



# Community participation in cultural heritage management: A systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices

Ji Li<sup>a,\*</sup>, Sukanya Krishnamurthy<sup>b</sup>, Ana Pereira Roders<sup>a,c</sup>, Pieter van Wesemael<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of the Built Environment, Eindhoven University of Technology, the Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, UK

<sup>c</sup> Department of Architectural Engineering and Technology, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Community participation  
Cultural heritage  
Management approach  
China  
Literature review

## ABSTRACT

Community participation is an essential issue in heritage management. The international heritage organisation ICCROM published a guidance document discussing people-centred approaches to heritage management in 2015. Cultural heritage management is recommended to be carried out through a community participation process. Despite the growing literature on community participation in cultural heritage management, little research has been done on comparing Chinese to international approaches. Although in China several pilot projects have conducted effective community participation and achieved excellent outcomes. This paper aims to fill this gap by providing an overview that compares and discusses the similarities and differences between Chinese and international approaches. A systematic literature review of the state-of-the-art was conducted to explore these differences based on four themes: engaged communities, participatory methods, degrees of participation and steps taken within cultural heritage management. This review concludes both Chinese and international practices seek to collaborate with and empower local communities in their approaches, with Chinese pilot cases, such as Tianzifang in Shanghai. However, in general, Chinese cultural heritage management is government-led, in which community participation is happening to a minimal degree. China is encouraged to learn from international practices when developing contextualised management approaches, to better face the challenges of rapid urbanisation.

## 1. Introduction

Community participation is an essential issue within heritage management and effective community participation is a process that is vital to enhance long-term sustainable heritage management (Landorf, 2009). Furthermore, with the approval of the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, community participation is recognised as a fundamental tool in heritage management practices (Taylor, 2016; UNESCO, 2011; Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, & Colenbrander, 2013). This recommendation seeks to involve public participation, in order to, among other aims, mediate conflicts between stakeholders, including residents, visitors, developers, experts and governments (Srijuntrapun, Fisher, & Rennie, 2017; Verdini, Frassoldati, & Nolf, 2017). Moreover, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention have emphasised the importance of the participation of a variety of stakeholders in heritage identification, protection and preservation as a worldwide strategic policy (Bruku, 2015; UNESCO, 2012). These guidelines

attempt to ensure that local communities' needs are included and not solely the interests of experts or governments (Schmidt, 2014).

In 2003, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) initiated the Living Heritage Site Programme in the Southeast Asia region, including projects in Thailand, Cambodia, and Sri Lanka (Poulios, 2014; Court & Gamini, 2015). Based on this programme, ICCROM published a guidance document discussing the concept of living heritage and people-centred approaches to cultural heritage management in 2015 (Court & Gamini, 2015; Wijesuriya, Thompson, & Court, 2017). People-centred approaches develop a community-based process to inclusively manage heritage properties connected to religious affiliations, traditions, social networks and daily lives of local communities (Khalaf, 2016; Wijesuriya et al., 2017). These approaches are positioned within the mainstream framework of urban planning policies and practices, highlighting the roles and human factors of local communities (Ripp & Rodwell, 2015; Sully & Cardoso, 2014, 2016). In this setting, cultural heritage is managed as a dynamic resource contributing to societies and

\* Corresponding author at: Groene Loper 5, Room 7.09, 5612 AE Eindhoven, the Netherlands.

E-mail address: [j.li3@tue.nl](mailto:j.li3@tue.nl) (J. Li).

communities in the present as well as to future generations (Dormaels, 2016; Khalaf, 2016).

Despite common international principles, differences between European and Asian heritage management approaches have been noted and recognised, caused by different local developmental conditions and socio-political regimes (Taylor, 2004; Verdini et al., 2017; Winter, 2014). Taylor (2004) and Winter (2014) report that Asian countries place more emphasis on managing daily lives of residents as associated with local cultural heritage and improving overall living spaces under the pressure of rapid urbanisation. In line with this, cultural heritage management projects in China are undertaken by local governments as profit-driven processes are used as a catalyst for the promotion of socio-economic urban growth (Fan, 2014; Verdini, 2015). Some European scholars classify Chinese approaches as unorthodox, because they rely on top-down management processes and emphasise urban growth over the conservation of built heritage (Verdini, 2015; Verdini et al., 2017). Even so, as Verdini et al. (2017) point out, Chinese cultural heritage management has its own contextual identity whilst still adhering to international frameworks and practices. In addition, Verdini et al. (2017) suggest that sufficient and effective community participation for cultural heritage management has to be facilitated as a long-term strategic goal in order to address the European criticism.

Given the centralised and profit-driven process of decision-making in China, cultural heritage management could easily become a top-down process in which local communities have insufficient opportunities to be engaged (Fan, 2014; He & Wu, 2009; Verdini et al., 2017). Local governments generate alliances with profit-driven developers in order to foster pro-growth urban (re)development and heritage revitalisation (Ng, Zhai, Zhao, & Li, 2016; Zhai & Ng, 2013). Residents lack public participation opportunities and governments have the exclusive power in the process of decision-making (Shin, 2010; Zhang, 2017). Yung, Chan, and Xu (2014) point out that public participation is considered a practical solution to mediate the social tensions between different stakeholders (Fan, 2014; Verdini et al., 2017). Some pilot projects have conducted effective community participation and grass-roots initiatives and achieved excellent outcomes (Fan, 2014; Verdini, 2015; Verdini et al., 2017). However, bottom-up processes of decision-making in China still need to be explored, further understood and developed so that these pilot projects can be expanded on further (Fan, 2014; Zhang, 2017).

Despite the growing literature on community participation in cultural heritage management, little research has been done on comparing Chinese to international approaches. This paper, therefore, aims to fill this gap, by providing an overview that compares and discusses the similarities and differences between the two approaches. A systematic comparative literature review of the state-of-the-art was carried out by reviewing papers from the last 15 years detailed below.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Publication collection processes

The systematic literature review began with retrieving and collecting related publications, and followed the review process developed by Boland, Gemma Cherry and Dickson (2014). Two phases of literature retrieval were performed to collect publications from current academic databases. We identified a series of keywords, namely China, Chinese, heritage, cultural, management, conservation, community, residents, people, public, engagement and participation. The first search strings in Scopus were finalised as TITLE-ABS-KEY (“communit\*” and “heritage” and (“participat\*” or “engage\*”) and (“conservation” or “management”)), and the retrieval returned 581 documents<sup>1</sup>. A set of inclusion criteria was drawn up to help eliminate the low-relevance publications,

as shown in Table 1. In this phase, 53 case studies were selected, and out of these were four Chinese case studies. In order to include more Chinese cases, we conducted the second search strings (“communit\*” and “heritage” and (“participat\*” or “engage\*”) and “Chin\*”) in Scopus and Google Scholar. We identified seven additional relevant publications focusing on Chinese cases from the last 15 years in the second phase. Overall, the 60 collected publications included 11 Chinese and 49 other international case studies, and these were all selected for the full-text review. Geographical distribution of these cases is worldwide and presented in Fig. 1.

For the inclusion criteria shown in Table 1, the selection process included seven steps related to publication time, language, keyword-frequency, accessibility and relevance to the topic. A PICOSS tool was designed to assess the quality of each selected paper regarding the topic, which was then applied in steps 6 and 7 (Boland et al., 2014). The PICOSS tool includes the following six aspects: (1) population: local communities who live and/or work within or nearby heritage properties; (2) interventions: heritage management that engages local communities; (3) comparator: none; (4) outcomes: outcomes of participatory governance; (5) study design: participatory methods in case studies; and (6) setting: cultural heritage.

### 2.2. Review focus themes

To analyse publication designs and outcomes, each case study was researched by using pre-coding methods (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; e.g. Guzmán, Pereira Roders, & Colenbrander, 2017). At first, these 60 selected publications were categorised as either Chinese or international, depending on the location of their case studies. They were also classified on their main focus, using the themes / keywords: (1) engaged communities, (2) participatory methods, (3) degrees of participation and (4) steps within cultural heritage management. The theme / keyword (1) engaged communities, included the following stakeholders: residents, governments, experts, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), tourists and businesses. Then, (2) participatory methods were categorised as: questionnaires, interviews, meetings, workshops, committees and digital technologies. With regard to the (3) degrees of participation, the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) model was used (see Table 2): i.e., inform, consult, involve, collaborate and empower (AbouAssi, Nabatchi, & Antoun, 2013; De Leiuwen & Arthure, 2016). The sequence represents the extent to which community participation varies from lower to higher degrees. Last, (4) the process of cultural heritage management takes place in three steps: identification to understand contexts, programming to develop strategies, and execution to manage actions (Veldpaus, 2015).

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were used to review these 60 selected publications. For the quantitative analysis, the frequency percentages of these pre-coding keywords were counted and Chinese and international cases compared. For the qualitative analysis which forms the main body of this paper, the 49 international case studies were compared with the 11 Chinese case studies to discuss Chinese contextualised management approaches from a global perspective.

### 2.3. Quantitative overview of selected case studies

Fig. 2 presents the quantitative overview in focus (ratio between the four main themes / keywords), distinguishing the Chinese and international studies (based on the original review results presented in the Appendix). Globally, the top three communities engaged in cultural heritage management are residents, experts and governments. Residents were engaged in most cases, slightly more on the international cases (98 percent), than the Chinese cases (86 percent). Governments were engaged in almost 2/3 of international cases (62 percent), while Chinese cases always included the government as stakeholders. Heritage experts were involved in most of the international cases (88 percent), and in more than half of the Chinese cases (57 percent).

<sup>1</sup> We conducted this literature retrieval on 10 July 2018.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/13463183>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/13463183>

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