain keywords, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of imagination and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts and judgments (De Vreese & Lecheler, 2016, p. 2). Furthermore, the ‘emphasis’ frame approach described by Borah (2011, p. 248) compliments this definition by specifying it as an approach that ‘showcases that accentuating certain considerations in a message over others can influence individuals to focus on those particular considerations’ of a specific issue.

The issue of culture and context is also important to consider in framing, and in this case relevant when analyzing media of a different country than the one where the researcher is from. A frame might reference a resident in the surrounding culture, and the presence of the frame invites audiences to apply the information and meanings within which the culture has imbued the frame. This context dependency has been described as ‘cultural resonance’ or ‘narrative fidelity’ (Tewksbury & A. Scheufele, 2020, p. 57). Moreover, Van Gorp and Vercruyssen (2012, p. 1275) argue that framing is a process that is merely partially conscious on the part of the person who creates a message. This happens since each culture possesses a repertoire of symbols and worldviews that its member can use as a toolkit to attribute meaning to the many events and issues with which they are confronted. When authors frame a message, they connect a topic to notions that are part of this ‘common ground’ within a certain culture, such as values or shared narratives.

Lastly, this subsection will touch upon the distinction between inductive and deductive framing analysis approaches. Research that tries to detect news frames in texts usually relies on an inductive approach and refrains from analyzing news stories with a previous defined news frames in mind – frames emerge from the material during the course of analysis. On the other hand, a second and different approach is deductive in nature and investigates frames that are defined and operationalized prior to the investigation (De Vreese & Lecheler, 2016, p. 2). This discussion will be relevant to the discussion of the methodologies in the next section.

Borah (2011, p. 247) declared that the existence of diverse theoretical and methodological approaches to framing has led to a more comprehensive understanding of the concept, that is – as succinctly described above – complex and multiple. The

discussion of the chosen method is preceded by the examination of a few other approaches to framing analysis.

3.2. Approaches to Framing Analysis

Just as there are multiple definitions for the concept of framing, there are many differing framing analysis approaches suggested by different authors that are more or less suitable for specific disciplines. As D'Angelo and Kuypers (2010, p. 3) have discussed, academic specialization, along with theoretical and methodological pluralism, has led to a somewhat fragmented and often confusing understanding of what framing is and how it works. However, the pluralist premises of framing research are also capable of integrating theories and methods from different social sciences and humanities disciplines to shed light on the complex process of framing.

Framing analysis' methods were conceived to be employed in specific disciplines, as illustrated by the following models. D'Angelo's (2019) framing method showcases a close association with communication studies, since framing analysis here pivots around studying new stories, specifically how frames in news are the product of behaviors of news sources and journalists, and how people draw on textual news frames and their own knowledge to get informed and express opinions about issues. Also in regards to news media, Pan and Kosicki (1993) introduce a framing analysis approach in constructivist terms, to examine news discourse with the primary focus on conceptualizing news texts into empirically operationalizable dimensions – syntactical, script, thematic, and rhetorical structures – so that evidence of the news media's framing of issues in news texts can be gathered.

When studying social mobilization, Snow and Benford (1988) devised an influential framing method by identifying the core functions of a collective action frame. A collective action frame offers strategic interpretations of issues with the intention of mobilizing people to act. According to the authors, there are three basic framing tasks: diagnostic (it identifies what is the problem and why), prognostic (it presents a solution to the aforementioned problem) and motivational (it tries to provide a reason for people to join collective action).

Beyond the multiple approaches to framing in different disciplines, another issue intimately related to framing is the debate among scholars between the use of either issue-specific or generic frames. The first pertain merely to the specific issues that they were

devised for, and the second can be identified in relation to various topics, over time and in different cultural contexts. While some academics have highlighted the importance of studying a consistent set of frames, others have called attention to the tendency to create a unique set of frames for every study that can lead researchers to ‘easily find the evidence they are looking for’, and make frames difficult to generalize, compare, and use as empirical for theory-building (De Vreese & Lecheler, 2016, p. 2). Borah (2011, p. 249) suggests a middle ground, arguing that examining specific frames has value in understanding that particular issue or event; however, it is crucial that these are connected to the larger findings of scholarship on framing theory. This state of affairs has, paradoxically, contributed to generating the multiple existing methods since questions continue to be asked about the validity and reliability of different types of framing analysis of media texts (David et al., 2011, p. 331).

Matthes and Kohring’s (2008) inductive method was considered for the purpose of this study. It starts with an operationalization of the four elements identified in Entman’s definition of framing: problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and treatment recommendation. The text is coded in accordance with the four of these frames, later analyzed for cluster or cooccurrence patterns whereby frames emerge from the pattern of cooccurrences of frame elements in the media content. Each of the frames are then part of a ‘umbrella’ frame that defines a specific issue (Matthes & Kohring, 2008, 266-7).

This method has clear advantages. It is extremely detailed and informative, since defining the elements that constitute the frame leads to a deeper understanding of what is being measured. The frames are not subjectively determined beforehand, but empirically suggested by an inductive clustering method (Matthes & Kohring, 2008, p. 275), that first appeared as important characteristics to take into considering for this study. However, I believed it to be more suited for a broader issue than the one tackled in this thesis, since the issue of ‘protecting and safeguarding’ would merely be one of the many ‘umbrella frames’ of, hypothetically, a study on *Haenyeo* in general. Furthermore, the focus of this thesis is not necessarily on ‘problem-solving’ the issue of safeguarding *Haenyeo* culture – which seems to be the focus of this method – but more on the assessment of how media portrays it.

The frame analysis chosen to be employed in this study is Boydston et al.’s (2014) ‘Policy Frames Codebook’, which is described as a ‘coding scheme for analysis across

issues, whereby issue-specific frames are nested within high-level dimensions (or frame types) that cross-cut issues'. The next chapter will discuss in detail its characteristics and how it was adapted to this thesis.

4. Methodology

Framing is a complex but flexible concept that can be applicable in multiple research designs and within distinctive paradigmatic positionings (D'Angelo, 2019, p. 1-2). Since the theoretical framework employed in this thesis follows Robert M. Entman's definition of framing, I believe it useful to reflect on it in order to better apply the methodological approach: 'to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described' (Boydtsun et al., 2014, p. 2).

The mention of the idea of a 'perceived reality' relates to the ontological position of **constructivism**, that states that social phenomena and their meanings are continually being created – and revised – by social actors (Bryman, 2014, p. 33). Ontology in general relates to the nature of reality and its characteristics (Creswell, 2013, p. 20).

On the other hand, epistemology pertains to the issue of what is or should be regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline. The question of whether the social world can and should be studied according to the same principles, procedures, and ethos as the natural sciences is one of its main concerns (Bryman, 2014, p. 27). This thesis follows an **interpretivist** view in epistemological terms; this perspective denotes the idea that a strategy is necessary that respects the differences between people and the objects of the natural sciences, and thus requires the researcher to understand the subjective meaning of social action (Bryman, 2014, p. 30). It implies that knowledge about the social world is known through the examination of the multiple and subjective experiences of people (Creswell, 2013, p. 20).

This research is also qualitative in nature, meaning that it emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data (Bryman, 2012, p. 380). According to Creswell (2013, p. 44), qualitative research starts with certain assumptions and the use of theoretical frameworks that inform the study of research problems addressing the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human issue. For this thesis, the topic pertains to the safeguarding and protection of the *Haenyeo* community.

To study it, I use a qualitative approach to inquiry, meaning that the collection of data is conducted in a setting sensitive to the people and places involved in the study, and its data analysis is both inductive and deductive and establishes patterns or themes. The final presentation of the issue at hand includes the reflexivity of the research, a description and interpretation of the problem and its contribution to the literature or call for a change (Creswell, 2013, p. 44). In the next subsection, the data collection method will be described.

4.1. Data Collection Method

The newspapers articles included in this thesis were published within the last five years (March 2018 – March 2023) in three different newspapers based in Jeju Island: *Jeju Shinmun*, *Jeju Ilbo* and *Jemin Ilbo*. As discussed in the literature review, efforts towards the protection and safeguarding of *Haenyeo* were undertaken already before the inclusion of the community on the UNESCO Intangible Heritage List in 2016. However, since then there has been an increase in measures and initiatives, and therefore in media representation of the issue. Although this study was first designed to include articles published in the years leading up to the actual nomination, since the application to the UNESCO List was discussed in media, the large quantity of articles that came up on the initial search deemed it impossible.

Three local newspapers from Jeju Special Self-Governing Province were selected for their extensive coverage of local issues. As Jeju *Haenyeo* are native to the island, it was anticipated that these newspapers would provide a more comprehensive coverage of their protection compared to national ones. The online versions of these newspapers will be analyzed for this study.

The newspaper first published in 1945 under the name *Jeju Shinbo* went under many name changes until 1996 when it became known as the *Jeju Ilbo*, the designation used until today. The newspaper prides itself as being part of the community of Jeju and claims to put the public opinion of its residents first. It affirms that it strives to create value for Jeju, revive its identity and promote the welfare and happiness of the people of the island (Jeju Ilbo, 2023). The editor's emphasis on the community's thoughts stood out to me, since it seemed to be likely to include extensive reporting on *Haenyeo* by journalists living in the island. The *Jeju Shinmun* is a local daily newspaper that started publishing in 2007 under the name *Jeju Women Times*, as the first daily newspaper

founded by a woman in South Korean media (Jeju Shinmun, 2023). The initial focus on women's affairs by the newspaper drew my attention, and the continued reporting on women's issues seemed relevant when searching for articles about *Haenyeo* women divers. Similar to the *Jeju Ilbo*, the *Jemin Ilbo*, first published in 1990, strives to strengthen grassroots community-based media by giving space to public opinion of residents of Jeju alongside its articles. Claiming to have 'the pride of Jeju residents', the newspaper claims to have addressed multiple regional issues in the past and present of Jeju, being its ultimate goal the promotion of the Jeju community, the development of the island and the interests of its people (Jemin Ilbo, 2023). Since the newspapers do not seem to advance competing agendas, this study will consider their articles in general without conducting comparisons between them.

Initially, in order to search for articles that address the safeguarding and protection of *Haenyeo* of the newspapers, I used the key term 'haenyeo' (해녀) with either the Korean term for 'protection' or 'safeguard' (*boho* or 보호) or the term for 'preservation' (*bojon* or 보존). However, the second term seemed to be less effective, since it mostly generated search results that had nothing to do with the thesis topic. Therefore, only the first term came to be used for the search, which issued more than enough relevant articles.

In the *Jeju Ilbo*, seventy-three articles came up with the joint term of 'haenyeo' and 'boho', in the *Jeju Shinmun* thirty-six, and one hundred and twenty-one in the *Jemin Ilbo*. Many of these articles did not concern the issue of safeguarding or protection of *Haenyeo*, but merely included the joint term coincidentally, while others did not concern *Haenyeo* at all. After going through each of these articles in search of those who address the topic of this thesis, I was able to narrow the number of articles to twelve in the *Jeju Ilbo*, eleven in the *Jeju Shinmun* and twenty-nine in the *Jemin Ilbo*. The final conclusive number of articles amounts to fifty-two. The number of articles from the last newspaper exceeds for quite a bit the number of the other two— it was simply a result of it reporting on the issue more frequently. The next section will detail how the methodological approach was adapted to this thesis.

4.2. Framing Analysis

As briefly mentioned in the last chapter, the approach chosen to be used in this study is Boydston et al.'s (2014) 'Policy Frames Codebook'.

According to the authors, what frames are used to define a certain problem and how they evolve and diffuse are an important task for advancing our understanding of issues. However, the process by which scholars and researchers identify the catalogue of frames in discourse about a particular topic – frame discovery – is complex and time-consuming, as it is the secondary process of coding instances of framing in text – frame analysis. Furthermore, the challenge of tracing how frames are used across multiple policy debates comes up often among specialists (Boydtsun et al., 2014, p. 1-2).

After considering these issues in framing scholarship, and in accordance with Robert Entman’s definition of framing – ‘to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described’ –, the authors embarked on a three-year project that aimed to develop a data-driven, expert-informed, computational modeling of framing that enlarges the ability of researchers to discover frames and analyze their use in textual discourse named ‘Policy Frames Codebook’ (Boydtsun et al., 2014, p. 2-3).

This method of framing analysis provides a general system for categorizing frames cues across policy issues designated so it can also be specialized in issue-specific ways. The codebook contains fourteen categories of frame ‘dimensions’ (and one ‘other’ category) that are intended to be applicable to any policy issue and in any communication context. Researchers can employ only some of the categories, or nest issue-specific frames within each category. Although scholars can apply these in whatever way suits their research aims, the authors suggest coding each piece of communication according to the primary frame category used, as well as the presence of any additional frames employed (Boydtsun et al., 2014, p. 6-8).

The authors validate their general codebook by trying to assess how often it fails to capture frames that appear. According to their manually coded data, only 1.5% or fewer stories receive ‘other’ as the primary code for any issue, while most of them were codeable using the fourteen dimensions (Boydtsun et al., 2014, p. 9). This method thus appears suitable for this research for the following reasons. I was searching for a deductive method that would provide me with preexisting frames that could serve as a solid guide when carrying out framing analysis for the first time, but that would still allow me to further develop them in particular subframes that can come up when dealing with the specific issue of safeguarding *Haenyeo*. Furthermore, the fact that the frame types

introduced by the authors can be applied across different issues speaks of the practicality of such method, and hopefully this study can be taken into considering when studying more broadly the issue of protecting intangible cultural heritage in media.

In regards to the application of this approach to this thesis, seven of the fourteen frames were identified and analyzed: economic, capacity and resource, policy prescription and evaluation, health and safety, quality of life, cultural identity, and external regulation and reputation. Despite the suggestion of a possible ‘other’ category by the authors, the content of the articles did not justify it. For each of the seven frames issue-specific ones were created inductively, and their name and description will be mentioned in the subsection of every frame in the analysis chapter.

Each article was initially coded in Microsoft Word according to its ‘frame cues’ – Boydston et al. (2014, p. 6) defined them as signals that are not always explicit and easily equated with the frames, but more second-level issue cues that require a further reflection upon coding. After this primary process, the articles were read through once again and each of these cues present in specific text passages that evoked a particular frame dimension were thus coded (Boydston et al., 2014, p. 8). The primary frame corresponds to essential frame present throughout the article, and the secondary ones are additional frames that complement the information the primary one is transmitting. A table for each newspaper was later created where the frequency of each frame (as primary and secondary) was accounted for in order to aid in the analysis; these tables are not showcased in the analysis chapter, but merely one that combines all three newspapers. Lastly, despite this methodology also enabling coding for tone (positive, negative, and neutral), this analysis does not consider it necessary; since this seems to be more appropriate for polarizing or contested issues, which is not the case for the topic of this thesis.

4.3. Limitations, Ethical Considerations and Self-Reflexivity

The ‘Policy Frames Codebook’ (Boydston et al., 2014) methodological approach used in this thesis emerged as a result of a research project conducted by multiple people, while the one hereby described is the work of only one student. In fact, most methodological approaches considered in this study (Matthes & Kohring (2008); Noakes & Johnston (2005) were created by more than one researcher. While this does not signify that they are intended to be use by teams of researchers, this difference may impact the

process of coding by one researcher. A single person coding the material will most likely miss certain aspects of a text that would not go unnoticed by a different pair of eyes, or overly emphasize a frame that might not be clear for anyone else. The inherent subjectivity cannot be completely mitigated, however constant reviewing by the researcher can minimize these issues. In this case, the articles in this study were coded two times and read over one more time in the process of writing the analysis.

In terms of ethical considerations, due to the nature of this research, Bryman's (2014, p. 135) four principles of ethical research – no harm to participants, inclusion of informed consent, no invasion of privacy and no deception – do not apply to a framing analysis approach to newspapers articles that are publicly available online for free. However, Bryman (2014, p. 144) reference to the need of 'integrity, quality and transparency' can pertain to this study. Integrity and transparency refer to the disclosure of conflicts of interest and partiality from the researcher in order to ensure ethical research (Bryman, 2014, p. 146); this chapter aims to discuss these. Quality may indicate many things, yet in broad terms refers to a study that is well-designed in terms of its data sample, choice of methods and research question (Bryman, 2014, p. 144). I have made efforts to conduct this research following these principles.

Bryman (2014, p. 314) raises how language is often a significant barrier to the researcher that it is writing on a country or culture that is not one's own. The present research is conducted on a South Korean issue by a non-native Korean speaker. As such, even though I can understand, speak, and write in Korean at an intermediate level and analyze the newspaper articles in their original language, I often had to resort to a dictionary in order to grasp the meaning of a certain word or expression that I was not familiar with. This process may affect what framing category I place a particular passage or article in, making this differ from a native speaker's categorization. In order to try to minimize this issue as much as possible, when in doubt, I have tried to look up different definitions of a certain word I did not know, so I could feel more assured about its meaning. A similar issue is the choice of employing only one keyword when searching for relevant articles, which most likely resulted in missing articles that could have affected the outcome of this research. This problem is difficult to manage since the number of articles would be extremely high, however my choice of the keyword came from its inclusion in the description of UNESCO's objectives in the Korean language. Given its

primary role in managing intangible cultural heritage internationally, I believe the term to be the most appropriate.

The fact that I am a non-Korean individual studying a topic particular to South Korea further requires a reflexive stance. As any other culture, Korean culture possesses a certain set of symbols and worldviews that attribute meaning to the events and issues its members experience (Van Gorp & Vercruysse, 2012, p. 1275). This ‘cultural common ground’ that Korean people have I do not possess, and I might ‘miscode’ certain frames, or might not pick up on certain nuances of a passage that can hint a certain frame that is not linguistically obvious. As a European that has studied about Korea mainly in European universities, my understanding of Korean culture is thus shaped by my experiences as a Western woman studying mostly from and with other Westerners. I have sought to be mindful of this throughout the research process.

5. Analysis

In this chapter, I will proceed to describe the analysis process following the methodological approach highlighted in the previous section, its findings and a brief discussion that will precede the conclusion of the thesis.

As outlined in the methodology chapter, a total of fifty-two articles were coded and then sorted in one of the fourteen frames suggested by Boydston et al. (2014). After the initial coding process, twelve out of the fourteen frames were identified in the articles. However, five of these merely occurred between one and six times, both as a primary and a secondary frame, in the data and were thus deemed to be too insignificant to be properly analyzed. Therefore, seven frames were taken into consideration for this study, all of which were present as primary or secondary frames to different degrees of occurrence. The table below showcases the original twelve frames, with the five not included ones in red. They are divided into primary and secondary frames, include the total number of their occurrence, and are organized following Boydston et al.'s (2014) order.

	Economic	Capacity and resource	Mortality	Fairness and equality	Policy prescription and evaluation	Law and order, crime, and justice	Health and safety	Quality of life	Cultural identity	Public opinion	Political	External regulation and reputation
Primary frame	3	5	2	X	18	X	8	6	10	X	4	1
Secondary Frames	16	9	4	1	9	1	8	9	19	1	X	23
Total	19	14	6	1	27	1	16	15	29	1	4	24

As there was no particular difference between the content of a primary or secondary frame in regards to a specific frame, they are to be analyzed in their total. The

next section will go in depth into each frame and in the subframes that were identified for each; they vary from two to five in number. I proceed by order of frequency in occurrence, and the order is thus the following: Cultural identity, Policy prescription and evaluation, External relations and reputation, Economic, Health and safety, Quality of life and Capacity and resources.

5.1. Cultural identity

The most common frame in this analysis is the Cultural identity frame, which is defined by Boydston et al. (2014, p. 7) as referring to ‘the social norms, trends, values, and customs constituting culture(s), as they relate to a specific policy issue’. For the purpose of this study, I have taken into consideration not merely the cultural traits of the *Haenyeo* culture that might be mentioned, but also what these represent for Jeju, Korea, and the world. This frame occurs twenty-nine times or in 55.7% of the fifty-two articles, which corresponds to over half of the material analyzed in this thesis and speaks of the importance given to the cultural identity of *Haenyeo* for the promotion and preservation of the culture. This frame is present as a primary frame ten times, and as a secondary frame nineteen times, and possesses five subframes that will be examined below.

5.1.1 Haenyeo as representative of Jeju’s identity and culture

The most common subframe in the Cultural identity frame relates to *Haenyeo* as representative of Jeju Island’s identity and culture, and it is present in nine of the articles (31.1%). Articles write of *Haenyeo* as crucial to regional identity in various ways: as representing Jeju, as being one of its many valuable cultural heritages or even the island’s biggest asset. *Haenyeo* are the center of the Jeju community, and they are part of the identity of the people from the island, since most have mothers or grandmothers that are or were divers. *Haenyeo* are also often represented in many art forms produced by the people of Jeju. Therefore, developing *Haenyeo* as a local heritage is closely related to maintaining Jeju’s identity, and that can account for the presence of this frame in regional media. Considered to be ‘the pride of Jeju’, the safeguarding and protection of this community is, according to this study, meaningful most importantly for this reason.

5.1.2. Haenyeo as symbols of Korea and its nationalism

The present subframe relates to *Haenyeo*’s cultural identity and its relationship with Korea, and it corresponds to 24.1% or seven of the articles. Many articles portray *Haenyeo* as a nationalist symbol due to their participation in anti-Japanese protests in Jeju

during the colonial occupation; in a similar way, there is a point to clearly distinguished Jeju *Haenyeo* from the Japanese divers called *ama*. Others mention how *Haenyeo* culture is the pride of Korea, and it is a cultural heritage that it is not only Jeju's but also the mainland's; it is portrayed as representing Korea's traditional maritime and fishing culture, and it is a Nationally Designated Intangible Cultural Property and National Fishing Heritage. Interestingly, there is a reference to how *Haenyeo* are also present in Busan, and not merely in Jeju. These mention all speak to a national pride in regards to *Haenyeo* and that the people of Korea consider it part of Korean culture that should be protected and safeguarded.

5.1.3. Haenyeo as possessing unique characteristics

The third most common subframe appears six times (or 20.7%), and it pertains to *Haenyeo*'s culture seemingly unique characteristics that differentiate them from other similar cultures in the world and in mainland Korea. The divers are depicted as having a tenacious spirit and vitality and being a symbol of the strong and diligent women of Jeju. The matriarchal nature of a community that celebrates and encourages women to work and independently support themselves and their families is portrayed as more equal (when it comes to gender issues) than the more patriarchal culture of mainland Korea. On a different note, *Haenyeo* culture is also deemed sustainable due to their nature-friendly gathering techniques and cohabitation with the marine ecosystem, and the sustainable development they represent is part of their uniqueness. *Haenyeo*'s skills, knowledge, and rituals constitute the century-long one-of-a-kind culture that should be protected to also safeguard these unique values.

5.1.4. Haenyeo as representative of a 'community culture'

This subframe occurs in four articles, or 13.8% of the twenty-nine included in the Cultural identity frame. The strong community spirit of *Haenyeo* is often mentioned in the articles, along with the values of mutual consideration, trust, and cooperation. This community spirit has contributed to the emergence of the new economy in Jeju, which is a point later addressed in this study. Furthermore, beyond what it means for the everyday life of the community, it is mentioned as crucial for the efforts for the transmission and protection of *Haenyeo*. The constant mutual aid, reliance and unity keeps the community alive and thriving: practices such as older *Haenyeo* teaching the newcomers how to fish and the existence of an equal division of income among the divers – although the elderly

receive 20% of the profits – are among those who contribute to the longevity of the community.

5.1.5. Haenyeo as a valuable representative of world culture

The least common subframe is present in 10.3% or three of the articles, and it relates to *Haenyeo* as representative of the culture of the world. Articles mention the community as a global cultural asset, a precious intangible cultural heritage of mankind, a representative of the world's maritime culture and part of the human and natural history of the world even before its inclusion in UNESCO's Intangible Heritage List. Furthermore, it is affirmed that *Haenyeo's* community culture is representative of global human rights norms such as freedom, equality, and solidarity. *Haenyeo* cultural identity is thus portrayed through its value and importance for world culture, beyond Jeju Island and Korea.

5.2. Policy prescription and evaluation

The second most common frame in this analysis is the Policy prescription and evaluation frame, and it corresponds to 'particular policies proposed for addressing an identified problem, and figuring out if certain policies will work, or if existing policies are effective' (Boydston et al., 2014, p. 7). For this analysis, I have also considered articles that deal with particular policies for the issue of protecting *Haenyeo*, even if they do not include the discussion of their effectiveness. Occurring twenty-seven times – eighteen as a primary frame and ten as a secondary frame – this frame is the most echoed as a primary frame, and it is present in 51.9% of the fifty-two articles. Three subframes have been identified and will be discussed below.

5.2.1. Educational and cultural promotion policies

The most common subframe appears in more than half of the articles, making up 51.9% (or fourteen) of the twenty-seven in this frame. It corresponds to the efforts in promoting educational and cultural policies towards toward promoting the culture of Jeju *Haenyeo*, which as ascertained in the previous subsection, it is a crucial for its safeguarding and protection. In terms of education, reporters speak of the creation of schools that provide courses on the cultural elements of the traditional knowledge of *Haenyeo*, smart management of the *Haenyeo* Museum and introducing of the *Haenyeo* Experience Program to cultivate the culture among the Jeju community in general. In the cultural field more broadly, there is call for creating a cultural and artistic 'brand' of

Haenyeo culture easily recognized by protecting the cultural and artistic expressions of the divers. Due to COVID-19, there has also been an encouragement towards using technology to preserve and utilize cultural assets, as digitalization of cultural heritage data.

Reporters have been highly assertive over how they believe that a stable foundation for transmission of *Haenyeo* culture should be; one of its core aspects is the focus on the relationship between *Haenyeo* and the local community. *Haenyeo* culture is not being properly maintained and protected due to weak policies such as ‘one-time’ projects that would need continuity to be effective, limited benefit supports and poor welfare aid. Furthermore, despite the cultural projects that do exist, the level of involvement of the citizens and their understanding and cultural awareness seems to be low. Articles call for a focus of cultural transmission that deals with the present of the community and not merely with its past or future: the focus should be on the local communities and its values, encouraging community efforts to preserve and transmit *Haenyeo* by educating locals and visitors on the significance of cultural traditions and knowledge, such as its maritime cultural heritage. It is thus suggested that cultural policies follow this approach, so that more cultural experiences can be available, organizations that protect Jeju culture protected, cultural contests promoted, and awards to celebrate those that continue to protect *Haenyeo*, such as the Jeju *Haenyeo* Grand Prize awarded by the *Jemin Ilbo* and the World Cultural Heritage Preservation Foundation.

5.2.2. New Haenyeo support policies

This subframe is present in seven or 25.9% of the articles, and it pertains to the existence or suggestion of policies to nurture and assist new *Haenyeo* in easing their way into the challenging profession they are committing to. Reporters write of support given to new divers in the complex process of the registration system for them to be in fact able to be considered *Haenyeo*, advocacy for changing the complex requirements to enter a fishing village so that new divers can easily enter the profession, creation of more *Haenyeo* schools to provide training for those that wish to become divers and provide settlement and membership subsidies to encourage more women to join the fishing villages. In terms of policy evaluation, one reporter argues that the Jeju Provincial Government focuses too much on the promotion of *Haenyeo* oversees instead of focusing on measures that can prevent the community from disappearing, such as giving support to new *Haenyeo*. Other affirms simply that the policies proposed by the administration

are not actually truly helping with boosting the number of *Haenyeo* that decreases every year, nor with their quality of life. There is a call for improvement of their status such as providing more financial aid and personnel to *Haenyeo* schools, the creation of special acts at national level and more administrative support at the local level. It thus seems that when articles offer some kind of appraisal, it appears to be negative.

5.2.3. Fisheries and fishing villages management policies

The last subframe occurs in 22.2% (or six) of the articles under the Policy prescription and evaluation frame, and it refers to policies regarding the management of the fisheries and fishing villages where *Haenyeo* are part of and conduct their work. In regards to the fisheries management, the articles refer to maintaining the price of seafood in order to provide the financial stability to *Haenyeo* (that sell what they collect to costumers), restoration of the marine environment and prevention of resource depletion and promotion of the sustainable management of marine resources that are so crucial for the divers occupation and well-being. In regards to the fishing villages that each *Haenyeo* should be part, reports write of policies such as encouraging their autonomous management, nurturing fishing grounds, promote better practices in the villages and provide local support for marine fisheries projects. Articles further refer to improvement of dressing rooms and other physical spaces crucial for *Haenyeo*, and also for their diving suits. Lastly, there is a mention to safety measures and accident prevention when fishing that do not seem to be effective, however this specific topic will be later discussed with its own frame in this analysis. In this subframe, it seems that there is a suggestion of policies more than their evaluation, therefore it is difficult to assess how successful they are.

5.3. External relations and reputation

The External relations and reputation frame is the third most common frame in this analysis, being present in 46.1% of the articles: one as a primary frame, and twenty-three as a secondary frame. According to Boydston et al. (2014, p. 7), this frame refers to ‘the United States’ external relations with another nation; the external relations of one state with another; or relations between groups. This includes trade agreements and outcomes, comparisons of policy outcomes or desired policy outcomes’. As this thesis does not concern the United States but South Korea, I focused on the reputational aspect of the frame highlighted in its name and interpreted it as the reputation and relations of *Haenyeo*

intangible cultural heritage in the international setting. The four subframes will be addressed below.

5.3.1. Haenyeo as part of UNESCO'S Intangible Heritage List

The most common subframe corresponds to 50% (or twelve) of the articles, and relates to the mention, emphasis, and discussion of the inclusion of *Haenyeo* in UNESCO's Intangible Heritage List in 2016. The articles can often refer to the inscription as a form of introduction to the community which highlights the importance given to this international recognition for its identity or be paired up with the call for its protection and safeguarding; in other words, that *Haenyeo* should be protected due to many reasons, but also because they are recognized by UNESCO as Intangible Cultural Heritage. On another hand, the mention of UNESCO is preceded by the mention of many national recognitions, such as National Important Fishery Heritage, National Intangible Cultural Heritage, and National Fishing Heritage by the South Korean government.

5.3.2. Haenyeo as an international model example of ICH management, research, and sustainability

The present subframe corresponds to six or 25% of the articles in the External relations and reputation frame. The articles either write of *Haenyeo* already being or its potential to be an international monitoring research model and an exemplary practice of Intangible Cultural Heritage preservation and management. Reports also mention *Haenyeo* culture as an example and leader in international discourse in terms of sustainable development, and how it is highly regarded internationally due to this aspect that is so crucial in cultural heritage protection. The positioning of *Haenyeo* culture as a global standard further relates to its placement as representative of Korea's cultural heritage internationally and the pride evident from this positive reputation.

5.3.3. Haenyeo and other international recognitions

The third most common subframe corresponds to 16.6% or four of the articles, and it deals with *Haenyeo* and international recognitions beyond its inclusion in the UNESCO List. Despite the clear emphasis on UNESCO's recognition as an intangible cultural heritage, articles have also referred to the aspiration of being included in one other international inscription: the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). In a more abstract

sense, reporters have referred to a wish that *Haenyeo* culture and values to be acknowledged by the world apart from international lists.

5.3.4. Haenyeo and comparisons to other intangible heritage

The last subframe corresponds to merely two articles (8.4%) out of the twenty-four, and they regard the comparisons made between the management of the *Haenyeo* culture and other cultural heritages in the world, most specifically China. Articles have recommended that those protecting and promotion this culture should take example from domestic and foreign intangible cultural management cases, such as the Glove Puppetery in Fujian Province, or the landscape live performances in Guanxi. These articles take a more skeptical approach in regards to how the *Haenyeo* culture is being managed and present these examples in China as conducting a better approach and strategy in promoting and safeguarding their cultural heritage.

5.4. Economic

As the fourth most common frame in this study, the Economic frame includes nineteen occurrences: three as a primary frame, and sixteen as a secondary one. The 36.5% of the articles included in this frame refer – in the author’s words – to the costs, benefits, or monetary/financial implications of the issue (to an individual, family, community, or to the economy as a whole) (Boydstun et al., 2014, p. 6). This frame can often be confused with the Capacity and resource frame, that can deal as well with the lack or sufficiency of financial resources. When in doubt, I have decided to characterize the articles that deal objectively with specific amounts of money in regards to *Haenyeo* protection and safeguarding within this frame, whether they relate to the lack or the abundance of it. Three subframes were identified.

5.4.1. Tourism promotion and risk of commodification

This subframe includes ten articles (or 52.6%), which makes it the most recurrent within the Economic frame. The issue of protection and safeguarding *Haenyeo* is intertwined with the transmission and promotion of its culture, and tourism promotion purposes are often included in this discussion. Articles refer to efforts by the Jeju Provincial Government to turn *Haenyeo* into a cultural tourism product and create a ‘brand’ of this living culture in order to attract tourists to the island and generate income for the province. For instance, there is a mention of the possible use of the metaverse to *Haenyeo*’s symbols to promote tourism in Jeju. However, the use of the culture as a

national tourism brand and culture asset comes with its risks, and articles have referred to the possible commodification of *Haenyeo* culture. The mere focus on providing tourists with constructed ‘experiences’ of the culture that people can ‘enjoy’ as a commodity in order to increase the inflow of money instead of presenting *Haenyeo* as they are present in the articles as well. The call for and the question of how *Haenyeo* can escape commodification is thus a debated issue, and highly relevant to its cultural transmission and overall protection.

5.4.2. Haenyeo as essential for Jeju’s economy

The present includes 31.5% or six articles that relate to the idea of *Haenyeo* as crucial and important for Jeju Island’s economy. Since the 19th century that the community has been a driving force behind expanding and supporting economic development in Jeju. This historical contribution includes, for instance, how the divers how donate part of their income to build schools in the province. Nowadays, as an intangible cultural heritage, *Haenyeo* also contributes significantly to the economy of Jeju, and articles recognize the community’s part in evolving with the times and supporting Jeju in different ways across the decades. In the future, there is the expectation that they can aid Jeju in becoming a ‘maritime powerhouse’ in the international field.

5.4.3. Investment or divestment (in won) in the protection of the Haenyeo community

The last subframe corresponds to three articles, or 15.9 within the Economic considerations and implications of the issue. These three articles deal either with the investment or divestment in numbers of the Jeju Provincial Government into the protection of *Haenyeo*. In 2019, there was an investment of 6.6 million won in the preservation and of the *Haenyeo* culture in multiple projects, while in 2020 it was reported that the budget for the marine and fisheries sector – in which the *Haenyeo* Cultural Heritage Department is included – was reduced by 7 million won compared to the previous year. This year, the budget of 1.73 billion won was completely cut out, which is a culmination of the decreasing in investment into *Haenyeo* protection throughout the years (27 million won in 2020, 13 million won in 2021 and 1.8 million won in 2022). The articles reflect the impossibility of conducting proper protection and safeguarding policies when funding is lacking, and the frustration of the provincial government with the country’s administration.

5.5. Health and safety

The Health and safety frame occurs sixteen times in this study, being the fifth most common. Its definition refers to healthcare access and effectiveness, illness, disease, sanitation, obesity, mental health effects, prevention of or perpetuation of gun violence, infrastructure and building safety (Boydstun et al., 2014, p. 7). This frame includes 30.7% of the articles analyzed; eight as a primary frame, and eight as a secondary frame. The discussion of the two subframes follows.

5.5.1. Accident prevention

‘Accident prevention’ is the most reoccurring subframe, encompassing 87.5% (or fourteen) of the articles within this frame. Due to the high number of elderly *Haenyeo*, these are more at risk of accidents when fishing, and many articles mentioned the urgency when dealing with this issue. The accidents due to old age is one of the factors for the decreasing number of divers, and there are many references in the newspapers to how the government can prevent accidents and how it can promote a prompt response when they occur. The measures to prevent fishing accidents include CPR training for *Haenyeo* in order for the divers to be capable of helping each other while waiting for the emergency services, investment in new diving equipment (including masks) for better safety, the establishment of a retirement allowance so senior *Haenyeo* can retire and the number of accidents diminish, and promotion of sea-cleaning activities to clean up the beach from potentially dangerous discarded fishing gear.

5.5.2. Healthcare support

This subframe comprises 12.5% or merely two of the articles in the Health and safety frame, These refer to both a general support given to the divers for their medical expenses, and a specific lottery fund that is set to help protect their health by covering the same costs. The health of *Haenyeo* is portrayed as crucial for the longevity of the community; not only for elderly divers that are more fragile to health issues and accidents, but also to newer *Haenyeo* that require welfare support in this realm too.

5.6. Quality of life

The Quality-of-life frame is present in 28.8% or fifteen articles in this analysis: six as a primary frame, and nine as a secondary frame. Boydston et al. (2014, p. 7) define this frame as dealing with ‘the effects of a policy on individuals’ wealth, mobility, access to resources, happiness, social structures, ease of day-to-day routines, quality of community

life, etc.’. For the purpose of this thesis, I have included the policies and the effects related to quality of life in order to distinguish them from the Policy prescription and evaluation frame, and closely examine a topic that is frequently raised in Jeju newspapers. The three identified subframes are explored below.

5.6.1. Improving the quality of life of older Haenyeo

The most common subframe appears in nine articles (or 60%) and it relates to the policies and effects described as improving the quality of life of older *Haenyeo*. As mentioned in previous sections, the issue of aging in the community is a valid and common concern for those involved in the protection and safeguarding of *Haenyeo*. Therefore, the interest in improving a comfortable retirement is often present in the articles. They refer to welfare policies such as the improvement of the pension system by implementing a retirement allowance – it was suggested that it would be provided up to three years upon retirement to prevent further fishing that can endanger elderly divers –, efforts towards income preservation and establishment of funds that cover medical expenses are the ones commonly mention. Other reports criticize these policies and claim that the income preservation allowance is not enough to support one’s life, and that older *Haenyeo* are still forced to work due to its inefficiency. The focus of the articles is mostly on the retirement allowance (or the ‘wealth’ part of the author’s definition) and how crucial it is for stable living conditions, and it is regarded as the main policy for improving the quality of life of elderly *Haenyeo*.

5.6.2. Improving the quality of life of new Haenyeo

Similarly, to the previous one, the present subframe relates to the improvement of the quality of life of new *Haenyeo*, and it is included in four (or 26.7%) of the articles. The continuation of the *Haenyeo* culture depends on the existence of women who are willing to join the profession and the challenging lifestyle it entails, and reporters have written about what has been and what should be accomplished to ease the new divers into the occupation. As it was mentioned for elderly *Haenyeo*, support for the ones that recently starting diving include medical aid, income stabilization and overall – and unspecified – help to promote the livelihood stability of new *Haenyeo*. Despite it being a crucial step in guaranteeing the preservation of the *Haenyeo* culture, it seems there has not been many references to the efforts in aiding new *Haenyeo* as one would expect.

5.6.3. Improving the state of working facilities and working conditions

The last two articles, or 13.3% of them, correspond to the improvement of the working conditions and working facilities for *Haenyeo* in order to ease the day-to-day activities of the community, as defined by Boydston et al. (2014) in the definition of the Quality-of-life frame. These refer to the improvement of the dressing rooms where *Haenyeo* change from and into their diving suits, the state of the many *bulteok* around the island, promotion of sea-clean up activities and caring for fishing grounds, and efforts to solve disputes between divers and fishermen. These endeavors will help to improve the quality of life of all *Haenyeo*, including with their everyday pursuits and sense of community.

5.7. Capacity and resources

The Capacity and resource frame is the seventieth more common frame across the fifty-two articles, and according to Boydston et al. (2014, p. 6), it refers to the lack of or availability of physical, geographical, spatial, human, and financial resources, or the capacity of existing systems and resources to implement or carry out policy goals. It is present as a primary frame five times, and as a secondary frame nine times, which corresponds to fourteen instances and 26.9% of the articles. Two sub-frames were identified, and their discussion is as follows.

5.7.1. Poor budget allocation, planning and management

This sub-frame occurs nine times (64.3% of the fourteen articles), and it relates to the lack of mostly financial resources that permit an effective protection and safeguarding of the *Haenyeo* culture. Articles refer to a lack of provincial support to conduct a proper management of *Haenyeo* cultural heritage, including the *Haenyeo* Museum, the reduction of the budget and size of the Haenyeo Cultural Heritage Department as the years go by and a mismatched budget planning, when the money is available, that prevents initiatives that were approved from being executed, such as the building of a support center for the divers. Furthermore, there is a mention of how only the local government is investing in the protection of the community, and there are apparently little resources coming from the national government for this effort.

5.7.2. Measures to protect and safeguard Haenyeo fall short

The present sub-frame refers to the incapacity of the Jeju Provincial Government to carry out policy goals, and it is present in five or 35.7% of the articles within this frame.

The articles claim that the measures to protect the community are not having the expected results; for example, the numbers of *Haenyeo* continue to decline, and the elderly divers who are at a higher risk of accidents when fishing – and who should receive a retirement allowance enough to live on – have no other option but to continuing working, which defeats the purpose of safeguarding their well-being. The welfare provided to *Haenyeo* is deemed insufficient, for both the already mentioned elderly, but also to the new *Haenyeo* who need specific policies to ease their way in such a lifestyle. Lastly, the inability to pursue these policy goals translate to the impossibility in following UNESCO's guidelines to protect the *Haenyeo* culture and guaranteeing cultural transmission.

5.8. Discussion

The outcomes of this research have provided insight into the framing in local media of the issue of safeguarding and protecting *Haenyeo*. This chapter will analyze and interpret the findings described in the previous chapter by connecting them with the existing literature and seeking to answer the research question.

This thesis has analyzed seven different frames following Boydston et al. (2014)'s framing analysis approach, and multiple subframes have been created for each of them in order to examine extensively the issue, and thus answer the research question. From the seven frames, the Cultural identity one is the one that occurs the most, and within this frame, the *Haenyeo* as representative of Jeju's identity and culture is the most common. Following the rest of the frames, it is possible to assert that the discourses on culture, international reputation, the effectiveness of safeguarding policies, the role of economic resources and the importance of the quality of life (including health and safety concerns) in relation to *Haenyeo* are in very broad terms, the frames that are most commonly employed.

The research question in this thesis ('How is the issue of protecting and safeguarding *Haenyeo* framed in regional media?) was approached through three sub-questions, being its first: 'What are the reasons for the protection of *Haenyeo*?'. Given that Cultural identity is the most common frame, it can be argued that the idea of *Haenyeo* as representative of the island's culture, its role as a nationalist symbol and also as part of world culture has worked as a crucial motivation for the multiple efforts towards its preservation. Long and Labadi (2010) were mentioned in the literature review when discussing cultural heritage as a source of pride, social cohesion, and collective identity,

and *Haenyeo* seem to be a prime example of this case for Jeju Island and South Korea in general. However, this is also a point of interest: *Haenyeo* is framed at the same time as unique to Jeju, but also a symbol of Korea and even of the world. Perhaps this showcases how different aspects of an intangible cultural heritage can be argued to represent one thing or another by the multiple stakeholders involved according to their interests. The branding of Jeju *Haenyeo* as a unique cultural heritage of Korea can foster national-level support for their preservation (Lee, 2016) that maybe would not be promoted if only the local uniqueness was emphasized. These findings confirm Ireland and Schofield (2015)'s claim that that heritage work is continually caught in geopolitics and cultural diplomacy that converge in convoluted ways with politics of identity and recognition.

This argument is also evident in the External relations and reputation frame, where the importance given to the international reputation of *Haenyeo* is highlighted: not only the inclusion of the community in UNESCO's Representative List is continually emphasized, but also the wish to further receive international recognition and the representation of *Haenyeo* as an example of great ICH management. In turn, it reiterates the position of Korea in the forefront of ICH protection. Curiously, articles under this frame also reference how *Haenyeo* should learn from other ICH management plans, since the current measures are not as effective as expected; this contradicts the idea of the protection of the community being deserving of becoming an international example for intangible heritage protection.

The answer to the second sub-research question ('How are *Haenyeo* to be protected?') is found in the majority of the frames analyzed. In the Policy prescription and evaluation frame, there is a great focus on the educational and cultural policies for the community in Jeju, as well on emphasizing *Haenyeo*'s role in the protection of their own heritage. Li et al., (2020) have argued that effective community participation is crucial to enhance sustainable heritage management, and further emphasizes that public participation is recommended to mediate the complex conflicts between the cultural bearers, visitors, governments, among others. The newspapers frame local community awareness as key to safeguarding efforts in line with a portion of the academic literature. Similarly, Choe (2017, p. 72) has suggested ordinances in regards to the fisheries, medical treatment, or the establishment of cultural institutions as essential in securing the surviving of the community. Although the articles mention efforts towards preventing accidents, securing healthcare, improving the state of working facilities and of fisheries

management, there seems to be little evaluation of how effective they are in protecting *Haenyeo*. However, one issue that is largely mentioned and evaluated is the problem of aging in the community. Both the policies to attract new *Haenyeo* and secure the quality of life of older *Haenyeo* are framed as not effective, which translates into a constant decline in numbers every year and threatens the longevity of the community. Additionally, articles often refer to the lack of financial aid, and the poor planning of management of the money allocated for the protection of *Haenyeo*, which has further hindered the goal of preserving the community.

A critical issue debated in the literature review is the risk of commodification and objectification of intangible cultural heritage that can threaten a culture's identity and fluidity (Sandis, 2014). Kim et al. (2018, p. 11) has argued that cultural bearers in South Korea have complained of a top-down development approach that leads to a lack of empowerment in safeguarding and promoting their cultural heritage. While the articles in this thesis do not reference the existence or not of a top-down model nor they include the input of *Haenyeo* in this subject, reporters have written on the consequences of the tourism promotion around *Haenyeo*. The possible creation of touristic 'experiences' based on *Haenyeo*'s culture for visitors to 'consume' is a fear suggested in the articles. However, it is attested that the community has been essential in fostering Jeju's economy throughout the decades, and the commercialization of the culture is framed as a natural consequence of the orientation of the province towards tourism. Although the articles condemn this and write of keeping the 'authenticity' of the community, there are no mentions of how this should be conducted.

The last sub-research question ('How can this inform our understanding of the media framing of the state of intangible cultural heritage protection in Jeju?') ties up with what has been discussed so far. The significance of *Haenyeo* to the cultural identity of Jeju and South Korea is framed as a powerful motivator for the efforts towards its protection; this in turn seems to be a way of Korea asserting itself internationally as a model of great ICH management. Nonetheless, the articles seem to argue that these efforts are not translating into successful policies: the decreasing number of divers, lack of financial means and the risk of commodification due to high tourism demand have been threatening the execution of an efficient cultural heritage management policy. In conclusion, while cultural heritage protection in Jeju seems to be closely linked to the identity of its own people and the motivation of preserving what it is considered to be

‘unique’ in the world, the main issues regarding the safeguarding of the *Haenyeo* have not been properly resolved, nor there seems to be clear answers to these problems.

In the concluding chapter, the main points of this thesis will be summarized, and the implications, significance and limitations of the findings will be presented.

6. Conclusion

This thesis has addressed the central research question of how the issue of protecting and safeguarding Jeju *Haenyeo* is portrayed in local media. Through a detailed analysis of regional newspapers articles on the subject, this study has contributed into the field of heritage studies, and most specifically on the debates concerning the particularities, implications, and significance of intangible cultural heritage management. In this chapter, a summary of the findings is followed by a reflection on the research process, from which significant conclusions can be drawn.

Through the analysis of seven different frames present in fifty-two articles, this study has aimed to answer the three sub-research questions presented in the introduction chapter. In regards to what reasons for the protection of *Haenyeo* are showcased in the data, this thesis has found that the emphasis on the significance of *Haenyeo* for the identity of Jeju is the main stimulator for its protection. However, this dedication to heritage protection has further implications for Korea, since it places the country as a lead in intangible management protection, and it is a natural follow-up from its involvement in the earliest stages of UNESCO. The second sub-research question concerns how *Haenyeo* should be protected, and the articles have emphasized the crucial involvement of the community itself as well as of the local inhabitants' role in promoting the protection of the divers. Nonetheless, the articles have taken a more critical approach of the multiple measures in place to protect *Haenyeo* and criticize the lack of successful policies in attracting new divers and ensuring the quality of life of retired and/or elderly *Haenyeo*, the shortage of financial aid the touristification that can harm the identity of the community. The last question pertains to what this issue can apprise on the media framing of the state of intangible cultural heritage protection in Jeju. This thesis has demonstrated that despite the significance of *Haenyeo* for the island, and largely to South Korea, according to local media the policies in place fall short to actually resolve its main problems, and the initiatives seem to promote the image of *Haenyeo* at home and abroad rather than actually helping the members of the community in their daily struggles.

This thesis has contributed to a multiplicity of the debates brought up in the literature review: The issue of commodification is framed as a real and possible concern; nationalism is portrayed as a motivator for the protection of *Haenyeo* and the role of public engagement and the importance of community participation represented both as crucial and interdependent in heritage management. However, this study has not

addressed, or has only briefly mentioned, other debates mentioned in the previous chapters, such as the impact of the 2003 Convention on the community and how it limited the debate in Korea and the role of community in identifying *what* should be considered intangible heritage and how it should be protected. Given that the articles were not written by *Haenyeo*, it would be interesting to research how the issue is understood by the community itself. If the timespan for the articles were to be larger, not only the influence of the inclusion in UNESCO's Representative List in the forwarding of *Haenyeo* as an international example of ICH management could be assessed, but also the evolution of heritage protection before the 2003 Convention. Finally, given the small sample considered for this thesis, it should be noted that it is not representative of the media entirety of perspectives of the topic.

In conclusion, the research presented in this thesis has aspired to advance the understanding of the media framing of the management of *Haenyeo*, an intangible cultural heritage in Jeju Island. It is hoped that these findings will contribute to the field of heritage studies and encourage further research on the topic of safeguarding and protecting *Haenyeo*.

7. References

- Aikawa-Faure, Noriko. 2016. UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Republic of Korea. *Intangible Heritage Association*, 1(1), pp. 81-94.
- Akagawa, N. and Smith, L. 2019. *Safeguarding Intangible Heritage: Practices and Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- An, M.J. 2020. Globalization of Culture and Nationalism Discourse: Focusing on the UNESCO Inscription of Jeju Women-divers(jamnyeo)'s Culture in Korea. *History and Boundaries*, 117, pp. 167-200.
- Arantes, A.A. 2007. Diversity, Heritage and Cultural Politics. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 24(7-8), pp. 290–296. 10.1177/02632764070240072506.
- Blake, J. 2014. Seven Years of Implementing UNESCO's 2003 Intangible Heritage Convention—Honeymoon Period or the 'Seven-Year Itch'?. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 21(3), pp. 291–304. 10.1017/s0940739114000113.
- Borah, P. 2011. Conceptual Issues in Framing Theory: A Systematic Examination of a Decade's Literature. *Journal of Communication*, 61, pp. 246-263. 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01539.x.
- Boydston, A. E., Card, D., Gross, J. H., Resnik, P. and Smith, N. A., 2014. Tracking the Development of Media Frames within and across Policy Issues. *Working Paper*, pp. 1-25.
- Bryman, A., 2012. *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carman, J., & Sørensen, M. L. S. 2009. Heritage studies: An outline. In M. L. S. Sørensen & J. Carman. *Heritage studies: Methods and approaches*. New York: Routledge, pp. 11–28.
- Chang, W. 2005. Online civic participation and political empowerment: Online media and public opinion formation in Korea. *Media, Culture & Society*, 27(6), pp. 925-935. 10.1177/0163443705057680.
- Choe, J.H. 2017. Application of the Related Convention, Law and Ordinance for the Preservation and Utilization of the Culture of Jeju Haenyeo (Women Divers). *Intangible Heritage Association*, 2(1), pp. 35-73.

- Chong, D., and Druckman, J. N. 2007. Framing Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, pp. 103-126
- Cornelissen, J.P and Werner, M.D., 2014. Putting Framing in Perspective: A Review of Framing and Frame Analysis across the Management and Organizational Literature. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), pp. 181-235. 10.5465/19416520.2014.875669.
- Creswell, J., 2013. *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- D'Angelo, P. and Kuypers, J. A. 2010. *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- D'Angelo, P., 2019. Framing Theory and Journalism. In T. P. Vos & F. Hanusch. *The International Encyclopedia of Journalism Studies*. New York: Wiley, pp. 1-10.
- David, C. C., Atun, J. M., Fille, E. and Monterola, C., 2011. Finding Frames: Comparing Two Methods of Frame Analysis. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 5(4), pp. 329-351. 10.1080/19312458.2011.624873.
- De Vreese, C. H and Lecheler, S., 2016. Framing Theory. In Mazzoleni, G. *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- De Vreese, C. H. 2005. News Framing: Theory and Typology. *Information Design Journal*, 13, pp. 51-62. 10.1075/idjdd.13.1.06vre.
- Dronjić, M. 2021. Haenyeo Culture from Jeju Island as an Example of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Republic of Korea Nationally and Internationally. *Etnološka istraživanja*, 26, pp. 61–74. 10.32458/ei.26.9.
- Duvelle, C. (2014). A decade of implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage: Challenges and perspectives. *Ethnologies*, 36(1-2), pp. 27–46. 10.7202/1037598ar
- Encyclopedia of Korean Folk Culture, 2023. *Haenyeo*. [online] Available at: <https://folkency.nfm.go.kr/topic/detail/9669?pageType=search&keyword=%ED%95%B4%EB%85%80> [Accessed 15th May 2023]

Giaccardi, Elisa. 2012. *Heritage and Social Media: Understanding heritage in a participatory culture*. New York: Routledge.

Gitlin, T. 1980. *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row

Ireland, T. and Schofield, J. 2015. *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Springer.

Jeju Ilbo, 2018. Jejudo olhae yesan pyeonseong-gwa jibhaeng-eun 'nagjejeom'. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 23rd December. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2128062> [Accessed 17th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2019a. Sobangbonbu, haenyeo daesang simpyesosaengsul gyoyug. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 16th April. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2135868> [Accessed 10th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2019b. Jin-ib munteog nop-eun jejuhaenyeo, myeongmaeg kkeunhgyeoseoya. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 28th October. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2149486> [Accessed 11th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2019c. Golyeong haenyeo muljil jung samang binbal daechaeg sigeub. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 7th November. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2150234> [Accessed 11th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2020a. Seogwipo haenyeo galsulog julgo golyeonghwa simgag. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 5th February. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2156384> [Accessed 17th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2020b. Jeju haenyeo 57%ga 70se isang...97se haenyeo choegolyeong. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 12th February. Available at:

<http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2156857> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2020c. Seogwiposi, haenyeo eoeobjangbi jiwon. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 14th May. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2163737> [Accessed 11th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2020d. Jejusi, haenyeo bogji jeungjin wihae iljejosa silsi. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 3rd December. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2176232> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2020e. "Sola suchul maghyeo haenyeodeul eolyeounde buseo yesan geubgam". *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 25th December. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2175728> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2021a. Jeju haenyeo myeongmaeg yuji·anjeongjeog sodeug changchulhanda. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 17th March. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2180369> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2021b. Haenyeomunhwa yuneseuko deungjaewa baljeon. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 15th September. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2185711> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2021c. Gasang-gong-ganseo haenyeomunhwa cheheom·hwangyeong boho hwaldongkkaji. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] 9th December. Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=2187957> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jeju Ilbo, 2023. *Shinmun sasogae*. *Jeju Ilbo*, [online] Available at: <http://www.jejunews.com/com/com-1.html> [Accessed 9th May 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2018. Kaenbeoseu, aeng-geul, eum-ag-eulo nog-in jeju jayeon. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 12th December. Available at: <http://www.jejupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=92632> [Accessed 10th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2019a. Jejusi, haenyeobogjjeungjin deung 21gaesa-eob 66eogtu-ib. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 10th February. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=94434> [Accessed 10th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2019b. Jeju haenyeomunhwa, hang-ildoglib-yusan jikim-ilo jaejomyeong. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 10th April. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=96701> [Accessed 10th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2019c. Jejuhaenyeomunhwa jisog bojon jeonseung kkumkkunda. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 15th April. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=96862> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2019d. Jejuhaenyeo gongdongchemunhwa segye ingwongyubeomgwa eokkae nalanhi. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 20th August. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=100749> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2019e. Olhae jejuhansupul haenyeohaggyo jeonseungja 54myeong baechul. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 2nd September. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=101067> [Accessed 10th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2019f. Jeju haenyeoui geongang-eul jikyeo deulineun boggwongigeum. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 29th October. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=102506> [Accessed 6th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2020a. Euntoesudang hyogwa-edo hyeonjig golyeonghaenyeo yeojeon. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 5th February. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=104567> [Accessed 10th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2020b. 4~6wol jejuhaenyeo anjeonsago ‘ppalganbul’. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 5th April. Available at:

<http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=105953> [Accessed 6th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2021. Jiyeog yesul-in jiwon, domin munhwahyang-yu yeogjeom. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 7th February. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=112790> [Accessed 6th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2022. Jejuhaenyeo gyeoggam, jibjung yugseong daechaeg sewola. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] 18th January. Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=118898> [Accessed 6th April 2023]

Jeju Shinmun, 2023. *Shinmun sasogae*. *Jeju Shinmun*, [online] Available at: <http://www.jeupress.co.kr/com/com-1.html> [Accessed 9th May 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2018a. [Saseol] golyeonghaenyeo sago buleuneun haenyeosudang. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 11th July. Available at <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=528357> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2018b. [Haenyeo gihoeg] san-eob·munhwa gyeong-gye hablijeog gijun·daean jesi gwajelo. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 10th December. Available at <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=555963> [Accessed 21st April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019a. Jeju nong-eomin sodeug-anjeong jangchi malyeon saeng-gyeboho gidae. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 28th February. Available <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=574343> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019b. Munhwa gongdongche-ui someol wigi geugbog wihan banghyang jesi. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 6th March. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=575492> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019c. [Chang-ganho] munhwayusan neom-eo jiyeog gongdongche baljeon simjang-eulo. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 2nd June. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=597976> [Accessed 15th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019d. Jiyeog saengtaegyewa gyoyug hwal-yonghan gachi hwal-yong·hwagsan jumog. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 6th August. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=611321> [Accessed 15th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019e. Somo anin saengsanjeog haenyeomunhwa kontencheu hwal-yong jibjunghaeya. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 17th September. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=619143> [Accessed 15th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019f. Segyein-ui gaseum sog-e jeonhaneun haenyeoui sumbisoli. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 21st September. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=619740> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019g. Jejuhaenyeomunhwa, jeobgeun.hwal-yong yeong-yeog hwagjang tonghan jisogseong hwagbo pil-yo. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 29th September. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=630703> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2019h. "Jejuhaenyeoeoeb·munhwa milaejeog jeobgeun·hwal-yong jamjae gachi kkeul-eonaeya". *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 4th November. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=626869> [Accessed 15th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020a. Jejudo, haenyeo samangsago jelohwa kkumkkunda. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 12th January. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=636863> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020b. Jejuhaenyeo hyeonjae 3820myeong ijung golyeongja 58%. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 12th February. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=641840> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020c. Olhae eochongye pyeong-ga haenyeo anjeonsago yebang ganghwa. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 1st March. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=644932> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020d. Yeonsogseong dambohan munhwa kontencheulo saengmyeonglyeog-eul. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 23rd March. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=648852> [Accessed 21st April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020e. Jisogganeunghan jejuhaenyeo·haenyeomunhwa gongdongche injeongbuteo. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 8th June. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=660036> [Accessed 15th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020f. Poseuteukolona jejuhaenyeomunhwa 'saengjonlyeog' keun uimi. " *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 25th November. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=707141> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020g. "Yugseong bohohaeya hal haenyeo holdae". *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 25th November. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=707093> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020h. Dayangseong·yeongyeolseong...jiyeog yusan-ui sae ganeungseong-eul yeolda. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 21st December. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=708679> [Accessed 15th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2020i. 2020 Jejuhaenyeodaesang gwideog1lieochongye jamsuhoe. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 30th December. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=709319> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021a. Gugga chawon haenyeo jiwon bang-an mosaeg. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 17th March. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=713611> [Accessed 13th April 2024]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021b. [Jeminpoleom] geubgamhaneun haenyeo... saeng-eob bojang-i dabida. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 28th March. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=714204> [Accessed 13th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021c. Saeng-eob-eul neom-eo 'sal-aissneun' gongdongche yeong-yeog guchug. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 1st September. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=723584> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021d. Sago banbog anjeonchegamdo hyangsang jeohae. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 27th September. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=724843> [Accessed 12th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021e. [Uijeongkalleom]jeju haenyeo jiwi mich salm-ui jil hyangsang. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 16th November. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=727340> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021f. "Jejuhaenyeomunhwa, yuneseuko moniteoling yeongu modello". *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 16th December. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=728944> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

Jemin Ilbo, 2021g. Jejuhaenyeodaesang-e daepodong-eochongye imchunhui haenyeo seonjeong. ". *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 30th December. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=729735> [Accessed 14th April 2023]

- Jemin Ilbo, 2022a. [Sinnyeong gihoeg] jeju haenyeo munhwa, kolona ihu 'hoebog' jangchi jaepyeong-ga. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 2nd January. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=729807> [Accessed 13th April 2023]
- Jemin Ilbo, 2022b. Oemyeonbadneun jejuhaenyeo gongdongche munhwa sangjing 'bulteok'. *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 24th March. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=733984> [Accessed 13th April 2023]
- Jemin Ilbo, 2022c. "Kkaekkeushan badang mandeulgi, jejuhaenyeowa hamkkehaeyo". *Jemin Ilbo*, [online] 16th June. Available at: <http://www.jemin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=738913> [Accessed 12th April 2023]
- Jin G. H. 2019. Jeju Haenyeo (women divers) in Newspapers during the Japanese Colonial Period. *Journal of Jeju Studies*,52, pp. 231-284.
- Johnston, H. and Noakes, J.A., 2005. *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Jung, M.E and Lee, W.K. 2017. A Study on the Contents of Marine Tourism according to the Entry of UNESCO Humanity Intangible Cultural Heritage of Jeju Haenyeo Culture. *Korean Association of Island*, 29(1), pp. 1-20.
- Jwa, Y. 2019. *A Study of the Contextual Design of Cultural Tourism Product : Focused on Culture of Jeju Haenyeo*. MA. Ewha Woman's University. Available at: <https://dspace.ewha.ac.kr/handle/2015.oak/251081> [Accessed 12th February 2023]
- Kalay, Y.E., Kvan, T. And Affleck, J. 2008. *New Heritage: New media and cultural heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Kim, S., Im, D., Lee, J. and Choi, H. (2019). Utility of Digital Technologies for the Sustainability of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) in Korea. *Sustainability*, 11(21), pp. 1-19. 10.3390/su11216117.
- Kim, S., Whitford, M. and Arcodia, C. 2019. Development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource: the intangible cultural heritage practitioners' perspectives. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 14(5-6), pp. 1-14. 10.1080/1743873x.2018.1561703.

- Kim, S.M. and Hwang, K.S. 2012. Public welfare services and the needs of the Haenyeo and a comparative analysis,” *Journal of the Korea Academia-Industrial cooperation Society*, 13(10), pp. 4557-4563. 10.5762/kais.2012.13.10.4557.
- Kim, Y.G. 2016. Sustainable Development and Korea’s Intangible Cultural Heritage Policy. *Korean Journal of Cultural Heritage Studies*, 49(3), pp. 256-269.
- Kurin, R. 2004. Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: a critical appraisal. *Museum International*, 56(1-2), pp. 66–77. 10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00459.x.
- Lee, S., and Myong, S. O. 2018. Portraits of Jeju Haenyeo as Models of Empowerment in the Korean Newspaper Maeilshinbo during Japanese Occupation. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 20(2), 14. 10.7771/1481-4374.3284.
- Lee, S.H. 2016. *A study on revitalization strategies of cultural contents through storytelling focused on life history of Jeju Haenyeo*. MA. Jeju National University. Available at: <https://oak.jejunu.ac.kr/handle/2020.oak/22100> [Accessed 12th February 2023]
- Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Pereira Roders, A. and van Wesemael, P. 2020. Community participation in cultural heritage management: A systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices. *Cities*, 96. 10.1016/j.cities.2019.102476.
- Liang, X., Lu, Y. and Martin, J. 2021. A Review of the Role of Social Media for the Cultural Heritage Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13, 1055. 10.3390/su13031055.
- Logan W., Craith, M. N. and Kockel, Ul. 2016. *A Companion to Heritage Studies*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell
- Long, C. and Labadi, S. 2010. Introduction. In Labadi, S. and Long, C. *Heritage and Globalisation*. New York: Routledge.
- Matthes, J. and Kohring, M., 2008. The Content Analysis of Media Frames: Toward Improving Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Communication*, 58, pp. 258-279. 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00384.x.
- Ortiz, L. S and de Madariaga, J, C. 2021. The UNESCO convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage: a critical analysis. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 28(3), pp. 327-341. 10.1080/10286632.2021.1941914.

Pan, Z. and Kosicki, G.M., 1993. Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1), pp. 55-75. 10.1080/10584609.1993.9962963.

Park, J. 2019. The Legal Protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Republic of Korea. In Petrillo, P. L. *The Legal Protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Springer Nature: Cham, pp. 69-83.

Saeji, C. T. 2019. Replacing faith in spirits with faith in heritage: A story of the management of the Gangneung Danoje Festival. In Akagawa, N. and Smith, L. *Safeguarding Intangible Heritage: Practices and Politics*. New York: Routledge, pp. 155-173.

Sandis, C. ed., 2014. *Cultural Heritage Ethics: Between Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.

Scovazzi, Tullio. 2019. The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Generark Remarks. In Petrillo, P. L. *The Legal Protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Springer Nature: Cham, pp. 3-16.

Snow, A., and Bedford, R., 1998. Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1, pp. 197-218.

Stefano, M. L., Davis, P. and Corsane, G. 2012. Touching the Intangible: An Introduction. In Stefano, M. L., Davis, P., and Corsane, G. *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Woodbrige: Boydell & Brewer, pp. 1-6.

Tewksbury, D and A. Scheufele, 2020. News Framing Theory and Research. In Oliver, M. B., Raney, A. A. and Bryant, J. *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. New York: Routledge, pp. 51-68

UNESCO, 2023a. *Browse the Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of good safeguarding practices*. [online] Available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists> [Accessed 10th March 2023]

UNESCO, 2023b. *Culture of Jeju Haenyeo (women divers)*. [online] Available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/culture-of-jeju-haenyeo-women-divers-01068> [Accessed 14th May 2023]

UNESCO, 2023c. *Jeju Chilmeoridang Yeongdeunggut*. [online] Available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/jeju-chilmeoridang-yeongdeunggut-00187> [Accessed 9th May 2023]

UNESCO., 2003. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. In: UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), *UNESCO General Conference*. Paris, France, 17th October 2003. France: United Nations.

Van Gorp, B. and Vercruyssen, T. 2012. Frames and counter-frames giving meaning to dementia: A framing analysis of media content. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74, pp, 1274-1281. 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.045.

Yoo, J. and Jung, Y.K. 2017. A Study on the sustainability of Jeju Haenyeo, an UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Spring Conference*, 24(1), pp. 1228-1231.

You, W.H., Seo, S. and Choi B. K. 2018. A Study of Jeju Haenyeo's (Women Diver) Awareness on Self, Community and UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (ICH) Designation. *Journal of the Korean Institute of Traditional Landscape Architecture*, 36(1), pp. 89–96. 10.14700/kitla.2018.36.1.089.