

**EUROPEAN  
EXPERT  
NETWORK  
ON CULTURE  
(EENC)**

***The Social and Economic Value of  
Cultural Heritage: literature review***

by Cornelia Dümcke and Mikhail Gnedovsky

EENC Paper, July 2013

This document has been prepared by Cornelia Dümcke and Mikhail Gnedovsky on behalf of the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC). Support has been provided by Jordi Baltà, Leonid Yakov Abadzhev and Marina Castellà (Interarts).

The EENC was set up in 2010 at the initiative of Directorate-General for Education and Culture of the European Commission (DG EAC), with the aim of contributing to the improvement of policy development in Europe. It provides advice and support to DG EAC in the analysis of cultural policies and their implications at national, regional and European levels. The EENC involves 17 independent experts and is coordinated by Interarts and Culture Action Europe. For additional information see [www.eenc.eu](http://www.eenc.eu).

### About the authors

**Dr. Cornelia Dümcke** is a cultural economist and works as a project developer and arts consultant. She is the founder of Culture Concepts, an independent institute based in Berlin, providing research and consultancy services for clients in both the cultural and the development sector. Her thematic specialisation focuses particularly on issues of culture and development, cultural economy, cultural tourism, as well as on the museum, theatre and festival market. In the museum and cultural heritage sector she has conducted several applied research studies and has developed museum concepts. In 2011, she was nominated to the pool of experts in the field of cultural policies, set up by UNESCO Paris in the context of the implementation of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Since 2011, she is a member of the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC). See [www.cultureconcepts.de](http://www.cultureconcepts.de).

**Dr Mikhail Gnedovsky** is Director of Cultural Policy Institute, an independent agency based in Moscow, Russia, which specialises in cultural strategies development and cultural policy research. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the European Museum Forum (EMF), a UK-based organisation that has been presenting, since 1977, the European Museum of the Year Award (EMYA). He chaired the EMF Board in 2010–2012, and has been a member of the EMYA Jury since 2002. He is a member of the Board of ICOM Russia and of the Jury of the Cultural Policy Research Award (CPRA). Over the years, he has worked as an expert in several programmes of the Council of Europe. Since 2011, he is a member of the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC).

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1. Methodology	5
1.2. Scope	6
<b>2. Literature review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. Main findings and conclusions</b>	<b>135</b>
3.1. General perspectives	135
3.2. Heritage-based strategies and benefits for stakeholders	136
3.3. The economic value of cultural heritage	138
3.4. The social value of cultural heritage	139
3.5. The role of heritage in the context of smart, inclusive and sustainable growth	141
3.6. The need for further research and documentation	142
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>144</b>

## **1. Introduction**

This bibliography aims to describe and analyse academic literature and research reports addressing the social and economic value of cultural heritage, in order to allow the European Commission's Directorate General for Education and Culture (DG EAC) to identify relevant arguments, current theoretical approaches and also experts in this field.

The analysis places emphasis on publications made over the past five years within the EU but also includes references from other countries or regions as well as earlier publications which can be relevant to current debates in Europe.

The paper has been prepared following a request presented by DG EAC to the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC) in February 2013. The request emerged in the context of the implementation of 2007's European Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World, which highlights the potential of the cultural sector (including cultural and creative industries, but also cultural heritage) to social and economic development and aims to improve the availability of data in these fields. On the other hand, the request stressed the importance of the Europe 2020 strategy, the EU's mid-term growth strategy which aims to address the shortcomings of the existing growth model and to create the conditions of smarter, more sustainable and more inclusive growth – the cultural sectors are also expected to contribute to these aims.<sup>1</sup> A draft version of the literature review was presented in May 2013 and, following comments formulated by DG EAC, a revised text is submitted in July 2013.

The EENC has produced some literature reviews in the past, including one on 'the governance of culture'<sup>2</sup> and one on 'the public value of culture',<sup>3</sup> both presented in January 2012. Some findings of the latter, conducted by Jordi Baltà and John Holden, are also relevant to this review on the social and cultural value of cultural heritage.

---

<sup>1</sup> See 'Council Conclusions on the Contribution of Culture to the Implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy', *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 175, 15.6.2011. Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:175:0001:0004:EN:PDF>.

<sup>2</sup> Vesna Čopič and Andrej Srakar, *Cultural Governance: a literature review* (EENC, 2012), available at <http://www.eenc.info/news/cultural-governance-literature-review/>.

<sup>3</sup> John Holden and Jordi Baltà, *The Public Value of Culture: a literature review* (EENC, 2012), available at <http://www.eenc.info/news/the-public-value-of-culture-literature-review/>.

## **1.1. Methodology**

The literature review has been carried out by a team led by EENC members Cornelia Dümcke and Mikhail Gnedovsky, with support provided by Interarts as the secretariat of the EENC. Given the aim to present a broad and diverse list of documents, a request for contributions was disseminated in March 2013 to several networks and individual experts, including European members of the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), some correspondents of the Council of Europe / Ericarts' *Compendium on Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe* and experts in the EENC's core group.<sup>4</sup> The request presented the main aims of the exercise and asked for assistance in identifying relevant recent documents (e.g. papers, articles, evaluation reports, impact studies) addressing these issues, preferably within the EU.

Contributions received thereafter were listed and briefly analysed, before selecting the 87 documents that would be included in the final review. An effort was made to ensure diversity both as regards the countries represented and the areas of impact and arguments analysed. Following this, the research team has closely analysed the texts selected, producing a short summary for each. When preparing the individual reviews, priority has been given to the methodology used as well as the economic, social and broader impacts identified, in relation with the EU's objectives of smart, inclusive and sustainable growth.

Documents reviewed are presented in alphabetical order, with a full bibliographic reference, a translation of the original title where this was not in English and an Internet address in most cases.<sup>5</sup> Where relevant, information has also been included regarding the context in which research had been undertaken (e.g. European projects, national policy developments, international conferences, etc.) or the authors' broader work in this field. A short description of the authors and their institutional affiliation is included for each item, in order to facilitate the European Commission's identification of experts in this field.

Some of the trends and key observations derived from the literature review are presented in the final chapter.

---

<sup>4</sup> The contributors' names appear in Acknowledgements at the end of this document.

<sup>5</sup> Internet references contained throughout the document are valid as of early May 2013.

## 1.2. Scope

### *Definition of cultural heritage*

For the purposes of the present bibliography, the definition used in the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro, 2006) has been applied:

*[Cultural] heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time.*

However, in the context of the analysis of the value of cultural heritage, many authors complement this definition with a notion of **heritage sector** constituted by specialised activities involving heritage and related to other social or economic sectors. Consequently, two strands of analysis can be observed in the reviewed studies:

- a) **cultural heritage as a sector of activities on its own**, which provides jobs and generates growth (direct impact, mainly economic but which can include other dimensions of development as well);
- b) **spill-over social and economic effects of cultural heritage** in other fields, such as agriculture, regional development, environment, science and education, tourism, technology, innovation, social cohesion, intercultural dialogue, etc.

Heritage sector is sometimes considered a part of **cultural (or creative) industries**. In such cases, the analysis is not limited to the issues of heritage protection but stresses also the creative potential of heritage, including its spill-over effects in other creative sectors.

### *Types of heritage*

Some authors speak of **cultural heritage** in general, while others focus their studies on particular types of heritage, such as **built heritage**, **movable heritage**, **archaeological heritage**, etc.

An integrated approach leads to the formation of **historical landscapes** (sometimes **cityscapes**) – complex protected areas merging different types of heritage.

In some studies, **natural heritage** is considered a part of cultural heritage. Their authors point out that the dividing line between the two is very much blurred, as nature is always perceived through a cultural lens, and natural landscapes have often been

formed through human activity. In any case, both notions are crucial from the point of view of sustainable development.

The role of **intangible heritage**, as defined in the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), is widely discussed. The introduction of this notion has dramatically expanded the scope and potential of heritage but it has also posed serious challenges before the heritage sector.

There is also an ongoing discussion on the issues related to **recent heritage**, for example that originating in the period of the Cold War or in the legacy of Communist regimes in the Eastern European countries. Some authors stress the challenging and controversial nature of this category of heritage.

Finally, there are many studies focused on **heritage institutions**, such as archives, museums, libraries, national parks, etc.

### ***Value of cultural heritage***

Many authors underline the difference between **intrinsic value** of heritage and its **instrumental value**. Although the present bibliography is focused, mainly, upon instrumental value, i.e. the importance of heritage for the social and economic development, it should be noted that many authors warn against neglecting the intrinsic value of heritage as collective memory of the society.

In the recent years, the instrumental value of heritage, as manifested in its **social** and **economic** implications, has been claimed by various advocates of heritage and recognised by many policy-makers. Culture (and heritage, as its indispensable part) is now considered by many authors as one of the four pillars of sustainable development on an equal footing with the others.

As confirmed by multiple studies, heritage, if properly managed, can be instrumental in enhancing social inclusion, developing intercultural dialogue, shaping identity of a territory, improving quality of the environment, providing social cohesion and – on the economic side – stimulating tourism development, creating jobs and enhancing investment climate. In other words, **investment in heritage can generate return** in a form of social benefits and economic growth. This has been shown by many authors in theoretical discourse supported by numerous case studies.

At the same time, as sceptics are saying, success stories may overshadow existing failures. That is why the main purpose of the present bibliography is to guide the reader through the sources providing evidence of social and economic value of cultural

heritage – to demonstrate existing achievements but also gaps in contemporary studies.

Although a considerable progress has been made in measuring the economic value of heritage in **quantitative terms**, both on macro- and micro-levels, there is still a long way to go. Many observations have purely **qualitative** nature and are not supported by reliable figures. But even the existing methodology of measuring the economic impact of heritage has not become, so far, a routine instrument in heritage planning. It has been used only occasionally and is not used at all in many countries.



## **2. Literature review**

1.  
Agrupamento Europeu de Cooperação Territorial Galiza - Norte de Portugal (2011) *Estudo das Indústrias Culturais e Criativas en Galicia e o Norte de Portugal* [Study of the Cultural and Creative Industries in Galicia and Northern Portugal], Vigo. (328 pp.)  
[http://www.addict.pt/fotos/editor2/estudo\\_icc.pdf](http://www.addict.pt/fotos/editor2/estudo_icc.pdf)

Author / Institution: Galician Agency for the Cultural Industries (AGADIC, Galicia, Spain) / Agency for the Development of Creative Industries (ADDICT, Porto, Portugal) / Metropolitan Agency of Regional Development (PRIMUS, Porto, Portugal)

This study was carried out by the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation Galicia-North Portugal using figures obtained from mercantile registers in 2010. It claims to be the most comprehensive study about the dimension of the cultural and creative industries that has been completed in the Iberian Peninsula so far, particularly as regards the economic relevance of limited companies active in the cultural field (i.e. the private sector). Even though private companies are less active in the field of cultural heritage, the study does however provide a picture of their economic relevance in the regions under study.

After revising definitions of the concept of cultural and creative industries given by a number of institutions (such as UNESCO, UNCTAD and KEA), the authors underline the fact that this sector embodies an economic resource and a source for identity and social cohesion. According to the methodology used in the study, the companies analysed have been identified on the basis of a 'dynamic' model, including the core arts (which includes cultural heritage), cultural activities (which produce exclusively cultural outputs), creative activities (which incorporate cultural elements in their production process) and related activities (which facilitate the work of the abovementioned), considering all phases in their value chain.

Sections 4.8 and 5.8 of the study specifically deal with economic data of the heritage sector in Galicia and North Portugal respectively. In both cases, museum activities, historic buildings and place management, library activities and archives are taken into account. All of them are analysed in the commercialisation phase of their value chain. In the Galician case, companies and associations considered in the study had a total turnover of €33,953,000 in 2009, with a total number of 157 employees. An increase of 66.58% and 31.93%, respectively, was recorded with regard to data in 2006. The total turnover of strictly private agents in the heritage sector represented €34.5 m in the

same year. Professional or business associations and cultural foundations in the field of cultural heritage represent 89% of total turnover of all organisations analysed, although if we consider each subsector in cultural heritage separately, museums had the highest turnover, with 5% of the total.

In North Portugal, only 8 companies have been considered (including the Serralves Foundation in Porto). This small sample hinders the presentation of very clear conclusions in the Portuguese case. However, it can be stated that the organisations analysed had a total turnover of €11,331,986 in 2009, with 132 people employed. Like in Galicia, a positive growth of 24.84% (turnover) and 41.94% (employees) can be observed if compared to 2006.

Section 6 shows the weight of cultural heritage within the overall cultural and creative industries. Summarising the data obtained, it can be concluded that they represent a really rather small part: heritage-related companies constitute 0.97% of total number of companies in the sector in Galicia and 0.22% in North Portugal.

2.

Alonso Hierro, J. and Martín Fernández, J. (2008): *Conservación del patrimonio histórico en España. Análisis económico* [Preservation of the Historical Heritage in Spain. An Economic Analysis]. Madrid: Fundación Caja Madrid. (160 pp.)

<http://www.fundacioncajamadrid.es/Ficheros/CMA/ficheros/F-patri-edic-descarga-ecc3.PDF>

Authors: Juan Alonso Hierro and Juan Martín Fernández

Institution: Complutense University, Madrid, Spain

The latest of several studies published by Fundación Caja Madrid in the course of the last decade on the economic dimension of cultural heritage in Spain, this report (published in 2008, although relying on data from 2004) starts with a close analysis of public expenditure on tangible cultural heritage in Spain by several tiers of government (local, regional, national and EU), as well as an estimation of the expenditure by private sources (including the Catholic Church, the business sector, individuals and foundations). On this basis, the report argues that 91% of expenditure on the preservation of heritage in Spain comes from public sources.

Data on the public expenditure of central government in the field of cultural heritage in Spain is compared with that of France, Italy and Portugal. Even though the authors warn of some methodological difficulties, they argue that, among the four countries examined, in 2004 Spain had the highest proportion of expenditure in cultural heritage within the total expenditure of central government (at 0.55%) as well as the highest expenditure per capita (at €16.65 per inhabitant, with other countries ranging between

€12.84 – Italy – and €16.03 – France-). On the other hand, at 0.10%, Portugal had the highest proportion of central government's expenditure in cultural heritage as regards the national GDP.

Of particular interest is the correlation of public expenditure with private consumption on heritage-related cultural tourism, deriving from an exploitation at regional level of a Spanish national tourism survey. Authors aim to analyse the cost-effectiveness of public investment in the preservation of cultural heritage as regards the ability to attract tourism. 4 regions (Cantabria, Extremadura, Asturias and Castilla y León) are identified as having an above-average ability to attract cultural tourists if compared to the volume of public expenditure in heritage per capita – all of them being regions away from the Mediterranean coast and deprived of the traditional assets of tourism in Spain (i.e. sun, beach), they are seen as holding a potential to further invest in this field.

The report is complemented with a case study of the town of Albarracín, in Aragón, which serves to highlight how good preservation and management policies can contribute to local economic development. 17% of the local Gross Value Added in the area in 2004 could be attributed to cultural tourism; income derived from tourism may be 20 times higher than the average annual public expenditure in cultural heritage in the area.

Despite the fact that data is almost a decade old and that the methodology partly relies on an estimation of consumption based on surveys, the report provides an interesting approach to the type of impacts that can derive from public investment in the field of cultural heritage, notably in regions without other major tourism assets.

3.

Augusto Mateus & Associados (2010): *O Sector Cultural e Criativo em Portugal, Estudo para o Ministério da Cultura* [The Cultural and Creative Sector in Portugal. A Study on behalf of the Ministry of Culture], Lisbon: Augusto Mateus & Associados. (132 pp.)

<http://www.mincultura.gov.pt/SiteCollectionDocuments/Imprensa/SCC.pdf>

Authors: Augusto Mateus (general coordinator), Sandra Primitivo (executive coordinator), Ana Caetano, André Barbado and Isabel Cabral

Institution: Augusto Mateus & Associados, Lisbon

This study was commissioned by the former Ministry of Culture of Portugal, now a State Secretariat under the Office of the Prime Minister. It serves as an introduction to the economy of culture and the economic impact of the cultural and creative sectors, transferring current EU analyses to the Portuguese context and providing specific data at national and regional level.

The report includes an introduction to key concepts which draws on several major international reports in the field (e.g. UNCTAD, KEA, etc) and compares existing definitions and methodologies.

Chapter 3 focuses on the measurement of the size of cultural and creative sectors in Portugal, including the evolution in the number of museums and other cultural institutions over recent years and cultural consumption figures (based on data from the Eurobarometer and national surveys), as well as their economic relevance. In general terms, comparative data at European level shows that the economic relevance of the cultural and creative sectors in Portugal lies in an intermediate position in EU rankings.

According to an analysis of public budgets for culture, resources devoted to heritage preservation and valorisation increased from 33% in 2000 to 36% in 2008 within the budget of the Ministry of Culture.

On the basis of an economic analysis of the Gross Value Added generated by each sector as defined in the National Classification of Economic Activities, the study argues that in 2006 the cultural and creative sectors contributed €3.7 b to Portugal's GVA, thus representing 2.8% of the national economy. Cultural heritage accounted for only €32.4 m or 0.9% of the total GVA in the cultural and creative sectors and roughly 0.2% of the national GVA, but it had grown by 64% since 2000 (far outstretching the cultural sector's average growth of 19%), at an annual growth rate of 8.6%. On the other hand, activities related to cultural tourism accounted for €220 m in 2006, or 6% of the GVA in the cultural sector, and had grown by 27% since 2000.

127,000 people were employed in the cultural sector in Portugal in 2006, this representing 2.6% of the total jobs in the country. 1,227 persons were directly employed in cultural heritage, thus accounting for 1% of all jobs in the cultural sector, up from 0.8% in 2000. The annual growth rate of 3.6% over this period again surpassed the overall average of 1% in the cultural and creative sectors. Employment in cultural tourism accounted for 7,934 jobs in 2006 and had grown at an annual rate of 2.5% since 2000.

Evidence is presented regarding the socio-demographic structure, size of organisations and regional distribution in the cultural sectors, although this is not presented separately for heritage. The study does mention however that employees in the field of heritage had average monthly salaries of €985, slightly above the national average of c. €870. Data is also presented regarding international trade in cultural goods and services, with data from Portugal compared with that of other countries; again, it is difficult to obtain clear data for cultural heritage in this context.

The conclusions of the report argue that the cultural and creative sectors play an increasing role in the national economy. In this respect, authors suggest that synergies among different sub-sectors and more equal access to culture across the country be fostered. Specific recommendations also include the need to design more integrated regional development strategies, taking advantage of heritage assets in broader tourism and creative development initiatives. Investment in heritage preservation and communication in those regions where this arises as a competitive advantage should be fostered. Regional competitiveness can also build on the intangible valorisation of heritage, through the innovative development of heritage-related services (e.g. thematic routes, information and interpretation services, related artistic activities, etc.). Finally, the report highlights the positive effects of investment in heritage on other areas of development and public policy, including social cohesion and the information society (e.g. through the digitisation of collections).

4.  
Benhamou, F. and Thesmar, D. (2011): *Valoriser le patrimoine culturel de la France*. [Giving Value to France's Cultural Heritage] Paris: Conseil d'Analyse Economique. (132 pp.)  
[http://arald.org/ressources/pdf/dossiersenligne/valoriser\\_le\\_patrimoine\\_culturel\\_de\\_la\\_france.pdf](http://arald.org/ressources/pdf/dossiersenligne/valoriser_le_patrimoine_culturel_de_la_france.pdf)
- Author: Françoise Benhamou  
Institution: University of Paris XIII
- Author: David Thesmar  
Institution: HEC Paris

A report commissioned by France's Conseil d'Analyse Économique (CAE), an advisory body involving independent experts which provides expertise on economic issues to the Office of the Prime Minister, the text provides an approach to cultural heritage policies from the perspective of economic theory. It mainly collects evidence resulting from previous studies in France and abroad and presents recommendations for public policies enhancing the economic dimension of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. The report is authored by well-known cultural economist Françoise Benhamou and David Thesmar, a member of the plenary of CAE.

Following an introduction to the definition of cultural heritage and the preservation policies in this field at regional, national and international levels, the report presents data on the employment generated by heritage in France in 2007: 35,200 were employed in heritage preservation and 63,500 in architecture-related activities. Later on, another study of the National Heritage Agency (2009) is quoted, indicating that approximately 180,000 jobs exist in the preservation and valorisation of built heritage,

including 62,500 directly involved in museums and historic monuments as well as 109,000 jobs in other fields excluding tourism (e.g. companies specialising in preservation and restoration, heritage architects, researchers, etc.), although some of these may work only partially in the field of heritage. On the other hand, the report, using data from a number of previous studies, argues that indirect employment may be 8 to 11 times higher than direct jobs generated by heritage. Eurostat data on cultural employment in other EU Member States is presented, which shows France slightly below the EU-27 average, although this may be due to different definitions used in each country.

Chapter II explores the aspects which generate a market failure in the field of cultural heritage and explain why it is important for the public sector to intervene in this area: culture as a public good (including positive externalities measured through a number of previous studies where citizens are asked to express their willingness to pay for the existence of certain cultural institutions), positive indirect effects in other sectors, high fixed costs, imperfect information in the heritage market, etc. The types of potential public intervention in this field are described, and some limits of economic impact studies are mentioned.

The report argues that the economic dimension of cultural heritage should be recognised and not seen in opposition to the preservation of heritage for intrinsic purposes. The economic discourse and that which fosters collective identity can be reconciled in policies which combine the preservation and the promotion and valorisation of heritage. Some risks are identified, including the fact that seeing heritage as a tool for economic development increasingly places it in direct competition with other areas of public expenditure, something which is often overlooked as emphasis is exclusively placed on the positive effects of heritage. Authors also identify an increasing trend from the tangible to the intangible aspects of heritage: as museums are placed in the context of urban regeneration strategies, they tend to reinforce the branding of places – culture and heritage are key aspects in the production and distribution of goods and services, as well as raw materials for information societies.

Finally, some recommendations for public policies in this field are formulated, including improving evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms, making results of evaluation more visible, ensuring that indirect beneficiaries contribute to the preservation of heritage (e.g. through tourist taxes), decentralising heritage management competences at local level, improving accessibility of intangible heritage (digitisation, etc.), favouring entrepreneurship and financial autonomy in the crafts sector, enhancing branding in the heritage sector, etc.

The report is complemented with a number of annexes, including commentaries on its conclusions by other economists and analyses of individual sub-sectors.



5.

Bodo, S., Gibbs, K. and Sani, M. (eds.) (2009): *Museums as places for intercultural dialogue: selected practices from Europe*. Project MAP for ID. (114 pp.)

[http://www.mapforid.it/Handbook\\_MAPforID\\_EN.pdf](http://www.mapforid.it/Handbook_MAPforID_EN.pdf)

Author: Simona Bodo

Institution: Independent researcher

Author: Kirsten Gibbs

Institution: Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (currently: MK Community Foundation)

Author: Margherita Sani

Institution: Istituto Beni Culturali (Region Emilia-Romagna)

This collection of case studies from Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands and Spain illustrates a shift in the contemporary methodology of museums, as heritage institutions, from cultural monologue to intercultural dialogue. The publication is based on the outcomes of the Museums as Places for Intercultural Dialogue (MAP for ID) project (2007–2009), funded by the European Commission as part of the Grundtvig Lifelong Learning Programme.

In the framework of the project, 30 case studies were developed in four European countries, all focused on the methodology of museums' work with cultural minorities and migrant communities. While some of the cases were devoted to helping immigrant communities better integrate into and become familiar with the history and culture of their new home, others offered examples of how immigrants and other minorities can use these same resources to teach their host communities something about their own culture of origin.

However, a third group of cases existed that ventured towards intercultural dialogue as a bi-directional process actively engaging both autochthonous individuals and those with an immigrant background, which is dialogical and transformative on both sides, and in which all are equal participants. These cases embraced a dynamic, dialogical notion of "heritage," where meanings could be renegotiated, re-constructed and made available for all to share in a social space of interaction.

The project was aimed at rethinking the role of the contemporary museum. All partners viewed the museum as an institution which is capable not only of speaking, but also of listening to its audiences. The museums' audiences were not just seen as "visitors" or cultural consumers but also as cultural producers, participants in the process, decision makers, and protagonists in the creation and dissemination of a new museum discourse and practice.

In the authors' view, the starting point for any museum is the present, from which it explores the past and imagines the future, guided by the needs and expectations of its actual and potential visitors, staff, broader community and stakeholders. Such museum values as "heritage" not only objects or collections, but first and foremost individuals and the richness they embody: stories, ideas, emotions, desires, fears and hopes.

The significance of a museum lies not only in its collections, but also in the reflections and insights it is able to trigger around the objects, the knowledge it provides and the multiple visions and interpretations it offers on the heritage in its care. The ability of a museum to unfold narratives and suggest inferences allows it to act as a platform for reflection on knowledge systems, beliefs, values and attitudes.

The authors stress the difference between multicultural and intercultural approaches: to think of museums as places of intercultural dialogue requires one to question the social segmentation resulting from multicultural policies, in which the recognition of cultural diversity and distinct identities often ends up reinforcing discrimination and segregation. Intercultural dialogue is, on the contrary, a path of communication and exchange. Following this path, the museums become neutral zones, spaces for negotiation, or "third spaces" where cultures can communicate and explore each other.

The authors conclude that the project's findings have an extraordinary potential to challenge prejudice and stereotypes as well as to create shared spaces and a sense of belonging. The methodology developed in the course of the project can be also used in a broader context: assuming that "the past is a foreign country," these principles could be applied to practically all museums and their audiences.

6.  
Bouchard, D. (2009), 'Museums, cultural heritage and dialogue in Northern Ireland: strategies for divided societies', in Council of Europe: *Heritage and beyond*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 91-100.  
[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf)

Author: Dominique Bouchard  
Institution: Mid-Antrim Museums Service, Northern Ireland

This article presents the experience of Northern Ireland's Mid-Antrim Museums Service (MAMS) in developing a community engagement strategy which aims to promote a positive exploration of history and cultural identity through museum programmes involving a variety of local community groups.



In 2006, with support from the EU Special Programme for Peace and Reconciliation (Peace II) and local authorities, MAMS developed a programme entitled *Making History*, which places emphasis on the shared history and experiences of both communities but also provides space for exploring constructively more divisive periods of Irish history. Taking into account that previous community development work had traditionally focused on the promotion of understanding among the ‘two communities’ and thus somehow reinforced stereotypes of division, *Making History* aimed to engage with ‘overlapping identities’, recognising the complexity of personal and community identity-building. In this respect, the programme also aimed to foster the creation of personal narratives, in order to promote a critical attitude to established narratives and encouraging a broader perspective on history, permitting multiple viewpoints to be acknowledged. 20 community groups and around 250 individuals, including in particular those from areas adversely affected by the conflict and those who had traditionally been excluded from public history (women, young people, older citizens, minorities and people with disabilities), were involved in the activities and an effort was done to ensure ownership of the process by all those involved.

*Making History* was evaluated by an independent consultant, who carried out interviews with 40 individuals who had taken part in the programme. The evaluation found that positive impacts had been recorded under the three initial objectives, namely: acknowledging and dealing with the past – cultural and attitudinal change; building positive relationships; and capacity building. The report concluded that *Making History* had ‘succeeded in engaging participants in user-directed explorations and debates about their own identity (cultural and personal) and that of others. In doing so, it has debunked some of the myths about history, opened up new perspectives for participants and, crucially, created an appetite for more knowledge and a willingness to consider an alternative interpretation of past events. This is fundamental, in that this model represents an active approach to “designing-out” inter-community conflict by addressing the core issues which fuel it i.e. misunderstandings of and lack of appreciation for different cultures, history and traditions... There is a desire to include more people in this exploration and a growing confidence to examine these topics in depth’ (quoted in p. 99). The programme culminated with regional exhibitions showcasing the films, publications and community multimedia archives that had been developed collaboratively with participants.

This experience is significant by linking contemporary heritage, and particularly personal and collective identities which are part of intangible heritage, with intercultural dialogue, conflict resolution and community reconciliation strategies, which has obvious meaningfulness in Northern Ireland but could be applied in other contexts as well.

7.

BritainThinks (2013), *Public perceptions of – and attitudes to – the purposes of museums in society. A report prepared by BritainThinks for Museums Association*. London: BritainThinks (50 pp.)

<http://www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=954916>

Author / Institution: BritainThinks, London

This recent report presents the result of a consultation exercise commissioned by the Museums Association to private consultancy firm BritainThinks, in order to explore the public perception of the meaning of museums in contemporary life. Data was obtained through a series of six mixed-technique, ‘deliberative’ workshops, held in different locations across the UK, overall involving 90 participants, half of whom were regular museum visitors and half who had not visited a museum in the previous year. By examining ‘What do citizens consider to be the most important purposes and roles against which public funding for museums should deliver?’, the report addresses how citizens rate both the intrinsic value of culture and a range of other areas of impact, including the economic and social value of museums.

The report found that attitudes towards museums have apparently become more favourable over the last generation, as museums have been increasingly seen as entertaining and interactive. Workshop participants had ‘*a relatively sophisticated understanding of museums as shaping our future as well as our past,*’ (p. 3) as well as a feeling that museums should concern themselves with their essential concerns rather than ‘spreading themselves too thinly’. In this respect, a hierarchy of purposes emerged from the research, including ‘essential’, ‘priority’ and ‘low priority’ priorities, as well as the purposes challenged by the public.

‘Essential’ purposes of museums, which are mentioned spontaneously by the public, are generally also those which refer to museums’ traditional role, including care and preservation of heritage, holding collections and mounting displays and creating knowledge for, and about, society. ‘Priority’ purposes may be less important than those mentioned above but they should also be held by all museums – it is here that the first indication of the economic and social value of museums arises, since participants identified the promotion of economic growth through tourism, investment and regeneration, the facilitation of individual development through education, stimulation and building skills and the promotion of happiness and wellbeing (although this was generally interpreted by participants as relating to entertainment, rather than health).

‘Low priority’ purposes are those which are not objected to, but which are seen as less important and should not divert from primary purposes. Some of the impacts which relate to the social impact of cultural heritage appear here, such as fostering a sense of

community and helping the vulnerable (*'The idea of museums reaching out into communities or sections of societies isn't one that the public sees them as being the best placed to do'*, p. 5; however, the social meaning of museums in rural communities and the need to be accessible to disadvantaged sectors were seen as important) as well as protecting the natural environment. Finally, 'purposes challenged by the public' included providing a forum for debate and promoting social justice and human rights.

The report somehow makes the case for the so-called 'public value of culture' or the intrinsic values of culture, given that *'museums are perceived to have a societal role that is broader than just satisfying individual visitors'* (p. 26), something which is valid both for regular attendees and for non-visitors. Nevertheless, even though there is a belief that museums should do what they are best at, evidence also demonstrates a widespread perception that museums have evolved and can contribute to other purposes, those in the economic sphere being particularly privileged. On this basis, the report makes some recommendations to reinforce the Museums Association's vision as expressed in its *Museums 2020* strategy.

Annexes include a set of the materials used during the deliberative workshops, as well as some of the results produced by participants.

Overall, this short report presents an integrated analysis of the value of museums and the roles that they can play in contemporary society today. The small-scale methodology used provides interesting qualitative evidence yet should not be seen as a clear indication of the broader public's general views on the museum sector. What emerges is, nevertheless, a complex spectrum of purposes and aims, where museums' traditional mission meets economic and social functions – something which can be seen as an inspiration for policies in this field.

8-20

Brunet, P. and Barone, L. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in France*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Cerveira Pinto, J. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Portugal*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Dümcke, C. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Germany*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Fischer, H. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Greece*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Ilczuk, D.; and Nowak, M. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Poland*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Inkei, P. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Hungary*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Jaurová, Z. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Slovakia*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Millar, G. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Ireland*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Pascual, J. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Spain*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Sacco, P.L. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Italy*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Suteu, C. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Romania*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Varbanova, L. (2012): *Culture and the Structural Funds in Bulgaria*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

Žáková, E. (2013): *Culture and the Structural Funds in the Czech Republic*. Barcelona / Brussels: EENC.

<http://www.eenc.info/news/culture-and-the-structural-funds-in-germany-italy-poland-and-spain/>

<http://www.eenc.info/news/culture-and-the-structural-funds-in-bulgaria-france-greece-hungary-ireland-portugal-romania-and-slovakia/>

<http://www.eenc.info/news/culture-and-the-structural-funds-in-the-czech-republic/>

Authors: Pascal Brunet and Laurence Barone (France); Jorge Cerveira Pinto (Portugal); Cornelia Dümcke (Germany); Hatto Fischer (Greece); Dorota Ilczuk and Małgorzata Nowak (Poland); Péter Inkei (Hungary); Zora Jaurová (Slovakia); Gráinne Millar (Ireland); Jordi Pascual (Spain); Pier Luigi Sacco (Italy); Corina Șuteu (Romania); Lidia Varbanova (Bulgaria); and Eva Žáková (Czech Republic).

Institutions: individual authors and European Expert Network on Culture (EENC), coordinated by Interarts and Culture Action Europe

This set of papers was commissioned by DG EAC in 2012, in the context of the design and negotiation of the EU's Cohesion Policy and the Operational Programmes for the funding period 2014-2020. The aim was to analyse how the cultural and creative sectors could foster local and regional development in the Member States under study, on the basis of the achievements of the previous period, as well as the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats identified both in the cultural sector and in the usage of the Structural Funds in the relevant territories. The task was coordinated by the EENC, which entrusted the elaboration of national papers to experts from each country.

Cultural heritage features prominently in most national papers, since this tended to be the area in which most projects with an explicitly cultural content tended to focus, at the

expense of the cultural and creative industries, which were often less visible. In this respect, links between investment in cultural heritage preservation and the promotion of tourism were identified in Bulgaria, Germany, Greece and Italy, among others, whereas many other countries also referred to the efforts done in the preservation and enhancement of cultural heritage – e.g. Romania, Spain, etc.

Generally speaking, the 13 papers can be seen as a good example of how cultural resources can contribute to broader development aims and to smart, sustainable and inclusive growth – this is proven by the fact that authors were able to identify recommendations to integrate the cultural and creative sector under each of the 11 Thematic Objectives of the European Commission's *Common Strategic Framework* for the Structural Funds 2014-2020, thus proving existing or potential synergies with a wide range of local and regional development objectives.

Among the heritage-related areas which authors stressed in particular were the strengthening of links between cultural heritage and the contemporary creative industries, since the latter had often been neglected in the design and implementation of Structural Funds programming, which could be reinforced by enhancing local cultural ecosystems and better integrating them in broader development strategies; the digitisation of cultural heritage, which emerged as an area needing further effort and exploration and with potential economic and social (i.e. access) benefits; and the examination of links between tangible and intangible heritage and environmental preservation measures.

21.

Canziani, A.; and Moioli, R. (2010), 'The Learning-Based Cultural District and the Monza and Brianza Case. Learning from Cultural Heritage', in Mälkki, M. and Schmidt-Thomé, K. (eds.): *Integrating aims – Built heritage in social and economic development*. Espoo: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications, pp. 159-181  
<http://lib.tkk.fi/Reports/2010/isbn9789526032849.pdf>

Author: Andrea Canziani

Institution: Politecnico di Milano / Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities

Author: Rossella Moioli

Institution: Politecnico di Milano / freelance architect

This article starts by arguing that the cultural and economic rationales for heritage preservation go hand-in-hand and should not be seen in isolation – '*The value of built heritage is only comprehensible within a global and integrated vision, involving economic and cultural and ethic viewpoints. Therefore it does not make any sense to*

*separate the protection processes from their territorial/environmental context.*' (p. 161; italics in the original)

Later on, authors introduce the notion of 'cultural districts', as '*a relationships system integrating enhancement processes of cultural resources with infrastructures and productive chains*' (p. 162), which include cultural heritage assets. Cultural districts involving heritage require more complex impact assessment methods than those which would focus on arts events, since they have major impacts in terms of cultural and social capital, including a potential to construct cultural citizenship. The links between heritage, territory and people should be taken into consideration. The most interesting and appropriate externalities in the case of cultural heritage, in the authors' view, are not related to economic aspects, but to the increase of cultural and intellectual capital – '*economic revenues are ... considered as a consequence of local community's capability improvement, enhanced by [cultural heritage's] fruition which may generate the positive externalities.*' (p. 166; italics in the original)

On this basis, the authors call for the recognition of 'Learning-based Cultural Districts', which should entail an active involvement of communities throughout the process, since only then can knowledge be stimulated towards innovation and development. This requires a focus on people (involving local communities), institutions (strategic thinking, and involving the private sector) and builders and other professionals (increasing the presence of highly-skilled workers in the building sector).

This theory is then illustrated with an observation of the cultural districts of Monza and Brianza, in the Lombardy region, funded by Cariplo Foundation. Taking into consideration the three areas of focus mentioned above (people, institutions and building sector), four sets of objectives are identified, including 'culture as conservation, fruition and production'; 'innovative conversion of the productive tissue'; 'education, training and research'; and 'identity of the territory', and specific measures were conceived linking the former with the latter.

Even though the article only introduces the potential areas of impact and presents little evidence of how this is made operational, it provides a complex approach to the broad impacts of tangible heritage and human landscape on sustainable development strategies. It is worth noting that the authors rely on references from several academic documents and that their work is related to that of Stefano Della Torre, an article of whom is presented in the same volume and is also quoted in the present literature review (see further below).



22.

Countryside and Community Research Unit (CCRU) and ADAS (2007): *A study of the social and economic impacts and benefits of traditional farm building and drystone wall repairs in the Yorkshire Dales National Park*. London: English Heritage (216 pp.)

<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/content/publications/publicationsNew/study-social-economic-impact-benefits-trad-farm-building-drystone-repairs-yorks-dailes/YorkshireDale-Study.pdf>

Author: Paul Courtney, Peter Gaskell and Jane Mills

Institution: CCRU, University of Gloucestershire (now Countryside and Community Research Institute, CCRI)

Author: Robert Edwards

Institution: ADAS, Leeds

This report assesses the social, economic and environmental impacts of six grant schemes which supported the restoration and repair of traditional farm buildings and drystone walls in the Yorkshire Dales National Park, in England, between 1998 and 2004. Research commissioned by English Heritage was undertaken in 2006 and the final report published in 2007.

The methodology of the study included an analysis of existing documentation, which allowed for the identification of financial data for 533 agreement holders (i.e. 'beneficiaries' of grants), representing 86% of those who had received funding during the period under study. 53 examples were analysed in detail, and interviews were carried out with the agreement holders. Interviews were also carried out with 10 building contractors and 6 walling contractors, along with 6 of their suppliers. This provided for the collection of data which enabled a local economic impact analysis using an adapted Local Multiplier 3 (LM3) model to estimate the income and employment effect of the grants. On the other hand, a field survey, a desk study and a scoring analysis were used to assess the visual public benefit of funded activities, as described further below.

The study estimated that during the period under study beneficiaries were paid a total of £6.71 m in grants, for the restoration of 517 traditional farm buildings and 191 km of drystone walls. The gross cost of all the building and wall restoration work was estimated to be £9.34 m. The interview survey found that without this injection of funding 76% of the traditional farm buildings would have become derelict through lack of maintenance. After restoration, the share of buildings which were not used fell from 33% to 5%. The main types of use were related to agriculture (housing of livestock and fodder crops, etc.), although 7% of renovated buildings were used for unspecified non-agricultural purposes. Funding schemes were also critical in ensuring that repair work

was undertaken using traditional materials and techniques, since it is thought that, in the absence of public funding, less noble materials would have been used.

The research team estimated that the building schemes generated between £4.27 m and £4.74 m for the local economy, whereas walling schemes generated between £2.81 m and £4.38 m. Figures included direct, indirect and induced effects, the latter being based on a sample of company owners, managers and employees who had been subcontracted to provide repair work. The income multiplier was 1.65 in the case of building projects and 1.92 for walling projects, since contracts were sourced to local providers more often in the latter than the former case.

Estimating the magnitude of employment effects of the schemes in the local economy suggests that building schemes are likely to have created up to 41 FTE jobs between 1998 and 2004, whereas up to 33 FTE jobs may have been created through walling schemes, around 23 of which as a result of direct employment, over the same period. Grant schemes had been of great value to the local construction industry, with building contractors having worked on a mean of 21 grant-funded contracts and walling contractors on a mean of 38 contracts during the period under study – programmes had therefore facilitated the sustainability of local traditional knowledge and economy in this field.

The study estimates that grant-maintained barns and walls may indirectly contribute £2.44 m annually (at 2004 prices) to the local economy through tourism expenditures.

One interesting feature of the study involves the assessment of visual public benefits of restored buildings and walls, using a visual impact approach which focuses on accessibility and visibility. 60% of the buildings assessed scored in the two highest categories in terms of their visual impact, particularly for being prominent landscape features and located in areas with a high density of public access routes. Low scores were most frequently due to the buildings being remote from any Public Rights of Way or highways or the terrain limiting visibility. Scores were slightly lower in the case of restored drystone walls, mainly as a result of poorer visibility from public access routes and open access land.

This assessment aims to demonstrate how an objective scoring system can be used to measure the visual public benefit of renovated buildings and walls, an issue which could be seen as part of the 'public value of culture' and which could inform future funding schemes and other public initiatives. In this respect, the study concluded that *'[inclusion] of other public benefits, such as historical or nature conservation values, within this approach is also possible. Further refinement of the scoring system could be achieved by identifying, through further research, the elements of traditional farm buildings and drystone walls which are particularly valued by the public.'* (p. 104)



Other recommendations arising from the research include the importance of maintaining these landscape features because of their benefits for employment and for the tourism economy and the provision of attractive places for people to live and work. The study also includes four case studies as well as detailed evidence within the annexes, in the form of maps and methodological documents.

Overall, the study provides an interesting and detailed assessment of one specific subsector of the built heritage, with emphasis being placed on its immediate impacts in the specialised industry (i.e. building and walling restoration companies) and only occasionally on the broader tourism effects, in contrast with similar impact studies. An original approach to the public value of heritage, represented by a scoring system of accessibility and visibility aspects, is also worth noting.

23.

Creative & Cultural Skills (2008): *The Cultural Heritage Blueprint*, London. (pp. 15-16)  
<http://www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=18398>

Author/Institution: Creative & Cultural Skills, London

Section 2.1 of this development plan, *The role and Purpose*, defines the heritage sector in the UK and provides some useful statistics related to its operation and growth, including the fact that the sector contributed £1.01 b to the UK economy in 2008, an increase from £952 m in 2006.

There were 1,510 businesses in the cultural heritage sector in the UK in 2008, which had increased from 1,430 in 2006; 9% had a turnover equal to or more than £1 m. In 2006, the sector employed 53,810 people in the UK, whereas two years later the figure had increased to 57,350. Higher numbers were deployed in a voluntary capacity. Museums accounted for 59% of the total workforce.

Out of these businesses, 30% employed 20 or more people. 4% of the sector was self-employed. 13% of jobs were temporary and 44% of these were seasonal. 10% of the sector was located in Scotland, 3% in Northern Ireland and 4% in Wales. In England, 27% of the workforce was based in London, and 14% in the South East. While many creative and cultural industries had a location-bias towards London and the South East, cultural heritage organisations were more evenly spread across the UK. For example, 10% of the sector was based in the South West.

There was a small majority (52%) of female workers in the sector; 93% of the workforce was white, which was reduced from 95% in 2006. 54% of the workforce was aged over 40.

The cultural heritage sector was predominantly funded by the public sector. A significant proportion of the workforce was voluntary by choice. There can be a tendency to overlook the voluntary workforce but they still require skills development in order for the sector to thrive. Separate to this, there is also a culture of unpaid work experience as a prerequisite to getting a job in the sector, which was contributing to a narrowing of entry routes and contributing to a lack of diversity in the sector's workforce.

Section 2.2, *The Contribution of the Sector*, presents some figures that illustrate the contribution of this sector to the country's economy, not only from an economic point of view, but covering also the social impact. The sector makes a significant contribution to the economic and social well-being of the UK and to its development as a central player in the international arts and culture arena:

- ▶ 87% of people thought the historic environment played an important part in the cultural life of the country;
- ▶ 2.5 m schoolchildren visited historic sites in 2006;
- ▶ The economic benefits of the UK's major museums and galleries were estimated to be £1.5 b per annum taking into account turnover and visitor expenditure;
- ▶ The annual turnover of Britain's major museums and galleries exceeded £900 m. Broadly £1 in every £1,000 in the UK economy could be directly related to the museum and gallery sector. The major museums and galleries spent over £650 m a year;
- ▶ It was estimated that developers invested approximately £135 m in archaeological investigations through the planning process in 2007/8;
- ▶ New museums and galleries have contributed to the economic and social regeneration of industrial cities;
- ▶ There were over 42 m visits each year to major museums and galleries;
- ▶ Seven of the top ten visitor attractions in the UK were museums. Museums and galleries are a significant factor in attracting visitors to the UK;
- ▶ Privately-owned historic houses generated an economic contribution of over £1.6 b;
- ▶ There were 62.8 m visits made to historic environment attractions in 2006;
- ▶ Heritage Open Days, organised by volunteers for local people, are the biggest mass participation event in England with over 3,500 properties and over one million people taking part.

Culture and heritage are the biggest drivers of the UK's tourism industry, which was estimated to be worth approximately £85.6 b in 2006, with over 32.6 m overseas visitors in 2007. While the value of the UK's tourism industry is impressive and ranked sixth in the world, competition from other countries is growing and so there is a need to ensure it is equipped to compete in this global market.

The creative and cultural sectors have experienced significant growth in comparison to the economy as a whole and this is projected to continue over the next ten years. The projected employment growth for the UK economy is 0.39% per annum between 2007 and 2014 whereas the comparable growth rate for the creative and cultural sector is 1.05% per annum – three times higher.

24.

DC Research (2010): *The Economic Value of Independent Museum Sector*, London. (46 pp.)  
<http://www.aim-museums.co.uk/downloads/2cef984a-dd70-11e1-bdfc-001999b209eb.pdf>

Author/Institution: DC Research, Carlisle and Leicester, UK

The Association of Independent Museums (AIM) commissioned DC Research to estimate the economic value of the independent museum sector in January 2010. The research results were due to be used for advocacy work by AIM at a national level on behalf of the sector, and by individual and small groups of independent museums at the local and regional levels.

The research comprised a survey of 100 AIM members, a number of follow-up case studies used to refine the approach, and the construction of an analytical model to estimate the impact of the entire sector. Based on visitor numbers and type, employment and purchasing patterns, facilities, and information on the locality in which museums were situated, the model was applied to the AIM member museums (of which there are nearly 700). Key findings from the research:

- ▶ Across the independent museum section, visitors (estimated to be over 9 m) represented around £364 m of gross visitor impacts;
- ▶ At least £124 m of direct, indirect and induced impacts as a result of spending on goods and services by independent museums (although impact might be as high as £349 m);
- ▶ At least 5,800 full time equivalent direct, indirect and induced jobs supported by the sector, equivalent to a further £122 m (although impact might be as high as 10,500 jobs, equivalent to £219 m).

Taken together, the total impact of the independent museum sector is estimated to be at least in the order of £610 m (although this could be as high as £930 m).

In addition to providing data to underpin the sector wide economic value analysis, the survey highlighted the importance of the volunteer workforce to independent museums. The museums responding to the survey reported volunteer numbers totalling 4,724, with 15% of these volunteers volunteering for two or more days per week on average, and 3.5% volunteering for four days a week or more. Just under half of responding museums reported that between 91% and 100% of these volunteers were local to the museum.

Further to this, responding museums reported 'in kind' contributions of goods and services of £621,000, and 'in kind' capital works (such as building work, repairs, development, refurbishment) of £11.5m.

The commissioning of this study highlights AIM's appreciation of the need to clearly articulate and demonstrate the contribution of independent museums in a tourism/economic context. This need is well recognised across the sector, and particularly in the current economic climate, there are concerns that there will be ever increasing pressure on museums to provide clear evidence of their contribution.

Importantly, this needs to be articulated in such a way that key audiences outside the sector (including central government, national and regional tourism organisations, regional development agencies and other potential funders) appreciate and are convinced by the evidence and the related advocacy based upon the evidence.

The diversity of museums contained in the independent sector is well understood by stakeholders in economic development and tourism, and the sector is recognised as being entrepreneurial, and perhaps being able to understand more about its visitors than public sector run museums. Larger independent museums are very well networked with local and regional tourism agendas, although engagement becomes much more varied in terms of small and medium-sized museums.

There are a number of case study examples where this joined-up approach is already in place, with museums benefitting from strong and mutually beneficial relationships with neighbouring attractions. It is clear that museums could benefit from further engagement and collaboration, either at a thematic or locality level, to provide a 'joined-up' offer that tourism organisations can effectively market.

A number of the case study museums had ongoing relationships with local authorities and other public bodies that affect their ongoing operations. Examples ranged from agreements about grant funding, service provision (including discussions around

moving from grant based approaches to commissioning of specific activities and outcomes through a social enterprise model), to issues around security of tenure.

All the case study museums recognise the need to diversify income streams away from grant income and admissions, with none being solely dependent upon income derived from visitors.

Finally, it is clear from the research that many independent museums are able to accurately and quickly generate the data that is needed to estimate economic impacts. This information can be used by AIM member museums to estimate their own impacts by using the toolkit that has been developed to accompany this research, with the toolkit having different levels to cater for all museum types and sizes.

The Toolkit is structured into three levels, including tourism impacts, employment impacts and impacts of spend on goods and services.

25.

Dresen, U. (2011). 'Seaplane Hangars in Tallinn – Creating a New Museum and Attempts how to Combine in that Development State and Local Interests with Public Awareness', in Kukaine, K. (ed.): *Cultural Heritage – Contemporary Challenge. The 4<sup>th</sup> Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum in Riga, 9-11 September 2010*. Riga: State Inspection for Heritage Protection, pp. 97-102.

<http://www.riksantikvaren.no/filestore/RigaForumPublication2010.pdf>

Author: Urmas Dresen

Institution: Estonian Maritime Museum

This short presentation tells a story of restoration and redevelopment of the seaplane hangars and harbour, a unique heritage from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The hangars built near Tallinn in 1915-17, and the territory around them, including the harbour, has repeatedly changed ownership and function over the last century. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, after 10-year-long court proceedings, the ownership of the area and historic buildings was given to the Estonian state. In 2010, with the help of a EU grant of €14.7 m, the area was regenerated and became a venue for the Maritime Museum that opened there in 2012.

The seaplane hangars are described as a unique but difficult heritage. Having been built by a Danish company on the commission of the Tsarist Russian government, they later served for military purposes under different political regimes. The hangars are a rare example of an early 20<sup>th</sup>-century concrete architecture and engineering, as well as of its original function as a base for seaplanes. The story of the buildings and area is

told in the new museum exhibition where Estonian maritime history is also related. The harbour is used for the Museum's collection of historic ships, which previously have been scattered all along the coast because of the lack of appropriate space.

The author discusses various factors influencing the popularity of the new museum venue, which include, on the one hand, its proximity to the city centre, and, on the other hand, its image of a closed military area and a poor state of its surroundings that still badly need regeneration.

26.

Della Torre, S. (2010), 'Economics of Planned Conservation', in Mälkki, M. and Schmidt-Thomé, K. (eds.): *Integrating aims – Built heritage in social and economic development*. Espoo: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications, pp. 143-157

<http://lib.tkk.fi/Reports/2010/isbn9789526032849.pdf>

Author: Stefano Della Torre

Institution: Politecnico di Milano

This article introduces the notion of 'planned conservation' of built heritage (also known as 'preventive maintenance'), understood as a complex strategy which merges a large-scale reduction of risks and a careful organisation of daily activities in the building sector. Beyond mere building maintenance or restoration, planned conservation involves posing questions about the strategies and links between preservation activities and local development processes. Evidence collected in Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and the UK shows that sustained preventive strategies of this kind are more cost-effective than one-off restoration exercises.

The text argues that this approach also enables a broad impact in terms of sustainable development: beyond the traditional model of heritage contributing to economic development through tourism attraction, planned conservation has important external benefits, including its impact on human capital – '*preservation counts because of its impact on capability to doubt, to learn, to innovate. In other words, focus shifts from heritage as a given asset to preservation processes as opportunities to increase intellectual capital.*' (pp. 143-44)

The author argues that economic analyses of cultural heritage as a public good should go beyond the pure quantitative impact assessment and require more complex evaluation models. He also considers that the best approaches to heritage management contribute to the development of 'learning organisations', because '*heritage conservation is a continuous challenge to standard solutions and to established beliefs*' (p. 151). This calls for critical approaches and an ability to regularly

‘unlearn’ that which had been taken for granted as regards preservation models – and this is indeed a pre-condition for innovation, a very important social and economic asset.

Planned conservation maximises the part of ‘soft’ or ‘noble’ activities involved in conservation (i.e. that which goes beyond manual skills and craftsmanship), because planning requires study and information management, because in preventive conservation advanced techniques of monitoring are applied and because even when old forms of know-how are revived, this is the result of a process of criticism and unlearning. Positive externalities for innovation emerge and this becomes a more relevant contribution to local development than the production and consumption externalities. The author also argues that planned conservation entails economies of scale and a reduction of costs and that it moves investment to more qualified activities (surveying, monitoring, data filing, information management, research, communication, etc.) than traditional preservation policies.

Overall the article presents an original perspective on heritage management techniques and broadens the traditional scope of economic impacts in this area. Even though it fails to provide clear evidence to sustain the arguments presented, its rationale seems solid and may deserve further exploration.

27.

Dos Santos, P.A. (2008) ‘Don’t we all have problems?’, in Voogt, P. (ed.): *Can we make a difference? Museums, society and development in North and South*, Amsterdam: Tropenmuseum, Bulletin 387, pp. 40-53.

[http://www.kitpublishers.nl/net/KIT\\_Publicaties\\_output/ShowFile2.aspx?e=1511](http://www.kitpublishers.nl/net/KIT_Publicaties_output/ShowFile2.aspx?e=1511)

Author: Paula Assunção dos Santos

Institution: Reinwardt Academy, the Netherlands

This article, included in a collection of essays addressing the contemporary role of ethnographic museums in the ‘global North’ and the ‘global South’, explores the challenges posed on Western European museums by the advent of multiculturalism and their practical consequences in terms of museology, including the social role of museums. ‘*Multiculturalism forces ethnographic museums to see “others” they represent not only as a subject, but as direct beneficiaries within a plural social context.*’ (p. 41)

One possible approach to address these challenges is exemplified by ‘cooperative museology’, which involves museums, including ethnographic museums in particular, working together with diverse communities. Likewise, the author identifies an increasing trend to address ‘development’ from the perspective of museums. Territorial



museums (sometimes referred to as *ecomuseums*) focus on the concept of a community living in a locality, whereas urban museums across the world play a role in community engagement, conflict resolution, etc. Dos Santos argues that Western European museums '*could (should?) do much more, considering the need to negotiate citizenship, fight social exclusion and improve intercultural dialogue in society.*' (p. 45)

In this respect, the author considers the issue of social inclusion and states that the simplest way for museums to work towards this aim is to become inclusive institutions, by providing access to different groups as audiences and addressing issues of representation and participation in the institutions. This needs to go beyond the notion of 'audience development', for '*[social] inclusion does not mean to include minorities in the museum. It means to improve access to opportunities in society, for which museums can work as means. To think only from the perspective of museums (from inside out; only in terms of bringing people in) is to underestimate and to misunderstand the potential role of museums and of heritage for development*' (pp. 46-47). She identifies a role for museums in fostering social inclusion at different levels, from small-scale work to a broader advocacy role, and highlights how some ethnographic museums, such as Paris' Musée du Quai Branly and Göteborg's Museum of World Culture, have invested in interventions on a societal level, although she also identifies differences in their approaches to diversity and community involvement.

The final section addresses the role of ethnographic museums, and particularly their processes (e.g. how exhibitions are made) and their means, in relation to 'the three pillars of social inclusion': access, representation and participation.

In terms of access, new opportunities for immigrant source communities to exploit museum collections (through the new media, participation in the making of exhibitions, catalogues, etc.) can have benefits for them, for museums and for society as a whole: '*The process of engaging with collections has the potential to serve as a factor of empowerment by generating social action, capacity building, developing conscience etc.*' (p. 49)

As regards representation, possibilities include exhibition partnerships, self-representation processes allowing communities to foster self-reflection exercises, and 'reflexive representation', whereby museums make their position as a social and political force explicit and become a stakeholder in a co-operative effort for development. New alternatives to collecting should also be considered, privileging more dynamic views of cultures and including direct input of people.

Finally, participation is seen as an essential process, which can involve a wide range of forms of engagement. The author notes the reluctance of some museum professionals to privilege minority communities in participation processes, as this is seen as



disregarding the broader public and risks leading to isolation and exclusion. In her view however, '[focusing] on minorities does not aim to isolate them or to ignore the rest; instead, it is a strategy of empowerment actually targeted at society as a whole.' (p. 51)

Dos Santos concludes by arguing that the key development work for ethnographic museums in a multicultural context lies in articulations and connections, and that this should involve cooperation with different stakeholders, from traditionally hegemonic actors to new empowered actors. '*Working with communities and minorities groups should be seen as a strategy of empowerment and equality, aiming at the broader context of society.*' (p. 52)

The article builds on previous research in the field of museum studies and ethnography and provides a good analysis of how museums can contribute to fostering social inclusion, what this means both for minority communities and for society as a whole and more particularly what steps in organisation and partnerships are needed to achieve these aims.

28.  
DSP-groep (2011): *More than worth it. The Social Significance of Museums*. Amsterdam: Nederlandse Museumvereniging (Netherlands Museums Association) (81 pp.)  
<http://www.museumvereniging.nl/Portals/0/NMV%20%27More%20than%20worth%20it%27.pdf>  
Original version in Dutch:  
<http://www.museumvereniging.nl/Portals/0/Meer%20dan%20waard.pdf>  
  
Authors: Annelies van der Horst, Marieke de Groot and Eric Lagendijk  
Institution: DSP-groep, in collaboration with staff of the Netherlands Museum Association and several museums

This report emerged from the 2009 edition of the annual Dutch Museums Conference, which discussed the significance of museums for cities and regions. Following the event, the Netherlands Museums Association commissioned consultancy firm DSP-groep to carry out research on the social significance of the museum sector. The project involved interviews with representatives of various public sectors and an analysis of national and international research. In addition, the agency Atlas voor Gemeenten was asked to quantify the social value of museums.

The report identifies five social values embodied by museums and provides tips for exploiting them through strategic development, communication and alliance-building. In particular, the five areas of value identified are as follows:

- Collection value, which refers to social issues such as stewardship, acquisition and disposal, digitisation and visitor profiles, i.e. issues which are in line with public

cultural policies. Community participation in the selection of exhibited works, new forms of collection presentation including through the digitisation of contents and the diversification of exhibition spaces (e.g. in schools), can enhance the social value of collections.

- ▶ Connecting value, which includes civic participation, volunteer policy, democratisation and social cohesion, service organisation and social and professional networks, i.e. issues which are mainly related to public social policies. The organisation of public discussions on issues of local relevance, cooperation with libraries or civic organisations, the promotion of voluntary work (21,000 volunteers were involved in Dutch museums in 2007, up from 18,000 in 2001), the role of museum friends' associations and the use of social media profiles are some of the ways in which museums strengthen their connecting value.
- ▶ Educational value, which involves links with the demands of the labour market, adult education, lifelong learning, talent development, work placements, civic integration and the knowledge economy, i.e. issues which relate to public educational policies. Specific activities in this field include the organisation of educational visits and workshops for different target groups, the implementation of research and scientific activities and the promotion of amateur art.
- ▶ Experience value, which includes fulfilment, tolerance, leadership, relaxation and mental health care, i.e. areas which relate to leisure policies, welfare policies and healthcare. The provision of spaces for self-reflection and the organisation of festive events (e.g. Museum Nights) are some of the ways in which this experience value is explored.
- ▶ Economic value, which refers to tourism, city marketing, merchandising, area development and quality of life, i.e. issues that are related to public economic policies and town and country planning. Relevant aspects in this field include the attraction of tourists (41% of foreign tourists who visited the Netherlands in 2009 visited at least one museum, up from 31% ten years earlier), contribution to national branding, the promotion of employment as well as the direct, indirect and induced economic effect of museums (which is estimated to be in the region of €3.5 b to 6.4 b per year in the Netherlands).

Each area of impact is illustrated with examples and includes suggestions for potential partnerships. The report ultimately calls '*the museum sector, government and the private sector to join forces and invest in the value of museums, in order to capitalise on this value in a modern and innovative way.*' (p. 72)

Even though its title refers to the 'social' significance of museums, the report actually addresses the social, economic and cultural values attached to museums in contemporary society. Its arguments are relevant to other countries and provide arguments for reflecting on the development of future partnerships and new areas of development.

29.

Du Cros, Hilary & Salazar, Noel (2012): *Tourism and Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization. (131 pp.)

<https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/123456789/272790/2/NBS-UNW.pdf>

Author: Hilary du Cros

Institution: Hong Kong Institute of Education

Author: Noel Salazar

Institution: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

This study commissioned by the World Tourism Organisation offers an in-depth research on the relationship between tourism and intangible cultural heritage, through a series of case studies from around the world.

Chapter 2 deals with major challenges of tourism development related to intangible cultural heritage (ICH). The definition of ICH in this study is based on the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). According to this, ICH is defined as the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups, and, in some cases, individuals, recognise as part of their cultural heritage. Six domains have been identified in the study in which ICH is manifested (the domain gastronomy and culinary practices in the study had been added to the definition of ICH of the UNESCO Convention 2003):

1. Handicrafts and visual arts that demonstrate traditional craftsmanship
2. Gastronomy and culinary practices
3. Social practices, rituals and festive events
4. Music and the performing arts
5. Oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of intangible cultural heritage
6. Knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe

Alongside these six domains, the study provides in Chapter 3 and in the Annexes a convincing number of case studies from different world regions which demonstrate good practices in terms of the design of sustainable ICH-based tourism products.

Chapter 4 revises how stakeholders should act in order to profit from intangible cultural heritage.

Against the background of the diversity and the richness of the case studies documented, the study can be valued as an important contribution to the current

discourse on ICH in the context of the development of contemporary cultural tourism strategies and concepts.

The case studies and the summary of considerations to be taken into account by each of the six domains of ICH demonstrate different benefits and impacts in economic and social terms, e.g. how tourism can benefit local communities, particularly women, who reside away from major tourist flows, etc. An underlying argument of the study is that fostering the responsible use of this living heritage for tourism purposes can provide new employment opportunities, help alleviate poverty, curb rural flight migration among the young and marginally employed, and nurture a sense of pride amongst community members. With reference to several case studies the authors argue that tourism also offers a powerful incentive for preserving and enhancing ICH, since the revenue it generates can be channelled back into initiatives to aid its long-term survival.

Nevertheless, in Chapter 2.14 'Monitoring Performance, Impacts and Ensuring Sustainability', the authors summarize that *"recent debates about intangible cultural heritage and associated products indicate the lack of a framework for understanding and assessing changes to perceptions of social and cultural values."* (Page 21)

30.

Ecorys (2012): *Economic Value of Ireland's Historic Environment. Final report to the Heritage Council*. Dublin: Heritage Council. (94 pp.)

[http://www.heritagecouncil.ie/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Publications/Corporate/Economic\\_Evaluation\\_of\\_the\\_Historic\\_Environment\\_Ireland.pdf](http://www.heritagecouncil.ie/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Corporate/Economic_Evaluation_of_the_Historic_Environment_Ireland.pdf)

Author/Institution: Ecorys (formerly known as ECOTEC) and Fitzpatrick Associates

This report, commissioned by Ireland's Heritage Council, follows a similar methodology and approach to that applied by ECOTEC and Ecorys in other countries (see e.g. ECOTEC's 2010 reports on the historic environment in Wales, below). Evidence was collected through a literature review, collation of relevant financial, economic and tourism data, consultations with core heritage organisations and the production of a set of ten case studies. The core aim of the document is to determine the current value of economic activity generated by Ireland's historic environment, primarily through quantifying levels of employment and national income which may be attributed to it, directly and indirectly. In addition, some wider community benefits are also described, and the policy and research implications of the evidence found are presented. The focus of the research lies on built heritage assets, excluding the natural environment as well as museums except where they are located within a historic building or asset.

The economic analysis of the sector focuses on three major components: the core historic environment organisations (the so-called ‘inner wheel’ of the sector), the built heritage repair and maintenance sector (in relation to the pre-1919 building stock) and direct tourism expenditure by tourists principally attracted to Ireland by the historic environment. Their aggregate direct economic turnover in 2009 equalled €1.6 b and had an additional indirect and induced effect amounting to €1.1 b, thus having a total economic impact of €2.7 b. As regards the GVA, the sector contributed €1.4 b to the Irish economy. In terms of employment, the sector employed 23,971 FTE jobs (including 1,156 in the ‘inner wheel’, 9,820 in the built heritage construction sector and 12,995 in historic environment-related tourism) and generated almost 13,000 indirect or induced jobs – therefore, its total employment relevance amounted to almost 37,000 jobs in 2009.

Beyond this ‘conventional’ economic impact, the report argues that a range of wider economic, social and environmental benefits had been identified by the research exercise. These include the support to other sectors of the Irish economy (e.g. supporting growth and employment in the broader ‘visitor economy’, as well as the construction sector and the development and retention of traditional craft-based construction skills), the enhancement of education and lifelong learning opportunities (including the provision of attractive educational activities and the provision of resources for vocational education in engineering or craft skills), the strengthening of community identity, cohesion and development (e.g. volunteering opportunities and renewed sense of civic pride amongst the local population in areas whose heritage has been renovated and attracted tourism), the environmental enhancement of local areas (renovating historic buildings helps to improve the broader physical environmental fabric and reduces the pressure to develop new buildings on greenfield sites) and the attraction of inward investment into localities. It is worth noting that, according to the report, Ireland has a relatively limited tradition of volunteering, but *‘the built historic environment has acted as a focal point to bring community members together...’* through volunteering schemes (p. 30).

The concluding chapter summarises the arguments regarding the value of the historic environment and makes the case for renewed public intervention and investment in this sector. It also addresses specific policy and research implications, including the potential to further promote and present Ireland’s distinctive built heritage internationally, in order to unlock *‘a scale of as yet untapped visitor appeal and additional visitor revenues to the nation’* (p. 34), as well as the need to recognise and explore in particular the economic impact of the sector, beyond the rationale for heritage investment made on the grounds of the protection of heritage assets themselves. Additional recommendations are made regarding the need to improve the evidence base in the field of heritage and its economic dimension (e.g. investment by

local authorities, more precise indicators regarding the heritage construction sector and heritage tourism, as well as the tax revenue contribution of the sector).

A set of ten case studies makes up the second half of the report, each including a short presentation of the relevant historic asset, management model and activities undertaken (including recent major investments where applicable) and economic, social and environmental benefits identified. As compared to other similar reports, evidence presented in this section is mainly descriptive and only in a few cases appears to be based on previous, thorough evaluation reports. Additional technical and methodological information is presented in an annex.

Overall this report complements the set of similar research documents produced by Ecorys in neighbouring countries and helps to provide a contemporary assessment of the economic value of the built heritage in Ireland. Its shortcomings may include the lack of a broader view of heritage, as well as the limited evidence presented in case studies.

31.  
Ecorys (2012): *The Economic Impact of Maintaining and Repairing Historic Buildings in England*, London. (20 pp.)  
[http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/howwework/Documents/Historic\\_Buildings\\_Study\\_Ecorys\\_2012.pdf](http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/howwework/Documents/Historic_Buildings_Study_Ecorys_2012.pdf)

Author/Institution: Ecorys (formerly known as ECOTEC)

This document offers a general perspective on direct and indirect/induced effects of built heritage construction in terms of output, employment and GDP, thus calculating the subsequent multiplier, which arises from input-output tables. This is done both for England and for the UK as a whole.

Construction-related impacts, the specific focus for the analysis underpinning this report, comprise a major share of overall economic impacts associated with built heritage, with substantial amounts of money – private and public – spent each year on maintaining and conserving England's endowment of historic buildings and structures.

The key findings of the study may be summarised as follows:

- The built heritage construction sector is a highly significant contributor within the context of the wider national economy, directly supporting in the order of 180,000 FTE jobs. Including indirect and induced effects, it is estimated that the scale of



economic impact attributable to the built heritage construction sector in England supports approaching 500,000 FTE jobs.

- ▶ In terms of contribution to national income, England's built heritage construction sector is estimated to account for some £11 b in GDP.
- ▶ Broken down by region, the analysis suggests that the scale of the built heritage construction is most marked in the three English regions that make up the Greater South East – namely, the South East, London and the East of England.
- ▶ Combining the results of the impact analysis for England with revised figures developed under separate analyses for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, indicates a composite value for the UK's built heritage construction sector equivalent to almost £12.5 b in respect of GDP.

32.

ECOTEC (2008): *Economic Impact of the Historic Environment in Scotland*, Birmingham. (78 pp.)

<http://www.heacs.org.uk/documents/2009/ecotec.pdf>

Author/Institution: ECOTEC (now known as Ecorys)

The document provides data on employment numbers, input/output tables for direct and indirect impacts, and information on construction-related and visitor-related expenditure among organisations considered to be important in Scotland's historic environment management.

To summarise findings of the study:

- ▶ The historic environment is a highly significant contributor to the Scottish economy, directly supporting approximately 41,000 FTE employees. Including indirect and induced effects, it is estimated that the historic environment sector supports in excess of 60,000 FTE employees in Scotland.
- ▶ Overall, the historic environment sector is estimated to contribute in excess of £2.3 b to Scotland's national GVA, with this representing some £4.5 b in respect of output. The historic environment sector contributes some £1.4 b in employees' income.
- ▶ The greater share of economic impacts relates to tourism expenditure attributable to the historic environment. Indeed, tourism expenditure is estimated to support some 37,000 FTE employees in Scotland, with this representing nearly £1.3 b in respect of GVA and more than £2.2 b in respect of output.
- ▶ The built heritage construction sector also accounts for a substantial share of the total economic impact – supporting some 20,000 FTE employees in Scotland, and

generating approximately £1 b in respect of GVA. Notably, a significant proportion of this overall impact is rooted in grants and/or expenditure by core historic environment organisations, including Historic Scotland, National Trust for Scotland and the Heritage Lottery Fund.

- Within the context of Scotland's national economy, it is estimated that the historic environment sector's contribution to the national economy is equivalent to 2.6% of Scottish GVA and 2.4% of Scottish income (compensation of employees). Similarly, it has been estimated that the Scottish historic environment sector accounts for 2.5% of Scotland's total employment.

33.  
ECOTEC (2010): *Valuing the Welsh Historic Environment*, Cardiff: National Trust Wales and others. (38 pp.)  
[http://cadw.wales.gov.uk/docs/cadw/publications/ValuingWelshHistoricEnvironment\\_EN.pdf](http://cadw.wales.gov.uk/docs/cadw/publications/ValuingWelshHistoricEnvironment_EN.pdf)

34.  
ECOTEC (2010): *Valuing the Welsh Historic Environment: Economic Impact Technical Report*, Cardiff: National Trust Wales and others. (35 pp.)  
<http://cadw.wales.gov.uk/docs/cadw/publications/ValuingWHEEnvironmentEconomicImpact.pdf>

35.  
ECOTEC (2010): *Valuing the Welsh Historic Environment: A Monitoring Framework*, Cardiff: National Trust Wales and others (9 pp.)  
[http://cadw.wales.gov.uk/docs/cadw/publications/ValuingtheWelshHistoricEnvironmentMonitoringFramework\\_EN.pdf](http://cadw.wales.gov.uk/docs/cadw/publications/ValuingtheWelshHistoricEnvironmentMonitoringFramework_EN.pdf)

Author/Institution: ECOTEC (now known as Ecorys)

This set of documents was commissioned by the 'Valuing our Environment Partnership', which for over 10 years has worked to reveal through hard economic evidence that the environment is fundamental to prosperity in Wales. The partnership is led by the National Trust Wales and also involves the Countryside Council for Wales, the Heritage Lottery Fund and some departments of the Welsh Assembly Wales, including Visit Wales and the Department for the Economy and Transport. In this context, a working group was set up to commission research in order to fully capture the economic, social and environmental benefits of the historic environment and to design a consistent methodology in this field. These tasks were then entrusted to ECOTEC Research and Consulting.

The main document emerging from this project, *Valuing the Welsh Historic Environment*, describes the aims and definitions used in the research. The object of



analysis is a rather restricted definition of the ‘historic environment sector’ (as in the tangible aspects of cultural and natural heritage), the ‘inner cog’ of which is formed by organisations which are active in conserving, maintaining and managing and/or creating access to Wales’ historic environment – including in particular scheduled ancient monuments or archaeological sites, listed buildings, conservation areas, registered historic gardens or designed landscapes, registered historic landscapes, marine historic landscapes and museums or heritage centres which are located within a historic building or asset.

This ‘inner cog’, as well as the built heritage constructing sector and expenditure resulting from tourists attracted to Wales principally because of the historic environment, is estimated to have had a total turnover of £1.8 b in Wales (including direct, indirect and induced effects), GVA totalling £839 m and a total FTE impact of 30,453 jobs (including 19,300 direct jobs, as well as other indirect and induced effects) in 2009. Authors warn that the relatively narrow definition of the historic environment serves to ensure that the approach is transparent and robust but may under-estimate the true value of the sector. In their view, approximately one-fifth of total tourism expenditure in Wales can be estimated to derive from the impact of the historic environment. Tourism expenditure is estimated to support some 14,900 FTE jobs in Wales, representing £330 m in respect of GVA and more than £610 m in respect of output. On the other hand, the built heritage construction sector supports over 13,400 jobs in Wales and generates approximately £450 m in respect of GVA and £1.1 b in output.

Beyond this initial quantitative appraisal, the report presents a qualitative set of arguments regarding the broader economic value of the historic environment (e.g. supporting wider regeneration activities, enhancing skills for jobs, catalysing investment) which is illustrated with short examples – e.g. the ‘catalysing investment’ potential of the heritage sector is proven by the 26 Heritage Lottery Fund-supported Townscape Heritage Initiatives in Wales, which have raised £620,000 from partner organisations for every £1 m funded by the HLF.

This set of arguments regarding the economic value of historic environment is complemented with similar arguments regarding its environmental value (e.g. protecting the historic environment, maintaining environmental quality and biodiversity, conserving energy by refurbishing historic buildings) and its social value (e.g. promoting access to and understanding of the historic environment, increasing community identity and cohesion, enhancing civic pride, increasing community capacity and ownership, encouraging wellbeing and enhancing quality of life, providing learning opportunities for people of all ages and supporting the national curriculum for Wales). Several examples are provided, including references to volunteer engagement in the historic environment (e.g. in 2009, the National Trust in Wales worked with 4,407

volunteers, who contributed a total of 230,000 hours) and educational visits (e.g. the National Museum Wales has over 230,000 visits from the formal education sector and over 270,000 informal education visits per year).

The report is complemented with a set of nine case studies which provide detailed evidence for the diverse range of arguments formulated above. Each example includes data taken from previous evaluation reports.

On this basis, the report concludes that *‘[the] Welsh historic environment is a valuable asset that plays a key role in enhancing the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of communities in Wales. The active care and promotion of this asset is essential; once elements have been lost or forgotten they can rarely be recovered’* (p. 35), thus calling for sustained efforts and investment to protect, maintain and provide value to the historic environment, including cultural heritage.

This main report is supplemented by one technical annex, which describes the definitions and methodology used (review of secondary data and documents, consultations with 38 individuals from 24 organisations, economic assessment, case study descriptions, etc.), as well as ‘monitoring framework’, which should enable ongoing data capture by partners in the sector to understand the value of the Welsh historic environment. The latter document, which presents a set of indicators concerning existing historic environment assets and activities, their economic value (employment, expenditure, income, leverage, business, tourism), environmental value and social value (education, participation, social capital and community cohesion, health, crime), can be seen as a good practice in this field and its implementation could be considered elsewhere. However, authors stress that the framework still focuses on a rather restricted definition of the historic environment and relies mainly on quantitative data, these being two minor shortcomings of the evidence presented.

36.

ERS Research and Consultancy (2011): *Economic Impact Toolkits for Archives, Libraries and Museums. Final Report*. Glasgow: Archives, Libraries and Museums Alliance UK (ALMA-UK) (100 pp.)

[http://almauk.org/working-together/our\\_activity/economic-impacts/](http://almauk.org/working-together/our_activity/economic-impacts/)

Author / Institution: ERS Research and Consultancy, Newcastle upon Tyne

Rather than an academic document, this report should be interpreted as an attempt to develop a practical, comparative tool to assess the economic impact of archives, libraries and museums, on the basis of an analysis of existing literature and a broad consultation with British professionals in these fields. The document was

commissioned by the Archives, Libraries and Museums Alliance UK (ALMA-UK) in 2010, with a view to maximising usability and usefulness, providing an affordable, cost-effective tool which could be used by individual organisations but also for aggregation more widely.

Methodology included a literature review of over 60 economic impact reports and toolkits published since the 1990s, mainly in the UK and the US, which analysed the scale and quality of information, the transferability and complexity of the approaches used and the likely intensity of resources demanded in terms of data gathering and associated data analysis. In addition, a consultation exercise with 19 stakeholders identified by ALMA-UK was carried out, with a view to gathering information on the information already being collected, the feasibility of obtaining additional data and the form of toolkit most suitable for collection.

One of the aims of the literature review was to analyse how four different methodological approaches to economic impact study (multiplier analysis, contingent valuation, return on investment and economic valuation) had been used in the cultural sector and which where their advantages and disadvantages. The consultation also provided detailed information about the familiarity of professionals in the field with different assessment methodologies, including the finding that stakeholders in the museums sector exhibited the greatest level of understanding and experience of participating or delivering economic impact assessment, whereas very few studies linked to archives were identified and individuals from the libraries sector tended to refer to national, rather than regional or local studies.

Partly as a result of this, the research team suggested that two different approaches be followed, with a multiplier analysis approach being proposed for the museums and archives sector, in the form of a guide and a spreadsheet, as this would be particularly adequate for collecting impacts deriving from visitor numbers, as well as voluntary work, social and learning activities and regeneration impacts; and either return on investment or economic valuation for libraries, in order to collect the value experienced by local users. The report includes recommendations for piloting this model in a sample of museums, archives and libraries.

Even though the main emphasis of the report is placed on economic impact analysis, the desk research also provided detailed information about existing social impact assessment methods. Some of the methods suggested in the toolkit would also allow for the collection of data regarding impact in this field.

It is worth noting that following the publication of this initial benchmark report and its recommendations in 2011, a set of updated analyses and guidance documentation (including spreadsheets and how-to guides) were published in 2012.<sup>6</sup>

This initiative is relevant in particular for its ability to collect and cross-analyse previous research on the economic impact of cultural institutions, as well as the attempt to provide a common, comparative and practical framework for archives, museums and libraries, which should ease the collection of data and the publication of data at sector level.

37.

Europa Nostra (2009): *Why Cultural Heritage Matters for Europe. Europa Nostra Calls for European Action*, policy document, adopted during the Europa Nostra Annual Congress 2009 (Taormina, Sicily, 3 June 2009). The Hague: Europa Nostra (4 pp.)

<http://www.europanostra.org/UPLOADS/FILS/Why%20Cultural%20Heritage%20matters%20for%20Europe%20062009.pdf>

Institution: Europa Nostra

This short policy statement addresses the challenges experienced by cultural heritage in the context of economic instability in Europe. It was adopted by Europa Nostra, a network involving 250 member organisations, 150 associated organisations and 1500 individual members active in the field of cultural heritage, at a congress in Sicily.

In addition to stressing the value of cultural heritage as a shared asset for European societies, the text places particular emphasis on the economic benefits of heritage (jobs, tourism, catalyst for technical innovation, education, energy saving) and their broader societal benefits and impacts (social cohesion, intercultural dialogue, forging identity, enhancing quality of life). Areas of value are only briefly sketched, in the form of bullet points.

The outline of cultural heritage benefits provides the basis for the formulation of recommendations on the integration of cultural heritage in EU policies. The statement asks the EU to develop a cultural heritage strategy, in the context of the European Agenda for Culture. This should also involve the mainstreaming of cultural heritage in a broad range of EU policies and the improvement of interaction and coordination among different stakeholders.

---

<sup>6</sup> See [http://almauk.org/working-together/our\\_activity/economic-impacts/](http://almauk.org/working-together/our_activity/economic-impacts/) for additional information.

Finally, the text includes a list of activities envisaged by Europa Nostra at the time, in order to strengthen the attention paid to cultural heritage at European level, including the organisation of events and the regular liaison with European organisations and networks active in relevant fields.

Whilst some of the specific recommendations presented may be slightly outdated, the document operates as a good reminder of civil society action on cultural heritage at European level and the potential synergies with a broad range of EU policies.

38.

European Council of Spatial Planners (c. 2012): *Try This Way. Sustainable Development at the Local Level*. Brussels: European Council of Spatial Planners (26 pp.)

[http://www.ectp-ceu.eu/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=86&Itemid=119](http://www.ectp-ceu.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=86&Itemid=119)

Institution: European Council of Spatial Planners – Conseil européen des urbanistes (ECTP – CEU)

The European Council of Town Planners (ECTP – CEU), which brings together national associations of planners across the continent, has recently published this practical guide which aims to provide recommendations on how to contribute to sustainable development in spatial planning. The publication was produced by a working group involving ECTP – CEU members from different countries.

The main part of the guide includes an examination of different aspects of sustainable development which relate to spatial planning, with specific tips given to urban planners to integrate them when planning specific interventions. Among them is 'heritage and regeneration', alongside water; air and noise; soil and land; social quality, etc.

The approach to heritage prevailing in the document is one of preservation, rather than exploitation towards the achievement of social and economic objectives – urban planners are advised to take into account the opportunities and threats that spatial development provides to cultural heritage, by renovating and reusing existing buildings and urban structures, integrating existing heritage elements into the urban fabric and promoting historic elements and structures as part of cultural heritage. This could involve, among others, considering historic remnants as essential elements for urban design and creating a relation between new expansion and existing urban structures, thus fostering continuity. References to heritage-related issues can be found under other thematic sections as well – e.g. taking into account 'social quality' involves considering typical elements and structure as identifiable elements which enhance both the historical continuity and the identity of place and making use of historical and cultural elements to enforce local identity.

The last section of the guide presents stage-by-stage recommendations for implementing strategies in line with sustainable development.

Even though the perspective on sustainable development which the document adopts is one in which culture plays at most a secondary role (the introduction argues that *‘[sustainable] development includes ecological, economic and social aspects’*, p. 3), this document can be seen as a useful contribution to raising awareness of cultural heritage and its importance in sustainable urban planning. In practice, the items listed under most thematic sections account for a multidimensional view on development, where cultural aspects fit, implicitly rather than explicitly.

39.

EVoCH project (Economic Value of Cultural Heritage) (2009). *Charter of Brussels on the role of Cultural Heritage in the economy, and the creation of a European network for recognition and dissemination*. Brussels: Junta de Castilla y León (1 p.)

<http://www.jcyl.es/web/jcyl/binarios/95/39/Charter%20of%20Brussels.pdf?blobheader=application%2Fpdf%3Bcharset%3DUTF-8&blobnocache=true>

40.

EVoCH project (Economic Value of Cultural Heritage) (2012): *Final Conclusions EVoCH project*. Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León (2 pp.)

[http://www.jcyl.es/web/jcyl/binarios/859/100/FINAL%20CONCLUSIONS%20EVoCH%20PROYECTO.pdf?blobheader=application%2Fpdf%3Bcharset%3DUTF-8&blobheadername1=Cache-Control&blobheadername2=Expires&blobheadername3=Site&blobheadervalue1=no-store%2Cno-cache%2Cmust-revalidate&blobheadervalue2=0&blobheadervalue3=Portal\\_EVOCH&blobnocache=true](http://www.jcyl.es/web/jcyl/binarios/859/100/FINAL%20CONCLUSIONS%20EVoCH%20PROYECTO.pdf?blobheader=application%2Fpdf%3Bcharset%3DUTF-8&blobheadername1=Cache-Control&blobheadername2=Expires&blobheadername3=Site&blobheadervalue1=no-store%2Cno-cache%2Cmust-revalidate&blobheadervalue2=0&blobheadervalue3=Portal_EVOCH&blobnocache=true)

Institutions: Regional Government of Castilla y León, Regional Government of the Madrid Region, European Association of Architectural Heritage Restoration Companies (AEERPA), Tecnalia Research and Innovation, CARTIF Foundation, Santa María la Real Foundation, Caja Madrid Foundation, Secretariat for Culture of the Government of Portugal and others

These documents are part of a process initiated by the Regional Government of Castilla y León, Spain, and other partners in 2009, and which has recently involved the implementation of the EVoCH project (Economic Value of Cultural Heritage) with support from the European Commission's Culture Programme. After that project, which involved partners in Italy, Germany, Norway and Spain, a broader platform of public and private like-minded organisations has been set up ([www.jcyl.es/evoch](http://www.jcyl.es/evoch)).

2009's *Charter of Brussels*, signed by members or representatives of public authorities, institutions, companies and experts in the field of cultural heritage, highlights the



potential of this sector to contribute to the achievement of the EU's economic objectives. In this respect, the text calls for cultural heritage to '*cease to be considered as a burden that is only worthy of consideration during a period of economic boom*', instead considering it as '*a non-renewable asset*' that should receive permanent public support.

This should involve a strengthening of the place of heritage in education and lifelong learning, as well as the recognition that heritage conservation, restoration and management have an important economic relevance. Since cultural heritage '*is able to create stable, specialised and quality employment that cannot be relocated*', economic policies in this area should be seen as '*a public and private investment with a high rate of social profitability*.' Spillover effects as regards research, development and innovation as well as in quality of life, local regeneration, country branding and European integration are also mentioned.

The Charter closes with a commitment to pursue activities in this field and to set up a stable, open working group which should be active in this field. As a result, the EVoCH project (2010-2012) organised a number of forums in order to assess the importance of cultural heritage to the economy. Its final conclusions, adopted again in Brussels in April 2012, highlight the added value of cultural heritage not only to the economy but also to the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The text calls for cultural heritage to be recognised as an asset in employment and innovation policies and establishes links with the *Europe 2020* strategy.

Finally, the project conclusions set out a range of measures which the new EVoCH platform sought to implement, including the setting-up of an Observatory to analyse the economic and employment impact of cultural heritage and to collect good practices and success stories, as well as other activities in the field of research, awareness-raising and marketing.

The EVoCH Platform, which now involves a wide range of members including the State Secretariat for Culture in Portugal, English Heritage, several Spanish regional governments and the CajaMadrid Foundation, continues to foster reflection on the economic value of cultural heritage through public forums, presentations and practice exchange. Its website includes several publications produced in particular in the context of the EVoCH project forums.



41.

Figesma (2008): *L'Économie du patrimoine culturel en région Languedoc-Roussillon*. [The Economy of Cultural Heritage in the Languedoc-Roussillon Region] Paris. (166 pp.)

<http://www.vmfpatrimoine.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/patrimoine-languedoc-roussillon.pdf>

Author: Jean-Loius Lasnier

Institution: Figesma

This report was commissioned in 2006 by the Region Languedoc-Roussillon and the French Ministry of Culture's Regional Direction of Cultural Affairs in the aforementioned region. It builds on a previous study from the region of Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur which covered only historic monuments open to the public. In this new study, which focuses on a neighbouring region, the field of study has been enlarged, to encompass both direct and indirect economic effects of the overall heritage sector. Direct effects are related to heritage institutions such as monuments, museums or archaeological sites, but they also include public authorities and service providers (e.g. architects, heritage-related companies). Indirect effects include expenditure by tourists, hikers and residents in the region as well as other expenses related to accommodation and other services.

The report starts by proving the importance of cultural heritage in the French regional economy. In 2006, cultural heritage represented 14.8% of the tourism-related economy in Languedoc-Roussillon, where it employed 18,400 people, including 6,400 direct jobs and 12,000 indirect jobs – this amounts to 3.8% of all jobs in the region. In terms of turnover, it generated €1.46 b, or 2% of the regional economy. Tax receipts derived from cultural heritage reached a total amount of €203 m. On this basis, it can be estimated that each euro of public funds spent on heritage in the region generates €19, including €5 in the sector and €14 indirect effects.

The methodology was based on the distribution of a series of surveys to heritage institutions across the Languedoc-Roussillon region. Given that only a portion of them replied, researchers extrapolated the evidence obtained and present estimates for the overall heritage sector in the region.

In terms of FTE jobs, heritage institutions in the region (monuments, museums and archaeological sites) employed 2007 staff in total. As for the economic benefits generated by these actors, their total income was €23 m. Other organisations operating in the sector, including public authorities and private service providers, derived 3,962 jobs from this sector. Their turnover amounted to €342 m. In terms of indirect social and economic benefits, the volume of activity of the tourism sector was €6.9 b. The total number of visitors (including local, national and international tourists) was 20.6 m.

The study follows by offering a synthesis of conclusions obtained by a qualitative analysis of interviews with 14 members of organisations in the field of heritage management. In summary, they consider cultural heritage to be a factor of economic development, although a few respondents regret that the potential of the tourism sector is not being sufficiently exploited and remains stagnant. Nonetheless, in general terms, the geographic situation and attractiveness of the region strengthens its probability of becoming a strategic area.

The conclusions of the study point at some strategies that would lead to a better management of the heritage sector from the point of view of all actors involved.

42.

Giraud-Labalte, C., "The place of European cultural heritage in society", in Braeckman, G. (ed.) (2011): *Cultural heritage. A resource for Europe. The benefits of interaction*, Brussels: Flemish Government, pp. 31-42.

<http://ebl.vlaanderen.be/publications/documents/39677>

Author: Claire Giraud-Labalte

Institution: Université Catholique de l'Ouest, France

This text is included in the proceedings of a European conference on cultural heritage, organised by the Flemish Government during the Belgian Presidency of the EU in 2010. The author aims to highlight the range of benefits that heritage can bring to contemporary European challenges.

Analysing the developments of recent decades, Giraud-Labalte recognises a newfound appreciation of heritage among European societies, partly prompted by the threat of disappearance of some heritage assets. In addition to this increasing interest in cultural heritage preservation, links with several policy areas have been identified, including tourism, education, environment, etc., which are illustrated with some examples.

Other relevant effects of cultural heritage include the human and technical skills in trades and crafts, as well as the knowledge and expertise that they require, as an added value of cultural heritage to society, which is often underestimated but may call for more efforts in vocational training: '*whereas crafts and trades as such are highly valued, trade and vocational education today are often seen as a less desirable alternative for 'general' education*' (p. 37). The digitisation of cultural heritage and the introduction of cultural heritage in school from a young age, as a way of favouring the appreciation of a wide range of values, are some of the aspects in which cultural heritage can play a role in educational developments.

This connectedness with other areas of policy should go hand-in-hand with an integrated approach to cultural heritage that, rather than isolating it from everyday life, encourages interaction between the heritage sector and civil society. Some examples of cooperation are shown, including public and private organisations working together in the preservation and valorisation of the Loire Valley. This and other examples also show a more integrated approach to local sustainable development in which heritage assets play a major part – e.g. links with the preservation of natural heritage and with local transportation policies.

The author calls the heritage community to be more explicit in raising awareness of the importance of the sector, beyond the technical and short-term problems that it faces. In this respect, she also demands that lifelong training opportunities be provided to heritage professionals, so as to develop the skills necessary for multi-disciplinary, cross-departmental and cross-border cooperation. *‘This approach requires an open-minded attitude, even a degree of ‘unlearning’ perhaps, in order to broaden horizons, linking action to the relevant context and embracing proposals of others. This ‘culture of dialogue’ forms the basis of the interaction approach to European cultural heritage.’* (p. 42)

The author has extensive experience in heritage research, consultancy and training and currently chairs the ‘Understanding Heritage’ working group of the European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres (ENCATC).

43.

Goddard, S. (2009); ‘Heritage partnerships – Promoting public involvement and understanding’, in Council of Europe: *Heritage and beyond*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 141-148.

[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf)

Author: Sharon Goddard

Institution: GEM (The voice for heritage learning) (currently: Oakmere Solutions Ltd)

This article explores how the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society’s (Faro Convention) aims of public involvement, participation and partnership working can be linked together to deliver integrated services and activities which reach into wider areas of civil society, as well as the individual and societal value of engagement with cultural heritage and how it can be supported through partnerships.

Engagement with heritage, which can take different forms and various levels of involvement (information, consultation, deciding together, acting together, supporting independent community initiatives, participation in the governance of heritage organisations, etc.), has been found to have a range of positive effects at individual and societal levels – these can be enhanced through partnerships between heritage institutions and the formal education sector, organisations representing minority groups or those who generally participate less in cultural activities, etc. Drawing on research in different countries, particularly the UK, the author presents a framework of areas of benefit of heritage engagement, which can be summarised as follows:

- ▶ *Benefits for participants:* increase in self-confidence, self-esteem and general sense of well-being; opportunities to have fun and to gain enjoyment and satisfaction from participation; development of skills, particularly skills in using creative media and transferable skills such as literacy, numeracy, observation, thinking, communication and collaborative working; development of individual identity, pride and a sense of place; positive changes in attitudes and behaviour; access to heritage professional knowledge and expertise; increased knowledge and understanding of heritage resources, particularly local heritage; increased confidence and skills in using heritage resources for both specific and generic purposes.
- ▶ *Benefits for society:* enhanced integration of socially excluded groups supporting social cohesion and development; effective use of resources; development of intercultural and inter-generational understanding and respect.
- ▶ *Benefits for heritage organisations:* extending organisational mission as part of modernisation; the development of new products including new learning programmes and activities, web-based resources, loan boxes, and programmes for teachers; building new and more socially representative audiences; the piloting of new teaching and learning and engagement approaches which extend the skills of heritage professionals; the establishment of new and effective partnerships; gaining access to new sources of funding.

On the other hand, Goddard also warns of existing challenges and barriers which could prevent the heritage sector from achieving its potential impact, including matching the heritage offer with the core curriculum of schools, colleges and other social institutions, identifying and accessing appropriate target groups, finding the right participation method, having staff with the right skill set, etc. According to her, many of these can be overcome by working in partnership. Partnerships can enable heritage organisations to identify and work with target groups, access additional and complementary resources and expertise, deliver high-quality outcomes, foster inter-professional learning, build capacity and pool expertise to deliver lasting organisational and sectoral change, among others.

Finally, the author provides a set of conditions which can lead to the building of effective partnerships (identifying shared policy agendas across Europe; finding and focusing on project complementarities; developing shared delivery through aligned programmes; agreements on funding, monitoring and reporting; embedding external, impartial evaluation; and learning through practice) as well as the characteristics of good partnerships (shared strategic vision and alignment with policy; good leadership; effective mechanisms for joint planning; clear objectives, targets and milestones; joint monitoring and evaluation; shared sense of ownership; respect for individual strengths; and openness and trust).

In summary, this text addresses several areas of impact of cultural heritage particularly in the social and educational sphere and provides a good, thorough list of practical recommendations for carrying out partnerships locally. Even though detailed evidence of the impacts is not presented, information is well summarised and serves to provide a wide range of arguments in this field. The author has extensive consultancy experience in the fields of learning and skills, volunteering, heritage interpretation and audience development, among others, and used to work at the UK's Heritage Lottery Fund.

44.

Grefe, X. (2009); 'Heritage conservation as a driving force for development', in Council of Europe: *Heritage and beyond*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 101-112.

[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf)

Author: Xavier Grefe

Institution: University of Paris I

This article seeks to highlight the links between cultural heritage and sustainable development, with a particular emphasis on the economic effects of heritage. By doing so, it aims to counter what the author perceives as a progressive disengagement of European governments with the preservation of cultural heritage, which is partly justified by the failure to recognise the immediate effects of heritage in contemporary society.

Relevant areas of impact include cultural tourism – although the author notes that, with the exception of certain prestigious heritage items, experience in numerous cases has proven disappointing and that tourism tends to have a limited effect on heritage in terms of income (most revenue is gained by the hotel and catering industry). A second area of impact is the environment and cultural landscape, which should increasingly be understood broadly, as a context which is forged by communities daily – in this respect, heritage conservation is an economic, social and cultural investment, as shown by schemes which contribute to saving energy or to enable communities to find out more

about their local environment. A third contribution comes from intangible heritage, which acquires a crucial role in the context of the knowledge economy – it is important to take an overall view of cultural heritage, which recognises the relationships between tangible and intangible elements. Finally, Greffe mentions a fourth dimension of heritage – its application for extrinsic purposes (e.g. in health contexts), which go beyond the original, traditionally-held view of heritage.

The second section of the article describes the necessary conditions for deriving value from cultural heritage, including the need to adopt an integral vision of heritage and explore its interrelations with other areas of development; the view of heritage as something dynamic rather than immutable; the need to establish a balanced relationship between heritage and economic development, where the arguments of both can be considered (*'[the] dynamics of conservation and beneficial use are not the same, and they bring into play different collective schemes of logic'*, p. 109); the inclusion of all kinds of heritage, including those which represent marginal communities (thus understanding heritage as a right); and the need for awareness-raising, education and training activities to be implemented, to underpin the contribution of heritage to sustainable development.

The author highlights how the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society ('Faro Convention') is relevant in this respect, by reinforcing the position of cultural heritage as a meeting point of various factors which are usually considered separately and, more generally, by recognising the five prerequisite conditions set out above. According to him, the Convention brings progress on three fronts: it emphasises the importance of intangible heritage and may alter communities' view of this type of heritage, whether their own or others'; it shows that heritage transcends individual communities and nations; and, as a result of these two issues, it emphasises the potential of heritage in terms of sustainable development, including its cultural, economic, social and ecological dimensions.

Overall, the text serves as a general introduction to the contribution of heritage, including in particular its less tangible aspects, to contemporary sustainable development strategies. Even though it does not provide specific data, it is a well-presented account of different areas of potential impact as well as the necessary conditions to maximise the contribution of heritage to sustainable development.



45.

Grefe, X (2011): *The economic impact of the Louvre*, in The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, Spring 2011. (pp. 87-112)

<http://www3.grips.ac.jp/~culturalpolicy/pdf/The%20Economic%20Impact%20of%20the%20Louvre%20Coointeg..pdf>

Author: Xavier Grefe

Institution: University of Paris I

This short article starts by introducing different approaches to measuring the economic value of cultural institutions, including those that are based on the demand side (e.g. contingent value, whereby users and other stakeholders are asked about the value they attach to an institution) and those that rely on the supply side (e.g. impact analysis, including direct and indirect effects). The study opts for the latter methodology, by analysing the direct, indirect and total effects generated by the public establishment of the Louvre (including the museum as well as the Tuileries gardens) on the whole of the French economy, based on data for 2006.

Each level of impact is described in detail. Therefore, the direct economic impact of the Louvre includes expenditure by the Louvre itself (€175 m; total workforce or full-time equivalents being 1,959 jobs), expenditure by foreign visitors to the Louvre (which ranges between €250 m and €535 m depending on the methodology used), expenditure by corporate partners (e.g. co-publication of written works or co-production of audiovisual materials, equalling €1.75 m) and expenditure by client companies (e.g. rental of spaces, concession of museum spaces for commercial purposes, etc; totalling €44.4 m). Overall, the direct economic impact of the Louvre amounts to a figure between €471.4 m and €756.2 m, depending on the methodology used to estimate the expenditure of foreign visitors.

As regards the indirect economic effect, given the lack of adequate tools to assess indirect impact, the study applies the multiplier value suggested by the US' National Endowment for the Arts to estimate the indirect economic impact of museums, which is 1.53. The author argues that the figure is reasonable and that it may actually underestimate the actual impact of the Louvre, given that NEA's multiplier focuses on small metropolitan areas rather than impacts on the broader national economy. The total economic impact thus ranges between €721 m and €1.156 b, depending on the direct impact estimated as per the paragraph above.

On the other hand, the consequences of this economic impact for public finances and employment are also analysed. As regards the impact for public finances, the study indicates that in 2006 the French government granted €110 m to the Louvre and contributed an additional €11 m deriving from tax deductions due to corporate



sponsorship or sponsorship by private individual donors residing in France. As regards its revenues, the state received the VAT paid by the Louvre (€11.8 m), VAT on other direct expenditure (ranging between €58 m and €114 m depending on the method of calculation), individual income tax receipts (ranging between €42 m and €65 m) and corporate income tax receipts (ranging between €7 m and €12 m). Taking all of this into account, the net balance of inflows and outflows for the French state may vary from a deficit of €2 m to a gain of €82 m. When an equal weighting is ascribed to each variable option, the net expected receipt would be €39 m.

As regards the impact on employment, the author estimates that the number of indirect jobs generated by the Louvre may range between 13,625 and 21,225 if an average annual salary cost of €30,000 is estimated; or between 10,292 and 15,720 if an average of €42,000 per year is calculated. Taking the least profitable variant for the French state, this would mean that the average cost for generating a job would range between €1,191 and €1,577 – the author argues that this is considerably lower than the minimum average costs required to create a single job in terms of state subsidies, which was €6,000 in 2006. In this respect, in the final section he writes that *‘[the] Louvre guarantees the existence of a significant number of jobs, at a very low cost for public finances at a time when employment is a major concern for political and economic agents.’* He also highlights the increasing role played by new forms of fundraising and income generation for the museum (e.g. through rent of spaces), which enable the institution to be less dependent on the exclusive contribution of central government.

Overall, the document provides a good analysis of the economic relevance of the Louvre, in spite of the limitations generated by the lack of evidence when measuring indirect effects. The substantial impact observed has later been quoted in other analyses. On the other hand, the rather unique nature of the institution means that the conclusions of the study may not be transferrable to other contexts, although they could partly be adapted to them.

46.

Grefe, X. (2012): *Concept study on the role of Cultural Heritage as the fourth pillar of Sustainable Development*, Venice: Sustcult project. (73 pp.)

[http://www.sustcult.eu/force.php?percorso=file/download/59/1341237725concept\\_study\\_on\\_the\\_methodology\\_of\\_cultural\\_heritage\\_as\\_the\\_4th\\_pillar\\_of\\_SD.pdf](http://www.sustcult.eu/force.php?percorso=file/download/59/1341237725concept_study_on_the_methodology_of_cultural_heritage_as_the_4th_pillar_of_SD.pdf)

Author: Xavier Grefe

Institution: University of Paris I

This report was commissioned in the context of a project entitled 'Achieving SUSTainability through an integrated approach to the management of CULTural heritage' (SUSTCULT), funded by the EU's South East Europe Transnational Cooperation Programme in the period 2011-2013. The project is coordinated by the City of Venice and involves 12 institutions from 7 countries (Italy, Slovenia, Greece, Romania, Hungary, FYROM and Albania). The concept study is not signed but, on the basis of the initials 'XG' being used throughout and several of the sources and case studies presented, it can be assumed to be authored by Xavier Grefe. The main aim of the study is to collect evidence on the ways in which cultural heritage can contribute to sustainable development and to provide guidance for public policies and governance in this field.

The document includes a long introduction to the role of culture and cultural heritage in sustainable development, tracing the origin of the discourse on 'culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development' back to several academic and institutional references from the early 2000s (e.g. the Agenda 21 for culture). On this basis, the ways in which cultural heritage can be seen as the fourth pillar of sustainable development are discussed, thus also presenting a wide range of impacts of cultural heritage at local and national level, which are illustrated with several examples and case studies:

- ▶ 'Cultural heritage is economically creative': it generates jobs that are more cost-effective than those in other sectors, and it allows communities to preserve assets that have a social and economic value whilst reducing future maintenance costs; it attracts cultural tourists; and it can be a driver for economic development (e.g. intangible heritage or crafts as a source of inspiration for contemporary creativity).
- ▶ 'Cultural heritage is socially creative': it provides 'socially-valuable leisure activities' that elevate people's thinking and contribute positively to their psychological and social well-being and enhance their sensitivity; heritage conservation and valorisation can also enrich the social environment with stimulating or pleasing public amenities, also providing a collective 'memory' for a community and serving as a reservoir of creative and intellectual ideas for future generations; it can also foster social inclusion (e.g. employment initiatives in the cultural heritage sector targeting young people at risk; partnerships between museums and prisons; etc.)

and cultural diversity (museums exhibiting collections which represent diverse communities; outreach programmes, etc.)

- ‘Cultural heritage is environmentally creative’: the preservation of cultural heritage can allow the maintenance of a friendly and acceptable built environment and it can help to save energy (well-restored historic windows can save energy as well as modern ones).

On this basis, the author considers the best ways in which cultural heritage can be managed to contribute to sustainable development, including the following key issues:

- ‘From the administration of a collective good to the governance of a common good’: whereas collective goods need a public decision, which is the government’s responsibility, common goods need a mix of private-public decisions, which imply ‘governance’, as well as collaboration, partnership and mutual trust.
- ‘Cultural heritage as an ecosystem: it is important to raise awareness of the importance of heritage (including all forms of heritage, as a whole), since only then can preservation policies be understood and supported.
- ‘Cultural heritage as a driver for cohesion: the example of cultural landscapes’: an integrated approach to local development should be adopted, which understands the synergies between cultural, social and environmental aspects of human landscapes. *‘By recognizing the multidimensional reciprocity of a cultural landscape, we recognize its social dimension and the aesthetic conditions of human fulfilment. We protect cultural landscapes not as an external treasure to be transmitted to posterity but as a part of our revolving identity and life.’* (p. 55)
- ‘Reticular evaluation of heritage: guaranteeing the right to culture’: a variety of criteria need to be integrated when evaluating programmes and projects, including diverse views such as those represented by audiences and communities.

Following a reflection on the importance of devising new forms of governance in the field of culture, inspired by the statements outlined above, the study closes with a set of conclusions regarding the potential for cultural heritage to become a tool for sustainable development in the countries of Southeast Europe. Despite recognising the specific difficulties identified in the region (e.g. physical destruction or deterioration experienced in recent times, inter-community strife, paucity of economic resources, lack of human resources, etc.), the author presents a set of conditions that could provide guidance for policies in this field: respecting the diversity of cultural expressions and asserting the right to culture, underlining the importance of intangible cultural heritage, networking to take advantage of economies of scale and comparing experiences.

Rather than presenting new evidence, the study serves as a good introduction to several of the ways in which cultural heritage can contribute to sustainable

development, drawing on a wide range of existing studies and discourses. Despite its initial focus on culture as the “fourth pillar” of development, most of the text actually addresses the synergies between culture and the three well-established pillars of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental development). In some sections a certain confusion appears to exist between ‘culture’ and ‘cultural heritage’, with examples addressing either of them often being presented alongside one another.

47.

Grefe, X. and Krebs, A. (2010): *The Relationship between Museums and Municipalities in Europe*, Brussels: ENCATC. (131 pp.)

[http://www.encatc.org/pages/fileadmin/user\\_upload/MU\\_Final\\_Conf/musees\\_municipalites\\_rapport\\_final\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.encatc.org/pages/fileadmin/user_upload/MU_Final_Conf/musees_municipalites_rapport_final_ENG.pdf)

Author: Xavier Grefe

Institution: University of Paris I

Author: Anne Krebs

Institution: Musée du Louvre, Paris

This report was the result of a European project entitled *E=MU<sup>2</sup> – Museums and Municipalities*, funded under the Culture Programme and coordinated by the University of Paris I – Panthéon-Sorbonne and the Louvre Museum, under the aegis of ENCATC. The study aimed to examine the current relation between museums and municipalities or local authorities in Europe, arguing that museums are increasingly aware of their role in social and economic development, which reinforces the need for them to cooperate with municipalities.

In the context of the study, two questionnaires (one for municipalities, the other for museums and galleries) were disseminated across Europe in the summer of 2010 and approximately 250 valid responses were obtained in total. Even though the sample cannot be considered representative, it does provide interesting qualitative information on these issues. Results were analysed by project partners in a number of meetings, interviews with approximately 10 professionals were carried out and 14 case studies were collected.

Of particular interest is chapter 3, which examines how museums and municipalities jointly address the challenges of sustainable development, including its social, economic and environmental aspects. In this respect, several areas of museums’ impact on communities are examined:

- Education and training: beyond the pure acquisition of skills and capacities, the emphasis of museums' educational programmes is increasingly placed on self-confidence, self-esteem, recognition of other cultures, the development of creativity, etc. 81% of museums and 70% of municipalities surveyed indicated that the main function in museums' educational role was to develop inquiring minds and curiosity among school children. 9% of municipalities, but only 3% of museums, indicated that the main aim should be to counteract children's poor performance in school.
- Inclusion and social cohesion: Impacts of museums' activities in this field include improved self-confidence, improved capacity for analysis, emotion and reaction and a reduction of social exclusion among groups with mental illness, as well as the promotion of healthy lifestyles and behaviours. This is illustrated with a number of examples, including a project by the UK's Walsall Art Gallery which led to an increase in the number of people seeking HIV tests in the local area. Other areas of impact include the motivation and restoration of dignity among prison inmates brought about by projects done in partnership between museums and prisons. The survey found that 75% of museums carried out training activities for young people aged 18 to 25, a group traditionally at high risk of unemployment in many European countries. However, when asked about the best way for museums to strengthen community cohesion, the most frequent reply was that they provide meeting places and a cultural experience (48%), whereas their role in fostering the inclusion of disadvantaged people was only mentioned by 3% of respondents – this may partly be due to the fact that only one of four options could be chosen.
- Cultural diversity: particularly when inviting members of the community to choose objects from the collections, inviting them to organise collections according to their own preferences and carrying out outreach activities, museums can integrate the principles of diversity in their own functioning and foster intercultural dialogue. Communities involved in this type of projects, as shown in the examples of Glasgow's Open Museum and Antwerp's Museum aan de Stroom, experience an increase in self-confidence, find new opportunities for self-expression and contribute to enhancing the awareness and recognition of minority cultures. By taking into account cultural diversity in the way they display their works, museums also foster accessibility by members of minority groups.
- Economic development: the report notes the diversity of methods of calculation that are used when examining the economic impact of cultural institutions, and the fact that some EU Member States (Germany, France) have provided standardised methodologies for this type of studies. A case study based on the special exhibition held in the German city of Osnabrück to commemorate the 2000<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (or *Varusschlacht*, Battle of Varus) is presented. When asked how they contributed to economic development, 40% of museums said that they did so by piloting innovation and technologies, whereas 33% argued that it was by functioning as a 'storehouse' of techniques and 23% by training their staff (multiple answers were possible). Interestingly, only 8% of respondents said that

museums enabled local residents to develop their skills, 7% that they created goods and services for local residents and 5% that they generated tourism. This contrasts with the views expressed by municipalities: 87% said that museums made a strong contribution to tourism and 87% thought they made a strong contribution to the creation of goods and services for local residents.

- Attractiveness of local areas: the role of museums in the promotion of urban renewal, as a source of growth and development, is highlighted in the study, whilst noting the difficulties found in measuring the actual impact of initiatives in this field.

Section 5.4 presents the conclusions of the section in the questionnaire which focused on museums' existing and desired indicator systems. Most of the museums surveyed had indicators addressing basic issues of demand, access and activity (e.g. total number of visits, school visits, activities organised by the museum, etc.). On the other hand, more complex social and economic indicators only existed in some cases: only 11% of museums had an indicator on the cultural diversity of visitors, which was seen as desirable by 30% of museums which did not have it and by 61% of municipalities; only 32% of museums had an indicator on the activities with a social purpose; 11% had an indicator on the museums' contribution to well-being in terms of health (which 68% thought was desirable, as did 82% of municipalities), etc. Indicators related to the economic dimension of museums were generally more widely available. It is worth noting that, whereas museums were asked whether these indicators were available, they were not asked to describe them in detail.

On the basis of the latter evidence, the report argues that “[the] social and economic function of museums are not yet well perceived by European museums and galleries; however, the needs expressed may also reflect an increased awareness of new directions to fulfil” and that “[while] museums fulfil their traditional missions ... very satisfactorily, they have much more difficulty in imagining new missions and functions that would meet immediate and urgent needs in their own geographical area, as well as needs that are relatively far removed from their educational mission.” (p. 103)

Overall, the report provides interesting insight on museums' perception of their role vis-à-vis local communities and sustainable development. Rather than providing clear evidence of the type of impacts experienced, it does focus on the awareness of potential areas of impact and the existence of strategies, programmes or projects in this field – only some of the case studies collected present figures or data which amounts to observed impacts. It should also be noted that the limited size of the survey sample renders results not significant, although it provides a picture of general trends in the sector.

ENCATC's Thematic Group on *Museums in Europe* continues to exist to this day, its activities including an e-list which is accessible via [www.encatc.org](http://www.encatc.org).



48.

Heritage Lottery Fund (2009): *Investing in success. Heritage and the UK tourism economy*, London: Heritage Lottery Fund. (48 pp.)

[http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/howwework/Documents/HLF\\_Tourism\\_Impact\\_single.pdf](http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/howwework/Documents/HLF_Tourism_Impact_single.pdf)

Author/Institution: Heritage Lottery Fund, and others including Oxford Economics.

This short report, published by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) with contributions by several public and arms-length bodies including VisitBritain, English Heritage, the then-existing Museums, Libraries and Archives council and Scottish Natural Heritage, aims to provide data to demonstrate that the heritage-based tourism economy is bigger than other studies had previously suggested. A broad view of heritage was adopted, encompassing historic buildings and monuments, historic towns, museums and galleries (excluding contemporary-art galleries), historic landscapes, historic parks and features of industrial and transport heritage such as canals, ships and trains.

The report was commissioned to economic-forecasting consultancy Oxford Economics, which collated visitor surveys and other data from the Office for National Statistics and VisitBritain concerning visit motivations and expenditure, as well as existing tourism research.

Research undertaken in this context showed that the heritage-tourism sector contributed over £12.4 b per year to the British economy, including £7.3 b based on built heritage and the museums sector, the rest (£5.1 b) resulting from natural heritage. £7.5 b, or roughly 60% of the total, was spending by UK residents making day trips and taking holidays in the UK.

The report concluded that heritage tourism made a contribution to the total output of the UK economy, as measured by GDP, of £7.4 b (including £4.3 b from cultural heritage), this making the sector bigger than the advertising, car or film industries. The sector supported an estimated 195,000 full-time jobs (of which 113,000 in cultural heritage). When including a multiplier factor for induced effects, the numbers increased to a GDP contribution of £20.6 b per year (of which £11.9 b related to cultural heritage), supporting a total of 466,000 jobs.

4 in 10 international visitors in the UK (for leisure purposes) cited heritage as the primary motivation for their trip, more than any other single factor. In addition, 53% of the local population made a trip to experience the atmosphere of a historic town or city at least once a year, and 42% visited a museum or gallery. In addition, the report argued that '*a more important message ... is the potential for growth in the sector.*' (p. 8), since the tourism economy was expected to grow by 2.6% a year between 2009



and 2018, much higher than the 0.8% forecast for manufacturing and similar to the growth rate of the retailing and construction sectors. The labour intensity of the tourism sector was also highlighted as a factor which should ensure job creation.

In addition, drawing on previous research studies, data concerning the HLF's investment in the UK tourism economy is presented and its impacts in visits – according to previous research, visit numbers typically rose by over 50% following an HLF-funded project. Evidence also showed that spending by visitors within local economies was much higher than their spending at heritage destinations themselves – 32% of expenditure during a heritage visit was spent on site, the remaining 68% being the direct result on restaurants, hotels or shops. Each project funded by the HLF created 53 jobs on average. On the basis of the data available, the report estimated that every £1 m of HLF funding led to an increase in tourism revenues for regional economies of £4.2 m over 10 years.

Beyond the statistical figures, the report includes a number of commentaries by institutional representatives in the sector as well as a set of case studies of HLF-funded projects – overall, they contribute to reinforce the general messages that heritage is a key resource for tourism attraction, that opportunities in this field exist across the country and that public expenditure in heritage should be seen as investment rather than a cost.

To sum up, the report serves to confirm and strengthen previous arguments regarding the economic impact of cultural and natural heritage, particularly as a factor in the attraction of domestic and international tourism.

49.

Holtorf, C. (2011): 'The Changing Contribution of Cultural Heritage to Society', in *Museum International*, n° 249-250, Paris: UNESCO, pp. 8-16.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0033.2012.01758.x/pdf> (Restricted Access)

Author: Cornelius Holtorf

Institution: Linnaeus University of Kalmar, Sweden

This short article traces the recent evolution in the meaning of heritage, the core values of which '*are now ... deemed to reside in the meanings and interpretations that humans invest in monuments, not in their physical substance*' (p. 8). The author aims to extend this line of thinking and consider the ways in which cultural heritage can contribute to 21<sup>st</sup> century society, with a particular attention to the European context.

In this respect, two main lines of reasoning are followed. Firstly, the author argues that the traditional notion of cultural heritage, which related to supporting an exclusive collective identity for each nation and was therefore seen as *particular*, is no longer relevant, because of the multicultural nature of European societies and the lack of single unifying factors in complex communities. In this context, it could be questioned to what extent cultural heritage remains relevant nowadays.

Secondly, the author observes that cultural heritage in European societies is increasingly addressing new challenges or familiar challenges in new ways, severing its links with collective origins and national identities and being increasingly '*used to promote social justice and social cohesion without drawing either on distinctive collective identities or even on the past*' (p. 13). Cultural heritage can provide opportunities for communities to care for something fragile together and thus promote a sense of responsibility, persistence and respect for the knowledge and values of fellow residents or citizens – this can ultimately foster social cohesion, through the process of engagement, rather than the provision of specific meanings or values. Examples from Sweden are mentioned, where young school drop-outs have built up their confidence, motivation and discipline, gone back to school and thus improved their employability; and different ethnic groups have learned to work together. On the other hand, cultural heritage can also '*locally soften the impact of the global economy*', e.g. by providing sustainable tourism and leisure opportunities in the context of the so-called 'experience economy'. Examples such as the Inspector Wallander route in Ystad, Sweden, based on the character in Henning Mankell's novels, show '*how the new cultural heritage can derive authenticity from popular culture*' (p. 14) and have an impact in terms of regional economic development. The potential of cultural heritage to foster personal reflection, to become a space for the promotion of values and virtues derived from humanism and a commitment to global solidarity and to contribute to improving the health and well-being of people of different ages (e.g. a project focusing on the childhood and youth memories of elderly people in the early stages of dementia which contributed to stimulating their memory and self-esteem) is also mentioned.

This wide range of areas of impact somehow help to answer the initial doubts about whether cultural heritage continued to be relevant today, thus leading the author to argue that '*the process of caring for cultural heritage, its appeal to attract visitors, its ability to provoke reflections and insight, and, not least, its capacity to improve people's quality of life and health in various ways have moved to the fore.*' (p. 15)

The article serves as a short, well-presented introduction to some contemporary issues in heritage policies, including the social, economic and broader public value of cultural heritage. Explicit evidence of impacts is limited, although some of the short descriptions of examples from Sweden and other Nordic countries are well-chosen and illustrative of the issues addressed.

50.  
Indecon (2009): *Assessment of Economic Impact of the Arts in Ireland*. (154 pp.)  
[http://www.artscouncil.ie/Publications/Arts\\_Council\\_-\\_Economic\\_Impact\\_-\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://www.artscouncil.ie/Publications/Arts_Council_-_Economic_Impact_-_Final_Report.pdf)  
and
51.  
Indecon (2012) *Assessment of the Economic Impact of the Arts in Ireland. An update report*. (14 pp.)  
<http://www.artscouncil.ie/Publications/Assessment-of-the-Economic-Impact-of-the-Arts-in-Ireland-An-Update-Report-2012.doc>
- Author/Institution: Indecon International Economic Consultants, Dublin

This set of documents produced by economic consultancy firm Indecon on behalf of the Arts Council of Ireland brings to the Irish context a model similar to that of other EU member states when aiming to assess the economic value of the arts and culture. According to the introduction to the 2009 report, the economic dimension is one of the three main areas of the value of the arts as understood by the Arts Council, alongside their intrinsic value and the social and community benefit.

As regards the economic value of the arts and culture, specific emphasis is placed on six elements: their contribution to job creation; the national benefit of investing in the arts; the local benefit of investing in the arts; the relationship between the arts and the creative industries and their significance for the Smart Economy; the impact of arts investment on cultural tourism; and the importance of the arts in re-building Ireland's international reputation. The analysis operates at several levels: on the one hand, the specific impact of Arts Council-supported organisations is measured; on the other hand, the impact of the broader cultural sector is analysed as well – evidence concerning cultural heritage is presented particularly within the latter. Several methodologies and sources of information are used; the study applies definitions and models provided by several international studies (including the KEA reports commissioned by DG EAC, as well as studies from the UK's NESTA and similar studies from other European countries).

Data obtained via the Irish Central Statistics Office's (CSO) Annual Services Inquiry and other statistics serves to affirm that in 2006 the wider 'arts' sector, including heritage (but excluding the broader creative industries), had a total Gross Value Added to the Irish economy of €782 m (0.5% of the total national GVA). Of these, €75 m were generated in the subsector comprising libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities. This makes this the second largest subsector, much behind literature and publishing (€437 m) and slightly above film and video (€71 m). The overall 'creative industries' had a total GVA of €5.479 bn (amounting to 3.5% of the national economy),

60% of which was generated by the software subsector. The update report published in 2012, which collects data for 2011, shows that the overall GVA in the wider arts sector had decreased by almost 10% to €713.3 m over this five-year period, whereas the contribution of libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities was also smaller, at €67.5. Similar reductions were visible in other sub-sectors, only film and video (from €71 m to €82 m) and arts facilities, including theatres and music venues (from €60 m to €66.7 m), attesting to an increase over this period. As regards the overall creative industries, their GVA had also been reduced to €4.644 bn.

As regards the expenditure of the wider arts sector on wages, salaries as well as other goods and services in the economy, data gathered through the CSO and other statistical publications shows that in 2006 the sector had a total expenditure of approximately €1,390 m, of which €213 m were contributed by the subsector comprising libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities, this being again the second largest subsector. In 2011, figures had decreased to €1,214 m for the overall sector and to €191.2 m for the subsector mentioned above. In order to estimate the indirect and induced effects on the broader economy, Indecon applies a multiplier value of 1.28 (resulting from the sum of the marginal propensity to consume, the marginal propensity to tax and the marginal propensity to import), which is based on previous national and international studies but which, according to the authors, is more prudent and realistic than others. Following this, the report estimates that the total direct, indirect and induced expenditure in the broader arts sector was €1,779 m in 2006. Using the same multiplier, the figure in 2011 was €1,553 m.

As regards employment, the initial study estimated that the total number of jobs in the wider arts sector was 16,689 in 2006, this representing approximately 0.8% of total jobs in Ireland at the time. Libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities accounted for 3,884 of them, this being the second largest subsector, only behind literature and publishing (4,343). In 2011, figures had decreased by roughly 25%: 12,972 jobs in the overall sector, 2,878 in libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities and 3,219 in literature and publishing. Using an average of existing international studies, authors apply a multiplier of 1.6 to estimate indirect and induced employment generated by the sector – on this basis, they calculate that direct, indirect and induced employment in the cultural sector totalled 26,519 jobs in 2006, and 20,755 in 2011. As regards the overall creative industries, in 2006 they employed 60,855 (3% of total employment in the country, of which almost 24,000 in software) and their total effect, including indirect and induced impact, was 95,649 jobs. Figures were down to 48,038 (direct) and 76,862 (total) in the update report based on data from 2011.

Chapter 4 analyses the impact of the arts and culture on the attraction of tourism. According to data from CSO and the Irish Survey of Overseas Travellers, in 2008 approximately 3.4 m overseas tourists visited places of historical or cultural interest in

Ireland, whereas 3.5 m engaged in cultural pursuits (historical / cultural visits, visits to gardens, attendance of festivals / events and persons tracing their genealogy). More specifically, the total number of tourists visiting museums and art galleries rose from 1.72 m in 2006 to 1.9 m in 2008. The share of overseas visitors who participated in a cultural / historical attraction increased significantly from 37% in 2002 to nearly 45% in 2008, peaking at 49% in 2007. The total expenditure of overseas tourists who visited places of cultural or historical interest increased from €1.2 b in 2003 to €2.2 b in 2008, although this includes expenditure in different areas (in fact, 63% of expenditure was on bed and board and food and drink) and does not imply that the main purpose of the visit was cultural. These figures are not updated in the 2012 study.

Overall, these documents provide detailed data on the economic importance of the arts and culture in Ireland. Even though figures presented are only partly relevant to cultural heritage, evidence does confirm trends similar to those of other European countries. A marked reduction in employment and economic weight in the context of the financial crisis is visible, although figures do not provide information on the actual extent of this reduction in the case of cultural heritage.

52.

Ineum Consulting (2010): *What strategies for sustainable employment and urban development planning?* Avignon: Forum d'Avignon (28 pp.)

[http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/2010\\_Etude\\_Ineum\\_UK.pdf](http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/2010_Etude_Ineum_UK.pdf)

[also available in French, *Quelles stratégies pour l'emploi et le développement des territoires ?*, at [http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/2010\\_Etude\\_Ineum\\_FR.pdf](http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/2010_Etude_Ineum_FR.pdf)]

Author / Institution: Ineum Consulting (now known as Kurt Salmon, an international consultancy company – see also another reference below)

This document builds on a previous report conducted by Ineum Consulting for the 2009 edition of the Forum d'Avignon, which was discussed at the event and informed subsequent developments. On the basis of analysing a sample of studies from across the world, the report aims to develop a typology and identify trends regarding the uses of cultural resources in the context of local development strategies. The 2010 edition collected statistical data and some qualitative case studies covering 47 major cities in 21 countries, which were complemented with approximately 40 interviews with international experts.

Authors present a typology of 6 categories of cities sharing similar strategic policies and circumstances, which are placed on a map structured along two axes: 'level of cultural and academic activity' and 'intrinsic economic performance'. Among the 6

categories identified, the so-called ‘historical cities’ (e.g. Paris, Florence, Dublin, Prague, Bologna, Krakow, Geneva, Luxembourg, Brussels, Rome, etc.) have high standards in both axes; ‘convinced cities’ (e.g. Berlin, Liverpool, Lyon, Santiago de Compostela) have heavily invested in cultural activities, are concerned with the link between culture and the economy and are waiting to see the benefits from this investment; ‘deliberates’ (e.g. Barcelona, Bilbao, Glasgow, Dresden, Lille) are viewed as newcomers in the cultural sector and have high public cultural budgets per inhabitant; etc.

Strategies followed by cities can also be analysed depending on whether they follow a ‘focus strategy’ (i.e. their cultural strategies place emphasis on only one or two subsectors of culture and the arts), a ‘diversification strategy’ (whereby an initial focus expands into related areas, as in Florence’s broadening of a previous focus on heritage and craftsmanship towards restoration and luxury goods management), or a ‘global strategy’ (where all subsectors are privileged, as in the case of Paris). The sectoral analysis carried out in 13 cities shows that heritage and museums is the subsector where more cities have placed emphasis (9 of them), whereas other heritage-related areas such as craftsmanship are promoted by a smaller number of cities (4, only 2 of which – Paris and Florence – are in Europe). Overall this analysis proves the diverse range of approaches that can be followed to integrate cultural assets in local development strategies.

One additional element in the analysis concerns the concentration of cultural enterprises in 21 cities in the sample group. Whereas the average for all cities is 346 cultural enterprises per 100,000 inhabitants, so-called ‘historical cities’ had 593 businesses per 100,000 inhabitant (thus 58% over the average), whereas ‘convinced cities’ came second, at 335 – therefore, those cities with strong cultural assets tended to feature more prominently in terms of the private cultural sector. The study also found that density of cultural businesses was generally higher in cities with over one million inhabitants.

The study found that there seemed to be a correlation between implementing a culture-based development strategy and a reduction in the unemployment rate; this trend was more marked where cities had had culture strategies in place for more than 10 years. The decrease in unemployment over 10 years was particularly visible among historical (-30.1%), as well as convinced (-24%) and deliberate cities (-23%), whereas the average reduction rate for all cities was -16%. According to the study, *‘[this] would seem to indicate that culture contributes towards a sustainable increase in employment.’* (p. 16)

Other findings of the study include the link between the development of a specialised cultural training offer in cities which have a cultural profile and the promotion of



innovation in the local context, as well as some links between cultural resources and the development of social cohesion and human capital.

The report closes with a set of reflections and recommendations for developing 'winning cultural strategies', i.e. *'those that enable an urban area to tap into a significant part of the potential for creating economic value by the development of its cultural appeal'* (p. 22). Different 'cultural levers' are identified, including the promotion of tangible or intangible heritage. Strategies include the systematic inclusion of culture in the overall development strategies, the design of new types of cooperation and teaching to facilitate innovation and job creation, the use of digital technologies to enhance, promote and facilitate access to tangible and intangible heritage and the promotion of festivals.

Even though the study covers all cultural sectors and only partially addresses heritage, the methodology used and wide geographic scope make it an interesting publication. Some doubts may exist about the comparability of data and some conclusions, but overall the document provides interesting and strong arguments to stress the relevance of cultural resources for local, particularly economic, development in European cities.

53.

INTRAC (2011): *Building Trust across the Cyprus Divide. Case Study 6: Kontea Cultural Heritage Circle Project*, Oxford. (22 pp.)

<http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/722/Building-Trust-across-the-Cyprus-Divide-Case-Study-6-Kontea-Cultural-Heritage-Foundation.pdf>

Author/Institution: International NGO Training and Research Centre (INTRAC), Oxford, UK

This is one case study from a series of seven, which together form an integral component of INTRAC's (International NGO Training and Research Centre) research project on the role of civil society in building trust and reconciliation in Cyprus. This particular case is focused on the ancient Kontea's village and its tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Since the Civil War in 1974, Cypriot society has been affected by the enmity between the two main communities. Greek Cypriot inhabitants were displaced to the southern part of Cyprus and Turkish Cypriot inhabitants were relocated to Kontea's village.

The project emerged from civil society concern about the state of decay of the village church and the former residents' interest in returning since the opening of the checkpoints in 2003. United Nations in Cyprus, the Kontea Community Council and the Kontea Refugee Association agreed to start the project and apply for UN funding. The Kontea Heritage Foundation established as an NGO by Greek Cypriot former residents



and the Turkish Cypriot Union of the Chambers of Cyprus Turkish Engineers and Architects (KTMMOB) set up a consortium and received a grant from the United Nations Development Programme – Action for Cooperation and Trust (UNDP–ACT).

The project proposal includes the study, renovation and preservation of the Greek Orthodox Church and its cloisters, a Catholic Chapel, a Frankish Mansion, and an Ottoman irrigation system of stone cisterns and aqueducts as archaeological sites and a Carob Tree Plantation as a natural heritage site. The project has been selected, actually, because of its potential contribution to trust building involving the two main communities.

The aim to build and renovate physical sites has initiated contact and interaction between the former and the current residents of Kontea. The role of participatory planning and transparency in all required decisions helped to create a feeling of involvement in and ownership of the plan. The willingness to cooperate provided by both communities and some mediation committees improved bi-communal relations and achieved to establish a dialogue for mutual understanding. Although Kontea forms a rural community, isolated and usually unable to take part in bi-communal events, its project has reached its goal successfully having kept in touch with both communities for a common benefit for a while, and even been able to create a special space for Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots in order to maintain and enhance their relations, such as the Peace Park.

Semi-structured interviews with relevant staff and stakeholders; group interviews or focus group discussions and participant observation were used as methods for these case studies. These were approached using some social capital indicators, which fall under three different types: bonding (capacity building, connectedness and trust), bridging (increasing engagement: quantity and quality, understanding interdependence and separation, promoting willingness to engage) and linking (formal contacts, leveraging additional resources for the community, influencing policy) social capital.

Evidence related to social impact is presented regarding the social inclusion achieved thanks to the coexistence between both communities, which acted concurrently together; intercultural dialogue has also been essential for their agreement in terms of preservation of the village's heritage sites. With regard to the economic dimension, the project has also shown some potential for creating employment and other economic benefits through construction, restoration, maintenance, preservation, service provision, and tourism initiatives. The linkages which have arisen between both communities and other cooperative agencies have also enabled civil society to have greater impact on policy and decision-making processes, in Cyprus and in international bodies. All in all, the project contributes to an inclusive growth of the Kontea region.

As a result, the satisfactory experience provided by this project allows its organisers to keep working for further increasing bi-communal interaction, and to appeal to other regions in Cyprus and other countries to launch similar projects.

This case is particularly relevant because it provides rare evidence of how cultural heritage can have positive effects in community reconciliation and trust building.

54.

Jersey Heritage (2009): *The value of heritage*, St Helier. (16 pp.)

<http://www.jerseyheritage.org/media/PDFs/value%20of%20heritage.pdf>

Author/Institution: Jersey Heritage

The Bailiwick of Jersey, one of the British Crown Dependencies, located in the archipelago of the Channel Islands, has worked over the last five years to explain the role that its insular heritage plays in drawing an identity and improving quality of life on the island. This document helps to improve the understanding of how heritage contributes to Jersey's economic, social and environmental agendas and reviews the instrumental, intrinsic and institutional benefits in this field. Instrumental benefits include environmental value through conservation, economic value through tourism and social value through education. Intrinsic benefits are formed by community's engagement with and appreciation of heritage as well as academic recognition of its importance. Finally, institutional benefits involve helping local people and organisations participate in local heritage, being fully transparent and accountable to the community and establishing Jersey Heritage as a national benchmark. A series of case studies as well as some survey data is presented in order to demonstrate the value of Jersey's Heritage and its potential.

Jersey Heritage is a charity which raises nearly half of its expenditure through self-generated income such as admissions, venue hire, retail, fundraising events and membership. Its sustainability is mainly based on private funders and the amount of tourists – more than 130,000 – visiting Jersey Heritage attractions every year.

The organisation has divided its different fields of action into five broad areas corresponding to: guardianship, learning, visitors, community and sustainability. By fostering the synergies among these areas, Jersey Heritage has been able to reach its specific goals such as restoring historic monuments, promoting an international image of Jersey, becoming a national benchmark, helping people acquire local knowledge and creating a sense of identity and community.

The document includes a set of case studies describing heritage projects and their impacts supported by Jersey Heritage, including the following ones.

In 2008 *Les Quennevais* School began a half-year project called *Identity*. The aim was to get the students thinking about their place in the world, with a view to setting goals for their future lives. Students and their families worked together with Jersey Archive's resources to explore their roots. This project resulted in a new closeness and better understanding across the generations and showed how families can make use of heritage resources to share life experiences, explore their own history and preserve their family memories.

The creation of the *Social Activities Forum* allowed a more vivid topic of conversation for people who may not be very active in the present and could contribute to social activity. The project was carried out by older Islanders as part of a partnership involving the Island's care community. Collaborative work done between older Islanders and carers helped to promote the use of sites for visits, organise reminiscence sessions, day centres and social groups, etc.

Volunteers from the *Friends of the Maritime Museum* are in charge of maintaining a fleet of eight historic boats using traditional and modern skills in woodwork and metalwork which ensure the regular use of boats between April and October. The Boat Shop is also a strong part of the visitor experience at the Maritime Museum and volunteers are always eager to talk to visitors about the current project. The effort put into ensuring that volunteers feel part of the organization is particularly noteworthy.

Evidence of these projects' success is presented on the basis of a public opinion poll carried out to capture social perceptions of heritage. 88% of the Islanders voted for "protection and conservation of historic buildings and sites" as the top ranking priority. The second most important priority was "teaching children about Jersey's history" supported by 71% households with 11-15 year-old children. Finally, 89% agreed it is "everyone's responsibility to preserve heritage".

The focus on people within the organisation has resulted in a culture where inhabitants are extremely passionate and enthusiastic about their heritage. People within Jersey Heritage clearly "live" the values of the organisation which is described as being a "community". That involvement in heritage justifies the 79% of tourists who said that heritage was a significant motivation to visit the Island.

This case is particularly relevant because of its social dimension contribution through revitalising places and enhancing both quality of life and the environment. Jersey Heritage allows inhabitants to participate in heritage projects and improve their access,

education and learning. This sustainable growth also includes an economic dimension, thanks to its effects in the tourism industry and voluntary work.

55.

KEA European Affairs (2012): *Use of Structural Funds for Cultural Projects*. Brussels: European Parliament (118 pp.)

<http://www.keanet.eu/docs/structuralfundsstudy.pdf>

Authors : Maria Iglesias, Philippe Kern and Valentina Montalto

Institution : KEA European Affairs

This study analyses the use of the Structural Funds (SFs, including the European Regional Development Fund - ERDF and the European Social Fund - ESF) in the period 2007-2013 and provides advice on how to facilitate access to SFs for culture in its broadest meaning under the new Cohesion Policy 2014-2020 and under the new financing period.

The report was commissioned by the European Parliament. In parallel, the European Commission, through the DG Education and Culture (DG EAC), commissioned the EENC to conduct short country studies devoted to the same issue (see the review further above).

The KEA study is based on a bibliographical research and on interviews, surveys and case study visits for the analysis of the functioning of Cohesion Policy at national and local level. The following 9 countries were targeted for the analysis: Italy, Spain, France, Ireland, UK, Finland, Poland, Belgium and Estonia. The report contains detailed analysis of 9 selected case studies, aimed to demonstrate best practices in the research field.

The study is structured in four sections (see page 16):

- The first one analyses the mind-shift in European policies and the new place of culture in policy-making;
- The second one critically presents the structure of the Cohesion Policy 2007-2013, the place of culture in official texts and the barriers and facilitators to access Structural Funds for the sector;
- The third one makes a similar analysis of the new proposal, by presenting advantages and limits for the cultural sector.
- Finally, the study makes conclusions on the importance of cultural investment supported by the case studies presented throughout the report and makes a series

of recommendations for EU institutions and Member States/regions to ease access to the Structural Funds.

- The study also includes fiches in the Annex relating to the 9 best practices that illustrate in an exemplary way the contribution of cultural investment to local development.

For the literature review on the social and economic value of cultural heritage, the following findings of the study for the SF period 2007-2013 can be highlighted:

- Cultural heritage, particularly tangible heritage, is identified and valued as a sector of considerable investment via ERDF and ESF.
- Protection and preservation of cultural heritage is one of the 3 main category codes (besides development of cultural infrastructure and other assistance to improve cultural services) for the allocation of ERDF and ESF budgets to culture under the Cohesion Policy.
- Culture is mentioned several times in the ERDF regulation, particularly with a focus on cultural heritage and tourism development for Convergence regions, promotion of cultural assets for socioeconomic development and tourism in Competitiveness regions. (see page 28)

In order to make the most of culture for regional and local development, several recommendations in the study are suggested to the EU and to the EU Member States, regions and cities.

Conclusions of the study towards the new SF period 2014-2020 regard cultural heritage in the following sense:

At European level, it is recommended that a new thematic priority should be introduced in the regulatory framework on preserving and promoting cultural resources, including heritage, arts and culture and the creative sectors/professionals for a sustainable economy and the corresponding investment priorities (support to: cultural skills, education, training and craft; cultural heritage and infrastructures; urban regeneration and social cohesion through culture; artistic projects and activities; cultural entrepreneurship; culture-based innovation).

At Member State level, heritage is explicitly mentioned in the recommendation for training, monitoring and capacity action.

56.

Kurt Salmon (2011): *Cultural undertaking & investment: from intuition to decision making*. Avignon: Forum d'Avignon (48 pp.)

[http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/bd\\_KS\\_Etude\\_Forum\\_Avignon\\_GB.pdf](http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/bd_KS_Etude_Forum_Avignon_GB.pdf)

[also available in French, *Entreprendre et investir dans la culture : de l'intuition à la décision*, at [http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/bd\\_K\\_Etude\\_Forum\\_Avignon\\_FR.pdf](http://www.forum-avignon.org/sites/default/files/editeur/bd_K_Etude_Forum_Avignon_FR.pdf)]

Author / Institution: Kurt Salmon (international consultancy company)

This study is one of a series of reports produced by Kurt Salmon (previously known as Ineum Consulting, see above for a previous reference) on behalf of Forum d'Avignon, which examine the role of cultural resources in local economic development and the attractiveness of territories. This document, which like others within the series was aimed at fostering discussion in the context of the Forum's public debates, focuses in particular on the decision models linked to investment in local cultural projects.

Building on figures and arguments developed over previous studies regarding the role of cultural infrastructure and events in attracting tourism and regenerating cities, authors carried out interviews with 60 public and private managers, cultural operators, project promoters and artists, as well as 45 case studies of diverse projects. This led to the identification of four main types of cultural investment – among them was 'investments in cultural facilities and built heritage', as well as others focusing on cultural events, creativity and collections, cultural industries, production of content and creating favourable conditions for creative stakeholders. Trends in cultural development were also examined, including the impact of technology on all subsectors, including heritage (e.g. the uses of digital technology in Château de Versailles).

The report also analyses the main factors in motivating major investment in the cultural sector, some of which are similar to that found in other sectors (e.g. return on investment) and others being more specific (patronage, which is however declining; branding, which is valid both for sponsoring companies and for cities; and the enhancement of employee motivation within the business sector). In addition to the steps that would be valid in all types of investment, intuition or passion may play a role when decisions in this field are taken. On the other hand, authors recognise that investment in the cultural sector tends to be perceived as a riskier bet than for other fields.

Drawing on the interviews, a typology of areas of impact of cultural investment, which can also be understood as a spectrum of potential areas of evaluation, is presented. Areas of impact within the economic dimension include reach and reputation (e.g. development of brand image), economic development (e.g. creation, installation and

development of businesses; employment), economy of knowledge (e.g. development of a qualified higher education) and heritage valorisation (including the valorisation of tangible and intangible heritage and valorisation of the brand, although the exact implications of 'valorisation' are not made clear). In the societal dimension, impacts include social cohesion and company culture (e.g. promotion of pride in belonging), social responsibility (e.g. improving equal opportunities and social diversity), development of cultural activities (development of uses and supply), and creativity and artistic expression (development of amateur and professional practices).

Forms of governance in decision-making processes are discussed, including the need for diversity to pervade governance structures, whether public or private. The study closes with a set of recommendations, including the need to develop new methods of assessing and valuing investment projects and the promotion of cooperation, competitiveness and clustering of companies in the cultural sector, as well as a series of case studies, including the Royal Library of Belgium's digitisation project.

Although the document only partly focuses on heritage, some of the ideas presented throughout, including the motivations and processes behind public and private investment in the cultural sector, are significant as regards the social and economic impacts of cultural heritage.

57.

Labadi, S. (2011): *Evaluating the socio-economic impacts of selected regenerated heritage sites in Europe*, Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation. (129 pp.)

[http://www.encatc.org/pages/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Forum/Sophia\\_Labadi\\_2008CPRA\\_Publication.pdf](http://www.encatc.org/pages/fileadmin/user_upload/Forum/Sophia_Labadi_2008CPRA_Publication.pdf)

Author: Sophia Labadi

Institution: University of Kent (current)

The result of a grant awarded to the author in the context of the European Cultural Foundation and Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's Cultural Policy Research Award in 2008, this study aims to assess the evaluation methods used to observe the socio-economic impact of four heritage sites across Europe that had undergone major regeneration processes. It can be seen as an 'evaluation of evaluations', which provides a critical approach to previous evaluation exercises and presents recommendations for improving them.

Evidence obtained in the four case studies is briefly presented hereafter:



1. The Lowry, a large arts and leisure complex in the regenerated area of Salford Quays, Greater Manchester, which opened in 2000 and includes gallery space, two theatres and a performing arts studio, as well as restaurants, conference facilities and shopping areas, among others. An evaluation carried out by ECOTEC on behalf of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF, which had supported the development) estimated that the construction process generated 450 person-years of direct employment for people living in the sub-region. In 2006, the Lowry employed 130 full-time equivalent posts. Using a combination of income / expenditure methodology and visitor surveys, the evaluation report estimated that the Lowry's expenditure supported around 2 FTE jobs in the local area and a total of 5 in the sub-region, whereas visitor-related expenditure contributed to 3.5 and 5.5 FTE jobs in the local and sub-regional level respectively, off-site visitor spending led to the creation of 35 and 36 FTE jobs respectively and private spending by staff employed at the Lowry provided for 17 and 26.5 FTE jobs respectively. The report briefly mentions some social effects resulting from the Lowry's educational programmes, although these were not covered in ECOTEC's evaluation report. Labadi stresses that the evaluation focused mainly on the economic impacts, rather than other areas of interest, that the evaluation was somehow biased since it aimed to prove the positive impact of the initiative in order to please the HLF and that evidence presented in some cases was insufficient for the claims made (e.g. small sample of the visitors' survey). The author also criticises the fact that the evaluation method *'gives us no idea whether the Lowry is financially viable.'* (p. 35)

2. Liverpool Rope Walks, another HLF-funded project which aimed to regenerate a historic area in the Liverpool docks. An ex-ante and ex-post evaluation, combining questionnaires, interviews, landscape survey and townscape evaluation and addressing a wide range of areas of impact, was conducted by Oxford Brookes University on behalf of the HLF over a five-year period (2000-2005), which was in fact due to continue until 2010 (but the latter phase was not included in Labadi's review). A complex matrix of 4 indicators (quality of life enhancement; townscape improvements; economic regeneration; and image and confidence building) and 16 related sub-indicators was constructed. The study presents only limited data obtained through the evaluation, preferring to focus on the methodology used and the general trends observed – in this respect, the report notes that the percentage of local residents who thought the area would improve fell from 44% in 2000 to 25% in 2005, whereas school results improved over the same period and the share of those who thought the area to be a good place to shop increased from 22% to 47% and those who considered it a good place to live rose by 14%. Between 2000 and 2005, improvement was recorded in 13 of the 16 sub-indicators; no progress was observed for 3, including employment and income; business vitality and investment; and pedestrian usage and traffic flow. Labadi highlights *'the intricacy and wealth of data collected by Oxford Brookes University'* (p. 63), whilst pointing out to some shortcomings, including the low rate of questionnaire returns, the absence of a clear cause-effect link in some of the impacts

observed and the lack of comparative data for the broader region which may help to place the actual effect of Liverpool Rope Walks in a wider context.

3. The Kazimierz area of Krakow, Poland, part of which was until the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War the main Jewish quarter in this city and from which the Jewish community was forced to escape (the area was the setting of Oskar Schindler's story, as featured in the film *Schindler's List*). The area has undergone a process of regeneration particularly since the mid-1990s although, as opposed to other case studies in the report, this has not been the result of a major regeneration programme with clear aims and steps, but rather a succession of unplanned initiatives. Labadi stresses that the evaluation of developments in Kazimierz, carried out by researcher Monika Murzyn in her PhD thesis, also stands out since it was carried out independently, rather than as a commission from an institution involved in the regeneration process. Murzyn analysed 4 elements of regeneration and identified a number of indicators within each of them: urban tissue, spatial planning and management (e.g. evolution of ownership and rental structures; volume of transactions in the real estate market); functional changes (e.g. number, type and location of crafts, small scale manufacture and production activities, and wholesale shops); social changes and uses (e.g. evolution of the population, number of individuals receiving public social care); and images and perception of the quarter (e.g. presentation of the quarter in guide books, leaflets and the daily press, cultural events, etc.). Several sources of information were used, including local archives, landscape surveys and student questionnaires. Changes observed included an increase in the number of restaurants (from 39 in 1994 to 133 in 2004), the mushrooming of local cultural institutions and events, which also led to an increase in visitors (museums attracted less than 40,000 visitors per year in the late 1980s but almost 100,000 in 2003), a slight reduction in the number of inhabitants, a process of 'gentrification' and an improved tourist image of the area, which some have however called a 'disneyfication' of the past. Labadi highlights the difficulty in evaluating an urban regeneration process without clearly-set objectives and commends Murzyn's ability to identify both positive and negative effects, whilst identifying some shortcomings in the evaluation exercise, including the absence of comparisons with similar developments in other countries.

4. The socio-economic impacts of Lille as European Capital of Culture in 2004 were evaluated by Thomas Werquin and his consulting firm Axe Culture on behalf of Lille Horizon 2004, the agency entrusted with the management of the event. Even though Lille 2004 was a broad initiative including several cultural activities, the programme included activities aimed at re-using derelict industrial buildings as new cultural centres (the so-called *Maisons Folie*) and it was part of a broader, long-term process in culture-led urban regeneration. The evaluation relied on several sources of information, including audience data obtained through the ticketing system, local socio-economic statistics, visitor surveys, etc. The evaluation report found that the number of tourists'

overnight stays in Lille went up by almost 40% in 2004 over the previous year, there was a 7% increase in jobs created in the hotel, restoration and culture sectors (a figure much higher than the regional and national data for the same period) and restaurants' turnover increased by 7-13%. For the first time, 35 new tour operators proposed Lille as a destination and there was a 14% increase in Eurostar traffic between Lille and London. Analysing more recent literature on the city, Labadi indicates that *'Lille 2004 has played a major role in giving the Nord-Pas de Calais region a more positive image, when previously it was associated with industrial decline and unemployment. It has been credited by some people as having influenced the decision to locate the new branch of the Louvre... in Lens in the Nord-Pas de Calais region, close to Lille'* (p. 96). However, she also stresses that the evaluation report did not provide sufficient information or data for some important dimensions, did not address the impacts of the participation of the local population in terms of identity or social cohesion and that it generally served to construct a discourse on the 'success' of Lille 2004 which was similar to that of the event organisers.

The chapter of conclusions presents a number of issues which stood out in the four case studies analysed, including the lack of secondary data at local, regional or national level (which meant evaluators often had to base their assessment on estimates), the so-called 'optimism bias' of most evaluations, the lack of evidence concerning social cohesion and inclusion and the underestimation of gentrification processes. A number of recommendations aimed at both regeneration processes and their associated evaluations are then presented, including the need to combine ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluations, the improvement and systematic collection of relevant data, the need to use qualitative evidence and the need to improve knowledge and understanding of the relationships between heritage access and social cohesion and inclusion, among others.

The study is interesting because of its critical approach to existing evaluation models regarding the social and economic impacts of cultural initiatives and its ability to present recommendations which could inform future exercises in this field. Whilst the title refers to heritage, some of the case studies analysed (in particular the Lowry and Lille 2004) have a scope much broader, which includes other cultural and leisure initiatives.

58.

Larsen, C. (2011). 'Cultural heritage as a valuable resource in rural and urban development', in Kukaine, K. (ed.): *Cultural Heritage – Contemporary Challenge. The 4<sup>th</sup> Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum in Riga, 9-11 September 2010*. Riga: State Inspection for Heritage Protection, pp. 17-21.

<http://www.riksantikvaren.no/filestore/RigaForumPublication2010.pdf>

Author: Carsten U. Larsen

Institution: Secretary General, Danish Parliament; former Director General of the National Museum of Denmark

In his opening speech at the 4<sup>th</sup> Baltic Sea region Cultural Heritage Forum held in Riga in September 2010, the author traces the challenges of preserving built heritage in the post-Second World War history of urban and rural development in the Baltic Region and, in particular, in Denmark.

The author claims that *'it is only in the past decade that cultural heritage – in the form of buildings and comprehensive entities like cultural environments – is being used by politicians, business people and planners as a means for strengthening local profiling and development'* (p. 17). The reason for that has been the realisation, supported by research, that cultural heritage, which encompasses built heritage, *'is an important parameter governing people's choice of where they want to vacation and where they want to settle down'* (p. 17).

In Denmark, this realisation followed the post-war developments: *'the economic boom after the Second World War and the establishment of the social welfare society made its mark everywhere and changed the Danish landscape forever'* (p. 18). The author points at a number of developments starting in the 1960s and going through the following decades, such as intensification of agriculture, changes of the character of villages, moving out factories from the historic city centres to countryside, construction of the new residential housing estates, laying down new, broader streets and highways to serve the increased need for transportation of people and goods: *'many large street break troughs that can be seen in many Danish cities still offer testimony to the dismantled urban and residential areas that were sacrificed in the name of progress'* (p. 18).

The reason for this neglect of the built heritage laid in the fact that *'the urban planning was being done "over the heads of the people" with a point of departure taken in what politicians believed were the people's wishes – not necessarily a matter of ill will but more because the politicians and the planners were of the firm conviction that they knew what was right'* (p. 19).

The situation changed in the 1980s-1990s when the realisation has come that 'we would have to base our planning much more on the population's own wishes and, to some extent, on the protection of the landscape and the cultural heritage' (p. 19). This is when a number of large projects were initiated in Denmark under government auspices that defined what parts of the landscapes should be protected and what parts could continue to develop. The slogan has been "Protect and use", and such is the task that is still being carried on in this country.

The author points out tasks that, with the arrival of post-industrial era, have become common for many European countries, such as re-use of the former industrial buildings and areas, including those of old ports and shipyards. The industrial heritage offers a resource in the areas as diverse as quality of life, residence, tourism and commercial development. Among the examples, redevelopment of Manchester and Liverpool in the UK, Ruhr area in Germany and Carlsberg brewery in Copenhagen, Denmark, are mentioned.

The author sees one of the contemporary challenges in the field of cultural heritage in the attitude towards 'the social welfare society's buildings, infrastructure and institutions... We have somehow agreed that they are just plain ugly. But that's not all there is to it!' (p. 21) It is a question of analysing what constitutes the values of these buildings and of understanding the thoughts that were fundamental to their creation.

59.

Lehtimäki, M. (ed.) (2008): *Cultural Heritage and Tourism. Potential, Impact, Partnership and Governance. A book on cultural heritage and tourism to inspire policy makers and practitioners at all levels*, proceedings of the III Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum, Vilnius, 25-27 September 2007. Vilnius: Department of Cultural Heritage (155 pp.)

<http://mg.kpd.lt/users/www/uploaded/3%20Forum%20publ%20on%20cultural%20heritage%20and%20tourism.pdf>

Author: Marianne Lehtimäki (and others)

Institution: Department of Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Culture of Lithuania (and others)

The book is an output of regional co-operation on cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea States. It congregates the regional perspective concerning relations and interactions between tourism and cultural heritage and opens a dialogue between tourism and cultural heritage sectors on local, national and regional levels.

The book includes presentations given at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum held in Vilnius in 2007. Materials are grouped in the following sections: *Potential, Impact, Partnership, Governance and Re-use of historic buildings*. Some of

the contributions are based on case studies, while others deal with the more general issues.

The idea of the Forum was developed by a Task Force involving experts from the heritage sector and researchers on tourism from Lithuania, Norway, Sweden and Finland. Experts from the European Institute of Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe, the Luxembourg Heritage Board and from the University of Liege were invited to widen the scope to other European experiences.

The Task Force was appointed by the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea States, which in turn is a regional network on cultural heritage since 1997. It consists of senior heritage experts from each country, mainly from National Heritage Boards and Museum Authorities. The Monitoring Group was appointed by the respective Ministers of Culture in the region.

In the *Impact* section, Gregory J. Ashworth, University of Groningen, The Netherlands, discusses the ways tourists consume heritage places. He analyses various assumptions of the existing heritage marketing practices and offers critique and, in some cases, solutions. One of his recommendations is to develop collaboration where competition currently prevails, i.e. in marketing different places, heritage sites and products to different types of consumers, including the local people.

Another author in this section, Terje Nypan, Norway, observes that cultural heritage has great value for other industries. It plays an economic role in property management, cultural and creative industries, and regional development. The businesses exploit cultural heritage in marketing, promotion and reception activities. Cultural landscapes, townscapes, individual sites and buildings are used for the film and television industry, and also as input or a backdrop for computer games.

However, the tourism sector is the industry that to the greatest extent uses cultural heritage as support for its backbone activities like hotel accommodation, transport and catering. Cultural heritage is used as the attraction that gets visitors to come. Cultural sites are used for leisure and outdoor activities, and as arenas for a diversity of events and spectacles. It serves as a venue and value added to restaurants and other meeting places, shops and commercial space or locations for conferences and seminars. Cultural heritage facilitates outlets and incitement for local products and production. Books, maps, multimedia, design and posters exploit and revive cultural heritage. Branding of products, of regions and localities are often based on cultural heritage.

The author stresses that cultural heritage tourism is one of the fastest growing segments of the market. Surveys document that the 'dedicated' cultural heritage tourist spends 60% more per day compared with a beach tourist. Yet, direct earnings for the



sites are small. Only 6-10% of the visitor's daily spending is left at the cultural heritage site, the rest, indirect earnings, flows to society around the site. Thus cultural heritage feeds other parts of the tourism industry: hotels, hostels and diverse transport systems like planes, trains, busses, taxis and car rentals.

Other authors in the Impact section deal with analysis of case studies. Monika Murzyn presents the case of Krakow, Poland, and Michael Lauenborg, the case of Ribe, Denmark.

In the latter case, impact analysis of Ribe Byferie, a complex of 94 holiday houses built in the vicinity of a medieval city, was performed. It showed that every year 5,100 families visit Ribe Byferie, amounting to 18,800 people. Their average stay is 3.6 days, providing a total of 66,600 days spent at Ribe Byferie every year. 28% of the people have been at Ribe Byferie before, 23% of them have found Ribe Byferie on the Internet, and 25% have had the place recommended to them by friends or families. 34% of the people felt that the possibility of staying at Ribe Byferie was decisive for their choice. For 31% Ribe Byferie was important, for 18% of little importance, and for 17% of no importance. Each family spent an average of €77.50 on dining, €37.50 at attractions and €152 on shopping, the total amount being €267 on their average 3.6 days in Ribe. When asked whether or not they wished to visit Ribe Byferie again, 47% answered 'definitely', 50% answered 'maybe' and only 3% said they would not visit Ribe Byferie again.

The closing section of the book includes *Recommendations for cultural heritage and tourism for the Baltic sea states* agreed by the Forum; *Communicating heritage*: closing remarks by the editor, *A dozen useful principles of how to start a cultural heritage itinerary* by Georges Calteux, Luxembourg, and *Lessons learned* by the Forum organisers Marianne Lehtimäki and Alfredas Jomantas.

60.

Licciardi, G. and Amirtahmasebi, R. (eds.) (2012): *The Economics of Uniqueness. Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development*. Washington: The World Bank. (331 pp.)

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSDNET/Resources/Economics\\_of\\_Uniqueness.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSDNET/Resources/Economics_of_Uniqueness.pdf)

Authors: Guido Licciardi and Rana Amirtahmasebi (editors), as well as several independent researchers

Institution: The World Bank

This collection of essays is part of the World Bank's Urban Development Series, which discusses the challenge of urbanisation and what it will mean for developing countries



in the decades ahead, in the context of the Bank's 2009 Urban Strategy. It presents contributions by a group of well-known scholars, including David Throsby and Donovan Rypkema, and has been the result of a broader consultation process which involved background papers by several experts from across the world. Given the World Bank's mission, the book is mainly aimed at influencing policies in developing countries, but it draws on experiences from cities in both the global South and the global North (e.g. an example of how Dublin has leveraged its cultural heritage with other assets to create a 'talent hub', pp. 8-13) and its conclusions can also be adapted in different contexts. All types of cultural heritage, including both tangible and non-tangible assets as well as their significance to communities, are taken into account.

Examples and arguments presented throughout the book emphasise the 'integrated conservation approach', whereby heritage conservation and local economic development are linked in order to create '*liveable downtowns – places where people like to go, meet, live, work, and invest, linking heritage conservation and local economic development*' (p. xxi). The notion of heritage as cultural capital is highlighted, and its use, non-use and cultural values are presented, the latter being particularly difficult to assess, although David Throsby suggests that the cultural value of a heritage building or site can be deconstructed into aesthetic, symbolic, spiritual, social, historic, authenticity and scientific value (pp. 54-57). Different economic valuation methods and their advantages and disadvantages are also discussed (see in particular Peter Nijkamp, 'Economic Valuation of Cultural Heritage', pp. 75-106).

Authors also stress the role of cultural heritage as a 'differentiator', which can attract investment for job creation, as well as talent. On the other hand, country-level data is used to show that heritage designation and its accompanying regulatory framework create a market-assigned value premium for heritage assets, in particular housing and retails (see in particular Donovan Rypkema's 'Heritage Conservation and Property Values', pp. 107-142). This raises some issues regarding the distribution of capital gains between the local community and outside investors, as well as other negative impacts such as gentrification. The impact of heritage investment on tourism is also explored, including its potential of allowing unemployed and underemployed individuals in developing countries to get jobs. Different financial models for investing in heritage, including public-private partnerships, land value finance mechanisms, urban development funds and impact investment funds (see Francesca Romana Merida, 'Financial Mechanisms for Historic City Core Regeneration and Brownfield Redevelopment', pp. 213-243).

Martin Rama's article, entitled 'Investing in the Sense of Place: The Economics of Urban Upgrading Projects with a Cultural Dimension' (pp. 15-43) explores in depth the economic, social and cultural rationale for public investment in cultural heritage development, with a particular emphasis on the restoration of buildings which, although

not seen as urban landmarks, are part of 'the soul of a place'. On the other hand, in 'Governance in Historic City Core Regeneration Projects' (pp. 143-181), which mainly focuses on examples from Latin America, Eduardo Rojas presents a typology of activities which can be used for the valuation of historic city cores, some of which involve the active engagement of communities (e.g. community involvement in support of preservation, participation of NGOs in decision-making processes, etc.). Rabah Arezki, an economist at the IMF, argues in 'UNESCO World Heritage List, Tourism, and Economic Growth' (pp. 183-212) that there is a positive relationship between the extent of tourism specialisation, in particular around World Heritage-listed sites, and economic growth through tourism.

Despite the fact that the book is mainly aimed at policymakers and international investors in developing countries, this collection of essays presents a thorough, in-depth, high-quality analysis of the interactions between cultural heritage and local economic development, drawing on a wide range of data, previous studies and new arguments and case studies, which make it relevant in a variety of contexts.

61.  
Ljungman, C. M.; and Taboroff, J. (2011): *Evaluation of Cultural Heritage without Borders (2008-2011). Final Report*. Stockholm: Indvelop. / Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). (86 pp.)

<http://www.chwb.org/dokument/pdf/Evaluation%20of%20CHwB%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Authors: Cecilia M. Ljungman and Dr. June Taboroff  
Institution: Indvelop.

Swedish consultancy company Indvelop. was commissioned by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) to produce an evaluation of Cultural Heritage without Borders' (CHwB) activities between 2008 and 2011. CHwB was founded in 1995 by members of the cultural heritage community in Sweden, in the context of the targeting and destruction of cultural heritage during the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Operating as an NGO, it is supported by SIDA among others, and carries out activities in different countries in the Western Balkans, including Serbia, Kosovo and Albania. The evaluation involved desk research, interviews, as well as workshops and site visits in the region.

CHwB's objectives include the contribution to the understanding of cultural freedom and diversity, the promotion of reconciliation as a prerequisite for peace and democracy based on human rights, the stimulation of economic growth through cultural heritage, the sustainable use of resources and the introduction of European laws, standards and ways of working to facilitate future EU integration of countries in the

Western Balkans. In addition to country programmes in Serbia, Kosovo and Albania, regional programmes involve the development and strengthening of a museum network, another network of heritage NGOs (the SEE Heritage Network) and the Regional Training Network.

Among the visible results achieved in 2008-11 which serve to enhance the place of heritage in sustainable development was the integration of heritage-related concerns into urban planning in Kosovo. In addition, the period witnessed a strengthening of regional networks: the Regional Museum Network, which brings together 11 museums from 6 countries, contributed to museum staff's capacity building in areas such as community partnerships and democracy through museums, developed a 'female network' to foster gender equality and co-produced a common exhibition, a rather rare development which served to foster cooperation and mutual understanding among neighbouring but often rival communities and countries. The Network is currently discussing the possibility of establishing itself as an independent organisation (see <http://www.bmuseums.net/>).

The South East European (SEE) Heritage Network, which brings together 24 heritage NGOs from 8 countries, is also a result of CHwB's activities in the region and was legally established in 2009. Through conferences, workshops and other awareness-raising activities, the network has contributed to discussing peace and reconciliation in the region, and how cultural heritage can be used or misused in this respect, as well as how cultural heritage can be a resource in local sustainable development.

By paying attention to tourism, the SEE Heritage Network can also be seen to enhance the role of cultural heritage in economic development. This is reinforced by some activities carried out by CHwB at national level, e.g. in Kosovo, where a conference on cultural tourism was organised and promotion tools have been designed.

The evaluation report generally commends the CHwB's achievements in the period under study, particular as regards the strengthening of regional networking, capacity-building in the field of heritage preservation and management and awareness-raising on heritage-related issues, including their relevance to economic development. On the other hand, more limited progress is perceived as regards the social dimension of heritage, including community involvement and civil society strengthening. A set of recommendations for the continuation of SIDA's support for CHwB are presented in the final sections.

The document can be seen as an interesting example in the evaluation of the political, social and economic implications of cultural heritage in sustainable development strategies, which raises interesting issues as regards community reconciliation and the promotion of peace.

62.

Local Government Association (2013): *Driving growth through local government investment in the arts*, London. (32 pp.)

[http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document\\_library/get\\_file?uuid=5ee9993d-f6e3-4c66-9c1f-c87e56b95cd0&groupId=10171](http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=5ee9993d-f6e3-4c66-9c1f-c87e56b95cd0&groupId=10171)

Author / Institution: Local Government Association

This recent report published by the Local Government Association, an organisation gathering local authorities and other local public-interest institutions in England and Wales, aims to show how the arts contribute in driving economic growth, and the key role that local government plays to achieve this.

Five major areas of economic impact for the arts and culture are identified: attracting visitors; creating jobs, developing skills and tackling unemployment; attracting and retaining businesses; revitalising places; and developing talent and investing in future value.

Recognising the importance of the arts for local development and changes in the distribution of competences which have devolved responsibility for growth-related funding and skills policy to local partners, the paper argues that four key steps are needed to ensure that the arts are integrated in local strategies: local political leadership; a strong story and evidence about the contribution of the arts to growth; strategic engagement of the arts sector in the local economic landscape; and a clear policy for commissioning arts organisations to achieve economic outcomes (since local councils are less involved in direct delivery and tend to commission services outside, arts organisations should be ready to seize new opportunities and funding streams).

Arguments presented above are illustrated with a wide range of case studies depicting the impact of the arts and culture, including cultural heritage, in local economic development. Relevant examples include the York Museums Trust, an independent charity which manages four historic museums, heritage sites and art galleries and is part of the City of York's local development strategy. Recent research has shown that the York Museums Trust supports 100 FTE jobs, brings £6.4 m annually into the regional economy, and that visits to its venues have an overall economic impact of £15.5 m per year to the York Economy – this is the equivalent of 196 FTE additional jobs and means that every pound invested by the local council has a return of around 10 pounds in the local economy.

Another example, this time concerning movable heritage, involves the Staffordshire Hoard, a collection of Anglo-Saxon gold and silver pieces discovered in the West Midlands in 2009. A summer tour of three venues in the region was arranged in 2011,

attracting over 50,000 visitors, with an estimated economic impact of over £1.5 m. The Hoard is thought to embody the potential to continue attracting tourism to the region in the coming years.

The publication emerged in the context of a new collaboration framework between Arts Council England and the Local Government Association, aimed at providing mutual support and working together to reinforce the value of culture across other sectors and provide practical support to local councils, among others.

Even though the paper provides little additional evidence or arguments, it presents a clear case and messages concerning the economic impact of culture and the arts, including cultural heritage, at local level, and is well illustrated with a set of well-chosen examples.

63.

Maeer, G.; Fawcett, G. and Killick, T. (2012): *Values and benefits of heritage. A research review*. London: Heritage Lottery Fund. (43 pp.)

<http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/howwework/Documents/ValuesandBenefits2012.pdf>

Authors: Gareth Maeer, Gail Fawcett and Tim Killick

Institution: Heritage Lottery Fund

This paper offers an annually updated research review commissioned by the Heritage Lottery Fund's (HLF) Strategy and Business Development Department. The HLF sustains and transforms a wide range of heritage through innovative investment in projects with a lasting impact on people and places. As the largest dedicated funder of the UK's heritage, with around £375 m a year to invest in new projects and a considerable body of knowledge, it is also a leading advocate for the value of heritage to modern life.

The HLF is administered by the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF) which was given the responsibility for distributing a share of money raised through the National Lottery for Good Causes to heritage across the UK, in 1994.

The report is structured around the values and benefits of heritage, matching the cultural value framework of intrinsic value and instrumental benefit. Topics covered include valuing heritage, heritage visits, social benefits and economic benefits. Each of these areas includes a wide range of external reports and specific data, which are relevant to the heritage sector.

Research projects in the area entitled “Valuing heritage” focus on the public’s attitudes towards heritage, using surveys and “willingness to pay” studies. Evidence suggests that natural and cultural heritage represents an important part of how people live or feel. Similarly, it is better considered to live near parks, historical sites, landscapes or museums, libraries and archives.

The “Taking Part” survey run by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport provides an extensive amount of information for heritage visits. Thanks to this continuous survey, it is known that 74.3% of the 2012 respondents had visited at least one type of historic environment site in the previous 12 months and 48.9% had attended a museum/gallery at least once in the previous 12 months. Results also indicated that visiting museums and galleries, heritage sites and archives is influenced by gender, educational attainment, socio-economic group and economic status. As far as tourism is concerned, the “Visit Britain” profile shows how Britain’s rich history and heritage continue to be the main drivers in attracting overseas visitors. In order to mention briefly the main findings of the profile, 50% visitors choose museums among a selection of cultural products; likewise 50% holiday tourists visited built heritage attractions.

Social benefits of heritage include several elements, such as benefits for individuals, cultural activity and well-being, health benefits of public space (built and natural environment) and community benefits. “Personal and skills development”, “new experience”, “improved confidence and self-esteem”, “changed attitudes”, “education support” and “social contact” are the phrases used by respondents in order to describe individual benefits experienced through taking part in volunteering for museums and art galleries or participating in libraries’ activities. A study in Bristol and Tyne & West Museums found that 81% respondents felt inspired to creativity and improved their understanding by their participation in a museum project.

Cultural activity is also estimated to have a positive impact on well-being, thanks to the ability that collective and/or volunteering projects have to make people feel that they “play a useful part in things”. A receptive attitude provides participants’ self-worth, social connectedness and life satisfaction.

Public space, built environment – parks, historical sites or natural environment, such as “green space” parks and landscapes – helps inhabitants to bolster their adult patterns of exercise, improving mental health and reinforcing local identity. As an example, British Trust for Conservation Volunteers’ (BTCV) “Green Gyms” involved 10,000 local volunteers in improving 2,500 green spaces. An evaluation, carried out between July 2003 and August 2007, found that 99% of 700 participants agreed or strongly agreed that their involvement had improved their health and self-confidence.



Although there is much less agreement on how cultural heritage can contribute to community concepts, the Heritage Lottery Fund has summarised in this review some studies which indicate that cultural heritage projects can promote understanding, tolerance and respect between generations and between diverse communities; foster active citizenship and create pride and interest in communities which have traditionally been marginalised.

Finally, a wide range of studies and statistics are provided to evidence economic benefits. All of these study results come up with an overall economic impact figured for a broad definition of heritage – which includes natural heritage – and heritage-based activity, across the whole UK. As an example, the Oxford Economics/HLT study gives a total of 700,000 jobs created from both tourism needs and renovation and maintenance employment. In GVA terms, the total contribution of heritage to the UK economy can be estimated at £28 b per year. However, it is important to stress that relevant differences exist among regions. Besides, this analysis highlights the role that heritage plays within overall regeneration and economic development processes within towns and cities, such as becoming a benchmark place for business.

As a conclusion, the exhaustive, detailed data stated on this report highlights cultural heritage as a sector of activity on its own and its social and economic spillovers, spread through the vast majority of the UK regions.

64.

Matarasso, F. (general rapporteur) (2008): *Open Doors and Open Minds*, report of the 1<sup>st</sup> European Heritage Forum on 'Heritage and Dialogue', Brussels, 23-24 October 2008. Strasbourg: Council of Europe / European Commission (32 pp.)

[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/ehd/DGIV\\_PAT\\_JEP2008\\_20rev\\_E\\_finalreport\\_MATARASSO.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/ehd/DGIV_PAT_JEP2008_20rev_E_finalreport_MATARASSO.pdf)

Author: François Matarasso

Institution: independent consultant

The European Heritage Forum was held in Brussels, Belgium, on 23-24 October 2008. It had two broad objectives: (1) to create an annual European platform of exchange on the theory and practice of heritage interpretation and dissemination; and (2) to position heritage as a means for dialogue, in the context of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue in 2008.

The Forum's format was centred on intensive round table discussions managed by independent facilitators and rapporteurs. Sixteen tables were set up to cater for some 250 participants from more than 40 countries. An expert panel was invited to open up



some contrasting and sometimes challenging ideas about heritage and its place in European society today. They came up, *inter alia*, with the following statements:

- ▶ Given that the human story is one of migration and interculturalism, and that European society is increasingly aware of its diversity, it is vital to include people in their own heritage – whether it is theirs by birth, adoption or residence.
- ▶ Society needs to acknowledge that there is nothing inevitable about heritage designation: people choose, as individuals and societies, to preserve and to discard different things on the basis of values. At a social level, this is a matter of political choice.
- ▶ This is also a process that excludes many people and their stories. It can make whole classes of people invisible, as when the formal rooms of great houses are shown but the servants' quarters are considered to be without interest.
- ▶ Who is authorised to say what things mean? Heritage professionals should open up the process of interpretation and recognise that everyone finds their own meanings in their surroundings. They should also accept that these meanings will inevitably be contested; as one contributor put it, "Don't believe this is always going to be nice", etc.

By way of introduction, the participants were asked to share their personal experience of heritage. Most people had drawn on childhood memories and, while many made reference to churches, old towns or landscapes, the exercise was also notable for the intimate and intangible heritage that shaped people's experiences.

This was followed by three main rounds of discussion (each held at 16 round tables).

First discussion: Why heritage contributes to dialogue? The participants were united in recognising the potential of heritage as a focus of dialogue in society at local, regional, national and European levels. There was a broad consensus that this dialogue was of special importance at a time when European societies were becoming more diverse. Dialogue facilitated by heritage was a vital support when people were confronted by complex histories and contested versions of the past. The following themes emerged in the course of discussion:

- ▶ Heritage is a mediator
- ▶ Heritage provides emotional experiences
- ▶ Heritage connects people
- ▶ Heritage supports identity
- ▶ Heritage stores and transmits memory
- ▶ Heritage is contested
- ▶ Heritage is always present

Second discussion: How heritage can contribute to better dialogue and understanding?  
The discussion resulted in debating around the following themes:

- ▶ Heritage is part of everyday life
- ▶ Heritage, tourism and the local economy
- ▶ Heritage, nationalism and conflict
- ▶ Heritage and different viewpoints
- ▶ Heritage can be a basis of common ground
- ▶ Heritage easily engages young people
- ▶ Heritage and its dangers

Third discussion: How we use heritage to promote dialogue? The intention was to produce ideas and commitments that people felt they could act on in their everyday professional environments. Some lines of action proposed by the participants are listed below:

- ▶ Working with digital technology and the Internet
- ▶ Working more effectively with the media
- ▶ Working with volunteers
- ▶ Working with schools and young people
- ▶ Working together and building networks
- ▶ Working to secure political and financial support

The Forum revealed two main strands of discussion:

- 1) Everyday concerns of management, interpretation, resources and outreach. There is already much to do to develop and extend best practice and to ensure that heritage can make the best contribution to dialogue at community, national and European levels.
- 2) Some of the debates focused on the relationship between heritage and development, and were concerned with how heritage can be an asset for wider societal concerns such as urban regeneration, economic growth or social cohesion. There was recognition that, if the potential of heritage in these areas is to be exploited, the Forum needs to work with other professionals, such as economists, planners, energy specialists, business people and educationalists. It also needs to engage directly with politicians and elected representatives at all levels.

65.

Michaelis-Winter, A. and Ruland, R. (eds.) (2007): *Städtebaulicher Denkmalschutz und Tourismusentwicklung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der UNESCO – Welterbestädte*. [The Protection of the Urban Architectural Heritage and Tourism Development, with a Particular Focus on UNESCO World Heritage Cities] Berlin: Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) and Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR). (109 pp.)  
[www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=218283](http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=218283)

Author/Institution: Anke Michaelis-Winter, Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS)

Author/Institution: Ricarda Ruland, Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR)

This study, on behalf of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) and the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR), was based on the crucial question of whether there is a verifiable link between the protection of the urban architectural heritage and the general positive tourism trend in Eastern German cities since the 1990s. The background was the existence of the investment programme of the BMVBS devoted to the protection of the architectural heritage in Eastern German cities (Programm Städtebaulicher Denkmalschutz).

In ten Eastern German cities exemplary analyses of tourism structures and developments, marketing activities and Internet presence of the cities, surveys among guests and businesses and conversations with urban planners and tourism experts were conducted. The selected cities in five federal Eastern German states (Länder) were Stralsund, Wismar and Malchow in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern; Neuruppin and Potsdam in Brandenburg; Tangermünde and Quedlinburg in Saxony-Anhalt; Görlitz and Zittau in Saxony; and Mühlhausen in Thuringia.

The study states that data from both official statistics and the individual towns are incomplete and inconsistent. Thus the basic idea for identifying causal connections was to apply a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research methods.

A general finding of the study is that the urban rehabilitation, the construction of hotels in accordance with demand as well as the further tourism-oriented development have run parallel to each other in East Germany since 1990 so that the individual influences can hardly be ascertained separately from one another. Nevertheless, the results clearly show that a “beautiful”, redeveloped town without any further key offers which are relevant to tourism (accommodation, attractive retail trade, good gastronomic offer, culture and entertainment offers, events), as well as being without professional marketing, remains a torso. Only a wide range of offers in its entirety makes a city trip

destination attractive. Hence, urban rehabilitation can only have full effect if it is embedded in an overall tourism strategy and if it gets a noticeable place in it.

Particularly Chapter 5 analyses the economic effects of the protection of the architectural heritage in the reference cities in terms of tourism development. Methods used include a quantitative measurement of the direct and indirect economic effects based on the number of tourists (day visitors and overnight guests); quantitative measurement of employment effects based on tourism spending; and qualitative assessment of indirect effects.

In 2005, a total tourism turnover of just under €1 b was generated by day visitors and overnight guests in commercial accommodation establishments in the ten reference towns, about 13% or €130 m of which are in close connection with the protection of urban historical structures.

Furthermore, the study identifies in the first stage the employment effect of ca. 1,900 employees (based on the expenditure of tourists) and in the second stage further 700 employees (based on indirect effects).

Besides the quantitative assessment the study underlines the importance of the positive immaterial and indirect effects of the protection of the architectural heritage in cities. These are for example higher prominence of the city, positive image production, attractiveness for citizens and investors, etc.

Many findings of the study are based on qualitative assessments and tourist surveys. Tourists very consciously register the results of urban development acknowledging them with a positive valuation and as being of great importance in view of the actual decision to make a trip to this place. Moreover, this is also reflected in the great interest in historical hotels and other historical accommodation establishments. Thus criticism of and dissatisfaction with the stay hardly arise from the still lacking rehabilitation, empty or vacant sites but rather, for the most part, from basic failings of tourism offers or services (unfriendliness, etc.).

The study concludes that even 16 years after the German reunification, the rehabilitation process of the East German towns is anything but complete. The positive effects of the programme for the protection of urban historical structures on tourism development can be considered to be unquestionable in the result of this study in spite of all other evidence.

Even though positive trends are observed over the years, the report also identifies the key factors which have enabled some cities to succeed better than others and provides recommendations to improve future performance. A need for further action, apart from

a number of individual activities in the particular towns, is highlighted in the following areas:

- ▶ Interior marketing: Improvement of the cooperation climate between urban development protection of historical structures and tourism.
- ▶ Urban design: Perfection of the signage system, routes, etc.
- ▶ Guided tours of the town: Cross-town and town-individual qualification of town guides on the topics of urban development, protection of historical structures, etc.
- ▶ Exterior marketing: Increased use of the UNESCO title and/or the development results/the townscape in national and international marketing.

Furthermore, the study recommends an “Urban Development and Tourism Guide“, aimed at identifying best practice examples relevant to actors for both sides – urban development and tourism.

66.

Ministerio de Cultura (2011): *Cuenta Satélite de la Cultura en España. Resultados detallados 2000-2009*. [Satellite Account on Culture in Spain. Detailed Results 2000-2009] Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura (120 pp.)

<http://www.mcu.es/estadisticas/MC/CSCE/ResultadosDet.html> (a summarised version in English is available at <http://www.calameo.com/read/0000753350c3ef677880d>)

Author / Institution: Spanish Ministry of Culture (now part of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports)

This report presents the results of the Satellite Account on Culture in Spain, an annual statistical operation within Spain’s 2009-12 National Statistical Plan, drawn by the former Ministry of Culture in close cooperation with the National Statistics Institute. The report, published in 2011 and which stands as the most recent publication in this series, covers annual data for the decade spanning 2000 to 2009. It aims to present detailed information regarding the contribution of culture and of intellectual property related activities to Spain’s GDP. The report covers all cultural sectors, including heritage – in this context, the latter includes ‘activities related to the management and use of elements of cultural heritage, such as historical monuments, museums and archaeological sites, generated as a result of their opening to the public’. Archives and libraries are analysed separately.

According to the data presented in the report, the contribution of cultural activities to the Spanish GDP increased from €19.8 b in 2000 to €29.8 b in 2009, at an average annual growth of 4.6%. The sector represented 3.0% of the overall Spanish GDP on

average over the decade, whereas all IP-related activities amounted to 3.9% on average over the same period.

The economic significance of heritage activities grew at an average annual rate of 12.5% between 2000 and 2009, a figure which is over two times higher than the Spanish economy growth rate over the same period (5.9%). Heritage remained a small part of the overall cultural sector, although its share also grew from 2.3% in 2000 to 4.4% in 2009. In absolute terms, heritage-related activities contributed to €453 m in 2000 (0.07% of the Spanish GDP at the time) and to €1.307 b in 2009 (0.12%). Figures for libraries and archives over this period increased at an annual growth rate of 8.8%, from €317 m to €677 m, the latter figure representing 2.3% of the total cultural activities and 0.06% of the Spanish GDP in 2009. Figures regarding the contribution of cultural activities in terms of the national GVA are also presented, generally following similar trends to those of the GDP.

In terms of employment, cultural activities were the source of 571,300 FTE jobs in Spain in 2000, a figure which grew to 632,300 by 2009, at an annual growth rate of 1.1%. In the case of heritage, archives and libraries (which are grouped), employment increased from 27,100 to 50,000, at an annual growth rate of 7.0%, this being the sharpest increase among all subsectors ('interdisciplinary' activities came second, at 3.0%, and performing arts came third at 2.3%). By the end of the decade, jobs in heritage, libraries and archives represented almost 8% of all cultural employment in Spain and 0.28% of total employment at national level.

Data presented across the report is also structured on the basis of different phases of the cultural value chain (production, distribution, etc.), although this does not seem to be particularly relevant in the case of heritage. A final section presents detailed information about the methodology and definitions used throughout the project.

The report can be seen as a detailed contribution to analysing the economic contribution of the cultural sector in Spain and shows both its sustained growth over the past decades and the increasing significance of heritage activities within the broader cultural economy.

67.

Mocevic. J. (rapporteur) (2012): *Meeting on the Theme of 'The European Dimension of Heritage Days Events', Strasbourg (France), 11-12 December 2011*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe / European Commission (46 pp.)

[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/ehd/2011/DGIV\\_PAT\\_JEP\\_2011\\_14\\_Report\\_MeetingED\\_11-12Dec2011\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/ehd/2011/DGIV_PAT_JEP_2011_14_Report_MeetingED_11-12Dec2011_en.pdf)

Author: Jelena Mocevic

Institution: Council of Europe

This document presents the report of a meeting of national coordinators from the European Heritage Days (EHD) programme, held in Strasbourg in December 2011. Building on issues which had been previously discussed at an International EHD Forum, the agenda revolved around the European dimension of heritage activities.

The issue was explored, in the first place, through the presentation of a set of case studies from several participating countries. This enabled experts and national coordinators to agree to a set of defining characteristics of the 'European dimension' of heritage events: among the 12 elements raised were a stress on cultural diversity (which should involve a focus on accessibility and attention paid to intercultural dialogue or exchange), active participation, engagement or cooperation between visitors and the local community, the development of people-centred activities (rather than object-oriented activities), the vision of cultural heritage as a resource (rather than an end or a goal in itself), the integration of the principle of sustainable development (particularly in economic terms, by fostering resource-generating activities rather than relying exclusively on external funding), the inclusion of youth and the promotion of bridges with the educational sector. Therefore, the 'European dimension' of heritage events embodies an understanding of cultural heritage as a key factor in social and economic development.

This was further analysed in a session which discussed how heritage events with a European dimension related to the principles of the Faro Convention (Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society). Discussants considered that the case studies presented previously could be seen as an excellent representation of the Faro principles, including the Convention's aims, the sustainable preservation and management of heritage, the recognition of the public value associated with heritage, its contribution to dialogue among communities and peoples, the promotion of access and democratic participation, etc.

Other sessions in the event included an exploration of funding opportunities within the European Commission's Culture Programme, as well as a presentation and training session on the software package developed for EHD national coordinators.



Whilst only briefly sketching the relation between cultural heritage and European affairs, the report is interesting by focusing on the notion of 'heritage events', i.e. community activities around tangible and intangible cultural heritage, and how these can relate to a broad range of aspects in the field of sustainable development. This is illustrated with a set of 9 presentations of existing or potential projects from EU Member States (Estonia, Slovenia, France, the Netherlands) and other European countries (Ukraine, Belarus, FYROM, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Switzerland, Norway).

68.

Museums, Libraries and Archives (2010): *Sharper investment for changing times: getting more out of museums, libraries and archives*, Birmingham: MLA. (24 pp.)

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/information-management/sharper-investment-for-changing-times.pdf>

Author/Institution: Museums, Libraries and Archives (MLA), a public body abolished in 2012, its functions transferred to Arts Council England and the National Archives

Commissioned by the UK's former agency for Museums, Libraries and Archives (MLA), this report proposes a wide range of strategic challenges in order to face the current time of shrinking resources due to the economic climate.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter describes specifically the value of museums, libraries and archives. In the context of the current recession, the document aims to demonstrate how these facilities can contribute to improving the economy. The sector has a key role to play in boosting the country's standing internationally and in sharing scholarship and training. At a local level, for example, a survey of 13,000 archive users showed that 78% of them had used local transport; 36% had used local shops and 17% had visited other places in the area, all of these aspects generating positive economic effects.

Increasing social mobility is supported thanks to the ability to source, select and make use of knowledge and information provided by these institutions in order to make good choices, empower people to improve their employability, support their children and take an active part in their communities. In a survey of volunteers in 2005, 49% of those surveyed thought that volunteering in museums, libraries and archives had helped them to gain employment.

A Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) survey showed that nearly three quarters of local residents believe that investment in the historic environment makes local areas more attractive, gives them an identity and 60% say it makes an area a better place to live.

The report argues that economic recovery and long-term prosperity will require a highly-skilled population. It is believed that learning and training cannot be delivered solely through the formal education system and that other learning provisions are needed. Inter-generational learning programmes for families, school children, students and adults should be seen as a key part of the local contribution to supporting learning through museums, libraries and archives. In a survey of 26,000 children, 68% of 11 to 14 year olds thought that museum visits made school work more inspiring and 90% of 7 to 11 year olds learnt new things as a result of the visit.

Connecting communities can be attained through fostering community cohesion, supporting health, well-being and democratic engagement. Museums, libraries and archives are places where challenging issues can be debated and discussed thanks to building greater understanding and creating a tolerant atmosphere. “Art and Islam”, a year-long programme of exhibitions and events at Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery (BMAG), has led to new relationships between the museum and the diverse communities in the West Midlands. It has also contributed to an improved understanding of Muslim cultures amongst the general public.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter presents recommendations to take more advantage of museums, libraries and archives at local level, suited to the current economic context. The report proposes ambitious but realistic suggestions based on a long-term partnership between local government, central government and museums, libraries and archives. Challenges identified include working to make a wider public impact as efficiently as possible, innovating and integrating these facilities with other services and ensuring longer term funding and statutory framework in which councils, museums, libraries and archives can have freedom, flexibility and stability. Suggestions made also include: distribution of services (develop new approaches to delivery, using technology to free staff from routine tasks and focus them more on community engagement), new governance and delivery models, new funding models, making investment more strategic, performance and efficiency, designing services with, and for, diverse communities, creating a workforce which can deliver change, working across local boundaries, re-positioning the service (this requires the “offer” from the service to be one that people want and it needs sector leaders to build political support and engagement) and reaching out to new audiences.

Some of these strategic suggestions have already been projected and accomplished. For example, in April 2009, Tyne and Wear Museums merged with Tyne and Wear Archives to create one joint service (TWAM), promoting collective working – through volunteer programmes – and resource pooling to create better standards and value for all. The merger has provided an excellent opportunity for joint learning. Besides, as one single organisation, information about the museum collections held in the archives is

now more accessible, helping to support exhibition development and the learning needs of the community. The relative strengths of the two parent organisations are extremely complementary and this is already bearing fruit in terms of new initiatives and an improved service for users.

The suggestions in this prospect make the case for cleverer investment in museums, libraries and archives and long-term benefits for society. The willingness to inspire innovative, integrated and sustainable services from these heritage institutions makes this report significant.

69.  
Olsson, K. (2010), 'Cultural Heritage as a Resource in Place Marketing', in Mälkki, M. and Schmidt-Thomé, K. (eds.): *Integrating aims – Built heritage in social and economic development*. Espoo: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications, pp. 253-270  
<http://lib.tkk.fi/Reports/2010/isbn9789526032849.pdf>

Author: Krister Olsson

Institution: Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm

This paper examines the use of cultural heritage in urban and regional planning from a theoretical perspective of place marketing, including an example from the western part of the Mälardalen region in Sweden. The author introduces an approach to place marketing from a planning and management perspective, arguing that adopting a place marketing approach in heritage management leads to a new understanding of the role of cultural heritage in urban and regional environments, including a new relation between an expert perspective and a lay person perspective.

Increasingly, the interpretation of the past and the designation of heritage are demand-oriented processes, which aim at satisfying cultural, economic or political objectives, rather than resulting from expert values which derive from objective, universal and intrinsic criteria. In this respect, in order to utilise cultural heritage as a resource in urban and regional social and economic development, there is a need to systematically consider how various stakeholders, not least the general public, perceive and value urban and regional environments as cultural heritage from their own perspectives.

The specific analysis of how cultural heritage is used in development policy and planning in the western part of the Mälardalen region in Sweden is based on studies of planning documents in three municipalities (local level), as well as studies of regional development programmes from their three corresponding counties (regional level). The author argues that these documents tend to focus on built heritage and show a very traditional view of cultural heritage – even though heritage is presented both as

something to protect and as an asset for future development, the 'restrictive' approach to its use tends to prevail, with limited clarity as to how cultural heritage could help advance future development strategies.

In this respect, in municipal documents heritage is mainly seen as something at risk, which needs safeguarding, whereas some regional documents seem to indicate a deeper understanding of the links between heritage (in both its tangible and intangible dimensions) and social and economic development, but this appears to be taken for granted, without the case for clearly-defined strategies being explicitly made. According to the author, most of the documents analysed also fail to recognise the role of cultural heritage from a place marketing perspective. They tend to be supply-oriented in their approach to cultural heritage (i.e. cultural heritage is seen as something that derives from expert analysis and is then 'sold' to internal and external markets) and therefore the main marketing measure is promotion.

On this basis, Olsson considers that *'there is a discrepancy between theory and practice concerning the understanding of cultural heritage, as well as regarding views on place marketing and on planning. In practice, cultural heritage is mainly understood as material remains from the past, identified by heritage experts, whereas from contemporary theoretical perspectives, cultural heritage could be understood as a result deriving from a negotiation process among various stakeholders. Furthermore, place marketing is in practice seen as a supply-oriented process, whereas theory stresses demand-orientation'* (p. 267). He calls for a stronger involvement of local citizens in the definition of heritage, which would help to maximise its contribution to place marketing and to urban and regional development.

Overall, the article provides an interesting, critical approach to local management practices regarding the role of heritage in the practice of development strategies. Whilst the methodology used may be limited (i.e. based on the analysis of a few planning documents), some ideas may be valid elsewhere and point to the need to bridge the gap between theory and practice in this field.

70.

Organisation of World Heritage Cities (2012): *Historic Cities in Development: Keys for Understanding and Action. A compilation of case studies on the conservation and management of historic cities. Book of Case Studies*. Lyon: OWHC / UNESCO (216 pp.)

[http://www.ovpm.org/fichiers/cahier\\_trilingue\\_jan13.pdf](http://www.ovpm.org/fichiers/cahier_trilingue_jan13.pdf)

Institutions: Organisation of World Heritage Cities (OWHC), UNESCO – World Heritage Centre, Council of Europe, Getty Conservation Institute, ICOMOS, City of Lyon

This extensive publication, which combines contents in English, French and Spanish, presents 40 case studies from cities across the world which have recently carried out initiatives related to the preservation and management of their historic city centres, some of which can be seen as good practices in local sustainable development. The compilation of case studies was initiated by the City of Lyon and coordinated by a Steering Committee involving representatives of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the Getty Conservation Institute, the Council of Europe, ICOMOS and the Organisation of World Heritage Cities.

European examples include the cross-national, URBACT *HerO* project ('Heritage as Opportunity'), the setting-up of a new visitor centre at the Suomenlinna military fort in Helsinki (which has contributed to improving relations with the public and led to an increase in the number of visitors), the use of heritage assets as new cultural and leisure spaces for residents and tourists in Córdoba (Spain), Lyon and Thessaloniki, the strengthening of local economy through heritage preservation and tourism development in Salamanca and Naples, the promotion of citizen participation in local heritage management in Albi (France) and Rhodes (Greece), the revitalisation of the historic centre of Vilnius through the reinstatement of traditional craft activities and the development of local development strategies fostering sustainable transportation and heritage preservation in Strasbourg and Tallinn, among others.

In fact, two thirds of the examples contained in the volume come from European cities. Interesting examples from other regions include the development of a tourist market around traditional local products in Saint-Louis (Senegal), the improvement of living conditions for craftsmen in Timbuktu (Mali), the revival of traditional trade in Cuenca (Ecuador) and the development of participative governance around historic heritage in Lima (Peru).

Each example is classified according to the main themes raised in the publication, including its relevance in terms of development or planning, urban management, conservation and valorisation or governance and relation with the public. In this respect, whereas some examples have only limited direct relevance to the purposes of social and economic development (in particular those that stress heritage management

and conservation), overall the publication presents a wide range of approaches to the contemporary preservation and exploitation of (for the most part) tangible, built heritage. The structure of each case study includes a section on ‘Learning’, which describes the results or impacts achieved and the questions and challenges raised by the initiative.

Project descriptions are clear and, over 4 pages, present thorough visual and written information on the approach adopted, context, aims, areas of intervention, implementation process, funding, timeline and the impact of the activity on the value of the heritage properties involved. The book may lack a final chapter of conclusions and a clearer analysis of the issues raised and their relevance to local development, but overall presents an interesting, diverse range of approaches to the preservation of cultural heritage in historic centres and its relevance to sustainable local development.

71.

Ozdemiroglu, E., ed. (2012): *Study of the Economic Value of Northern Ireland's Historic Environment*. Belfast: EFTEC. (68 pp.)

[http://www.doeni.gov.uk/niea/study\\_of\\_the\\_economic\\_value\\_of\\_ni\\_historic\\_environment\\_may\\_2012.pdf](http://www.doeni.gov.uk/niea/study_of_the_economic_value_of_ni_historic_environment_may_2012.pdf)

Author: Declan Mackin and Alan Davidson  
Institution: RSM McClure Watters

Author: Craig Bullock and Ece Ozdemiroglu  
Institution: EFTEC

Through quantitative economic research and a range of qualitative examples, the study tries to demonstrate the full economic and social importance of the historic environment to local communities and to Northern Ireland as a whole. Chapter 3 presents both direct and indirect / induced impacts, in terms of GVA, employment and output.

The Terms of Reference for this study defined ‘historic environment’ as “the state care monuments, scheduled monuments, historic parks, gardens, demesnes, buildings and structures of historic value, and archaeological sites of significance that exist in Northern Ireland. This includes the coastal waters surrounding Northern Ireland in addition to the terrestrial features”. The authors note that this definition is a narrow one concentrating on the built heritage (excluding landscapes and biodiversity) but it has determined the scope of the study.

Quantitative assessment of economic value of Northern Ireland's historic environment is based on an analysis of: (1) expenditure by core organisations on the historic



environment; (2) the portion of construction industry output that can be associated with the historic environment; and (3) spending by out-of-state and domestic tourists as a result of the historic environment. For domestic tourists, only leisure day visits were included. The multiplier effects of this spending and the employment effects are also considered.

In summary, the analysis indicates that before the impact of domestic tourists is included, Northern Ireland's historic environment: generates some £287.1 m of output per annum, within a range of £225.0 m to £362.2 m; creates or sustains 5,383 jobs, within a range of 4,218 to 6,790; and supports some £134.6 m of GVA each year, within a range of £105.5 m to £169.8 m.

The benefits from leisure day visits to historic environment sites by Northern Ireland residents are estimated as:

- ▶ Output – £245.1 m;
- ▶ Employment – 4,596 FTE jobs; and
- ▶ GVA – £114.9 m.

Therefore, including domestic tourism yields a total estimated GVA of some £249.5 m per annum in relation to Northern Ireland's historic environment. When assessed on a per capita basis, the historic environment in Northern Ireland produces a lower level of output, employment and GVA than its neighbouring jurisdictions (Republic of Ireland, Scotland and Wales), which suggests that there is significant potential to further develop the historic environment sector in Northern Ireland.

A list of wider economic (social) benefits of the historic environment has been highlighted by the stakeholders who responded to a survey. The principal benefits stated by respondents were:

- ▶ A sense of identity and history (84% of respondents);
- ▶ Preservation of heritage for future generations (79% of respondents);
- ▶ Provision of a better living environment (79% of respondents);
- ▶ Economic regeneration (e.g. increased tourism income and employment) through heritage conservation and renovation (79% of respondents); and
- ▶ Provision of access to historic environment sites for those who are from socially and economically disadvantaged communities (68% of respondents).

Key areas of benefit are also highlighted in case studies developed as part of the research:

Economic benefits: attracting visitors and creating jobs; increased footfall in areas in need of regeneration; enhancement of night-time economy.

Social benefits: community cohesion; sense of identity and place; civic pride and wellbeing; creating safer and shared spaces; focal point for wider regeneration; skills development and volunteering opportunities.

The case studies have also revealed a number of common issues including:

- ▶ Financial viability and sustainability of sites;
- ▶ Ensuring that benefits that are derived from the historic environment flow to all parts of the society; and
- ▶ Strengthening links between individual assets and events to increase awareness.

Recommendations of the study include development of an economic impact toolkit for use within the historic environment sector.

72.

Passamar, H.; and Marchetti, M. (eds.) (2009): *Étude nationale des retombées économiques et sociales du patrimoine*. [National Study on the Economic and Social Effects of Heritage] Aix-en-Provence and Paris : Agence Régionale du Patrimoine Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur and Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication. (156 pp.)

[http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/politique-culturelle/etude\\_eco\\_patrimoine.pdf](http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/politique-culturelle/etude_eco_patrimoine.pdf)

Author: Hervé Passamar

Institution: Agence Régional Du Patrimoine Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur (currently known as Agence pour le Développement et la Valorisation du Patrimoine)

Author: Marco Marchetti

Institution: Mission Valorisation du patrimoine, Direction de l'Architecture et du Patrimoine, Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication

Following an initial analysis of the economic and social effects of the built heritage carried out in the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur region in 2005, this study broadened the scope of analysis to the national level. It was conducted between 2007 and 2008 by a team combining regional and national staff, by collecting data from previous research projects, as well as newly-obtained data from heritage sites and monuments, regional directorates of the Ministry of Culture and Communication, regional tourism observatories and private business in the heritage restoration sector. The project, involving a wide range of stakeholders for which regular advice and consultation was

provided, led to the setting-up of a dedicated website ([www.impact-patrimoine.fr](http://www.impact-patrimoine.fr)), enabling regional agencies to upload and compare data.

The first part of the study focuses on the direct economic impact of heritage sites, monuments and labelled museums (Musées de France) which are open to the public for over 40 days per year and which have a box office or paid guided tours. The study estimated that 10,662 people were directly employed by this type of institutions; 21,334 worked in the field of heritage among public authorities; and 1,394 were authorised heritage guides (although the latter figure could increase to roughly 2,500, depending on the source).

According to the survey, these sites and museums collected €258.6 m in admissions in 2007, of which 69.5% in the Ile-de-France region. €92.4 m were obtained in their bookshops and shops, of which again 74% were obtained in Ile-de-France. €16 m were collected through guided tours and visits, €2 m through the rental of audioguides, €12.5 m resulted from the rental of museum spaces and an additional €138.9 m came from other sources, including the licensing of shopping areas or restaurants, film or photo rights, rental of bicycles, etc. Overall this meant that the direct economic impact of the museums and heritage sites identified amounted to €521 m.

The next chapter presents an estimation of employment in organisations which provide services to heritage institutions, including companies which have been certified for the restoration of buildings (which employed an estimated 20,610 people in tasks directly related to heritage), SMEs in traditional building techniques (*entreprises artisanales du bâtiment*, which employed an estimated 52,876), heritage architects (757), restoration experts (1,377), staff of heritage-related laboratories and research centres (546) and the estimated amount of heritage-related jobs in the tourism industry (163,189). The latter figure would mean that 15% of tourism employment was generated by heritage. Other employment in heritage-related areas was also considered, including training professionals (3,824), researchers excluding those in restoration (4,254), heritage-related crafts (45,292) and art experts and consultants (368). Overall, this set of sectors employed 279,780 people in mainland France and 1,601 in the DOM-TOM regions at the time of the study.

On the other hand, applying a multiplier of 1.6, the study estimated that employment induced by heritage in France totalled approximately 189,000. On this basis, which led to the conclusion that heritage was the source of 503,500 direct, indirect and induced jobs in France, the study concluded that each job in a major museum or heritage site generated 15 jobs in related industries and other beneficiary sectors.

As regards the financial impact of the heritage sector, the study found that SMEs involved in building restoration and in traditional building techniques had a total

turnover of approximately €5.1 b and heritage tourism generated €15.6 b per year. Adding other minor sectors to this, the indirect impact of heritage on the French economy was estimated at approximately €20.6 b. On the other hand, public investment in heritage restoration was estimated at between €680 and 760 m.

Data presented above is complemented with a set of tables presenting evidence at regional level, as well as several methodological annexes. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that the study presents detailed information about the methodology and approach used, including difficulties found and key issues identified by regional correspondents when aiming to collect data. Authors also recognise the shortcomings of the report, including its focus on a limited subsector of heritage sites and museums (even though the main heritage sites and museums are indeed included in the study) and the need to improve data-collection techniques in similar exercises in the future.

It should also be noted that the concepts used throughout the study somehow differ from those applied in other countries, ‘social effects’ (*retombées sociales*) referring here to employment (whereas ‘economic effects’ or *retombées économiques* apply to turnover) and ‘indirect employment’ (*emplois indirects*) referring to jobs in private companies and organisations which provide services to public heritage sites and museums.

Overall, this study presents a good set of data to prove the economic impact of heritage in the French economy, which has later been used in other documents and presentations. Despite its limitations, it can be a good starting point for analyses and awareness-raising both at national and at regional level.

73.

Pastor Eixarch, P.; Armas Andreu, I., Muñoz Lafuente, M.; Gómez Bahillo, C.; et al. (2011): *Impacto socioeconómico de las Fiestas del Pilar 2010*. [Socio-Economic Impact of 2010's *Fiestas del Pilar*] Zaragoza: Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza. (102 pp.)

<http://www.zaragoza.es/contenidos/cultura/observatorio/impacto.pdf>

Authors: Pilar Pastor Eixarch and Isabel Armas Andreu

Institution: Culture Observatory, City of Zaragoza

Author: María Muñoz Lafuente

Institution: Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Zaragoza

Author: Carlos Gómez Bahillo

Institution: University of Zaragoza

This study commissioned by the City of Zaragoza focuses on the 2010 edition of the *Fiestas del Pilar*, a traditional cultural event comprising a wide range of activities which takes place yearly in October. Whilst having a religious origin and including several activities which derive from folk culture, the event currently involves also contemporary cultural expressions, including pop concerts and children activities. The *Fiestas del Pilar* are seen as one of the more massive expressions of intangible heritage in Spain. The 2010 edition drew approximately 2.6 m participants overall. Most activities were held for free.

The methodology of the study involved an analysis of the local authority's budget allocations to the event, surveys of both local residents and tourists and a number of focus groups with local businesses and professionals in several fields which obtain indirect benefits from the event. The surveys provide detailed information about the demographic profile of attendees in different activities of the event, as well as participants' views on the quality of the programme, its main assets and the weaknesses perceived.

On the basis of surveys, budgetary information and tax records, the study estimates that the 2010 edition of the *Fiestas del Pilar* had a direct impact of €134 m and €52 m as indirect impact, thus contributing almost €186 m to the local economy. The service sector (including retailers, restaurants, hotels, and cultural and leisure services in particular) was the beneficiary of 81% of turnover generated by the event. Using an input-output framework, the study argues that 3,386.6 FTE jobs were created or maintained as a result of the event; of these, 3,348 were the result of the increase in private investment and consumption, whereas the remaining 38.6 were caused by the increase in the City Council's expenditure. Almost 3,200 jobs were created in the service sector.

Even though the title of the study refers to the social impact of the event as well, the *social* dimension of the report mainly centres on an analysis of the event's visibility in local and national media, as well as on the perceptions of participants, rather than offering a more complex analysis of effects in terms of community cohesion or intercultural dialogue. However, the publication can be seen as a rather rare example of economic impact analyses in Spain, which serves to highlight the importance of cultural events for local development.

74.

Pôle Industries Culturelles et Patrimoines (2011): *Étude des Retombées Economiques et Sociales du Patrimoine Arlésien. Document de Synthèse*. [Study on the Economic and Social Effects of Arles' Heritage. Summary Document] Arles. (12 pp.)

[http://www.industries-culturelles-patrimoines.fr/images/stories/documents/erespa20110701\\_vd-impression.pdf](http://www.industries-culturelles-patrimoines.fr/images/stories/documents/erespa20110701_vd-impression.pdf)

Author/Institution: Pôle Industries Culturelles et Patrimoines / Agence pour le Développement et la Valorisation du Patrimoine

Commissioned by the Pôle Industries Culturelles et Patrimoines, a body set up in 2006 by the regional council of Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, this document summarises the results of a study which aimed at evaluating the social and economic benefits of cultural heritage in the city of Arles. The study, carried out from June 2009 to June 2010, is based on a complex methodology which includes, inter alia, a thorough collection of available data on the subject, interviews with several representatives of cultural institutions in order to obtain qualitative evidence, and the delivery of questionnaires to collect information concerning the management of historic sites and monuments.

The study takes into account mainly direct and indirect economic effects, as well as some induced effects in terms of employment generation – i.e. generated as a result of the remuneration linked to direct and indirect employment. Direct social benefits are expressed in terms of employees (337 jobs in historic sites, 21 in public authorities and 10 as heritage guides). If considering direct, indirect and induced jobs related to heritage, this constitutes a total amount of 4,000 employees in the city, which represents 12.1% of the labour force in Arles.

Direct economic benefits involve a total income of €5.56 m. Ticketing represents the highest proportion in this chapter (78% of total income). Indirect jobs related to cultural heritage represent a total number of 2,133, the highest part (85%) being constituted by heritage tourism, while induced employment amounts to 1,500 jobs.

Evidence is also presented regarding the direct and indirect economic impact of heritage tourism separately. In this regard, the total turnover of companies linked to building restoration in the region is about €2.025 m. The estimation of turnover for craft enterprises linked to heritage is €5.519 m. Tourism-related expenditure constitutes €87.78 m, the highest proportion of which is represented by accommodation. Total indirect economic benefits amount to over €95 m, thus leading to a total figure of €101 m for the direct and indirect economic benefits. This amounts to 0.2% of the total GVA in the Département of Bouches du Rhône.

75.

Prats, M. (2011): 'Les retombées économiques du patrimoine culturel en France', in: ICOMOS: *Le patrimoine, moteur de développement*, Paris, Proceedings of the 17<sup>th</sup> ICOMOS General Assembly Symposium. (pp. 745-753) [The Economic Effects of Cultural Heritage in France / Heritage, an Engine for Development]

[http://www.icomos.org/Paris2011/Symposium\\_proceedings/INTEGRALE.pdf](http://www.icomos.org/Paris2011/Symposium_proceedings/INTEGRALE.pdf)

Author: Michèle Prats

Institution: ICOMOS France

This short speech at the General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites collects the results of several studies on the economic effects of cultural heritage in France. It also describes the economic impact of the Pont du Gard, a World Heritage site which has important impacts in a broad geographical area.

The author, the vice-president of ICOMOS France, starts by providing a broad definition of cultural heritage, which stretches from its tangible dimension to a landscape perspective, and then lists several areas of impact. As regards tourism, studies show that the inclusion of a site in the UNESCO World Heritage List may generate an increase of 20-30% visitors on average. This has clear impacts on the local economic structure (32% of the local income in Arles results from the cultural industries) and other social effects on the community (stronger ownership of heritage and community engagement, as shown in Le Havre, Bordeaux, Nancy, Amiens or Lyon).

Data from previous studies presented in the text serves to show that in the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur region, each euro invested in the built heritage had a return of €10 for the regional economy. On the other hand, a survey of major monuments and heritage sites in 17 French regions (which only included 40% of those in the sector, but 87% of the 207 most-visited monuments in France) found that they were the direct source of 32,800 jobs and indirectly generated 280,000 jobs (of which over 50% in



cultural tourism, the rest corresponding to restoration and other heritage-related areas) and induced an additional 187,500 jobs, thus generating 500,000 jobs in the French economy. In terms of economic turnover, these monuments collected €519 m directly and indirectly generated €20.6 b, thus contributing over €21 b to the French economy – given that public expenditure in the heritage sector amounts roughly to €700 m per year, each euro spent has a return of €30 nationally, a figure which the author claims is underestimated.

An impact study of the Pont du Gard, a monument which hosts 1.1 m visitors per year, showed that direct expenditure by visitors on-site was only 2.6% of the total economic impact generated by the monument. Each visitor spent €3.27 on site and an additional €123 outside, on average – this meant that, in 2005, the site had a direct economic turnover of €3.6 m but a global economic impact of €138.5 m, with effects visible in three different regions (Languedoc-Roussillon, Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur and Rhône-Alpes), as well as €21.5 m in tax receipts. This contributes to 1,209 indirect FTE jobs, in addition to the 112 employees of Pont du Gard. Each euro spent by public authorities in the Pont du Gard is complemented by one euro provided by visitors on site and €40 spent by them in the surrounding region.

Similar evidence is presented for other cultural and natural heritage sites, including some mixed sites such as the Grand Site Sainte-Victoire, in Provence, which generates €60 m in the tourist economy each year.

The author closes her speech by indicating ICOMOS France’s aim to pursue the analysis of the economic effects of World Heritage-listed sites as well as the economic impact and social value of cultural heritage in general.

The text serves to present some illustrative figures of the economic impact of cultural heritage in France. The use of previous studies means that only limited information is provided as regards the methodologies used, but otherwise the speech is informative and clear.

76.

Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd (2009): *World Heritage Status. Is there opportunity for economic gain?* Cumbria: Lake District World Heritage Project. (106 pp.)  
<http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/documents/WHSTheEconomicGainFinalReport.pdf>

Author/Institution: Rebanks Consulting Ltd, UK

This is a report of the study commissioned by the UK's Lake District World Heritage Project with a view to establishing potential social and economic benefits from World Heritage Site inscription. As the cost of attaining WHS status is estimated in the UK to be up to €462,000 (£400,000), this has led to a national debate about the costs and benefits of getting the UNESCO designation and how its value can best be exploited for communities/sites. The brief called for research and analysis to identify best practice from existing UNESCO World Heritage Sites (WHSs) that had been successful in converting such designation into socio-economic gain.

Previous research methodologies have tended to ignore the differing motivations and actions of the WHSs. This has resulted in a body of research that has shown some sites that have achieved a range of socio-economic impacts but offered no framework for understanding why or how these were achieved in some places and not others.

The present study involved innovative research of all existing 878 World Heritage Sites (as of May 2009) with the creation of a new database that enabled sites to be judged against 15 criteria to ascertain their defining characteristics, motivations and actions. This filtering approach has provided new insights into the activities and impacts of WHSs around the world.

The study demonstrates that sites that have achieved significant impacts have had a clear logic chain from the identification of the issues and problems they wished to address, a clear understanding of how WHS status could be used to catalyse change, following through to investing in the resources, activities and processes to deliver the impacts desired.

The research has revealed the different motivations which led to places becoming WHSs. There are four kinds of WHS, as defined by the perceptions held of WHS status:

- 1) A 'Celebration' Designation – i.e. a celebration or reward designation for heritage already preserved.
- 2) A Heritage 'SOS' Designation – an emergency attention designation for unique heritage at risk.

- 3) A Marketing/Quality Logo/Brand – a growing minority of sites see the WHS designation as a marketing or quality brand for historic places.
- 4) A 'Place Making' Catalyst –WHS status as a powerful catalyst for economic development using heritage to develop powerful new identities for places and to change places fundamentally.

The impact of sites is markedly different depending upon which one of these four categories a site belongs to. Places that see the designation as a 'Celebration' do not use it to achieve socio-economic impacts – preserving the heritage was the achievement, WHS the reward. Places that want it as an 'SOS' to save heritage, go on to try and do just that, namely saving heritage – the result are efforts to preserve heritage. Places that want the designation for marketing or branding go on to use it in their marketing and branding with little additional activity other than that related to the development of tourism. Only the 'Place Making' WHSs use it to generate wider socio-economic impacts and fundamental change to communities and places.

The research showed that only a very small minority – as few as 5–10% of sites – perceive WHS status as being about the third and fourth of these categories, i.e. as a tool for socio-economic impact. Additionally, socio-economic motivations for WHS inscription are relatively recent in origin; from the first designated sites in 1978 until the late 1980s virtually no sites had a socio-economic motivation for designation; between the later 1980s and mid-1990s a small minority of sites innovated with the designation to achieve a variety of socio-economic impacts, and since the mid-1990s a growing but significant minority of sites have had socio-economic motivations of one kind or another for securing the designation.

By filtering the 878 WHSs the research was able to identify shared characteristics of sites achieving socioeconomic impact, and to reveal the ways that becoming a WHS had added value. The key finding was that whilst WHS status has been a powerful catalyst for socio-economic change in some communities, the interventions made to achieve this were highly site-specific.

A key concept that emerged from the research was the idea of a 'network effect' resulting from the addition of new WHSs. Rather than the addition of new sites devaluing perceptions of the brand, the reality appears to be that the addition of new sites is increasing consumer understanding of the WHS designation. Key WHSs believe they are succeeding in attracting high value cultural visitors because of their WHS status – this 'WHS literacy' appears to result in dynamic WHSs attracting disproportionately large numbers of high-spending cultural visitors.

The research resulted in 14 case studies and revealed 12 distinct types of socio-economic benefit that can be generated as a result of WHS designation:

(1) media/PR value – raising profile of the site; (2) preservation of the Heritage Unique Selling Point (USP) – developing conservation and preservation industries as a dynamic and wealth generating sector; (3) new/improved identity image; (4) education – developing and selling site specific education products and services; (5) civic pride/quality of life – developing a reputation for having a high quality of life and a dynamic lifestyle offer; (6) culture and creativity – developing heritage-based cultural and creative industries; (7) ‘cultural glue’ – uniting, through the core narrative of the place, disparate community facilities, and visitor attractions into a coherent product that is bigger than the sum of its parts; (8) regeneration programmes; (9) coordinating Investment through strategy – binding together, within an overall strategy and under an efficient management organisation, previously disparate communities and facilities; (10) better/new services – persuading local authorities to invest in new facilities or services for residents and visitors alike; (11) business development – making businesses adapt or create new services for the visitors who travel to the site; (12) quality infrastructure.

Better understanding of these areas of benefit and of the ways they can be achieved will result in better outcomes for existing or new World Heritage Sites in the future (see Chapter 3).

The research highlighted the fact that if the investment in attaining WHS status is made with the primary motivation of socio-economic impact, then scale is a significant factor. As evidence suggests, the tourism footfall impact of the designation is unlikely to exceed 0-3%. However, with effective marketing of a quality product, WHS status might be used effectively to change the visitor profile. The key to payback is the scale of the market, and the ability to use the WHS designation to attract higher spending cultural visitors.

77.

Ripp, M. (coord.) (2011): *‘The Road to Success’. Integrated Management of Historic Towns. Guidebook*. Regensburg: Stadt Regensburg. (pp. 12-15)

[http://urbact.eu/uploads/tx\\_projectsresultsdocuments/hero\\_guidebook\\_FINAL\\_02.pdf](http://urbact.eu/uploads/tx_projectsresultsdocuments/hero_guidebook_FINAL_02.pdf)

Author: Matthias Ripp

Institution: City of Regensburg

The document *‘The Road to Success’. Integrated Management of Historic Towns* has the character of a Guidebook. The Guidebook is the result of a 3-year city network project, HerO – Heritage as Opportunity. Sustainable Management Strategies for Vital Historic Urban Landscapes (2008-2011), funded under the European Commission’s

URBACT II programme. The UNESCO city of Regensburg acted as Lead Partner of this city network, with the World Heritage Coordination Office being responsible for the project management. Regensburg's 8 partners in the HerO network were Graz (Austria), Naples (Italy), Vilnius (Lithuania), Sighişoara (Romania), Liverpool (Great Britain), Lublin (Poland), Poitiers (France) and Valletta (Malta).

The network aimed to develop integrated and innovative management strategies for historic urban landscapes. Its main objective was to facilitate the right balance between the preservation of built cultural heritage and the sustainable, future-proof socio-economic development of historic towns in order to strengthen their attractiveness and competitiveness (*Heritage as Opportunity*). The guidebook reflects a peer-learning process focused on a very concrete objective, namely the development of a cultural heritage management plan for each partner city within the network.

Chapter 2 of the Guidebook describes briefly the benefits which cultural heritage can bring for attractive and liveable cities. Historic towns are shaped in particular by their cultural heritage assets – monuments, groups of buildings, historic sites, social values and traditions – which present a multitude of opportunities and economic, social and environmental benefits. These benefits are identified on four levels (pages 12 – 14):

Economic benefits: The revitalisation of historic urban areas and the safeguarding of cultural heritage contribute to the creation of jobs, businesses and economic growth through:

1. Work generated for local businesses by the labour-intensive repair and renovation of the historic fabric.
2. Restored old buildings which provide special places for businesses (i.e. creative industry).
3. The improved location quality and image through the heritage environment and infrastructure for business activities, in particular for the creative, cultural, tourism and gastronomy industry, and as location factor for investment.
4. Attracting and binding highly-skilled workers, businesses, visitors and tourists through the attractiveness and uniqueness of the place (the cultural heritage helps to distinguish from other towns in the global competition; cultural heritage as "trade mark").
5. Public investment in the cultural heritage as catalyst for the revitalisation of the wider area, attracting local as well as external private investment and stimulating new development.

Social and cultural benefits: The revitalisation of historic urban areas and the safeguarding of the cultural heritage assets contribute to:

1. Providing a place for cultural and creative activities.
2. Providing local identity, pride and community spirit for a place to live and work.
3. Learning and knowing about its history and culture.
4. Recuperating patrimonial value.
5. Activating citizens to get involved in the urban development.
6. Improving the quality of life (location quality). This supports binding and attracting new and old inhabitants, creating a “corporate feeling” and strengthening the identification with the town and places.

Environmental benefits: The maintenance and reuse of the historic fabric, in particular of historic buildings and the historic centre, contribute to the efficient handling of natural resources through:

1. Reducing the need and consumption of new materials (e.g. for construction).
2. Reducing further land consumption (use of already used areas and surfaces).
3. Securing the “city of short ways” (historic urban areas generally show a compact urban structure and are located in the city centre or nearby, reducing the length of transport ways and causing less commuting).
4. Attractive historic urban areas which contribute to the mitigation of suburbanisation trends (people stay and live in the centre).

Giving identity: Historic towns with well-maintained cultural heritage assets provide a distinct identity and image, conveying a feeling of home, community, likeness and appreciation. Often citizens are very proud of their local heritage, identifying themselves strongly with their town, which also leads to the development of a collective identity of the residents and stronger identification with the place. Well-maintained cultural heritage serves also to develop a positive image to outsiders as a unique soft location factor in the global competition of attracting enterprises, skilled working force, inhabitants and tourists.

78.

Rypkema, D. (2009); 'Economics and the built cultural heritage', in Council of Europe: *Heritage and beyond*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 113-123.

[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf)

79.

Rypkema, D. (2010), 'The Role of Heritage Conservation in a Sustainable Economy', in Mälkki, M. and Schmidt-Thomé, K. (eds.): *Integrating aims – Built heritage in social and economic development*. Espoo: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications, pp. 197-211

<http://lib.tkk.fi/Reports/2010/isbn9789526032849.pdf>

Author: Donovan Rypkema

Institution: Heritage Strategies International / PlaceEconomics, Washington DC, USA

These two articles by US consultant Donovan Rypkema provide a wide range of arguments on the implications of cultural heritage for sustainable development, including its economic, social and environmental components. The author, who has extensive experience in the field of heritage conservation, presents examples from both the US and Europe. The two texts can be seen to complement one another.

The first text, entitled 'Economics and the built cultural heritage', focuses on the economic value of the built cultural heritage, adopting the Faro Convention's view of built heritage, which expands beyond 'monuments' to the context within which they exist – because '[it] is from this broader understanding of "cultural heritage" that many of the economic benefits emerge' (p. 113). In this respect, the author calls for an approach to the evaluation of impacts which goes beyond the focus on monuments or sites and understands indirect and induced effects on communities more broadly.

Measurable economic benefits of the built heritage include jobs and household income, which tend to be positively correlated in this sector because heritage rehabilitation is a labour-intensive industry and jobs tend to be relatively well-paid. The author argues that the characteristics of the employment market in this field (large number of well-paid jobs and a shortage of labour to fill them) merit a high public policy priority. Another impact derives from the prevalence of small businesses, which hire workers locally and spend their profits at home. The author also highlights the contribution of heritage to tourism, city centre revitalisation, the promotion of the notion of 'adaptive reuse' of buildings and resources, adaptation to the effects of globalisation, the potential to ensure differentiation and quality of life in local environments, etc. On the other hand, non-measurable effects should also be taken into account, including social, educational and cultural effects of heritage that may ultimately also have a positive economic impact.



Finally, the author identifies a range of public policy priorities which are advanced when built heritage is incorporated in economic development strategies, including import substitution, compatibility of history with modernisation and contemporary needs, the provision of a context of authenticity and originality for the sale and display of local goods and services, geographic dispersion, the development of counter-cyclical economic resources, incremental change, the strengthening of NGOs and product differentiation, among others. As a result of this, Rypkema argues that '*[a] policy of heritage conservation makes a city viable, liveable and equitable*' (p. 123) and therefore contributes to our view of sustainable development.

The second contribution can be seen as a more thorough exploration of some of the arguments mentioned above. In it, the author argues that heritage conservation has a central role in responding to the two simultaneous challenges currently faced by governments: in the short term, how to get the economy rolling again; in the intermediate and long term, how to restructure economies so that they become sustainable.

Rypkema mentions recent examples from France, Norway and Hong Kong, where governments have increased their investment in the heritage sector in the context of the financial crisis, on the understanding that heritage resources are long-term assets, which contribute to skill development and create sustainable employment.

He then presents a figure of sustainable development as the confluence of three components: environmental, economic and social/cultural responsibility. In his view, '*[these] three components create three important nexus: for a community to be viable there needs to be a link between environmental responsibility and economic responsibility; for a community to be livable there needs to be a link between environmental responsibility and social responsibility; and for a community to be equitable there needs to be a link between economic responsibility and social responsibility.*' (pp. 199-200)

A sustainable economy would have ten characteristics, including the use of local assets, its ability to participate in economic globalisation but mitigate cultural globalisation and its contribution to the cause of social/cultural responsibility. On this basis, Rypkema describes how heritage conservation can respond to these ten criteria:

1. Heritage conservation contributes to a sustainable economy because it is based on the use of local assets: historic buildings are local assets themselves, and city centre revitalisation based on historic preservation has a substantial effect in the broader local economy. In the US, a major public programme called *Main Street* has leveraged nearly \$27 of other investment per each dollar invested.

2. Heritage conservation has widespread, measurable benefits – this being another key feature of a sustainable economy. Expenditure on heritage conservation has direct and indirect economic impacts, including the creation of good, well-paying, productive jobs, as shown by studies in several countries.

3. A sustainable economy is oriented towards the private sector, particularly small business – and this is, again, one feature of the heritage industry, which is largely made up of small business, including contractors, architects, conservationists, historians, consultants.

4. The components of a sustainable economy should contribute both in economic downturns and in up cycles. According to the author, heritage conservation responds to this criterion because its activities can be downscaled to the suitable level when resources diminish; because it can take place in a variety of places, including those which are less severely affected by the crisis; and because any investment in this sector will have an indirect effect on surrounding areas.

5. Heritage conservation can provide a sense of continuity and adaptation to cultural globalisation, whilst counteracting the disruption which economic globalisation tends to exacerbate – again, this aligns the heritage sector with the prerequisites of a sustainable economy.

6. Sustainable economic development strategies should acknowledge quality of life as a major component of economic competitiveness. The author argues that heritage buildings are an important component of a high quality urban environment, as proven by recent studies, and that therefore they can be key in attracting and retaining investment – since workers and companies are increasingly mobile.

7. Strategies for sustainable economic development should be long-term, not short-term. Heritage is relevant in this respect, in the first place, because it is long-term, almost by definition, but also because employment in the sector is always necessary, either in building or in rehabilitation.

8. As in good sustainable economic development, heritage conservation is not a zero-sum game whereby what one country wins is lost by another – instead, the fact that one community effectively uses its heritage resources does not preclude another one from doing the same.

9. Heritage conservation also advances the cause of the environmental component which is central to sustainable development, because the rehabilitation of a building helps to save energy whereas razing a historic building and building a new one entails

throwing away embodied energy and replacing old, more sustainable materials with new, more energy-consumptive materials.

10. Finally, Rypkema argues that heritage conservation also advances the cause of the social/cultural component of sustainable development, because it helps us understand who we are, where we have been and where we are going.

As a conclusion, the author suggests that *'heritage conservation is ... the singular strategy that is simultaneously environmental responsibility, economic responsibility, and social/cultural responsibility'* (p. 210), and therefore should be central to sustainable development. However, most of the debate on sustainability revolves around environmental issues and 'green buildings' – yet *'[at] most perhaps 10% of what the environmental movement does advances the cause of heritage conservation. But 100% of heritage conservation advances the cause of the environment. You cannot have sustainable development without a major role for heritage conservation.'* (p. 210)

Overall, the article provides a short but clear account of the links between heritage conservation and economic development. Some of the arguments may seem only superficially sketched and other key issues in the sustainable economy may have been overlooked, but generally the article is well-considered.

80.

Schwarz, M. and Yair, K. (2010): *Making Value: craft & the economic and social contribution of makers*, London: Crafts Council. (122 pp.)

[http://blueprintfiles.s3.amazonaws.com/1321212530-making\\_value\\_full\\_report.pdf](http://blueprintfiles.s3.amazonaws.com/1321212530-making_value_full_report.pdf)

Author: Mary Schwarz

Institution: Freelance cultural sector consultant

Author: Karen Yair

Institution: Crafts Council

This interesting report explores the working conditions of so-called 'portfolio workers' in the crafts sector – that is, professionals who combine activities aimed at making, exhibiting and selling craft objects with a wider range of tasks including the provision of services to private businesses, engagement in community activities, involvement in education, etc. According to the statistics presented, approximately 65-70% of crafts makers in the UK create their careers this way.

The study presents mainly qualitative data, which serves to present a broad range of areas of involvement of and value creation by portfolio workers. Its methodology

included a literature review, a set of semi-structured interviews with 35 professionals in the field as well as interviews and consultations with other stakeholders and one research workshop. The study found that over three quarters of the makers interviewed worked in other industry sectors, over half in community settings and just over a third in education settings.

The text places the crafts sector in the broader context of creativity and innovation, highlighting how professionals in the sector, who may be involved in a variety of industry contexts (examples are given of portfolio workers employed in the fields of architecture and interior design; cultural heritage; fashion and advertising; creative media; leisure, tourism and events; performing and fine and visual arts; retailing; and manufacturing), *'bring a specialist knowledge of craft materials and processes to their work across industry sectors, which creates economic value for their colleagues and clients'* (p. 41). The dynamics of interaction with different economic sectors, the nature of work done in different fields (e.g. digital design) and the benefits derived of crafts by users and consumers (e.g. courses in traditional crafts for citizens, user-centred design targeting elderly people, new product innovations with a strong person-centred orientation, etc.) are illustrated with examples and images.

In terms of 'making value in community settings', the report describes how portfolio makers engage in work with children and young people, community groups and organisations and health and disability. In these settings, crafts activities can enhance the focus and concentration of beneficiaries, foster freedom and autonomy, increase confidence, self-esteem and sense of value, generate a sense of achievement and ownership, provide an experience of enjoyment and the development of imagination and skills, foster social inclusion and interaction and develop employability. Again, arguments are illustrated with specific examples drawn from interviews with makers.

This analysis is complemented with a section describing the contribution of craft-making in formal education settings (early years, primary, secondary, special education). Benefits in this field include taking a focused, individual student-centred approach, enabling sustained involvement and enhanced freedom of expression, encouraging experimentation and risk taking, working cross curriculum, supporting teacher development and providing an insight into the world of professional making, among others.

The report is complemented with a broader analysis of the working conditions of portfolio makers in the crafts sector, their professional development needs (learning, support schemes, mentoring, networking), as well as evidence collected through the literature review and a description of the methodology used.

Moving away from other reports' focus on the provision of quantitative evidence, this report provides an interesting, qualitative and wide spectrum of areas of value for the crafts sector, as well as the synergies which exist with several economic, social and educational contexts. Whilst being based on a relatively limited sample of cases, it does present clear, in-depth arguments regarding the impact of crafts.

81.  
Selwood, S. (2010): *Making a difference: the cultural impact of museums*. London: NMDC. (68 pp.)

[http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/media/documents/publications/cultural\\_impact\\_final.pdf](http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/media/documents/publications/cultural_impact_final.pdf)

Author: Sara Selwood

Institution: Sara Selwood Associates and *Cultural Trends*, UK

This essay explores cultural impacts, as distinct from economic or social impacts. The author analyses the difference that museum programmes make to individuals and organisations, focusing on programmes' subject matter and content, and on responses of the people to them. The author stresses that, wherever possible, the evidence used is that of the impactee rather than the impactor.

The essay is based on a questionnaire circulated among the members of the National Museums Directors' Council (NMDC), UK, in January 2010. Responses were received from 22 out of 28 NMDC members. They described around 85 projects, and sent a number of reports and other documents. Taken together, these suggest a number of common interests – both in terms of intentions and subject matter – promoting a wider interest in history and the world in general and more specifically, generating empathy for and understanding of minority groups; addressing marginalization; encouraging community engagement; advancing institutional interests, authority and values; dealing with difficult subject matter; challenging perceptions and creating associations and identities.

As revealed through the questionnaire, in addition to their standard means of presentation – exhibitions, displays, education programmes, events and publications, museums seek to exert cultural impact in the following ways:

- ▶ Some NMDC museums reported rebranding in an attempt to extend, or reinforce, their sphere of influence and to encourage a better appreciation of their public value.
- ▶ They undertake research projects, intended to generate new knowledge and understanding of museum collections. Several such projects have been facilitated by the UK Research Council's development of a portfolio of knowledge transfer activities, which embrace interactions between the research base and user

community, commercialisation, collaborative research and development, and collaborative training.

- ▶ NMDC members are involved in partnerships and networks including those with academics and museum colleagues centred around the sharing of expertise and collections, and the potential to reach more, if not different, audiences. Others involve completely different organisations. Some are prompted, and certainly supported by funding initiatives; others are driven by common goals – such as those dedicated to contributing to changing attitudes to science.
- ▶ Digital technologies have opened up the possibilities of cultural organisations overcoming the traditional constraints imposed by physical sites; expanding their audience reach; opening new avenues for developing areas of activity; creating new sources of economic and cultural value, and prompting new business models.

The author observes that the kinds of impacts that museums exert are often perceived very broadly by the professionals. They tend to report those that comply with generic frameworks, although they may – in some cases – regard such outcomes as secondary to their main purpose.

Further on, the author explores what audiences, themselves, have said about how museum experiences have impacted on them – what they have been prompted to think about, and why – rather than how institutions have sought to advocate for themselves. Their comments refer to the specific content of projects and programmes which NMDC members describe as ‘making a difference’. The types of evidence cited include personal testimonies, media and online coverage, including the blogosphere and social networking sites.

People’s reactions are grouped into four main themes describing what the impact of a particular museum project has been:

- ▶ saying the unsaid – articulating and exploring sensitive and difficult issues within the context of a national institution;
- ▶ generating a sense of belonging and integrating themselves within local communities and society;
- ▶ opening themselves up to different attitudes and perceptions – envisaging potential and revisiting personal histories;
- ▶ considering their affiliations and associations – albeit to the personal and the national.

The author concludes that the nature and substance of museums’ cultural impacts have been neglected in relation to arguments constructed around their economic and social impacts. Indeed, the kinds of successes they report tend to be predictable, precisely because of the standard form in which they are described. Museums provide



vital space in which knowledge is transferred, and in which cultural impacts are effected. But little is known about how they impinge on people's sensibilities, or contribute to broader cultural change.

82.

Several authors (2010): *Europe's Living Landscapes: Cultural heritage as a force for rural development*. The Hague (?): European Archaeologiae Consortium (EAC) / Europa Nostra / European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) / European Council for the Village and Small Town (ECOVAST) / European Federation of Farm and Village Tourism (EUROGITES) / European Landowners' Organisation (ELO) / International Association Rurality-Environment-Development (R.E.D.) / Rural Investment Support for Europe (RISE) Foundation (8 pp.)

[http://www.europanostra.org/UPLOADS/FILS/Europes\\_living\\_landscapes.pdf](http://www.europanostra.org/UPLOADS/FILS/Europes_living_landscapes.pdf)

Institutions: European Archaeologiae Consortium (EAC) / Europa Nostra / European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) / European Council for the Village and Small Town (ECOVAST) / European Federation of Farm and Village Tourism (EUROGITES) / European Landowners' Organisation (ELO) / International Association Rurality-Environment-Development (R.E.D.) / Rural Investment Support for Europe (RISE) Foundation

This joint statement issued by a coalition of eight non-governmental organisations concerned with the European landscape, cultural heritage, rural tourism and rural communities aims to make the case for the strengthening of the EU's rural development policy vis-à-vis the preservation and enhancement of Europe's 'farmed cultural landscapes'.

The introduction argues that these areas are important for their own sake (natural assets and resources, historic features, archaeology, traditional buildings, local customs, etc.) but also because they generate jobs and wealth, can attract inward investment, foster a sense of European, national and local identity and promote social cohesion. Since cultural heritage in rural areas is often in private hands and its owners cannot afford to preserve it, the text calls for these landscapes to be recognised as a public good which requires public policies.

The eight key messages which provide the backbone to the statement include references to several areas of impact, including environmental benefits (maintenance of landscapes and ecosystems) and economic effects (tourism, employment). Other linkages between rural heritage and local development are presented elsewhere in the text: the re-use of redundant historic buildings as workspaces for rural businesses in keeping with the local character, the local branding of food and farm produce around the cultural heritage of regions, employment generated by the management of landscapes and upkeep and repair of traditional buildings, traditional approaches to



land management providing lessons for the sustainable management of land and resources, etc.

Because of these connections, EU support should take the form of multi-objective agri-environment or farming schemes, wherein different objectives support one another. In this respect, the text considers that ‘*CAP and wider EU rural policy needs (sic) to continue to evolve to ensure it delivers adequate environmental, social and cultural benefits for public investment through the adoption of a “public goods for public money” approach.*’ (p. 4). Authors also point to the challenges and threats being experienced by rural landscapes nowadays, including the loss of historic landscape features and types through agricultural intensification, the abandonment and dereliction of traditional farm buildings and the loss of cultural inheritance as a result of the depopulation of some rural areas.

In this respect, they highlight how some Member States have included measures to conserve and enhance landscapes and cultural heritage in their Rural Development Programmes and call for this approach to be increasingly systematised, through the integrated management of natural and cultural assets in rural areas across the EU.

Whilst only briefly sketching the arguments and focusing on one particular institutional context, the statement provides some interesting policy recommendations for the integration of cultural heritage management in broader rural development strategies.

83.

Several authors (c. 2011): *VII Congreso Internacional AR&PA 2010. Economía del Patrimonio Cultural* [7th AR&PA International Congress. The Economy of Cultural Heritage]. Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León (290 pp.)

[http://www.jcyl.es/web/jcyl/binarios/515/30/actas%20arpa%202010.pdf?blobheader=application%2Fpdf%3Bcharset%3DUTF-8&blobheadername1=Cache-Control&blobheadername2=Expires&blobheadername3=Site&blobheadervalue1=no-store%2Cno-cache%2Cmust-revalidate&blobheadervalue2=0&blobheadervalue3=Portal\\_EVOCH&blobnocache=true](http://www.jcyl.es/web/jcyl/binarios/515/30/actas%20arpa%202010.pdf?blobheader=application%2Fpdf%3Bcharset%3DUTF-8&blobheadername1=Cache-Control&blobheadername2=Expires&blobheadername3=Site&blobheadervalue1=no-store%2Cno-cache%2Cmust-revalidate&blobheadervalue2=0&blobheadervalue3=Portal_EVOCH&blobnocache=true)

Author: Several individual authors

Institution: Congress organised by the Regional Government of Castilla y León, Spain

This extensive publication presents the proceedings of an international congress on the economy of cultural heritage organised by the Regional Government of Castilla y León, Spain, in 2010. Academic articles and case studies approach the subject from a variety of perspectives and present examples from a number of countries in Europe and the Americas.

The book opens with an article by Juan Alonso Hierro and Juan Martín Fernández (see relevant publication in this literature review), who discuss the reduction in public funding for cultural heritage in Spain in the context of the economic crisis and provide a set of arguments and potential strategies for integrating cultural heritage in new economic development policies.

This is complemented with a presentation by Romano Toppan (University of Verona), who provides some figures on the economic relevance of heritage in Italy and at international level and addresses how heritage can play an important role in the 'economy of intangible assets' and the 'experience economy'. Some examples of 'integrated cultural districts' which embody this approach in Italy, such as San Giusto Canavese and the 'Ville Venete e Castelli' Association, are briefly presented.

The presentation by Marion Dedieu, as president of the Association Européenne des Entreprises de Restauration du Patrimoine Architectural (AEERPA), should also be noted – her text highlights the economic, social and environmental impacts of heritage preservation and management, including through the generation of employment, the attraction of tourism, the transmission of sustainable forms of living and the contribution to community cohesion.

On the other hand, in 'Methods for calculating economic turnover generated by cultural heritage', Terje Nypan (Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway) presents different models used to estimate the economic contribution of cultural heritage and provides examples from recent bibliography in the field, with specific evidence regarding the economic impacts of heritage.

Other contributions provide specific case studies, either at policy level (e.g. the work by Andalusia's Institute for Historic Heritage and how it has evolved over the past decades; the Spanish Government's estimation of the 'Satellite Accounts for Culture'; an analysis of legal aspects related to the economic exploitation of cultural heritage in Spain, etc.) or as regards specific programmes and projects in a wide range of countries (e.g. the development of Strategic Heritage Programmes in Castilla y León, innovation in fundraising strategies in European museums, etc.).

The publication could have been enriched with an introduction presenting its general aims and the context of presentations. However, it does provide a wide range of examples and experiences from several lesser-known territories which prove how the discourse on the economic relevance of cultural heritage has taken root in a variety of contexts.

84.

Several authors (c. 2011): *The value of historic houses for tourism, economic and social development. Conference report*, proceedings from a conference held in Brussels, 30 September 2011. Brussels: European Historic Houses Association – L'association des demeures historiques européennes (EHHA) (22 pp.)

[http://www.uehha.org/images/cont/94\\_81576\\_file.pdf](http://www.uehha.org/images/cont/94_81576_file.pdf)

Author : Several individual authors

Institution : Conference organised by the European Historic Houses Association

This conference was part of a series of European conferences about the social and economic development of heritage. The conference report summarises the one-day conference in Brussels on 30 September 2011. The conference was organized by the European Historic Houses Association (EHHA), which represents 50,000 owners of historic houses in 16 European countries, and was conducted in collaboration with Europa Nostra, which represents 250 institutions in Europe.

The report provides no list of the participants of the conference, however, given the background of the speakers of the conference (France, UK, Estonia), the conference reflected common European themes regarding cultural heritage in the context of tourism and economic and social development.

The report documents the presentations of 8 speakers in 2 thematic panels:

Panel 1: How to achieve a symbiosis between historic houses and tourism?

Panel 2: Culture heritage and innovation: a vehicle for social and economic development?

In several presentations the importance of the tourism sector was stressed by declaring that there are 9 million jobs linked directly or indirectly to the sector. The market of conservation of cultural heritage is estimated at €5 billion per year in the EU. Nevertheless, cultural heritage is fragile and each year there is an equivalent loss of €14 million. Therefore, the protection of cultural heritage, in the context of global change, is a major concern for decision-makers, stakeholders and citizens.

As representatives of the European Commission stressed, more than in the past, a multiple integrated approach was being used in the field of cultural heritage.

This regards the implementation of new environmental technologies as well as new research approaches.

It was highlighted that regarding cultural heritage and environmental technologies, the objective is to develop new technologies for:

1. The environmentally-sound and sustainable management of the human environment including the built environment, urban areas and landscapes,
2. The protection, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage from environmental pollution.

Furthermore, more research must also be developed regarding:

1. Advanced and non-destructive techniques for damage diagnosis;
2. New products and methodologies for restoration;
3. Mitigation and adaptation strategies for the sustainable management of both movable and immovable cultural assets.

In the opening speech to this conference it was stated that around 30% of cultural heritage is privately owned and that the private management of historic estates had been a positive influence for the development of the rich variety of culture and architecture. Two of the eight presentations deal with preservation of historic houses from private and commercial perspectives.

In general, the workshop had no academic character but reflects a specific debate concerning the crucial role of historic buildings for regional and local development strategies.

85.

STADTart (2009): 1. *Kulturwirtschaftsbericht Thüringen. Kulturwirtschaft und öffentlicher Kultursektor: Verflechtungen und Entwicklungspotenziale*. [1st Report on the Cultural Economy in Thuringia. The Cultural Economy and the Public Cultural Sector: Interrelations and Development Potential] Erfurt: Thüringer Kultusministerium. (193 pp.).

[http://www.thueringen.de/imperia/md/content/tkm/aktuelles/pressemitteilungen/kulturwirtschaftsbericht\\_thueringen.pdf](http://www.thueringen.de/imperia/md/content/tkm/aktuelles/pressemitteilungen/kulturwirtschaftsbericht_thueringen.pdf)

Authors: Ralf Ebert, Friedrich Gnad and Uwe van Ooy

Institution: STADTart, Dortmund

Author: Rainer Ertel

Institution: Niedersächsisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (NIW), Hannover

The First Cultural Economy Report for the Free State of Thuringia, commissioned by its Ministry of Culture, was prepared by STADTart Dortmund and the Institute for Economic Research Hannover. For two decades, the individual federal states (Bundesländer) in Germany have addressed the topic of cultural economy or creative industries for a number of reasons. In 2009, Thuringia was one of the last federal states in Germany to publish its *first* Cultural Economy Report.

Similar to several other cultural economy reports in Germany, the methodological approach is based on the ‘three-sector model’. According to this model, the cultural sector is divided into a core area of artists / cultural production and a peripheral surrounding area comprising the public, the intermediate (non-profit) and the private (market-oriented) sub-sectors.

An important finding of the report is that in 2008 the cultural economy in Thuringia produced a total turnover of €782 m whereby the expenditure of the public cultural sector (the non-profit sector included) involved €287 m (25% of the cultural economy). This finding demonstrates the specific role and importance of the public cultural sector in Thuringia. The authors argue that in Thuringia strong interdependencies and complementary relationships exist between the private/commercial and the public cultural sector.

The report stands out among similar reports in Germany because of the attention paid to museums, monuments and other heritage assets as well as the cultural tourism potential of selected residential cities in the region.

The economic and regional effects of cultural heritage in Thuringia were analysed in the report via case studies of selected tangible and intangible heritage assets in the region, such as the Dance- und Folkfestival in Rudolstadt, the Kyffhäuser Monument,

the Panorama Museum, the Lindenau Museum in Altenburg, the Klassik Foundation Weimar and the Bauhaus University in Weimar.

In order to demonstrate the economic and regional effects of the cultural heritage under review, each case study applied the same methods for the evaluation. The authors identified three levels of effects: tangible effects (quantitative); intangible effects (qualitative); and interdependence effects (quantitative and qualitative).

The measurement of tangible effects in the case studies is based on a well-known methodology. Direct and indirect economic effects have been calculated by several indicators, such as public expenditure, figures of visitors and tourists and their consumer behaviour, turnover of tourist spending in the region etc.

Intangible effects in the case studies of the report are understood in terms of a plurality of qualitative effects, such as image production for the city or the region, network effects, educational effects, etc.

An interesting finding of the report concerns the third level of effects in the case studies: the so-called interdependence effects. In each case study the authors identify concrete interdependencies between the mostly publicly-run heritage sites or museums and the sector of the cultural economy.

The report findings have to be valued against the following background: two decades of a transition period in one the five East German states, the demand for an 'evidence-based policy', together with a tightening of government spending and of the crucial question regarding the role of culture and cultural heritage in a broader development context of the region.

86.

Thurley, S. (2011): "The changing perception of cultural heritage: new approach and new challenges", in Braeckman, G. (ed.): *Cultural heritage. A resource for Europe. The benefits of interaction*, Brussels: Flemish Government, pp. 43-51.

<http://ebl.vlaanderen.be/publications/documents/39677>

Author: Simon Thurley

Institution: English Heritage

The paper by Simon Thurley, Chief Executive, English Heritage, puts the notion of heritage in perspective. The author claims that, on the one hand, the definition of heritage has recently greatly expanded, while on the other, the instrumentalist approach based on the economic justification of heritage fails to convince policy-

makers that the heritage sector is worth investing into in the times of financial crisis. A shift is required in the political and legal infrastructure of heritage, towards greater appreciation of what heritage means to the public. Heritage appeals to and is related to the soul, rather than the balance sheet of Europe.

In the last decades, understanding of heritage has shifted from individual monuments to whole landscapes. This integrated approach now pursued by academic historians and geographers reflects what ordinary people have known for centuries: the landscape embodies a society's collective memory and is integral to that society's identity. As such, the public understands, cherishes and wants to protect the landscape.

The sophisticated model of protecting landscapes is reflected in the European Landscape Convention, also known as the Florence Convention (2000). Rather than having an exclusively protectionist and preservationist agenda, the convention is about recognising the essence of the landscape as a living, evolving place, with a developing character, and a changing dynamic both physically and in terms of perceptions and opinions.

The reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is vital in that respect. Farmers manage 80% of the land in the EU. While the first pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy comprises market support measures and direct subsidies to EU producers, the second pillar focuses on rural development programmes. Some countries have been using pillar II funds towards schemes aimed at tourism, village renewal or farmstead conservation. England, Flanders and the Netherlands in particular have led the way.

As well as a widening geographical appreciation of heritage, the concept of time depth has changed too. Over the last few years, recent heritage and culture have gained a greater appreciation, with Northern European countries at the forefront of this development. The Danish cultural agency, for example, has been protecting modernist buildings for many years. In the Netherlands, as in the UK, measures are being taken to protect the most significant post-war buildings.

For much of Europe, recent heritage can be particularly problematic. For example, the legacy of the Cold War poses some true heritage dilemmas. It is recent, concrete, unattractive and intellectually complex. In some places, local governments have robustly come to terms with such legacy treating it as the heritage of the late twentieth century.

As our understanding of heritage has radically changed, heritage has become much harder to deal with, define, understand and protect. It has also become more of a challenge to reach political consensus on heritage. At the same time, another issue



arises: too many still think that heritage is about the past. The importance of that past, however, is in how it shapes the future.

Politicians and policy makers are driven by the present. Democracy also disenfranchises those who are not yet born. As a result, major cultural decisions are often influenced by short-termism. Heritage requires management of the type that can focus on generations, and not just months ahead.

The Swedish initiative Operation Heritage (Agenda Kulturarv) was launched in 2001 and ran until 2004. The programme explicitly set out to acknowledge that the future is a product of people's perception of the past. It stressed the important role of cultural agencies in helping society look at the remnants of their past as a dynamic force, as assets for a worthwhile future, rather than obstacles to development. In Operation Heritage, four challenges were identified: putting people first (participation, consideration of future effects); working in the midst of society (collaboration, particularly with groups who are less likely to be involved in culture); preserving in order to tell a story (connecting physical structures with the stories and meanings behind them); and taking responsibility for diversity.

These challenges force governments to think differently. Governments generally find it hard to deal with cross-cutting issues. Heritage is a classic cross-cutting topic, affecting cultural policy but also planning, agriculture, sustainability and many other areas. Heritage is a hugely pluralistic issue. It is a product of the free market, of individual patronage, of local, civic and national pride and identity, a shared sense of national history. From a political perspective, heritage is on the one hand hard to legislate for. On the other, heritage can very easily be inadvertently damaged by legislation intended for other purposes.

Common across Europe are now instrumentalist cultural policies. They have led to strenuous efforts by European heritage agencies to demonstrate the economic benefits of heritage. However, instrumentalism has not worked, particularly now that almost every European country is making heavy public expenditure cuts and cultural services are being reduced. Instrumentalism encouraged quantifying the impact of heritage on education, health, crime, its contribution to the big government agendas. Heritage, however, is only cross-cutting because it is impacted by a range of other policies. Investing in heritage will never be the most effective way to reduce crime. A safer world might be an extra benefit, but it is not the main target when protecting and sharing heritage.

Most people have a simple, instinctive interest in history, in where they have come from, an emotional response to beauty and a wonder at the impressive achievements of previous generations. The question is why it seems so difficult to translate this into

the political discourse. The way heritage is generally perceived today may not be the way most policy makers see it. They generally find it easier to appreciate and protect the limited “chocolate box” view of heritage, focussing on cathedrals, castles, national parks. Landscape and post-war heritage are very difficult to argue for. Nevertheless, it is crucial not to reduce the importance of the global European cultural achievement to an economic balance sheet. There is clear evidence that this approach has not, so far, been effective. Moreover, it permanently reduces the value of heritage itself.

Politicians and policy makers need to be made more fully aware of the passion that millions of people feel for the places they live in. This requires politicians to engage in a different way with the public. Sweden, among other countries, has been experimenting in this respect. A much wider experiment across Europe is needed. The challenge is to increase people's involvement in decisions that affect their cultural identity, to give them a voice, so they can articulate more clearly why heritage matters.

87.

Volz. U. (coordinator) (2012): *Revitalisation through Arts and Culture. New Developments for 5 European Industrial Complexes*. Nuremberg: Project Second Chance (61 pp.)

[http://www.secondchanceproject.eu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/SECOND-CHANCE\\_Mid-Project-Brochure\\_online\\_final.pdf](http://www.secondchanceproject.eu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/SECOND-CHANCE_Mid-Project-Brochure_online_final.pdf)

Author: Ute Volz (and others)

Institution: City of Leipzig, with the Cities of Nuremberg, Venice, Krakow and Ljubljana

This publication contains a summary of the outcomes of the first 30 months of the transnational project “SECOND CHANCE - From Industrial Use to Creative Impulse”, devoted to the creative regeneration of former industrial sites in five European cities.

SECOND CHANCE is implemented through the CENTRAL EUROPE Programme, co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF).

The project connects public entities, public equivalent institutions and private companies from Germany (Nuremberg, Leipzig), Italy (Venice), Poland (Krakow) and Slovenia (Ljubljana) that are re-developing former industrial sites. Common goals are the use of art and culture as the new contents for the ‘second chance’ of these sites and the creation of sustainable operational and financial structures through public-private partnerships.

As since the 1990s thousands of factories have been shut down and more than 50% of the manufacturing jobs in Europe have been lost, the questions this project deals with are crucial for many European cities and their local and regional authorities. Consequently, in every country and almost every city of Europe, one can find

brownfield areas in need of revitalisation providing a chance to preserve or improve the quality of urban living conditions.

The publication contains:

- A theoretical framework for the project which is given by two guest lecturers on the broader issue of 'Culture and Creative Regeneration'.

In this framework main reference is taken to the concept of the creative city.

- 5 Case studies in the context of the Second Chance project.

The project gives the St. Lawrence district in Krakow, the HALLE 14 of the former Cotton Spinning Mill in Leipzig, the former Rog factory in Ljubljana, the former AEG factory in Nuremberg and the Porta Nuova tower on the site of the Arsenale in Venice a "second chance". The case studies demonstrate innovative concepts and strategies to transform derelict sites into the cultural linchpins of their cities, while at the same time enhancing the attractiveness of the neighbourhoods where the sites are located.

- A documentation of conferences and workshops held in four cities of the Second Chance project.

Each event had an own thematic focus.

The conference in Nuremberg was the first public event within the conference series and provided an opportunity to introduce the project's objectives and methods as well as the five sites participating in this transnational cooperation. The conference also explored the possible synergies between the revitalisation of brownfields, the opportunities offered by culture and creative industries and the needs of urban development.

The symposium in Leipzig focused on sustainable strategies for the survival of public and private art institutions as part of post-industrial revitalisation projects.

The event in Ljubljana had a focus on the role of creative and cultural industries in urban development. In the event it was stressed that creative industries are a development opportunity for contemporary cities, but not the solution to all development challenges of cities and regions.

The Venetian event aimed at an in-depth examination of the following two themes: (1) the recovery of post-industrial sites and their revitalisation through cultural activities

addressed to local citizens and (2) the exploration of possibilities to create local partnerships with private investors.

Several contributions in this project report stressed the coherence between cultural heritage and tourism and its complexity, particularly when it comes to mass tourism. *“The relationship between the city and culture is complex, particularly when the effects of art, historical heritage and tourism are taken into account. The valorisation of cultural heritage and mass tourism can create difficulties for cultural production and cultural policies. Cultural production, creativity and innovation need new centres, places, symbols and modalities. Status as a European Capital of Culture can be used as a development tool when leveraged to increase employment in the cultural sector, to enable innovation and integration in all sectors and to take the risk of mixing quality and quantity tourism. In this way, public participation is increased and, at the same time, culture is used as a sustainable development tool.”* (see page 114)

### **3. Main Findings and Conclusions**

#### **3.1. General perspectives**

This review shows that in recent years the social and economic value of cultural heritage has been extensively under review by both different research disciplines and by different interests of international, national and regional actors.

Given the number of research studies, reports and articles devoted to the subject matter, the assessment of the value of cultural heritage seems to be recognised as a distinguished research topic.

Whereas the economic value of cultural heritage has been more extensively under research focus, the social value of cultural heritage seems to have gained a research interest in recent years only. At the same time, the observation shows that an increasing number of documents simultaneously address both of these dimensions as well as their synergies.

It should be recognised that this review on the social and economic value of cultural heritage is part of a broader debate of the valuation of cultural goods within the *cultural economy*.

Determining the value of cultural goods and in particular the topic of the *social and economic value of cultural heritage* under this review are the subjects of a long debate between different scientific disciplines. On the one hand there is the discourse of economic theory with models of supply and demand, economic impact assessment, assessments of job creation via heritage-led tourism development, contingent valuation, etc; on the other hand, there is the discourse of cultural theory with an aesthetic, humanist, and sometimes anti-utilitarian approach and discourse. The latter regards particularly the assessment of the social value of cultural heritage. Only recently, these different research disciplines have become interrelated and involved in the creation of the foundations of the contemporary cultural economy.

Against the background of the findings in this review it can be argued that cultural heritage in its broadest sense plays a central role in research on the cultural economy. Other discourses within the cultural economy, such as the new emerging theme of the transformational role of the cultural industries in economic and social terms and the role that cultural tourism can play for regional development have also contributed to this research interest.

### ***Geography, scale and types of publications reviewed***

The literature review contains 87 documents. The types of publications reviewed were:

- ▶ Fully-fledged, primary research (e.g. evaluation reports, impact studies)
- ▶ Collections of case studies
- ▶ Essays developing the philosophy of heritage and its intrinsic, cultural and economic value
- ▶ Combinations of the above

The countries in which more documents under review have been published are the UK (24%) and France (13%). Several studies and research reports, in particular those which are conducted by relevant European institutions (such as the Council of Europe and the European Commission), relate to different countries or regions in Europe. A common working method of these research undertakings is to work with 'case studies'.

When analysed by geographic distribution and scale, it can be observed that some EU Member States are not included in the review. Although the literature review cannot claim to be representative for the whole of the 27 EU Member States, an effort has been made to identify and analyse the most relevant documents.

Most of the studies and reports under review have a national or regional / local background, mainly focused on the economic value or dimension of cultural heritage. The social value of cultural heritage has been analysed, mainly, in the form of case studies and essays, allowing only for qualitative assessment and judgement. Obviously, the more prominent position of economic studies of cultural heritage is partly due to the fact that it can be measured more easily than the social dimension.

Regarding intangible cultural heritage and its associated products the research indicates a recent interest in its social and economic value and/or valuation. At the same time, the review demonstrates the lack of a framework for understanding and assessing changes to perceptions of intangible heritage [29]<sup>7</sup>.

### **3.2. Heritage-based strategies and benefits for stakeholders**

The demand for studying the economic and social value of cultural heritage, and for obtaining the appropriate data, has increased, simultaneously, within various groups of stakeholders.

---

<sup>7</sup> Figures in square brackets presented in this section refer to the entries in the literature review.

- ▶ Heritage professionals, who have been always aware of the intrinsic value of cultural heritage, are now looking for additional arguments to justify, advocate and secure funding for heritage projects.
- ▶ Policy-makers at various levels are concerned with the efficiency of the economic and social strategies for their territories. They need to know the potential of cultural heritage for place-marketing, cultural tourism development, providing cohesion in the communities, etc.
- ▶ Businesses need to plan for profits while developing projects that directly involve cultural heritage or depend on it being in the vicinity of where they operate.
- ▶ Communities want to be certain that heritage projects are worth spending local budgets on, as this is going to improve their economic well-being and create a better environment and lifestyle for them.

These and other stakeholders turn to experts and researchers to assess existing heritage-related projects and policies and propose new strategies that would go in line with the interests of all groups, bridging existing gaps in the perception of the potential of cultural heritage and its value for the economy and society. One author even defines cultural heritage as a 'result deriving from a negotiation process among various stakeholders,' claiming that designation of heritage is increasingly a demand-oriented process, which aims at satisfying cultural, economic or political objectives, rather than resulting from expert values derived from intrinsic criteria [69].

Some authors observe that heritage-based strategies, especially those involving the built heritage, are long-term and it may take several years before return on the investment can be expected. This period of time is often longer than the political cycle wherein policy-makers operate. However, in the long run, this is a sustainable strategy, which also takes into account multiple social implications of preserving heritage and the 'simple, instinctive interest in history' that most people have [86].

More often than not, heritage-based development strategies are based on a complex model providing a certain balance between economic and social benefits, and having in view a combination of additional impacts where the cultural heritage agenda overlaps with other agendas. As the studies under review show, there are complementary benefits stemming from heritage-based strategies in such areas as agriculture, education, intercultural dialogue, city regeneration, creative industries development, etc. All of those, if properly pursued, provide additional value for the cultural heritage.

Preservation of cultural heritage is no longer seen as an end in itself but as a base for multiple uses. Some authors see advantages in developing heritage-based education [43, 54, 68, 76]; others point out that cultural heritage has become an important factor in the European agricultural policies, as many rural development projects supported by the EU include tourism development, village renewal or farmstead conservation [86].



There are studies focused on the role of heritage in the development of the creative or knowledge economy [21, 44, 73], in providing a sustainable environment [22, 30] and in city regeneration [52, 60, 65]. At the same time, certain flaws in the methodology of evaluation of heritage-based regeneration projects have been revealed [57].

There is also a strand of research where heritage is discussed *in marketing terms*. And it is not only tourist marketing that the authors are discussing but also broader city marketing or, even more generally, *marketing of places* [69]. – such as, for example, UNESCO World Heritage Sites. Thus, interpreting heritage as a Unique Selling Point (USP), some authors demonstrate that it can be used as an instrument for drawing resources – investment, businesses but also tourists – to a territory [76]

### **3.3. The economic value of cultural heritage**

#### ***Methodology for the economic impact assessment of cultural heritage***

The economic value of cultural heritage has been studied on the national, regional and local levels. National studies often contain comparisons with other countries. There are also studies providing data by sector, such as museums, and studies of the economic impact on a micro level, providing assessment on the level of separate heritage institutions, such as museums, libraries, archives or heritage sites.

The literature review has identified that the economic value of cultural heritage is currently assessed using conventional and well-known economic impact models [see, for example, 3, 22, 24, 30].

Methods used for the assessment of the economic value of cultural heritage include the following conventional approaches:

- ▶ Economic analysis of the Gross Value Added (GVA) by the cultural heritage sector [3];
- ▶ Local economic impact analyses using an adapted multiplier [22];
- ▶ Number of visitors to heritage sites and their gross visitor spending (private consumption) as well as other impacts [24];
- ▶ Direct, indirect and induced effects that are calculated in terms of spending and employment creation [22, 24].

Some countries, such as the UK, provide easy-to-handle ‘toolkits’ for the self-assessment of tourism impacts, employment impacts and impacts of spending on goods and services which relate to specific heritage institutions or sites [24].

In addition to this, the majority of the studies under review use concrete case studies for the demonstration of the impact of specific heritage sites and museums, and, to a lesser extent, of intangible cultural heritage.

### ***Cultural heritage in the context of the cultural / creative industries***

In several studies under review, assessment of the value of cultural heritage has been part of a broader research on the impact of the cultural and/or creative industries [1, 2, 3, 85].

Among other sub-sectors within the creative industries sector, cultural heritage is assessed not as an explicit sub-sector or branch but, rather, as a cross-cutting prerequisite for economic development, particularly for the tourism industry and job creation. Such evidence based on the interconnection between cultural heritage and the emerging research of the creative industries sector is a recent phenomenon.

Although the individual approaches in determining the impact of the cultural heritage sector within the broader cultural industries research differ, certain commonalities can be identified.

The methodology of research refers to the so-called ‘three-sector model’ where cultural industries are divided into a core area of artists / cultural production and a peripheral surrounding area comprising the public, the intermediate (non-profit) and the private (market-oriented) sub-sectors.

Cultural heritage and its actors are located in all of the three above-mentioned sectors. Based on this observation, some authors claim that public funding is crucial for cultural heritage, particularly for museums. These studies refer to the notion of public goods which brings forward the arguments for public intervention, public funding and the need for cultural policies aimed at supporting cultural heritage [4, 23, 26].

With regard to cultural heritage, in particular the mostly publicly-run heritage sites or museums in Europe, the identification of concrete interdependencies of cultural heritage with the creative industries sector seems of importance and of interest for further observation and research.

### **3.4. The social value of cultural heritage**

Unlike the economic value of cultural heritage, its social value is subject, mostly, to qualitative assessment. To demonstrate the social impact of heritage, the majority of studies offer series of descriptive case studies or data based on questionnaires and

expert interviews. Few studies contain attempts at developing a general methodology of quantitative assessment of the social value of heritage based on a consistent system of measurable indicators [35].

At the same time, on the level of particular heritage projects, social impact is often set as an aim and, as subsequent evaluation shows, such aims can be successfully achieved. This is confirmed by numerous case studies.

The studies most often relate to such social effects of heritage projects as enhancing social cohesion, fostering social inclusion, community empowerment and capacity building, enhancing confidence, civil pride and tolerance, broadening opportunities for learning, skills development, etc.

The social impact of cultural heritage becomes particularly graphic in the cases where heritage is used for stimulating a dialogue between different cultural groups. Fostering intercultural dialogue, cultural and social inclusion and creating an atmosphere of tolerance through heritage projects or heritage institutions form part of a contemporary agenda discussed by many authors [5, 6]. At the same time, methodologies developed in the course of such projects are not limited to dealing only with cultural minorities or migrants: they form a foundation for a new universal approach to using heritage as an instrument of social development [27].

Such practices of using heritage for enhancing a dialogue in society are only emerging and have not yet become widespread in museum and heritage projects. Neither are they recognised by the general public as part of the mission of heritage sites and museums [7]. It will, obviously, take much more time and effort for them to become a part of the professional culture of heritage institutions.

Many authors stress that the economic and social values of heritage are interrelated [21]. On the one hand, economic growth brings prosperity and well-being to a territory. On the other hand, social harmony – community cohesion, absence of conflicts, tolerance, etc – is a prerequisite to economic development. Thus the ability of heritage to provide distinctiveness of a place is seen as an advantage both for tourist development and for the well-being of local communities. Improvement of the social climate also leads to the enhancement of the investment climate [76].

### ***The interpretation of heritage***

Some authors – especially those studying the operation of museums – explore different ways for the *interpretation of heritage*. One issue, which is now being widely discussed in Europe and beyond, is the necessity to develop new modes of *intercultural interpretation* of heritage in the communities where different cultures co-exist. This

approach calls for an on-going intercultural dialogue where heritage plays the role of a catalyst facilitating social cohesion [5, 6, 27].

Other researchers stress that nowadays heritage is used – especially in museums – to articulate and explore sensitive and difficult issues, as well as to generate a sense of belonging in the individuals and integrate them within local communities and society [81]. However, as research demonstrates, there are still gaps between intentions of heritage professionals and perceptions of the general public [7].

Some authors stress the importance of developing *heritage narratives* that include object-related stories facilitating their interpretation, personal stories of community members [6] but also bigger narratives of places, which may act as a ‘cultural glue’ holding together heritage industry on a vast territory [76].

### **3.5. The role of heritage in the context of smart, inclusive and sustainable growth**

The *Europe 2020* strategy aims at tapping into Europe’s potential for innovation to achieve smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. In several of the Europe 2020 flagship initiatives cultural heritage played already a vital role, such as the Digital Agenda, the Innovation Union or the Agenda for New Skills and Jobs.

Cultural heritage can be crucial in achieving *smart, inclusive and sustainable growth*, an aim set by the Europe 2020 strategy<sup>8</sup>.

Many authors stress that *generation of knowledge* is an indispensable feature of the heritage sector [81]. A vast variety of *educational products* are being developed there – around museum collections but also around the built heritage, landscapes, etc [76]. Contrary to a common perception, the heritage sector is also *innovative* – and not only where it overlaps with the creative industries [1, 21] but also in its core activities related to conservation and restoration [26].

As multiple researches have shown in many European regions, cultural heritage has a great potential for *skills development* [see, for example, 31, 32] but also for *generation of direct, indirect and induced jobs* [22, 30]. Along with drawing investment and tourists, heritage institutions, projects and programmes appear as efficient tools for providing *social and territorial cohesion* [47]. In the cities and regions with a culturally-mixed population or divided communities, properly-designed and managed heritage projects

---

<sup>8</sup> The Europe 2020 strategy:

- *smart growth*: developing an economy based on education, knowledge and innovation;
- *inclusive growth*: fostering a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion;
- *sustainable growth*: promoting a more resource-efficient, greener and more competitive economy

can serve as efficient means for the policy of *social inclusion* [27], *intercultural dialogue* [5] and *conflict resolution* [6, 53].

Cultural heritage contributes to *sustainable growth* through merging *modernity and tradition*, and through a creative combination of the *legacy of the past* with *innovative ideas* aimed at shaping the future [30]. Heritage is thus seen as a resource, which not only preserves *historic memory* but, if used creatively, can also bring various *social and economic benefits* to a variety of stakeholders. It raises the profile of places making them more *competitive* in the contemporary world, and serves as a source of inspiration for the contemporary arts and creative industries [46].

### **3.6. The need for further research and documentation**

One of the conclusions of this literature review is the necessity of further research on the economic and social value of cultural heritage. Such research could be conducted in the framework of the Europe 2020 strategy.

Although toolkits for the measurement of conventional economic impact levels for example for museums [24] or built heritage [30] have been developed and substantial research allowed to measure the economic and (partly) the social impact of cultural heritage, it is still difficult in some regions or countries in Europe to obtain data [3] or to build an evidence base of the economic and social value of cultural heritage-based interventions.

Some authors argue that economic analyses of cultural heritage should go beyond the pure quantitative impact assessment and require more complex evaluation models with reference to ‘learning organisations’ which might be indeed a pre-condition for innovation [26].

Given the Europe 2020 strategy, it has to be recognised that the Union’s action in the field of cultural heritage is complementary to national and regional action. Therefore, actions taken on the national, regional and local levels are crucial for the protection, conservation, interpretation and use of cultural heritage.

Nevertheless, even within the literature review the evidence base is strong on all levels – EU, national and regional – to ensure that both the problems and the potential of the cultural heritage sector are given due consideration in other sectors such as regional planning, environment, agriculture, and last but not least local and regional innovation policies.

Against this background new research questions might emerge which go beyond the question of determining the economic and social value of cultural heritage in Europe.

Further research, which is to be conducted and, perhaps, supported on the EU level, could be focused on the following issues:

- ▶ Comparative cross-border studies, on a macro level, of the economic impact of heritage sector across Europe, especially involving countries where no relevant data has been gathered so far.
- ▶ Development of methodological guidelines and toolkits for the assessment, on a micro level, of the economic impact of heritage institutions and sites.
- ▶ Analysis of best practice demonstrating the social impact of cultural heritage, as well as those aimed at:
  - developing heritage-based intercultural dialogue;
  - interpretation of recent, especially 'difficult' or controversial heritage;
  - involving intangible heritage.
- ▶ Analysis of the increasing role of cultural heritage for well-being in the context of structural changes in specific European regions (e.g. search for new sources of economic development, socio-demographic changes, etc.).
- ▶ Development of energy-efficient strategies for heritage sites.
- ▶ Development of guidelines for heritage-based strategies, on the regional and local level, aimed at smart, inclusive and sustainable growth in urban and rural settings across Europe.

## Acknowledgements

The researchers would like to thank the following contributors, for the assistance and references provided in the course of the study.

- ▶ Beatriz Alonso, Technical Secretariat, Platform EVoCH, Junta de Castilla y León, Spain
- ▶ Ulrike Blumenreich, Scientific Research Assistant, Kulturpolitischen Gesellschaft, Germany
- ▶ Simona Bodo, independent researcher, Italy
- ▶ Laura Clayton, Head, Social and Economic Research, English Heritage
- ▶ Jean-Cédric Delvainquière, Research Officer, Department of Studies, Future Trends and Statistics (DEPS), Ministry of Culture and Communication, France
- ▶ Cristina Farinha, Executive Director, ADDICT - Agency for the Development of Culture and Creative Industries, Porto
- ▶ Marian Fitzgibbon, Head, School of Humanities, Athlone Institute of Technology, Ireland
- ▶ Sarah Gardner, Executive Director, IFACCA
- ▶ Daniela Angelina Jelinčić, Research fellow, Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Zagreb
- ▶ Anita Kangas, Director, Unit for Cultural Policy/Politics Studies, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä
- ▶ Anja Lungstraß, Researcher, Kulturdokumentation, Vienna
- ▶ Matina Magkou, Researcher, Panteion University, Greece
- ▶ Yann Nicolas, Studies and Research Officer, Department of Studies, Future Trends and Statistics (DEPS), Ministry of Culture and Communication, France
- ▶ Pavla Petrová, Director, Arts and Theatre Institute, Prague
- ▶ Erminia Sciacchitano, Head of Research and Development Unit, General Directorate for the Valorisation of Cultural Heritage, Ministry for Heritage and Cultural Activities, Italy
- ▶ Judith Staines, Europe Editor of Culture360.org, and freelance writer, researcher, editor and project manager, UK
- ▶ Aleksandra Uzelac, Head, Culture and Communication Department, Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Zagreb



