

Heritage in a Globalised World: Pilot Study for Perception by Analysis of Buildings' Potential

Huriye Armağan Doğan, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

Abstract – Heritage connects the past and present, but at the same time it connects people with each other and with the place itself. The perception of heritage regarding the built heritage can be a problematic issue in the globalised world, since it might not be easy to relate to an artefact that is not necessarily one's own, or an environment, which does not carry the characteristics that one is used to. This research aims to understand the constraints of the perception of built heritage by using the Modern Movement artefacts and tries to analyse the perception of different societies by a pilot survey. The pilot survey suggests that prior knowledge and public awareness has a colossal impact on the perception or evaluation of the built heritage.

Keywords – experiment, globalisation, heritage, Modern Movement, perception.

INTRODUCTION

According to UNESCO and World Heritage Convention, the label of World Heritage is designated for places, which contain outstanding universal value to humanity, and they need to be protected for future generations to both appreciate and enjoy. Carrying this label for a heritage building is crucial, since it gives the object recognition and appreciation around the globe.

When a subject of preservation and conservation of the built heritage is discussed, most of the time, the meaning of it for the local user is arguably disregarded, and everyday usage of the site is unrecorded. According to Evans visitors to many heritage sites are predominantly domestic, which means that most of the time the heritage sites are used more by the locals in their everyday lives rather than touristic purposes [1]. The perception of heritage and how people are evaluating the heritage of other societies is a different aspect of cultural heritage, especially regarding the built heritage when it involves the existing buildings in an existing environment, if it is analysed for multi-cultural societies. When the built heritage is somebody else's and if you are only visiting those places for touristic reasons, it might feel a lot different, since you do not have the responsibility to protect that heritage rather than just watch it on holiday. However, in the multi-cultural societies of the contemporary world, the situation is a bit different. People need to live in an environment with a heritage, which is not necessarily theirs, but they still need to respect and also protect these artefacts.

The Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which was signed on 14th of May 1954 in Hague by the member countries of the United Nations can be regarded as the first treaty that focuses on the protection of cultural property. At the beginning of the convention, it is stated that “*damage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of all mankind, since each people makes its contribution to the culture of the world*” [2]. This

statement demonstrates another significant characteristic of the convention, which is the distinction it makes between the heritage owned by different nations. As Harrison asserts, the Hague Convention recognised the connection between cultural heritage, national identity, and the use of heritage in nation-building in an explicit manner [3]. Therefore, the division regarding the heritage and whom it is owned by is a continuing discussion for more than the last half a century, and it puts heritage in a mysterious era.

This paper aims to answer the questions, such as if it is possible for people to perceive other peoples' or cultures' built heritage as their own, and how the perception of built heritage changes depending on different societies, furthermore, if memories or cultural identity affect the judgment. However, the conducted research has its limitations due to being performed by an online questionnaire and by the usage of photographs of the buildings, rather than giving the possibility for the participants to evaluate the artefacts in their environment. Hence, this survey is the start of a broader research, and it aims to understand the tendencies and the primary responses of the participants for performing a more detailed research in the existing environment. Therefore, the survey is merely a pilot study for the starting point of the comprehensive research, which performs an analysis to understand the role of cultural memory in the formation of architectural languages and attempts to measure perception of people in their assessment of cultural heritage.

The first part of the paper performs a literature review for understanding the connection between memory, place, and identity. The second part of the paper analyses the data achieved by a survey, which was conducted in 2019 for establishing a new model for heritage perception, which is part of broader research [4]. However, in this paper, the data conducted for broader research is analysed in a different manner. The results of the survey are analysed regarding the perception of different societies towards heritage, which is located in places where they live, and heritage with the same architectural style but located in another country. In that regard, the heritage of Modern Movement was used in the data collection of this paper, since it has the characteristics of an international style.

I. MEMORY AND PLACE

In order to remember events, facts or processes, people need to commit them to their memory with different inputs. The process of creating a memory involves various steps, such as encoding, storing, retaining and subsequently recalling information. A memory begins in short-term storage, and once this process is finished, it goes into long-term memory. As Brady et al. state, when things go into long-term memory, the amount of perceptual

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: huriye.dogan@ktu.lt

detail that is stored decreases. When people look at the image, first, they store it in their short-term memory, and they will be able to remember it in detail only for a while, and days later, they might only be able to report the gist of what they had seen [5]. For people to feel their connection with the past events or objects and remember them more strongly, they need to remember with other senses as well, such as smell, taste or physical contact they had with the object that they could remember actively and establish a mental code for the memory. In that regard, architecture can be remarkably effective for developing mental codes for people, since it constitutes the physical environment, which can as well contain stimuli for various senses.

According to Sternberg, the mental codes are used for organising incoming information and inputs for storing memories, and both visual and verbal codes can be used when recalling information [6]. However, images tend to play a more effective role for people in the process of remembering. As it was stated in Paivio's theory of dual coding, visual and verbal perception act as two distinct systems, and visual stimuli can be recalled and remembered easier than verbal codes. The theory is based on the picture superiority effect, and Paivio claims that visual information has advantages over words while coding and storing [7]. As he explains, visual stimuli tend to be encoded dually, since it is easier to generate a verbal code for an image and not as easy or likely to create image labels for a verbal code. He performed various experiments for understanding the way people store their memories and the way associative recognition memory works [8]. The results of his experiments suggested that people reacted faster to remember images in comparison to the words. Moreover, people remembered much better if they had associated the words with an image, and they succeeded to provide more information about the features they needed to remember. As Hockley states, the memorial representation of pictures is in some ways more elaborate, distinctive or meaningful than the representation of words [9]. Therefore, it might be possible to state that images give more analogical information to people, rather than symbolic ones that they could be recalled and remembered easier.

Architecture and old buildings can be used as images but at the same time as physical structures that trigger other senses. As Pallasmaa states, architectural work is not merely experienced as a set of isolated visual images, but in its fully embodied physical and spiritual presence [10]. In that regard, architecture can have a significant impact on remembering. With the images people create and the sensations that they obtain through architecture, people can construct a relationship between space and time. Moreover, the continued existence of space, especially in the environments that contain cultural heritage, can allow recreation and reinterpretation of memories over time, which establishes a substantial attachment.

However, the connections between the memories and the places are not just due to heritage objects that the environment contains, or monuments, which are reflecting the memories, but it is more of a core level. According to Eco, remembering includes different stages. The first stage is building the memories, and the second stage is travelling again through that space [11]. When

the memory is analysed, it is possible to state that it is not that different from a city or a built environment, since it undergoes the same process by constructing first and then travelling around it. Furthermore, the built environment itself strongly reflects the memories of people who used to live in that area. The architecture of cities is the sum of cultural memories that people have gone through, and they are the results of the past and the past experiences of the people. Therefore, it is not just the monuments, which are the manifestations of memories, but even the houses of the people that carry the continuity of memories. As Halbwachs states, having a daily contact with historical districts and houses establishes a different universe for people, which contains all the different memories tied to these images [12]. Places help people to remember, and at the same time, to feel connected. Therefore, there is a particular connection between memory and place; furthermore, memories help people to remember and identify. Hence, it is not just purely remembering the place, but it is the combination of the place and the memories, which make the space meaningful. In that regard, the perception of a place has a close connection with the place in the present time. However, most of the time, the perception of the place can be related to the sum of memory and images, which generate the interpretation and the representation of the past. Thus, people can recollect events, dates and even names by associating them with a place, and both place and architecture have an essential influence on memory and remembering, but at the same time, they can help to establish new memories. Therefore, architecture is not the narrator of the past by itself, but it has the ability to stimulate one's memory and bind the memories.

The organisation and the form of a house are influenced by the culture it was designed for, and the cultural values and habits could be expressed and carried by the architecture. As Pinotti states, the transmission of cultural values, in general, can be a very abstract issue if one does not refer to specific objects, which act as carriers or vehicles or supports of the transmission itself [13]. In this regard, architecture, by means of vernacular or monumental and by means of cultural heritage, can play the role of the carrier. The patterns that the architecture carries in itself can work as a reflection of cultural values, traditions, and memories of the environment. Environment and the cities carry their own memories and walking through cities helps people to remember. Furthermore, it is not just the cities: rural settings have this effect on people, which results in people establishing place attachment. The landmarks in the environment create bonds with people, and those bonds allow people to develop more interest and, at the same time, more emotional connection with it. As Hristova points out, a city remembers through its buildings; thus, the preservation of the old urban fabric is analogous to the preservation of memories in the human mind [14]. Therefore, a city is a collective memory of its people, and it is a way of remembering, which is associated with objects and places. Associations that people obtain through architecture assist in establishing potential stimuli for people to remember on a daily basis, which is one of the crucial impacts of architecture on people.

However, a memory that is provided by architecture does not merely work in the present, but it has a relationship with the past as well. Buildings and towns express people's values and aspirations. Furthermore, they provide one of the primary means by which people visualise themselves and their society in history. History is essential in all aspects of life because without remembering the past, societies cannot advance. All original thoughts are at some level dependent upon something that has happened in the past or before them. Therefore, past decisions and events inherently influence the present condition of any era and the area. According to Marot, Freud suggests that a city can be analysed like an organism whose previous states of existence are accessible to different degrees by various factors [15]. The sense of memory that the city establishes in itself does not require the construction of a museum or a memorial. Every city and building site can be thought of or identified as a palimpsest, which carries the traces of the past. When the historic cities around the world are analysed, it is frequently easy to notice the different layers that the cities contain. Therefore, it might not be an incorrect approach to view all the cities and buildings as palimpsests as well. Buildings can be read as a part of the cultural fabric of a community, and they can carry traces of past stories. Architecture can transform ideas, needs and desires into spaces, and it can capture memories from the present or the past in tangible and buildable forms. Therefore, memory creates a unique relationship with space by holding on to the essence of it. As a result, architecture represents the history, tradition and culture of a specific community and memory.

However, it is not merely the memories that architecture carries. Architecture carries identity as well. According to Norberg-Schulz, the relation of people to a city or a place is not only related to the ability of them to orientate as Lynch suggests, but it is the sum of identification and orientation together [16], [17]. As he states, people's identity presumes the identity of the place, which helps people to distinguish each place from any other. Therefore, architecture itself carries identity, and at the same time it allows people to find the reflection of their own identities as well. However, identity is not a straightforward subject, and it involves various historical layers either related to time or place. Furthermore, the connection between identity and architecture is an essential issue, which has been discussed by scholars and architects for many years.

II. PLACE AND IDENTITY

According to Giddings, "*society is a collection of individuals united by certain relations or modes of behaviour, which mark them off from others who do not enter these relations and who differ from them in behaviour*" [18]. As a consequence of all the interaction and relations that people have, they shape their identities in society. However, Giddings states that society involves both likeness and difference, which are logical opposites, but at the same time, the comprehension of the relationship between them is necessary. As a dominant share in the constitution of society, having the same standards, same interests in everything, accepting the same customs, representing the same opinions without

questioning and without variety, might cause societies and civilisations not to become advanced. Moreover, culture might remain primitive. Thus, society needs a variation in itself for its existence and continuance, which would help the process of evolution.

Due to the current developments and wars, which caused economic and political instability, the improvements in communication and transportation, a remarkable number of people left their countries and moved to other places to build their futures, which established societies with ample differences. The figures of the United Nations Population Fund of 2015 demonstrate that 244 million people, or 3.3 per cent of the world's population, inhabited a country other than the one of their origin and were separated from their social opportunities [19]. Therefore, nowadays, communities are not predominantly created by people who are sharing the same background and the same memories, but more by people who are sharing the same geography with a shared interest. Hence, today's communities create a global identity rather than a national one. The growth of globalisation all around the world with the new ways of communication, education and social media changed the national boundaries and thus brought people a cosmopolitan character, which evokes internationalism, and as a result, people establish multiple identities, which affect their cultural identities as well.

Cultural identity is a sense of belonging to a specific group based on various cultural categories, and it is constructed as well as maintained through the process of sharing collective knowledge. As Hall states, cultural identities derive from somewhere, and they have histories; however, like everything historical, they change and transform, and they are subject to the continuous play of history [20]. This characteristic of the process of change was accelerated by the globalisation of the world. As Tomlinson points out in his research about globalisation and cultural identity, there are views about globalisation, which argue that it is a seamless extension of, indeed, a euphemism for, western cultural imperialism, and it is destroying cultural identity [21]. However, other scholars disagree, such as Adler, who states that globalisation is a positive concept, and it is creating a new form of human who is multi-cultural [22]. The changes and developments around the world have an impact on cultural identity, and these changes shape a different form of society.

The development of an identity, which is related to culture is an ongoing process in its own nature, and it is possible to state that both identity and culture do not eternally stay the way they are, and they keep evolving. Therefore, they can assist society in becoming more affluent. According to Sassen, cities are the new nation-states, due to containing their own societies and with their impact on the economy and shaping global thinking [23]. Therefore, if they can be called small nations, it might be easier for people who are living in these places to connect with each other even though they are coming from different backgrounds and different cultures. However, it is still an unanswered question if different societies perceive heritage in the same way. In that regard, a survey conducted to analyse buildings' potential to be perceived as heritage.



Fig. 1. Buildings that were demonstrated through the online survey [Pictures: Author of the Article].

III. DESIGN OF THE SURVEY

The aim of the survey was to understand how people perceive the built heritage, which is listed and acknowledged by the institutions, with the same architectural style and expression in different countries. In that regard, Modern Movement buildings were selected, since it is an international style, and it is not specially designed for a nation or a specific location, therefore being the heritage of humankind. The Modern Movement buildings, which were demonstrated in this survey, are listed objects that were built between 1915 and 1940. In the survey, instead of a demonstration of public buildings, more of the private buildings were selected due to the probability of expression of more regional characteristics. However, as a sample from the period, two public buildings are also presented. The data for this survey was acquired through an online tool with a qualitative approach and non-probability sampling method. In total, 274 participants that were willing to participate were randomly selected by the convenience sampling technique and took part in the experiment. Participants were heterogeneous regarding age, which ranged between 15–70 and heterogeneous regarding their gender. However, the criterion of age and gender was found irrelevant to the experiment. Seventy-seven participants out of 274 were living in Lithuania. One hundred seventy-five participants were inhabitants of Turkey, and twenty-two participants were from different countries, which were selected as a test group. The goal of the survey was not to achieve objectivity in the selection of samples or attempt to make generalisations (i.e., statistical inferences) of the sample that was studied by the broader population of interest. In that regard, 24 buildings

located in Lithuania, Turkey and Germany were demonstrated to the participants, which represent Modern Movement style of architecture and which are officially designated as cultural heritage by the institutions (Fig. 1). The participants were required to answer if the buildings on photographs were cultural heritage or not. Additional questions were asked, such as age, gender and where they are from, to collect basic demographic information on participants. Analysis of buildings' potential to be perceived as heritage is used for comprehending how to engage society in safeguarding processes of architectural legacy, but not to be used as a tool for identification of the value of architecture.

IV. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of the survey were evaluated by two different methods. The first method was comparing the percentages of YES (which suggests that the building is perceived as cultural heritage) and NO (which suggests that the building is not perceived as cultural heritage) answers of the participants from Lithuania, Turkey, and the test group (Table I). The second method was dividing the results of the test group by percentage into two groups: score 1 suggests that the building was evaluated as heritage by more than 50 per cent of the participants; and score 0 suggests that the building was evaluated as heritage by less than 50 per cent of the participants (Table II).

According to the survey, all demonstrated buildings located in Kaunas by participants from Lithuania were identified more likely as structures of cultural heritage when compared with

TABLE I
RESULTS OF ONLINE SURVEY [AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE]

ID	LOCATION	TYPE	BUILT	RESULTS OF LITHUANIANS	RESULTS OF TURKISH	RESULTS OF TEST GROUP	ID	LOCATION	TYPE	BUILT	RESULTS OF LITHUANIANS	RESULTS OF TURKISH	RESULTS OF TEST GROUP
1	Bristol Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	YES 21% NO 79%	YES 42% NO 58%	YES 36% NO 64%	13	Vytauto Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PUBLIC	1932	YES 90% NO 10%	YES 49% NO 51%	YES 59% NO 41%
2	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1934	YES 95% NO 5%	YES 71% NO 29%	YES 55% NO 45%	14	Anafartalar Str. Ankara, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1932	YES 40% NO 60%	YES 14% NO 86%	YES 32% NO 68%
3	Erich-Weinert Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	YES 5% NO 95%	YES 17% NO 83%	YES 18% NO 82%	15	Konya Str. Ankara, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1938	YES 24% NO 76%	YES 11% NO 89%	YES 23% NO 77%
4	Alt-Moabit Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1936	YES 32% NO 68%	YES 13% NO 87%	YES 32% NO 68%	16	Emmentaler Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1931	YES 13% NO 87%	YES 22% NO 88%	YES 18% NO 82%
5	Anafartalar Str. Ankara, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1937	YES 13% NO 87%	YES 13% NO 87%	YES 23% NO 77%	17	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1933	YES 74% NO 26%	YES 29% NO 71%	YES 45% NO 55%
6	Donelacio Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PUBLIC	1939	YES 91% NO 9%	YES 66% NO 34%	YES 86% NO 14%	18	Kestucio Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1930	YES 67% NO 33%	YES 60% NO 40%	YES 64% NO 36%
7	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1938	YES 62% NO 38%	YES 32% NO 68%	YES 27% NO 73%	19	Fritz-Reuter Ave. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	YES 24% NO 76%	YES 29% NO 71%	YES 23% NO 77%
8	Stavenhagener Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	YES 42% NO 58%	YES 29% NO 71%	YES 27% NO 73%	20	Kestucio Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1937	YES 26% NO 74%	YES 12% NO 88%	YES 14% NO 86%
9	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1937	YES 58% NO 42%	YES 25% NO 75%	YES 59% NO 41%	21	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1930	YES 27% NO 73%	YES 12% NO 88%	YES 18% NO 82%
10	A.Falkenberg Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1916	YES 58% NO 42%	YES 25% NO 75%	YES 59% NO 41%	22	Lowise-Reute Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	YES 19% NO 81%	YES 35% NO 65%	YES 36% NO 64%
11	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1930	YES 91% NO 9%	YES 80% NO 20%	YES 82% NO 18%	23	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1938	YES 65% NO 35%	YES 43% NO 57%	YES 59% NO 41%
12	Inonu Str. Istanbul, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1936	YES 58% NO 42%	YES 30% NO 70%	YES 49% NO 51%	24	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1932	YES 54% NO 46%	YES 32% NO 68%	YES 41% NO 59%

TABLE II
RESULTS OF ONLINE SURVEY REGARDING THE SCORES [AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE]

ID	LOCATION	TYPE	BUILT	RESULTS OF LITHUANIANS	RESULTS OF TURKISH	RESULTS OF TEST GROUP	ID	LOCATION	TYPE	BUILT	RESULTS OF LITHUANIANS	RESULTS OF TURKISH	RESULTS OF TEST GROUP
1	Bristol Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	0	0	0	13	Vytauto Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PUBLIC	1932	1	0	1
2	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1934	1	1	1	14	Anafartalar Str. Ankara, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1932	0	0	0
3	Erich-Weinert Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	0	0	0	15	Konya Str. Ankara, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1938	0	0	0
4	Alt-Moabit Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1936	0	0	0	16	Emmentaler Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1931	0	0	0
5	Anafartalar Str. Ankara, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1937	0	0	0	17	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1933	1	0	1
6	Donelacio Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PUBLIC	1939	1	1	1	18	Kestucio Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1930	1	1	1
7	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1938	1	0	0	19	Fritz-Reuter Ave. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	0	0	0
8	Stavenhagener Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	0	0	0	20	Kestucio Str. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1937	0	0	0
9	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1937	1	0	1	21	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1930	0	0	0
10	A.Falkenberg Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1916	1	0	1	22	Lowise-Reute Str. Berlin, GERMANY	PRIVATE	1930	0	0	0
11	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1930	1	1	1	23	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1938	1	0	1
12	Inonu Str. Istanbul, TURKEY	PRIVATE	1936	1	0	0	24	Laisves Ave. Kaunas, LITHUANIA	PRIVATE	1932	1	0	0

the Turkish participants and participants from other countries (buildings No. 2, 6, 7, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24). The structures which are commonly displayed in the exhibitions or conferences due to the European Capital of Culture label of the city and UNESCO file preparations appeared to be identified as heritage by more than 90 per cent of the Lithuanian participants. However, the structures, which have not commonly been promoted, were not identified as cultural heritage by the Lithuanian participants.

On the other hand, participants from Turkey did not have higher perception of heritage when compared to other participants of the building located in Turkey. Furthermore, the results suggest that Turkish participants indeed did not identify any of the buildings with the Modern Movement characteristics that are located in Turkey as cultural heritage. Therefore, it is possible to state that the participants of the survey from Turkey had lower perception of Modern Movement heritage in general.

When the results of the test group of participants from different countries are analysed, it reveals that only 33 per cent of the structures were evaluated as heritage and got score 1. In comparison, it is 50 percent by Lithuanian participants and 16 percent by Turkish participants. Therefore, most of the time, the survey participants from Lithuania identified the Modern Movement structures as cultural heritage more accurately than the Turkish participants or participants from other nationalities belonging to the test group.

One of the findings of the survey is that even the global heritage of the Modern Movement, which is supposed to be the heritage of all, is appreciated if the participants have some sort of information about the structure. Evaluations of the built environment or architectural objects by people can be affected by the impact of the motor activity that is triggered by objects, or it can also be related to the specific qualities of the observers' experiences. Even though the perception of an environment or an object is closely connected with the observer, and it is a subjective matter, when the artefacts are seen on a daily basis, it influences the perception. Therefore, it is possible to state that public awareness has a significant impact on people's evaluation of heritage. However, as the survey demonstrates, the knowledge of the physical existence and experiencing the artefact on daily-basis might not always be enough to perceive it as heritage, as it was seen both in the examples of Lithuanian and Turkish participants. The connection with a place or a building is not only the result of the characteristics of them but also the meaning people are attaching to them. Therefore, to raise awareness of people and to pass the relevant information to help them to understand the heritage values is critical, and it can be crucial in the perception and appreciation of heritage in the globalised world.

REFERENCES

1. **Evans, G.** Whose heritage is it anyway? Reconciling the 'National' and the Universal in Quebec City. *British Journal and Canadian Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2003, pp. 333–347. <https://doi.org/10.3828/bjcs.16.2.9>
2. The Hague Convention: Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict [online]. *UNESCO Digital Library* [cited 20.08.2019]. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000138645>
3. **Harrison, R.** *Heritage and Globalisation, The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* [E. Waterton, S. Watson, eds.]. Palgrave and Macmillan Publishing, 2015. 297 p.
4. **Doğan, H.A.** Assessment of the Perception of Cultural Heritage as an Adaptive Re-Use and Sustainable Development Strategy: Case Study of Kaunas, Lithuania. *Journal of Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 9, Issue 3. 2019. pp. 430–443.
5. **Brady, T., Konkle, T., Alvarez, G., Oliva, A.** Visual long-term memory has a massive storage capacity for object details. *Proceedings of The National Academy of Sciences Journal*, Vol. 105, No. 38, 2008, pp. 14325–14329. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0803390105>
6. **Sternberg, R.J., Sternberg, K.** *Cognitive Psychology*. London: Wadsworth Publishing, 2003. 316 p.

7. **Defeyer, M. A., Russo, R., McPartlin, P.** The picture superiority effect in recognition memory: A developmental study using the response signal procedure. *Journal of Cognitive Development*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 2009, pp. 265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2009.05.002>
8. **Paivio, A.** Chapter 11 - The Relationship Between Verbal And Perceptual Codes. *Perceptual Coding* [Edward C. Carterette, Morton P. Friedman eds.]. 1978, pp. 375–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-161908-4.50017-6>.
9. **Hockley, W.** The picture superiority effect in associative recognition. *Journal of Memory and Cognition*, Vol. 36, No. 7, 2008, pp. 1351–1359. <https://doi.org/10.3758/MC.36.7.1351>
10. **Pallasmaa, J.** *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Publishers, 2005. 44 p.
11. **Eco, U.** Architecture and Memory. *Via*, No. 8, 1986, pp. 88–94.
12. **Halbwachs, M.** *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. 141 p.
13. **Pinotti, A.** *Memory and Image*. Colombia: The Italian Academy of Advanced Studies Press, October, 2003. pp. 1–8.
14. **Hristova, Z.** *The Collective Memory of Space: The Architecture of Remembering and Forgetting*. Toronto: Ryerson University Press, Theses and dissertations. Paper 1635, 2010.
15. **Marot, S.** *Sub-urbanism and the Art of Memory*. London: Architectural Association Press, 2003. 88 p.
16. **Norberg-Schultz, C.** *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. London: Academy Editions, 1980. 213 p.
17. **Lynch, K.** *The Image of the City*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1960. 208 p.
18. **Giddings, F.** *The Principles of Sociological Theory*. Guildford: Genesis Publishing, 2004. 504 p.
19. Immigration. [online]. *United Nations Population Fund* [cited 10.07.2019]. <http://www.unfpa.org/migration>
20. **Hall, S.** *Cultural Identity and Diaspora: Identity, Community, Culture, and Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart Publishing, 1990. 225 p.
21. **Tomlinson, J.** *Globalisation and Cultural Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 269 p.
22. **Adler, P.** *Beyond Cultural Identity: Reflections on Multiculturalism, Intercultural Communication*. London: Wadsworth Publishing, 2002. 362 p.
23. **Sassen, S.** *Global Networks-Linked Cities*. London: Routledge Press, 2002. 376 p.



Huriye Armağan Doğan (Turkey, 1983). Bachelor of Architecture, 2008, Master of Restoration and Conservation of Cultural Heritage, 2011, Doctor of Humanities, 2020 (Kaunas University of Technology). She is a junior scientific researcher with the Institute of Architecture and Construction of Kaunas University of Technology. Her current and previous research interests are adaptive re-use, preservation of cultural heritage, modern movement, early 20th century architecture, cultural memory.

CONTACT DATA

Huriye Armağan DOĞAN

Institute of Architecture and Construction, Kaunas University of Technology.
Address: Institute of Architecture and Construction, Kaunas University of Technology, 60 Tunelio St., Kaunas, Lithuania.
E-mail: huriye.dogan@ktu.lt
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3413-0199>