



# Is the heritage really important? A theoretical framework for heritage reputation using citizen sensing



Vasco Monteiro <sup>a, \*</sup>, Marco Painho <sup>a</sup>, Eric Vaz <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Instituto Superior de Estatística e Gestão de Informação (ISEGI), Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Campus Campolide, 1070 Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>b</sup> Department of Geography, Ryerson University, 350 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario M5B 2K3 Canada

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Available online 18 July 2014

### Keywords:

Heritage reputation  
Framework  
Citizen sensing  
Public opinion  
Social media  
Web 2.0

## ABSTRACT

Heritage value, conservation and protection are significant issues in heritage studies and urban and regional planning. In a time where both urban and tourism growth impact the heritage, understanding the relationship between the surrounding heritage and the citizens, especially the local communities, can play an important role in urban and regional planning. This paper aims to provide a theoretical framework for heritage reputation, that integrates the heritage value and the causal framework regarding beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behaviors towards an object, in this case the heritage. Heritage reputation can be strategic for urban and regional planners when analyzing and implementing policies. Crowdsourcing geographic knowledge, web 2.0 and social media play a significant role in today's society because this new source of information can help modeling the evolving human landscape, complementing the existing methods. Indeed, location-based user-generated content can be a relevant source for heritage studies and citizen sensing can be used to model and measure heritage reputation.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## Introduction

“Heritage is an important part of societal and community well-being” and therefore a major component of quality of life (Tweed & Sutherland, 2007). The dimensions of heritage value over time and in different cultures have been broadly studied in academia (Carver, 1996; Darvill, 1995; Deeben, Groenewoudt, Hallewas, & Willems, 1999; Dix, 1990; Drury & McPherson, 2008; English Heritage, 1997; Frey, 1997; ICOMOS, 2000; Lipe, 1983; Mason, 2002; ; Riegl, 1996) and heritage value is considered to be the intrinsic reason for heritage protection and conservation (De la Torre & Mason, 2002).

In the urban and regional planning field the growing preoccupation of endangerment of heritage due to urban growth and urban sprawl has been studied (Al-hagla Khalid, 2010; de Noronha Vaz, Cabral, Caetano, Nijkamp & Painho, 2012; Tweed & Sutherland, 2007) and decision-making and participation in economic development by local communities (Hampton, 2005; Li, 2006).

In the last years, web 2.0 technologies have resulted in the increased production of user-generated content (UGC) and are

increasingly the location-based information available. Social media services, one of the characteristics of web 2.0 technologies, are impacting on and stimulating social change (Sui & Goodchild, 2011). Such services are producing user-generated geospatial data providing unprecedented opportunities to understand users' behavior (Fischer, 2012; Stefanidis, Crooks, & Radzikowski, 2013), community interests, opinions and experiences at a global scale (Reips & Garaizar, 2011).

Goodchild (2007a, 2007b) considers humans as a type of sensor network, more interesting than electronic ones since they own five senses and the intelligence to gather and interpret what they sense, and are free to roam around the world. The role of this multisensory experiences in interpret the individual's surroundings environments, places, landscapes and tourist experiences has been focus of many studies (Agapito, Mendes, & Valle, 2013; Degen, 2008; Jütte, 2005; Porteous, 1985; Rodaway, 2002). Now, this network of citizen sensors, with over seven billion components globally, has its abilities augmented with devices that collect other geographic information, such as smart phones with GPS (Goodchild, 2007a, 2007b). However, further work is required to understand the capabilities of this citizen sensing and it is desire to improve the process of harvesting, processing and disseminating this information.

This paper proposes a theoretical framework for heritage reputation and how citizen sensing can help model and measure it: the possibility of using location-based social media data to provide

\* Corresponding author. +351 939 155 888.

E-mail addresses: [vmonteiro@isegi.unl.pt](mailto:vmonteiro@isegi.unl.pt) (V. Monteiro), [painho@isegi.unl.pt](mailto:painho@isegi.unl.pt) (M. Painho), [evaz@ryerson.ca](mailto:evaz@ryerson.ca) (E. Vaz).

knowledge with spatial-temporal information about the relation between the citizens and heritage.

The remainder of this paper is divided as follows: first we present the heritage reputation theoretical framework, where we analyze the various constructs of the framework: values, beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behaviors; second we analyze the citizen sensing and its potential to measure heritage reputation; third the theoretical framework is revisited and finally the conclusions are presented.

### Heritage reputation as a theoretical framework

In order to create the theoretical framework for heritage reputation, the point of start is the heritage value, a concept that has been the focus of much academic research (Carver, 1996; Darvill, 1995; Deeben et al., 1999; Dix, 1990; Drury & McPherson, 2008; English Heritage, 1997; Frey, 1997; ICOMOS, 2000; Lipe, 1983; Mason, 2002; Riegl, 1996) and then a reputation framework used for corporate reputation is explored (Money & Hillenbrand, 2006), based on the causal framework of Fishbein & Ajzen (1975).

### Heritage value

Value is the intrinsic reason for heritage protection and conservation: “It is self-evident that no society makes an effort to conserve what it does not value” (De la Torre & Mason, 2002). The previous sentence underlies that the protection and conservation are the consequence of the heritage value. The English Heritage (EH), in its strategy for 2005–2010 has conceptualized a heritage cycle, adapted from Thurley (2005) (Fig. 1), which embodies the motto “Making the Past Part of our Future”, where the value is highlighted and emphasizes the caring, as conservation and protection, as a consequence of value. Fig. 1 depicts the Heritage Cycle: ‘by understanding they will value the heritage, by valuing they will want to care for it, by carrying it will help people enjoy it and from enjoying it come a thirst to understand’. The EH strategy wants “to help people develop their understanding of the historic (...), to get (...) onto other people’s agenda (...) [in order] to enable and promote sustainable change (...) [and] to help the local communities to care” (Thurley, 2005).



Fig. 1. Heritage Cycle (adapted from Thurley, 2005).

According to Van der Aa (2005), five dimensions of heritage value can be distinguished: which values (functional values of heritage), whose values (person or group-related), where values (scale level: local, national, and global level), when values (past, contemporary or future), and uniqueness values (exceptional or general).

Table 1 summarizes the **first dimension** proposed by Van der Aa (2005), with the various heritage value typologies developed and published by various scholars and organizations over time and across different cultures. In an analogy proposed by Mason (2002), these typologies tend to describe the same pie, only sliced in different ways. Normally they tend to implicitly elevate or minimize some kinds of values and/or lead to conflicts between the adoptions of certain values at the expense of others. Labadi (2007) notes that the social value, for instance, does not appear in the early-heritage value typologies, although in the Burra Charter's typology (ICOMOS, 2000) it is referred to, and it predates Lipe's typology (Lipe, 1983); after the mid-1990s almost all the typologies mentioned in Table 1 have the social value included. (Mason, 2002) argues that the most comprehensive and balanced is the English Heritage (1997) typology. As pointed out by Labadi (2007), if we examine the heritage typologies by regions, for example, we see that the Australian Burra Charter (ICOMOS, 2000) and the Dutch system by Deeben et al. (1999) do not indicate the market and economic value, but English Heritage (1997) and the American Getty Conservation Institution (Mason, 2002) do mention it. However in the heritage values proposed in 2008 by the English Heritage (Drury & McPherson, 2008) the economic and market value is not explicitly mentioned, showing changes in the principles of this institution in the 21st century.

The **second dimension** proposed by Van der Aa (2005) analyses how different stakeholders assign different values to heritage. He states that each one of us would make a different preferred heritage list, due to different values in relation to heritage sites; and says that lists made by academics and by the general public are likely to differ. Relph (1993) and Aitchison, MacLeod, and Shaw (2000) argue that this happens because we experience places individually with our attitudes, experiences and intentions and from our unique circumstance. Leblanc (1984) argues that a list proposed only by experts would have problems, because they have often different points of view and even opposing ideas regarding heritage value, while Van der Aa (2005) notes that the same diversity of views would occur when the general public composes lists. Relph (1993) points out that the valuation of heritage is typically done by elite groups or individuals that do not represent the expression of the values of all the community members, while Van der Aa (2005) emphasizes that powerful groups can deny the existence of identities other than their own, which can affect other groups, especially minorities.

The **third dimension**, the where values dimension, is related to the scale level. Van der Aa (2005) explains that the heritage sites can be esteemed at different scale levels, from the individual to the global. LeBlanc (1993) states that “heritage begins with you and grows all the way to the whole world”, referring first to our personal heritage (family pictures, personal objects, special persons in family traditions) and secondly to the things, persons and traditions which are considered to be our common heritage – “Places such as the Pyramids of Giza, the Acropolis of Athens or Mount Everest (...) do not belong to Egypt, Greece or Nepal. They are part of humanity's heritage and these countries are simply the custodians of these incredible treasures.” (Fig. 2, adapted from LeBlanc, 1993).

The **fourth dimension** concerns the time scale in heritage valuation. Dix (1990) notes that this valuation varies over time and Lowenthal (1998) emphasizes that heritage lists are drawn up in a current context. Indeed, Stovel (1992) argues, for example, that a

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1047742>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1047742>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)