



People. Places. Potential.

Keywords for Adaptive Heritage Reuse

The Adaptive Heritage Reuse Glossary Project

Edited by
Markus Kip,
David Amacher



Contents

PREFACE	3
ADAPTIVE REUSE	5
AFFORDABILITY	7
ALTERNATIVE CREDIT AND FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES	10
BENEFITS: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC	12
CIVIC-MINDED ENVIRONMENT	15
CO-GOVERNANCE	18
COMMONS	20
CONNECTIVITY	23
CROWDFUNDING	25
CROWDSOURCING	27
CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP	30
CULTURAL HERITAGE	33
DISADVANTAGE: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC	38
HERITAGE COMMUNITY	41
IMMATERIAL HERITAGE	44
INCLUSIVENESS	47
JOBS AND BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES	50
OPEN HERITAGE	52
PARTICIPATION	54
PUBLIC-PRIVATE-PEOPLE PARTNERSHIPS	57
REGIONAL INTEGRATION	59
RESOURCE INTEGRATION	62
SOCIAL INNOVATION	64
TRANSFERABILITY	68

Preface

Adaptive reuse of cultural heritage has become a focal point for researchers from a variety of academic disciplines and policy-makers and practitioners from different fields. Transdisciplinary engagements across disciplines and fields of practice, however, require a clear vocabulary to facilitate communication. Key terms in the area of adaptive heritage reuse often have distinct meanings, uses and implications in each of these disciplines and fields. This poses the risk of misunderstandings and confusion in collaboration. Nevertheless, we need to hold on to such key terms as they refer to the same real-world phenomena and try to find a common ground among these perspectives or at the very least arrive at a mutual appreciation of these perspectives. Doing this exercise in transdisciplinary communication promises to enrich our understanding of phenomena related to adaptive heritage reuse and deepen the potential for collaboration among different partners.

At OpenHeritage, we have set ourselves the task to engage such transdisciplinary communication as an open-ended process. With this Adaptive Heritage Reuse Glossary Project, we begin with a limited set of key terms and perspectives to facilitate further reflection and refinement. This process invites the ongoing addition of new key terms and approaches, continual exchanges and revisioning, and further clarification of differences and commonalities across academic disciplines and fields of professional expertise.

The process for developing this glossary began within the OpenHeritage project, involving 16 partner institutions from academia, policy-making, and NGOs and counting around 50 affiliate members. Already in the first two consortium meetings in 2018, consortium members became aware of the great variety of perspectives that the consortium members assume on adaptive heritage reuse and our collective project tasks. Members took note early on about key terms that re-occur within the discourses of consortium. In some cases, the rather loose and vague use of these terms caused some irritation as members realized that an ambiguous use of terms brushes over relevant conceptual debates in different disciplines or fields. After all, several of these terms are rather contested, with significant ethical, professional, or political implications, as it is evident in terms such as “cultural heritage,” “social benefit,” and several others.

As keywords were collected based on individual suggestions from OpenHeritage members, the list grew to more than 100 key terms by 2019. It was decided among partners to cut down the list to a smaller number to get the process started. At the fourth consortium meeting in December 2019, consortium members prioritized a much smaller set of key terms (more or less the current set) to start the process and agreed on a general format for the glossary.

The format of the glossary entry includes a short definition of the term of around 250 words, followed by a section on key debates around the term involving a

diversity of fields and perspectives. A short bibliographical section with key references from the entries provides orientation for further investigation.

The review process was organized as an internal peer-review among consortium members of OpenHeritage. First, each term was to be drafted by an OpenHeritage partner with expertise on the term. These drafts were then published on OpenHeritage's digital participatory platform (coordinated in collaboration with OpenHeritage partner Platoniq), in order to allow for all consortium members to review all available drafts, give comments or propose a modification. This open system of peer-review was bolstered by designating committed reviewers for each term, identifying reviewers who approached the term from a different disciplinary or professional perspective. This process was coordinated by the team of Georg-Simmel Center at Humboldt-University. This need for coordination is reflective of transdisciplinary processes more generally that are often time-consuming and don't involve the career incentives related to peer-production in given disciplines or fields.

Following the EU reviewers' suggestions in the Midterm Review of the OpenHeritage project in February 2020, the OpenHeritage Glossary was expanded to include input and additional terms from our sister project CLIC. As the OpenHeritage research unfolded throughout this process and new insights were generated, by May 2020 a handful of key terms were added, others were dropped from the list in late 2019.

In its current state, any key term included in this glossary expresses only the perspective of the authors listed under each term, not of all partners. It needs to be emphasized that the list is only a starting point for further transdisciplinary clarification of these terms. Neither do we consider this list of concepts as complete nor do these glossary entries reflect the broad variety of fields involved in OpenHeritage or CLIC. Nevertheless, we hope that the glossary may serve as a helpful guide for orientation and further elaboration.

The Adaptive Heritage Reuse Glossary Project is published on the OpenHeritage website (www.openheritage.eu) in August 2021 and is also available for download as pdf. If you would like to get in touch with us about the Adaptive Heritage Reuse Glossary Project, provide us with comments, propose modifications or additional terms, please contact us at dialogue@openheritage.eu.

Markus Kip and David Amacher

Adaptive Reuse

John Pendlebury

Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom;
john.pendlebury@ncl.ac.uk

Loes Veldpaus

Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom;
loes.veldpaus@ncl.ac.uk

Short definition

Adaptive reuse suggests the change of function of a building or place from one use to another, which requires some level of material change. While strongly associated with the conservation of buildings that have been considered of historic value, it is a term that might apply to any building and is increasingly being applied to a diverse range of contexts, including places and landscapes. Adaptive reuse projects range from careful schemes of architectural conservation to more radical interventions, involving substantial demolition and change. Similarly, adaptive reuse projects might be small-scale community-based projects or prestigious commissions undertaken by “starchitects”. Integral to adaptive reuse beyond material change is communicative intent. Material interventions are used as a communicative device, as an aesthetic strategy, and/or to signify other social and political messages.

Key discussions around the term

Buildings have been put to new uses throughout history as part of the natural evolution of place. The term ‘adaptive reuse’ appeared in the early 1970s at a moment when in the “West” modern, progressive architecture and planning was intent on the large-scale reconstruction of urban areas. A standard response to obsolescence was to demolish and build new. Recycling buildings and putting them to a new use became, therefore, a distinctive approach that stood counter to this dominant practice.

The evolution of adaptive reuse can be traced to: (1) extending the subject of heritage protection, which began to close off the option to demolish and redevelop; (2) evolving architectural praxis, through the work of Carlo Scarpa and others, that sought to define new dialogues between old and new fabric, and; (3) countervailing ideas of urbanism, informed by, for example, Jane Jacobs that placed an emphasis on the utility of old, adaptable buildings as part of flexible and vital urban places. More recently we might add to this a discourse of sustainability, advocating reusing and recycling rather than demolishing the built environment.

Much of writing on adaptive reuse reflects that it is a practice, done rather than theorised, and is case study based. More recently, some theoretical texts have emerged, including Wong (2017), Plevoets and Cleempoel (2019), and Stone (2019). However, the literature remains strongly architectural, orientated to considering adaptive reuse as a design problem. There is thus a need for greater understanding of the cultural location of adaptive reuse, and how the reuse process transforms social and heritage value, and which actors are advocating for, or against, reuse. Furthermore, it is important to consider these issues in relation to community-led campaigns, with increased space for informal and 'bottom up' practices and participatory processes. Multiple local, community-led, counterculture projects across the world show alternative trajectories of development responding to local issues as well as global challenges.

Reference list

Plevoets, Bie, and Koenraad Van Cleempoel. *Adaptive Reuse of the Built Heritage: Concepts and Cases of an Emerging Discipline*. London New York: Routledge, 2019.

Stone, Sally. *UnDoing Buildings: Adaptive Reuse and Cultural Memory*. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Wong, Liliane. *Adaptive Reuse: Extending the Lives of Buildings*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2016.

Affordability

Christian Darr

Stiftung trias, Hattingen (Ruhr), Germany; christian.darr@stiftung-trias.de

Rolf Novy-Huy

Stiftung trias, Hattingen (Ruhr), Germany; rolf.novy@stiftung-trias.de

Short definition

"Affordable spaces" relates to the demand of the operators and users to have access to a space that fits their needs in physical perspective, but also corresponds to their economic power. Affordability recognizes that socio-economic inequalities exist that make it difficult or impossible for deprived groups to meet basic needs such as nutritious food, housing, working, transportation, etc. The term thus raises the importance for such groups to be able to access and enjoy these goods sustainably. It also recognizes the relevance of resource integration, which can be understood through two different perspectives: First, the integration of resources is a key requirement for the success of revitalization attempts, especially in deprived and/or marginalized areas, like for example the integration of volunteer work from the surrounding area of a site or the use of specialized funding opportunities. Second, the specific resources of (heritage) sites belong to the unique features, which are an important element of success.

Key discussions around the term

Affordability in (urban) planning relates in most publications on *"relationships between housing, non-housing expenditures and income poverty"* (Haffner and Hulse 2019, 65). The debate has become broadened after the Global Financial Crisis 2009 as *"revival of discussions about housing affordability as a consequence of house price and rent increases and urban restructuring"* (*ibid.*). As a result the growing influence of the financial sector on the economy (Brown et al. 2017) and especially the real estate sector, summarized as financialization (Mertens 2014, 55; Plan Limited 2017) and (with smaller impact) migration and urbanization tendencies (Heeg 2013) have led to growing capital investments in land and real-estate. Combined with financial deregulation and addressing individual responsibility, more investments in real estate have occurred, which result in rising expenditures for housing between 2000 and 2011 from 20,3% to 23% of total household expenditures in the EU (Heeg 2013, 10). The debates and therefore the definition of affordability is almost comparable for housing and non-housing purposes. Therefore, the question of affordability is crucial also for the projects related to OpenHeritage, because the preservation and presentation of the heritage aspects is an additional financial expenditure.

Affordable often relates to vulnerable users and groups with smaller economic opportunities, compared to the overall standard, which is pointed out for example for artists (Center for Cooperatives 1993, 46) or people in social transfer systems (Dickerson 2014, 274), elderly people (Housing Solutions Platform 2019, 28), minorities or refugees. Examples of affordable spaces for these groups are studios for arts and culture, social housing apartments, or spaces for certain businesses, like workshops or parking lots for food trucks for people who are not able to finance a restaurant (Dickerson 2014, 233). The market liberalization tendencies noticed since the 1980s, led to increasing gentrification. The results are growing inequalities and displacement tendencies in European cities (Cocola-Gant 2019).

In conclusion, the term "affordability" is linked to three conditions: space must be available, it must meet the needs of the intended use, and the financial cost of access and maintain must correspond to the economic possibilities of the users. The relation between financialization and ownership has been summarized by Maryel Battin: "*The importance of local owners can not be overstated. Each has a stake in the community and ownership is not just an investment for them*" (Delvac et al. 1995, 36). This means, in order to enlarge the accessibility of affordable spaces it is important to address questions of ownership to secure affordability and responsibility. The ownership among people of the local community seems to offer a good perspective to combine affordability and responsibility. Collective ownership can be organized with shares and memberships, where revenues and decision-making are organized with shares and memberships in legal forms. Examples are cooperatives, associations, and companies.

Reference list

Brown, Andrew, David A. Spencer, Marco Veronese Passarella. "The Extent and Variegation of Financialisation in Europe: a Preliminary Analysis." *Revista de Economía Mundial (World Economy Journal)*, no. 46 (2017): 49-69.

Center for Cooperatives. *Cooperative housing compendium: resources for collaborative living*. Edited by Lottie Cohen, Lois Arkin. Davis CA: Center for Cooperatives, University of California, 1993.

Cócola-Gant, Agustin. "Gentrification and displacement: urban inequality in cities of late capitalism." In *Handbook of Urban Geography*, edited by Tim Schwanen and Ronald Van Kempen. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2019.

Delvac, William F., Susan M. Escherich, Bridget Hartman. *Affordable Housing Through Historic Preservation: A Case Study Guide to Combining the Tax Credits*. Diane Pub Co, 1995.

Dickerson, Michele. *Homeownership and America's Financial Underclass: Flawed Premises, Broken Promises, New Prescriptions*. Austin TX: School of Law, University of Texas, 2014.

Haffner, Marietta E. A. and Kath Hulse. "A fresh look at contemporary perspectives on urban housing affordability." *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 25:sup1 (2019): 59-79.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2019.1687320>.

Heeg, Susanne. Wohnen als Anlageform: Vom Gebrauchsgut zur Ware. *Emanzipation* 3, no. 2 (2013): 5-20.

Housing Solutions Platform. "Collectief Goed: Affordable Housing, Participation and Empowerment." In *50 Out-of-the-Box Housing Solutions*, edited by Housing Solutions Platform. Brussels: Housing Solutions Platform, 2019.

Mertens, Daniel. "Varianten der Finanzialisierung: Was treibt und was bremst die private Verschuldung in Deutschland?" In *MPIfG Jahrbuch 2015-2016*. Köln: Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung, 2015, 55-60.

Plan Limited. "Financialization of housing and the right to adequate housing". 2017, Accessed May 12, 2020.

<https://www.girlsrightsplatform.org/node/1110>

Tosics, Ivan. "The housing paradox: more financing - less affordability?" *URBACT*, March 3, 2020. <https://urbact.eu/housing-more-financing-less-affordability>.

Alternative Credit and Funding Opportunities

Christian Darr

Stiftung trias, Hattingen (Ruhr), Germany; christian.darr@stiftung-trias.de

Rolf Novy-Huy

Stiftung trias, Hattingen (Ruhr), Germany; rolf.novy@stiftung-trias.de

Short definition

Credit and funding opportunities can be divided into equity and debt capital. "Genuine own money" (Stiftung trias 2017, 9), public funding, gifts and donations, cooperative and other company shares, and private loans are summarised as equity. Examples for debt capital are loans from public or special financing institutions, instruments of the German GLS Bank like "loan and gift community loans" (ibid.) or guaranteed loans, loans offered by the public sector, and land charge loans offered by local banks "Traditional" funding opportunities are deposits and loans, which are backed up by widely accepted security values (Schneck 2006, 11), like land property or building leases (Stiftung trias 2019, 16). In opposition, any other funding opportunities can be defined as "Alternative Credit and Funding Opportunities" (ACFO). A classification about what is "alternative" is defined, in accordance with their standards, by the risk management of each bank or money lender, in order to determine risks of lending capital to costumers and their and stability. Most banks see any loan which is not secured by land or buildings as "alternative" financing. In addition, people, who do not have access to the classic sources of funding, have developed new ways for getting access to capital and other sources needed for a project to become reality. "Alternative" means in a lot of cases sharing the risk within a group of people by dividing it and each backing it with small guarantees. Examples are company shares or "loan and gift community loans" or other different forms of crowd-investing.

A number of banks have developed guidelines to evaluate the risks of certain funding opportunities and are able to deal with these funding opportunities.

Key discussions around the term

The lack of a universally accepted definition is widely recognized in the relevant literature (Segal 2016; Obiora 2017). In addition, there are attempts in the literature to establish definitions regarding the different origins of money, with financial markets and banks being referred to as "traditional" and all other sources as "alternative" (Allen 2013; Segal 2016; Obiora 2017). When it comes to peer-to-peer-lending models (Bakker 2017) or the role of online tools (Segal 2016) the limits of these definitions become visible. The above-described example of the "loan and gift community loans", which is offered by the German

GLS Bank, would not be representable with the definition offered by the literature: While the loan is issued by the bank, the security is provided by a community, consisting of a number of people, each giving guarantees for a small amount of the total loan. The use of the internet has become absolutely normal, also an attempt to question the role of the provider of the online platform leads in the wrong direction.

In conclusion, it seems best to use risk and revenue structures in the decision-making process as a major factor for a definition that separates ACFOs from "traditional" instruments. In order to access certain target groups or markets, a number of banks are offering ACFOs and therefore they developed tools to assess the risks, most of them seem to still shy away from these funding opportunities. The reasons seem to be a lack of demand and the small size of the market. *"Although the key traditional financing method of using bank loans for financing SME startups is still the most predominant financing method till today at the rate of being 72 times larger in terms of net worth when compared with alternative sources, the rapid rise in alternative financing methods cannot be denied"* (Obiora 2017, 45). Allen et al. showed that *"[...] alternative financing channels play an important role in both developed and developing countries. In fast-growing emerging economies, the alternative financial system can be the most important source of external finance for firms"* (Allen 2013, 3).

Reference list

Allen, Franklin, Elena Carletti, Jun "QJ" Qian, Patricio Valenzuela, "Chapter 11 - Financial Intermediation, Markets, and Alternative Financial Sectors." In *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, Volume 2, Part A, edited by George M. Constantinides, Milton Harris, Rene M. Stulz, 759-798. Elsevier, 2013.

Bakker, Evan. "PEER-TO-PEER LENDING: How digital lending marketplaces are disrupting the predominant banking model." *Business Insider*, June 23, 2015. <https://www.businessinsider.com/peer-to-peer-lending-how-digital-lending-marketplaces-are-disrupting-the-predominant-banking-model-2015-5>.

Obiora, Sandra Chukwudumebi, and Tamás Csordás. "The Case of Alternative Versus Traditional Financing: A Literature Review." *Archives of Business Research* 5, no. 9 (2017): 42-53. <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.59.3581>.

Patti, Daniela and Levente Polyák. *Funding the Cooperative City*. Vienna: Cooperative City Books, 2017.

Schneck, Ottmar. *Handbuch Alternative Finanzierungsformen*. Weinheim: WILEY-VCH Verlag, 2006.

Stiftung trias. *Die Finanzierung zivilgesellschaftlicher Projekte*. Hattingen: Stiftung trias, 2017.

Stiftung trias. *Bürgerfonds für Fachwerkstädte: Gemeinsames Forschungsprojekt*. Hattingen: Stiftung trias, 2019.

Benefits: Social and Economic

Elena De Nictolis

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; edenictolis@luiss.it

Christian Iaione

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; ciaione@luiss.it

Maria Cristina Pangallozzi

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; mpangallozzi@luiss.it

Alessandro Piperno

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; a.piperno@luiss.it

Short definition

The social-economic benefit mainly refers to the improvement of economic and social conditions, as an increase in education and employment levels. Hence, the term "socio-economic benefits" applies to the advantages offered, thanks to the development of a product or a service, to a target audience, which could indicate the society as a whole or a specific community (Xun 2013, 302-309). Therefore, to define and measure the benefits different elements need to be taken into consideration: the beneficiaries, the scale of the impact, the scope of the activities, and the timing of analysis. As an example, *ceteris paribus*, the benefits could take into consideration the impacts that the actions have on the target groups with a short or long-term timeframe, significantly changing the definition of the benefit (Masocha 2016, 838-848). Hence, also the measurement of the benefits is a complicated analysis that needs to take into consideration different elements at the same time.

Key discussions around the term

The term socio-economic benefit refers to all the positive consequences of a specific action. In the case of adaptive reuse the attention focus on the economic, social, and environmental benefits of meeting the needs and demands of the different local stakeholders of the buildings (Bullen and Love 2011, 32-46; see also Rudokas et al. 2019). Therefore, the assessment of the socio-economic benefits of adaptive reuse is crucial for the understanding of the impacts generated by a project. However, the comprehension of the benefits requires a wide multidisciplinary analysis of the services/products. Thus, activities concerning common goods and resources create a variety of spillover effects that are difficult to delimitate. Hence, when analyzing the socio-economic benefit of heritage reuse elements from different disciplines, sociology, psychology, economics, etc. should be taken into consideration. Some of the aspects that might be taken into consideration are:

- Influences on the well-being of individuals and communities, taking into consideration also the effect on community cohesion.
- Influences on the attractiveness of the place to newcomers, taking into consideration also the possible gentrification process
- Influences on the education level of the community and the possibility of people to access the education systems
- Influences on the environment and the ecosystem, taking into consideration also the effect on energy efficiency and the creation of renewable sources
- Influences on the economic conditions of the place, including the creation of jobs and the capacity building
- Influences on the cultural life of the place and the ability to offer cultural and artistic services and on the heritage values
- Influences on tourism and the ability of the place to attract people, resources, and ideas
- Influences on the attractiveness of the place to business, taking into consideration also the effect on the real estate value

The multidisciplinary approach of the benefits arises issues also related to its measurement, as most of the socio-economic benefits are difficult to estimate. Hence the main discussion relates to the possibility to quantify some of these benefits and give them an economic value (Dallinger 2019, 482-496). Hence, the discussion can be divided into two different main streams that can be applied to different sectors and peculiarly to the urban and heritage regeneration activities. The first aspect questions how some intangible aspects of the benefits could be measured (Brazier 2016). As an example, it is difficult to measure the benefit generated by clean air or of the mitigation of climate change. The second aspect refers to the possibility to give economic value to non-economic benefits (Arvidson 2013, 3-18). These additional steps are essential to understand the overall positive or negative impact of a project. However, also, in this case, the definition of social and economic benefits in economic terms could be complicated. As an example, it is difficult to provide an economic value to saving the life of a person. Hence, the recent debate around the term focuses on defining the boundaries of impact and how they could be measured.

Reference list

- Arvidson, Malin, et al. 2013. "Valuing the social? The nature and controversies of measuring social return on investment (SROI)." In *Voluntary sector review*. 4(1): 3-18.
- Brazier, John, et al. 2016. *Measuring and valuing health benefits for economic evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bullen, Peter, and Peter Love. 2011. "Factors influencing the adaptive re-use of buildings." In *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*. 9(1): 32-46.

Dallinger, Bettina, et al. 2019. "Socio-economic benefit and profitability analyses of Austrian hydro storage power plants supporting increasing renewable electricity generation in Central Europe". In *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 107: 482-496.

Xun, Zhao, and Zhao Ting. 2003. "The socio-economic benefits of establishing National Geoparks in China." In *Episodes* 26(4): 302-309.

Masocha, Mhosisi. 2006. "Informal waste harvesting in Victoria Falls town, Zimbabwe: Socio-economic benefits". In *Habitat International* 30(4) : 838-848.

Rudokas, Kastytis, et al. 2019. "Valuing the socio-economic benefits of built heritage: Local context and mathematical modeling." In *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. 39: 229-237.

Civic-Minded Environment

Elena De Nictolis

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; edenictolis@luiss.it

Christian Iaione

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; ciaione@luiss.it

Maria Cristina Pangallozzi

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; mpangallozzi@luiss.it

Alessandro Piperno

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; a.piperno@luiss.it

Short definition

A civic-minded Environment is characterized by organizational arrangements, policies, and institutional spaces that are supportive of civic engagement, and more broadly of heritage-related initiatives brought up by NGOs, informal groups of residents, and coalitions of local actors. In a civic-minded environment, the public administration possesses or increases its institutional capacity to enable the collective action of civic actors (through capacity building processes) and supports civic reuse of heritage for sustainable, social, and economic purposes.

Key discussions around the term

City governments have been recurring to institutional spaces to design innovations to deal with a variety of urban issues (i.e. housing; food provision; mobility) with civic actors, such as city residents, NGOs but also research institutions and private actors (Raven *et al.* 2017). That takes the form of urban laboratories, city agencies, urban development agencies, urban think tanks, living Labs, city studios, urban innovation hubs, collabs, or neighborhood labs. Those spaces for experimentation are place-based and applied laboratories within a context, the city, which can be conceptualized as a laboratory herself (Evans and Karvonen 2014). Experiments organized in cities as laboratories indeed are different from artificial laboratories, because they provide a real-life context of experimentation, with factors that are not influenced by the experiment itself related to the concrete implementation of policies designed outside from their context of application. An example is the Collaboratory designed by the City of Reggio Emilia (Emilia Romagna, Italy) as a space to facilitate the agglomeration, co-design, and prototype of civic enterprises (Peredo 2006) that provides neighborhood services leveraging on urban assets, services, infrastructures including archeological and cultural heritage for democratic, collaborative development of the space. These experiments achieve concrete outputs (the realization of heritage reuse projects) but they also promote indirect institutional and social change by challenging existing mindsets (Gravagnuolo *et al.* 2018)

related to heritage conversation and allowing the chance for community innovation to be injected into heritage management models.

However, without attention on social differences and safeguarding fragile target groups, this can also potentially lead to a lack of inclusivity in the processes, so there is still a need for checks and balances, promoting public access, and working in partnership with organizations who are willing to invest time and resources. The capacity to govern experimentation is key in this process, as it is necessary to imagine an institutional infrastructure that is suited to adapt to the speed and power of the social innovation phenomena characterizing what was defined as the new era of the Anthropocene, where the traditional rationality demonstrates to be the heir of what David Graeber (2015) would call “structural stupidity” and that will be characterized by increasing involvement of the public administration in human activities which will result in a pressure to change in several branches of the law and policy. The presence of administrative organizational innovations and eventually an administrative function within the City that stimulates, coordinates, and supports the experimentation actions for adaptive reuse of cultural assets/space with civic actors is a key factor of success. This institutional space would have the crucial role to merge scientific rigor, policy design, and the enabling of forms of community-based enterprises (Peredo 2006), rooted in the neighborhoods. Emerging organizational innovations of this kind, that merge the idea of institutional spaces and processes that enable the administration to work with civic actors with the necessity of having an empirical-based approach to provide inputs to the policy-making process are emerging across cities all over the EU and are defined in some cases as “City Science Offices”. Several EU cities (Amsterdam; Hamburg; Reggio Emilia; Brno; Cluj-Napoca; Paris) are establishing CSOs and are networking within the Joint Research center-led Initiative “CSI, City Science Initiative”.

Reference list

- Evans, James and Karvonen, Andrew. 2014. “Give Me a Laboratory and I Will Lower Your Carbon Footprint!” — Urban Laboratories and the Governance of Low-Carbon Futures”, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38, n. 2, 413–430.
- Graeber, David. 2015. *The Utopia of rules*. New York: Melville House.
- Gravagnuolo, Antonia, Saleh, Ruba, Ost, Christian and Girard, Luigi Fusco. n.d. “Towards an evaluation framework to assess Cultural Heritage Adaptive Reuse impacts in the perspective of the Circular Economy”, special issue - URBANISTICA INFORMAZIONI: https://www.clicproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/ui278si_sessione_speciale_4-2.pdf.
- Peredo, Ana María and Chrisman, James J. 2006. “Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise”. *Academy of Management Review*. 31(2): 309-328.

Raven, Rob et al. 2017. „Urban experimentation and institutional arrangements“, *European Planning Studies*: 1-24.

Co-Governance

Elena De Nictolis

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; edenictolis@luiss.it

Christian Iaione

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; ciaione@luiss.it

Maria Cristina Pangallozzi

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; mpangallozzi@luiss.it

Alessandro Piperno

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; a.piperno@luiss.it

Short definition

Co-governance is a method of participatory management in which decisions are made at all relevant levels, thereby recognizing the decision of people affected by decisions equitably. The general idea is to bring public and private stakeholders together in collective forums with public agencies to engage in consensus-oriented decision-making processes. Co-governance involves the principle of subsidiarity—taking decisions at the lowest possible level of authority and creating new checks and balances on the overall decision-making activities. This inclusion of people in the decisions that directly affect them formalizes the process of just governance and democratic oversight by closing the gap between resource users and resource managers, producers, and providers, moving towards shared responsibilities and the recognition of different needs.

Key discussions around the term

Ansell and Gash (2008, 544) have defined co-governance as a “governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets”.

As a widely cited research, this definition brings a certain influence in the co-governance study. Co-governance models have been increasingly tested in the urban commons studies sector in recent years, and they are analyzed especially considering urban heritage as a commons (Head and Ryan 2004; Iaione 2016; Foster and Iaione 2019). The co-governance approach may refer to a single actor or several actors involved. There is a single actor when the project is managed by an organization that has only moderate interactions with other actors, but without creating stable relationships. There are multiple actors, instead, when two or more actors create an organization or steadily collaborate to achieve common goals (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 2000; Ackerman 2012; Peris-Ortiz et.

al. 2016). Co-governance structures should include nonstate actors, and they should be engaged directly in decision-making and not merely be consulted by public agencies. The purpose of the participants' forum is to make decisions by consensus, even if consensus is not achieved in practice. An article written by Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012) broadly defines co-governance as the processes and structures of public policy decision making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished. The concept broke the limitation of top-down ordinary governance models. The definition is widely accepted or referred to by research and case studies.

Reference list

Ansell, Chris and Alison Gash. 2008. "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice". *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 18(4): 543–571.

Emerson, Kirk, Nabatchi, Tina and Balogh, Steve. 2012. "An Integrated Framework for Collaborative Governance". In *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1): 1–29.

Etzkowitz, Henry and Leydesdorff, Loet. 1995. 'The Triple Helix: university–industry–government relations: a laboratory for knowledge-based economic development', *EASST Review*, 14(1): 14–19.

Foster, Sheila, and Iaione, Christian. 2019. *Ostrom in the City: Design Principles and Practices for the Urban Commons*. *Routledge Handbook of the Study of the Commons* (Dan Cole, Blake Hudson, Jonathan Rosenbloom eds.), Routledge.

Head, Brian and Ryan, Neal. 2004. "Can Co-governance Work? Regional and Natural Resources in Australia". In *Society and Economy*. 26(2-3): 361–382.

Iaione, Christian. 2016. "The CO-City: Sharing, Collaborating, Cooperating and Commoning in the City". In *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*. 75(2): 415–455.

Peris-Ortiz, Marta, Ferreira, João J., Farinha, Luís and Fernandes, Nuno O. 2016. *Multiple Helix Ecosystems for Sustainable Competitiveness*. Springer.

Commons

David Amacher

Georg-Simmel Center for Metropolitan Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany; David.amacher@hu-berlin.de

Short definition

The term commons is used to conceptualize non-capitalist modes of social organization based on cooperation and solidarity beyond state and market principles. A commons is often characterized by three intertwined dimensions. 1) common resources 2) communities (commoners), and 3) institutions (i.e. commoning practices) (Kip et al. 2015, 13).

Key discussions around the term

At the latest since the awarding of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences in 2009 to Elinor Ostrom for her contributions to commons research, the concept of the commons is widely discussed and used. Ostrom (1990) has shown that common pool resources (CPR) are being managed in a self-organized, sustainable manner on a larger scale beyond market or state principles. Based on her extensive work Ostrom has developed eight design principles for commons.

The term commons originates in medieval-area English property law to conceptualize social arrangements of meadows, fisheries forests, and peat bogs in which communities collectively manage these resources without 'owning' them (Caffentzis 2016). While the land was owned by the royalty, church or belonged to manors, the so-called commoners had a 'usufruct' – a right to use that was structured through customs, but also through struggles between the commoners and the landlords, the latter possibly using violence and parliamentary legislation for their advantage (ibid.).

While the power over land in England had been traditionally exerted through extrajudicial force, the 18th and 19th centuries demarcate an important turning point in which legislation was altered to enclose the commons. Marx later described this process as the primary accumulation, demarcating an important historical process in the emergence of capitalist modes of production and the landless proletariat (Wood 2017).

While the idea of the commons has largely been supplanted by capitalist modes of property regimes in Europe, authors such as Federici (n.d.) stress that modes of collective management over resources have been practiced in the Global South much longer. However, these have also been under pressure through colonial and imperial expansion of capitalist regimes peaking in the capitalist land

grab during the so-called debt crisis in the 1980s which have been referred to as the 'New Enclosures' (Caffentzis 2016).

Peter Linebaugh (2008) connects Marx's analysis of primary accumulation in medieval times with the waves of privatization of public resources and land through neoliberalization. While Linebaugh historicizes these recurring waves of privatization he also refers to recurring ideas and practices of reclaiming and maintaining commons and thus explains the renewed interest among movements and scholars.

While there is a strand of literature focusing on rural commons (e.g. Ostrom 1990), the concept of the commons has been extended to 'urban' commons in the 1990s framing urban gardening, communal basic infrastructure, or self-organized, decommodified housing as such as well as other initiatives operating within urban conditions (Kip et al. 2015; Iaione 2016). From this second stream of literature authors such as Iaione (2019) have used the concept of the urban commons concerning heritage reuse. Other strands of literature focus for example on virtual commons in knowledge economies (Carlsson 2008).

However, as Caffentzis (2016) points out, the uses of the term commons are conflicting and have been usurped into neoliberal and neo-Keynesian politics, e.g. through the United Nations policy of branding certain cities as 'heritage of humanity' and thus opening them up to commercial exploitation. Authors such as Federici (n.d.) have shed a light on the unequal effects that enclosures of the commons produce shaped by gender and neocolonial relations. A feminist conceptualization of the commons, therefore, aims at "a profound transformation in our everyday life, in order to recombine what the social division of labor in capitalism has separated." (Federici n.d.). Federici therefore differentiates between "adaptation[s] of the idea of the commons to market interests" and the possibility to "resist dependence on wage labor and subordination to capitalist relations" (ibid.). Central criteria for anti-capitalist commons could therefore not only be the degree of self-organization but also the degree of decommodification (Balmer and Bernet 2015).

The idea of the commons has had an influence on policy and practice regarding heritage reuse. One example is the change in urban policy and practice in the city of Naples where the idea of the commons was introduced to (collectively) manage abandoned real estate and heritage sites (Ciancio 2018, Iaione 2019). Regulations have been passed that reinterpret the historic usufruct rights into a new 'civic use' category (uso civico). The regulations are reinforced through the creation of institutional bodies that seek to promote principles of the commons.

Institutional arrangements and frameworks can thus promote or hinder the application of design principles of the commons for adaptive heritage reuse.

Reference list

Caffentzis, George. "Commons". In *Keywords for Radicals: The Contested Vocabulary of Late-capitalist Struggle*. Edited by Kelly Fritsch, Claire O'Connor, and AK Thompson, 1st edition. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2016.

Carlsson, Chris. *Nowtopia*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2008.

Ciancio, Giuliana. "When Commons Becomes Official Politics Exploring the Relationship between Commons, Politics, and Art in Naples". In *Commonism. A New Aesthetics of the Real*. Edited by Dockx, Nico, Gielen, Pascal, 283-94. Amsterdam: Antennae-Arts in Society Valiz, 2018.

Federici, Silvia, „Feminism And the Politics of the Commons". *The Commoner*, n.d., <http://www.commoner.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/federici-feminism-and-the-politics-of-commons.pdf>.

Iaione, Christian. "The CO-City: Sharing, Collaborating, Cooperating, and Commoning in the City". *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 75/2 (2016): 415-455.

Iaione, Christian. "Pooling urban commons: the Civic eState". *Urbact*, 2019, <https://urbact.eu/urban-commons-civic-estate>.

Kip, Markus, Bieniok, Majken, Dellenbaugh, Mary, Müller, Agnes Katharina and Schwegmann, Martin. „Seizing the (Every)Day: Welcome to the Urban Commons!". In *Urban commons: moving beyond state and market*, Edited by Dellenbaugh, Mary Kip, Markus, Bieniok, Majken, Müller, Agnes Katharina and Schwegmann, Martin, 9–25. *Bauwelt Fundamente 154*. Berlin, München, Boston: Birkhäuser, 2015.

Linebaugh, Peter. *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All*. University of California Press, 2008.

Ostrom, Elinor. *Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. *The origin of capitalism: a longer view*. London, New York: Verso, 2017.

Connectivity

Fabriza Cannella

Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy; fabriza.cannella@uniroma3.it

Federica Fava

Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy; federica.fava@uniroma3.it

Short definition

Connectivity is the capability of adaptive reuse practices to identify the use and organization of a space as an opportunity for a continuous exchange of knowledges and actions, linking local bottom-up projects to multi-scalar spatial relations. Thus, connectivity concerns the physical, institutional, and people-to-people linkages which implement opportunities to collaborate for a territorial integration strategy through community-led adaptive heritage reuse. By ensuring adequate connectivity, these projects create opportunities by bringing together different types of actors and restoring material links (e.g. transport network or more in general physical infrastructures) with other areas in the city to rebuild a heritage site in its broader spatial connections. Overall, connectivity aims at transforming governance relations generated by a specific project into linked-territorial planning, keeping together material and social infrastructure at different scales.

Key discussions around the term

Connectivity is a term widely used in the field of urban planning to refer to the density of connections within the city - in particular in a transport network - with the aim of providing adequate accessibility (both physical as social). In this regard, Madanipour (2010) pointed out that the planning process involves setting up a series of temporal, spatial, and institutional connections which have been subject to rupture and shrinkage. Hence, he identifies the need to rethink connectivity in planning through: new spatial connections that connect the plan and the project, draw on formal and informal mechanisms, plural and participatory and - finally - through new symbolic connections that, rather than marketing places or expressing ambiguous intentions, are created through a democratic process.

Moreover, connectivity has drawn forth a rising interest in the field around regionalism studies and regional integration (see glossary term on regional integration). From this viewpoint, connectivity becomes a priority in terms of public transportation (Castanho et al. 2017), but also in regards to immaterial infrastructure (Fau 2017), policy integration, and collaborative approaches to planning and urban policy (Show and Sykes 2006; European Commission 2011).

To conclude, "connectivity" seems to show strong similarities with the concept of integration as applied to policy, territories, actors. Starting with a specific place-based project, the concept of connection/integration (e.g. among stakeholders, governance levels, resources, territorial scale, etc.), represents a crucial factor to improving territorial and community development in its wider spatial structure. From this perspective, issues of connectivity can be bridged with those of urban regeneration and social innovation, specifically within urban strategies such as the "Integrated area development" one (Moulaert and Nussbaumer 2004).

Reference list

- Castanho, Rui Alexander, Vulevic, Ana, Fernandez, José Cabezas, Fernandez -Pozo, Luis, Gomez, José Manuel Naranjo, and Loures, Luis Carlos. 2017. Accessibility and connectivity – movement between cities, as a critical factor to achieve success on cross-border cooperation (CBC) projects. *A European analysis: Sustain. Cities Soc.*, 32, pp. 181-190.
- European Commission. 2011. Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions. Online: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/communications/2011/territorial-agenda-of-the-european-union-2020
- Fau, Nathalie. 2016. "Investment in Infrastructure and Regional Integration: Will Connectivity Reduce Inequalities?". In: *ASEAN Economic Community, A model for Asia-wide Regional Integration?*, edited by Bruno Jetin and Mia Mikic, pp. 291-310 . New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Madanipour, Ali. 2010. Connectivity and contingency in planning: *Planning Theory*, 9 (4), pp. 351-368
- Moulaert, Frank, Nussbaumer, Jacques. 2005. Integrated Area Development and social innovation in European cities: *European cities, City*, 8:2, pp.249-257.
- Shaw, David, and Sykes, Oliver. 2005. Addressing Connectivity in Spatial Planning: The Case of the English Regions: *Planning Theory & Practice*, 6:1, pp. 11-33.

Crowdfunding

Nadia Nadesan

Platoniq, Fundación Goteo, Barcelona, Spain; nadia@platoniq.net

Olivier Schulbaum

Platoniq, Fundación Goteo, Barcelona, Spain;
olivierschulbaum@platoniq.net

Short definition

Crowdfunding is an instrument among the alternative finance landscape. It combines the terms ‚crowd‘ and ‚funding‘ in the sense that an interested or general public redistributes capital to a group of people through an online platform in order to realize a certain project.

Key discussion around the term

“Crowdfunding” was coined by combining “crowd” and “funding”, indicating that many of the individuals provide their own contributions to create a fund (Schwienbacher and Larralde, 2010). Thus, crowdfunding works as an infrastructure, which enables projects to collect cooperation, attention, and trust from an amount of the general public. In very recent years, the position of crowdfunding in the alternative finance landscape has progressively shifted from being just a possible option to becoming a well-established and mature funding mechanism. Starting from a restricted pool of innovators, crowdfunding has steadily expanded its outreach.

In addition to entering the core alternative finance options, crowdfunding has also earned a primary role as a means of “democratisation of finance” (Passeri 2018). The term refers to asking for funding and providing it to a large crowd of individuals, but also to the processes of co-decision, co-creation, engagement, and ownership that it produces in all parties involved. A further evolution of mechanisms like this mechanism is represented by the so-called “civic crowdfunding” a term coined by Alessio Barollo and Daniela Castrataro during the “Torino Crowdfunding” convention (Olivia 2018). It defines a subcategory of crowdfunding through which citizens, often in collaboration with governments, propose, fund, and deliver projects that aim to provide a community service or deliver public value through local improvement projects. The peculiarity of civic crowdfunding is that, by leveraging the close ties that crowdfunding platforms enjoy with local communities, it can promote a sense of engagement and belonging among citizens by enabling them to contribute to specific projects that will generate common good in their local areas.

Both financial and non-financial benefits have increasingly attracted the attention of a wide range of public and private stakeholders, such as local and regional

authorities, development agencies and banks, and private foundations. These entities are partnering with crowdfunding platforms all over Europe and setting up match-funding schemes through which resources collected by crowdfunding campaigns in specific areas are topped up with an additional share of their own resources.

Goteo.org the platform partnering with the Open Heritage project is a pioneer in both Civic and Match funding, and the creator of an open funding standard for the creation, preservation, and sustainability of the commons.

Reference list

Morell, M. F., Hidalgo, E. S., & Rodríguez, E. (2020). Goteo. org civic crowdfunding and match-funding data connecting Sustainable Development Goals. *Scientific Data*, 7(1), 1-10.

Passeri, F. (2018). "Lessons Learned from Civic Crowdfunding and Match-Funding Schemes in Europe." In *CrowdAsset Crowdfunding for Policymakers*. Edited by Gajda, Oliver, Marom, Dan and Wright, Tim, 211-55. World Scientific Publishing Company.

Oliva, Nadia. 2018. "Crowdfunding and Civic Crowdfunding: Theoretical Features and Future Prospects." *Public Management and Administration*, April. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.74739>.

Schwienbacher, A., and Larralde, B. "Crowdfunding of small entrepreneurial ventures." In *Handbook of entrepreneurial finance*, Oxford University Press, Forthcoming (2010).

Crowdsourcing

Volodymyr Kulikov

Central European University, Budapest, Hungary - Vienna, Austria;
KulikovV@ceu.edu

Dóra Mérai

Central European University, Budapest, Hungary - Vienna, Austria;
Meraid@ceu.edu

Short definition

Crowdsourcing or citizen science is the activity of asking the public to take on tasks via the internet, which contribute to research or educational interest related to cultural heritage collections or knowledge. Crowdsourcing projects aim at generating or/and processing content, such as transcribing manuscripts or oral interviews, classifying objects, annotating documents, geotagging, identifying people and objects on photos. However, crowdsourcing is more than just a framework for creating content. It allows the initiators to build a community of interested individuals who are ready to work towards a specific aim.

Key discussion around the term

Crowdsourcing is based on the concept of “wisdom of the crowd” according to which under the right conditions, crowds can be remarkably intelligent (Surowiecki 2004). Many popular online services, such as Wikipedia, Google Translate, and Trip Advisor, are based on this principle. Crowdsourcing realizes the ideal of a participatory culture and focuses on working towards “a shared, significant goal or research interest” (Ridge *et al.* 2014, 2) together with the online community.

Crowdsourcing allows cultural heritage organizations to obtain new information, add to the existing collections, create new knowledge, present and promote heritage collections and organizations (see Ferriter 2017). Creating online communities is another crucial benefit of this model. Crowdsourcing can foster better engagement with the public and enable heritage experts and the public to share the responsibility for heritage assets. Crowdsourcing projects can also contribute to reaching some socially relevant objectives such as gaining new software skills and online communication experience. They also provide an opportunity for socializing.

Crowdsourcing as a tool for online public engagement has some limitations and side effects. Although volunteers usually do not get any monetary compensation, crowdsourcing projects require resources to set up and run a website, and to communicate continuously with the online community. Research has demonstrated that it is crucial to invest in website design, create clear user

manuals, and craft convincing texts explaining the social or academic significance of the project (McKinley 2016). Crowdsourcing is not about having the job done for free, but rather about being open to new ideas and willing to do things *for* and *with* the public.

Using unpaid volunteer work raises concerns about the ethical side of crowdsourcing. Is it acceptable to use the free work of people who could instead sell their labor for money or does it count as exploitation? Several studies have demonstrated, that the motivations of volunteers are usually combined with intrinsic and extrinsic elements, so they benefit from crowdsourcing in various non-monetary ways (Ridge *et al.* 2014).

Some heritage experts are skeptical about crowdsourcing due to the questionable quality of the results. However, there are several efficient controlling mechanisms, such as having different volunteers perform the same microtask. Another option is to engage experts at the final stage of the task so that they can check the quality of the results and request a rework if necessary. Practice shows that well-designed crowdsourcing tasks result in a high-quality outcome (Ridge *et al.* 2014).

Crowdsourcing is sometimes perceived as a job done by "an undefined generally large group of people in the form of an open call" (Howe and Robinson 2006). In practice, it is a little group of enthusiasts – so-called "supercontributors" – who do most of the work. The challenge is how to find such contributors who are interested in the topic and how to engage them. Moreover, if, for some reason, a "supercontributor" withdraws from the project, it significantly reduces the speed of the progress.

Engaging the public through the internet requires open access to the materials to make them available for the volunteers. Therefore, only those materials can be used whose online publication does not violate copyright regulations. The results of crowdsourcing projects should also be freely available online.

Democratizing heritage by increasing public participation is perceived by some heritage experts as de-professionalizing and amateurizing of the cultural heritage domain (Owens 2013; Fredheim 2018). Some heritage organizations also fear losing control over the process of working with their collections. Successful crowdsourcing projects are grounded on shared responsibility, trust, and collaboration between heritage organizations and the public.

Reference list

Ferriter, Meghan. 2016. "Inviting engagement, supporting success: how to manage a Transcription Center." *Collections* 12 (2): 97-116.

Fredheim, L. Harald. 2018. "Endangerment-driven heritage volunteering: democratisation or 'Changeless Change'." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24, no. 6: 619-633.

Howe, Jeff, and Mark Robinson. 2006. "The rise of crowdsourcing." *Wired magazine* 14 (6): 1-4.

McKinley, Donelle. 2016. Design principles for crowdsourcing cultural heritage [report]. Retrieved from <http://nonprofitcrowd.org/crowdsourcing-design-principles>

Owens, Trevor. 2013. "Digital cultural heritage and the crowd." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 56, no. 1: 121-130.

Ridge, Mia, Shelley Bernstein, Lucinda Blaser, Tim Causer, Melissa Terras, Sharon Leon, Michael Lascarides, and Ben Vershbow. 2014. *Crowdsourcing Our Cultural Heritage, Digital Research in the Arts and Humanities*: Routledge.

Surowiecki, James. 2004. *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies and Nations*. New Doubleday – Abacus.



Figure 1 Crowdsourcing project "Community of Gardens" collecting stories of gardens and the gardeners who make them grow in order to better understand the meaning and value of gardens to American life – today and in the future.

Source: <https://communityofgardens.si.edu/>

Cultural Entrepreneurship

Ruba Saleh

ICHEC Brussels Management School, Brussels, Belgium,
ruba.saleh@ichec.be

Christian Ost

Raymond Lemaire International Conservation Centre, KU Leuven
University, Leuven, Belgium, christian.ost@ichec.be

Short definition

To date, there is no agreed-upon definition of Cultural Entrepreneurship. We define it as a set of activities aimed at harnessing a cultural business opportunity. The novelty stands in being innovative in transforming cultural values into economic values. The process of creating new cultural expressions could be also interpreted as the business of capturing intangible values (performing arts, artistic creation, traditions and knowledge, etc...) into tangible outcomes in the form of cultural capital. The process of creating new adaptive reuse of heritage buildings is about the business of transforming abandoned, underused, or not in use cultural heritage into common goods which reflect the needs and aspirations of the contemporary local community with respect to the environment and social practices and interactions. By transforming the cultural asset, the cultural entrepreneur harnesses the existing cultural (tangible and intangible) and economic values and transforms them into enhanced cultural, economic, social, and environmental impacts, outcomes, and benefits. For both processes, the cultural entrepreneur makes use of new skills and technologies to transform assets into innovative cultural services, goods, uses, and organizational forms that generate financial revenues, positive societal impacts, and new creative and cultural markets.

Key discussion around the term

Cultural Entrepreneurship is studied by management, business, cultural studies, cultural economy, sociology, and anthropology scholars. Regardless of the discipline, entrepreneurship theory is the common denominator for the provided definitions. For instance, characteristics of general entrepreneurship theory such as exploration, assessment, and harnessing of an entrepreneurial opportunity; innovation both perceived as novel ideas, ways of doing, and the ability to bring innovation into the market; and the creation of an organization. Under the same theoretical framework, scholars do also investigate the virtues of the cultural entrepreneur and the motivation behind launching his/her entrepreneurial journey. In a true Schumpeterian perspective, this includes the capacity to manage resources, the organizational power, the talent of persuasion, the strength of their collaborative ways of working; the visionary vision, risk-taking and adventures traits, knowledge and sensitiveness to the artistic process, the

capability of interpreting, transforming and transmitting new goods and products without undermining their cultural and creative intrinsic value. However, a journey of a cultural entrepreneur can be very arduous. Limitations related to prolonged precariousness, access to initial capital and market, receiving a lower market income, developing and implementing a strongly sustainable business model, and enduring unknown risks, are some of the many challenges a cultural entrepreneur constantly struggles with.

The management discipline has been focused on projects, risk, resources, and management of cultural aspects. The business discipline looks more into the tools (innovative business models) that lead to value creation and delivery (enterprising). Cultural studies emphasize cultural and creative values while scholars in cultural economics focus on the embodied and yielded cultural and economic values. Finally, sociology exploits the Bourdieu framework of the forms of capital in order to understand how cultural entrepreneurship is characterized by a collaborative economy that mobilizes the social, cultural, and symbolic capital (Scott 2012). Different titles are attributed to a person launching a new activity, product, service, or organization within the cultural and creative sector. While the term cultural entrepreneur is frequently found in literature nowadays, one can also find cultural capitalist, culturepreneur, arts entrepreneur, and creative entrepreneur. A common denominator is the fact that individuals – sometimes as isolated and rejected innovators – provide a bridge between micro-ideas to macro relevance and impacts. In this meaning, cultural entrepreneurs contribute to the transition of the economy and society as a whole (Schumpeter, 1968).

Nevertheless, not all scholars agree on depicting cultural entrepreneurship as a voluntary choice but on the contrary, some refer to it as the activities carried out by self-employed freelancers and cultural and creative workers, who are forced by the precarious labor market conditions in the cultural sector to act as entrepreneurs (Ellmeier 2003).

Cultural entrepreneurship is an emerging field of study (Hausmann and Heinze 2016; Dobрева and Ivanov 2020). Recently, just like other impact entrepreneurs, cultural entrepreneurs are deploying sustainable business models which are attracting the attention of the public and private sectors alike. These innovative tools are also stimulating public policy drafting and discussions around the role of cultural entrepreneurship in not only growth and job creation but also in humanizing our lived environment. However, not everyone is an entrepreneur and not all cultural entrepreneurs are equipped with the right toolkit. For this reason, cultural entrepreneurship education is highlighted by different disciplines as key to accompany and empower the cultural entrepreneur in their entrepreneurial journey. Nevertheless, scholars put emphasis also on the environment as an enabler/disabler of cultural and creative activities.

Reference list

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1997. "The forms of capital". In: *Education: Culture, Economy, and Society*, edited by Halsey, Albert Henry, Lauder, Hugh. Brown, Phillip. Wells, Amy Stuart, 46–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caves, Richard Earl. 2000. *Creative Industries: Contacts between Arts and Commerce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1982. "Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston". *Media, Culture and Society*, 4: 33–50.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/016344378200400104>

Dobrev, Nevena and Stanislav, Ivanov. 2020. "Cultural entrepreneurship: a review of the literature". *Tourism & Management Studies*, n.2 (16): 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.18089/tms.2020.160402>

Ellmeier, Andrea. 2003. "Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. N.1 (9): 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663032000069158a>

Hausmann, Andrea, and Anne Heinze. 2016 "Entrepreneurship in the Cultural and Creative Industries: Insights from an Emergent Field." *Artivate* 5, no. 2 (2016): 7–22. doi:10.34053/artivate.5.2.0007.

Klamer, Arjo. 2011. "Cultural entrepreneurship". *The Review of Austrian Economics*. 24: 141–156. DOI 10.1007/s11138-011-0144-6

Schumpeter, Joseph, 1968. *The Theory of Economic Development*. 8th printing, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Scott, Michael. 2012. "Cultural entrepreneurs, cultural entrepreneurship: Music producers mobilising and converting Bourdieu's alternative capitals". *Poetics*, n.3 (40): 237–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2012.03.002>.

Throsby, David. 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cultural Heritage

Martina Bosone

Institute for Research on Innovation and Services for Development of
National Research Council (IRISS-CNR), Naples, Italy,
m.bosone@iriss.cnr.it

Antonia Gravagnuolo

Institute for Research on Innovation and Services for Development of
National Research Council (IRISS-CNR), Naples, Italy,
a.gravagnuolo@iriss.cnr.it

Short definition

Cultural heritage is characterized by the «value of memory» (Riegl 1903) which today has a twofold meaning: first of all, it represents the value of “what has been” and in this sense it constitutes a testimony for the present generation, from which to learn. Therefore, the recognition of this value implies that present generations must respect its tangible and intangible expressions to preserve and transmit it to future generations (Council of Europe 2009). The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013) highlighted for the first time the active role of local community groups in giving «cultural significance» (art.1.2) to cultural heritage, through the recognition of its tangible and intangible values. This interpretation process represents a starting point for the recognition of the connections between people and cultural heritage and, for this reason, of the interpretation of Cultural Heritage as “common good” (European Parliament 2015; Rojas 2018).

Key discussion around the term

The Athens Charter (1931) (Iamandi 1997) and later the Venice Charter (Icomos 1964) are the foundations in setting the international guidelines on the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites, recognizing the importance of urban or rural setting as the memory of a particular age and enlarging the attribution of a cultural significance both to great and modest works (Art. 1).

The definition of Outstanding Universal Values (OUV) (UNESCO 1972) was crucial for the identification of assets considered as “cultural heritage”, but it included only monuments, groups of buildings and sites, without intangible heritage.

In the subsequent years, the notion of cultural heritage slowly emerges also in terms of intangible heritage, recognizing its value as a founding element of societies and highlighting their responsibility in respecting and managing it (ICOMOS 1994). Following the Japanese Law for Protection of Cultural Property of 1950 (Japanese Government Agency for Cultural Affairs 1950), UNESCO highlighted the role of intangible heritage as a “vital factor for cultural identity,

the promotion of creativity and the preservation of cultural diversity" (UNESCO 2000, 3).

The increasing attention to a more holistic approach in the definition of the culture heritage (Jokilehto 2005) has determined its interpretation as a result of the human creative process (UNESCO 2001, Art. 7) and, for this reason, "of common importance for present and future generations" (UNESCO 2005, Art. 49).

On this basis, the definition of "Historic Urban Landscape (HUL)" (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2008) laid the foundations for the definition of *Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape* (UNESCO 2011b) in which cultural and natural heritage were integrated into a dynamic perspective, including also human, social and economic issues.

This approach has highlighted the consideration of cultural heritage as a "complex system" (Angrisano *et al.* 2016) characterized by a "complex social value" (Fusco Girard 1987; Fusco Girard and Nijkamp 1997) which includes also its "intrinsic value" (Fusco Girard and Nijkamp 1997). The latter represents the "glue value" (Turner 1993; de Groot *et al.* 2012; Ehrlich and Roughgarden 1987), the "essential meaning" (Riegl 1903) of heritage assets, determining a dynamic interaction both between people and a site and among people of the same community. These "circular bonds" (Fusco Girard 2020) shaping the space through an evolutionary process (Fusco Girard and Nocca 2019), highlighting the role of people in producing and recognizing it over time as a permanence to be preserved in the continuous dynamics of the city/territory (Fusco Girard and Vecco 2019; Fusco Girard and Vecco 2021).

Thus emerges the necessity to develop innovative civic engagement tools, knowledge and planning tools, financial tools, and regulatory systems (UNESCO 2011a, Art. 24).

Starting from this approach, the "cultural significance" of places was interpreted as the range of all tangible and intangible values derived from interactions between human activity and physical environment, complemented with the wide range of values and understandings attributed to them (Smith 2006, 1).

Today it is well established that *«tangible and intangible heritage are integral parts of a city's identity, creating a sense of belonging and cohesion. [...] This vision has received new energy with the explicit recognition of the role of culture as an enabler of sustainable development, and as one of the key conditions to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 11 to "[m]ake cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable" (UNESCO 2016, 6).*

Reference list

Angrisano, M., P.F. Biancamano, M. Bosone, P. Carone, G. Daldanise, F. De Rosa, A. Franciosa, et al. 2016. "Towards Operationalizing UNESCO Recommendations on "Historic Urban Landscape": A Position Paper." *Aestimum* 69.
<https://doi.org/10.13128/Aestimum-20454>.

Australia ICOMOS. 2013. "The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013." *The Burra Charter*.

Council of Europe. 2009. *Heritage and Beyond. Nature*. Vol. 477. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1038/477510a>.

Ehrlich, P., and J. Roughgarden. 1987. "The Science of Ecology." In *The Science of Ecology*.

European Parliament. 2015. "REPORT towards an Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage for Europe." *Representation*. Vol. 12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344897208656356>.

Fusco Girard L.; Nijkamp P. 1997. *Le Valutazioni per Lo Sviluppo Sostenibile Della Città e Del Territorio*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Fusco Girard, L.; and M. Vecco. 2021. "The 'Intrinsic Value' of Cultural Heritage as Driver for Circular Human-Centered Adaptive Reuse." *Sustainability (Switzerland)* 13 (6): 3231.

Fusco Girard, Luigi. 1987. *Risorse Architettoniche e Culturali: Valutazioni e Strategie Di Conservazione*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Fusco Girard, Luigi. 2020. "The Circular Economy in Transforming a Died Heritage Site into a Living Ecosystem, to Be Managed as a Complex Adaptive Organism." *Aestimum*. <https://doi.org/10.13128/aestim-9428>.

Fusco Girard, Luigi, and Francesca Nocca. 2019. "La Rigenerazione Del 'Sistema Matera' Nella Prospettiva Dell'economia Circolare." In *Matera, Città Del Sistema Ecologico Uomo/Società/Natura Il Ruolo Della Cultura per La Rigenerazione Del Sistema Urbano/Territoriale*, edited by Luigi Fusco Girard, Claudia Trillo, and Martina Bosone, 69–100. Naples: Giannini Publisher.

Fusco Girard, Luigi, and Marilena Vecco. 2019. "Genius Loci: The Evaluation of Places between Instrumental and Intrinsic Values." *BDC. Bollettino Del Centro Calza Bini*.

de Groot, Rudolf, Luke Brander, Sander van der Ploeg, Robert Costanza, Florence Bernard, Leon Braat, Mike Christie, et al. 2012. "Global Estimates of the Value of Ecosystems and Their Services in Monetary Units." *Ecosystem Services*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.07.005>.

Iamandi, Cristina. 1997. "The Charters of Athens of 1931 and 1933: Coincidence, Controversy and Convergence." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 2 (1): 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1179/135050397793138934>.

Icomos. 1964. "International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964)." *IInd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments*.

ICOMOS. 1994. "The Nara Document on Authenticity." *The Nara Document on Authenticity (1994)*. Japanese Government Agency for Cultural Affairs. 1950. "Law for the Protection of Cultural Property," no. 214: 1–120.

Jokilehto, J. 2005. "Definition of Cultural Heritage: References to Documents in History." *ICCROM Working Group "Heritage and Society,"* no. January: 4–8.

Riegl, Alois. 1903. "Entwurf Einer Gesetzlichen Organisation Der Denkmalpflege in Österreich, Wien: Bundesdenkmalamt Österreich (Progetto Di Una Organizzazione Legislativa Della Conservazione in Austria—Il Culto Moderno Dei Monumenti)." In *Alois Riegl: Teoria e Prassi Della Conservazione Die Monumenti*, edited by S. Scarrocchia, 216–26. Bologna: Clueb.

Rojas, Eduardo. 2018. "The Sustainable Conservation of Urban Heritage." In *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315728018-13>.

Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage. Uses of Heritage*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203602263>.

Turner, R. Kerry. 1993. *Sustainable Environmental Economics and Management: Principles and Practice*. Belhaven Pr.

UNESCO. 1972. *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13055&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

UNESCO. 2000. "Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity: Implementation Guide." <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/?pg=00103>.

UNESCO. 2001. *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/5_Cultural_Diversity_EN.pdf.

UNESCO. 2005. "Vienna Memorandum." *Memorandum de Viena. Document WHC-05/29.COM/5*.

UNESCO. 2011a. "Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, Including a Glossary of Definitions." UNESCO, Resources, Conventions, Recommendations. 2011.

UNESCO. 2011b. "Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape." Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

UNESCO. 2016. "Culture Urban Future: Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development." Paris.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. 2008. "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention." *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, no. July.

Disadvantage: Social and economic

Elena De Nictolis

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; edenictolis@luiss.it

Christian Iaione

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; ciaione@luiss.it

Maria Cristina Pangallozzi

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; mpangallozzi@luiss.it

Alessandro Piperno

Luiss University, Rome, Italy; a.piperno@luiss.it

Short definition

The term social and economic disadvantages could imply different sets of meanings. It could refer to the effect of a particular action, such as the disadvantages of decentralization, or the economic and social status of an individual. In the latter case, the social and economic disadvantages are characteristics that influence the ability of the individual to develop determined behaviors. The most important disadvantages are poverty, limited cognitive abilities, lack of social capital. In some cases, individual characteristics which do not necessarily imply a limitation might hamper individual development due to their perception by the environment. Some groups of individuals might experience disadvantages because groups have a predefined perception of these individual characteristics (De Jong 2001) or because of their social and relational context (Boyle 2002). Discrimination is an example, of a social context that transforms neutral individual characteristics such as religion, gender, and skin color, into a disadvantage. Concerning adaptive heritage reuse, these activities might affect the built environment and the socio-cultural life of the inhabitants related to the buildings (Haidar and Talib, 2013), as an example, influencing the individual well-being (Rosenbaum and Mark, 2019).

Key discussion around the term

The discussion on disadvantages has started from a psychological perspective. The role of economic and social disadvantages on the individual development of people has been studied. In particular, the studies have focused on how the disadvantages compromise the ability of people and their well-being (VC McLoyd 1998). Economic and social characteristics could lead to social exclusion and limit the individual participation in key activities of the society in which he or she lives (Conklin 2015). If for psychologists the attention of disadvantages focusses on individuals, the main discussion in social sciences, and not only, concern how economic and social advantages could be best assessed (Lin 2016). Hence, people with socio-economic disadvantages, as groups, are one of the primary

targets for public interventions (Fors 2019). Social welfare policy and practices try to understand how to resolve social issues by limiting the perception of disadvantages or trying to remove some of them. Hence, the main goal of public entities is to impact these disadvantages to give all people the same possibilities and opportunities. New possibilities for different actors to be actively involved in improving the social and economic conditions are emerging. As an example, social and community enterprises are becoming central actors in supporting individuals, groups, and territories to solve economic and social issues and supporting their empowerment (Teasdale 2010). However, the assessment of economic and social conditions is difficult as individuals experience simultaneous disadvantages, which could be also from very different life domains. The combinations of disadvantages could create a vicious circle which not only compromises the quality of life but also make it difficult for the individual to manage the challenges of everyday life (Scutella 2009). Hence, the discussion is focusing on understanding how a multidimensional approach can support a more realistic approach to the solution of economic and social disadvantage. An integrated approach to disadvantage would contribute to a more realistic estimate of the overall inequalities and how these could be targeted.

Reference list

- Boyle, Micheal H., and Ellen L. Lipman. 2002. "Do places matter? Socioeconomic disadvantage and behavioral problems of children in Canada." *In Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 70(2): 378.
- Conklin, Annalijn I., et al. 2015. "Gender and the double burden of economic and social disadvantages on healthy eating: cross-sectional study of older adults in the EPIC-Norfolk cohort." *BMC Public Health*. 15(1): 692.
- De Jong, Gordon F., and Anna B. Madamba. 2001. "A double disadvantage? Minority group, immigrant status, and underemployment in the United States." *In Social Science Quarterly*. 82(1): 117-130.
- Fors, Stefan, Ylva B. Almquist, and Lars Brännström. 2019. "Coexisting Social, Economic, and Health-Related Disadvantages in More than 2.4 Million Swedes: Combining Variable-Centred and Person-Centred Approaches." *In Social Indicators Research*. 143(1): 115-132.
- Haidar, Laila Ahmed, and Anuar Talib. 2013. "Adaptive reuse in the traditional neighbourhood of the Old City Sana'a-Yemen." *In Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 105: 811-822.
- Kirby, James B., and Toshiko Kaneda. 2005. "Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and access to health care." *In Journal of health and social behavior*. 46(1): 15-31.
- Li, Hongbo, and Yali Liu. 2016. "Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and urban public green spaces availability: A localized modeling approach to inform land use policy." *In Land Use Policy*. 57: 470-478.

McLoyd, Vonnie C. 1998. "Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development." In *American psychologist*. 53(2): 185.

Rosenbaum, Mark S., et al. 2019. "Improving well-being via adaptive reuse: transformative repurposed service organizations." In *The Service Industries Journal*, 1-25.

Scutella, Rosanna, Roger Wilkins, and Michael Horn. 2009. *Measuring poverty and social exclusion in Australia: A proposed multidimensional framework for identifying socio-economic disadvantage*. No. wp2009n04. Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, The University of Melbourne.

Teasdale, Simon. 2010. "How can social enterprise address disadvantage? Evidence from an inner city community." In *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*. 22(2): 89-107.

Heritage Community

Karim van Knippenberg

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; karim.vanknippenberg@ugent.be

Hanne Van Gils

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; hanne.vangils@ugent.be

Short definition

In contemporary literature, heritage community is one of the more difficult words to take issue with as it is often difficult to label people as part of a group (Crooke 2010). Back (1996, 238) has argued that “communities do not exist sui generis, they are created and imagined on a, more or less, daily basis”. In social psychological terms, communities are ‘lived’ through the negotiation of social representations and, as a consequence, through the co-construction of community identities. A heritage community is therefore best to be understood as a social creation that is continuously in motion, rather than a fixed entity (Waterton and Smith 2010). A heritage community can thus best be defined very broadly as those who signify material and immaterial heritage.

Key discussion around the term

Waterton and Smith (2010) note that community is one of the handful of words within the wider social sciences that are continually used, abused, and reused so that it is difficult to take issue with. Originally the term was used to describe a collection of people. But since scholars, and most notably Anderson (1983) started to move away from this dominant, nostalgic idea of a community and started to criticize the straightforward and unambiguous use of this term it became clear how difficult it is to identify a community as it is often difficult to label people as part of a group (Crooke 2010). Waterton and Smith (2010) define communities as social creations and experiences that are continuously in motion, rather than fixed entities and descriptions, in flux and constant motion, unstable and uncertain. Scholars now note that community is highly contested (e.g. Howarth 2001) and that communities are not very community-like (Brint 2001). Indeed, as Crooke (2010, 16) mentions “community is a multi-layered and politically charged concept that, with a change in context, alters in meaning and consequence”. Crooke (2008) underlines this as she states that a community can be whatever is needed or desired at the time and, even when formed, will adapt to the situation. Howarth (2001, 233) adds to this that communities are not simply groups to belong to. They may be imposed onto one; they may threaten one’s self-esteem; they may be a source of empowerment.

This is also particularly relevant for the field of heritage. Here too, community can be defined in various ways. A heritage community can be defined as those groups of, for example, citizens or individuals, who value and define material and

immaterial heritage in a specific spatial context. A heritage community can at the same time be defined as those being subject to heritage management and preservation. Waterton and Smith (2010, 11) explain this as follow: "community or group identity becomes the object of regulation through the heritage management process, not only reinforcing the power differentials in community-expert relations but also ensuring the legitimacy of essentialist notions of 'community' and their continual misrecognition". A heritage community is thus also highly formalized and institutionalized in a context of government officials and consultants, academic researchers, legal experts, and, perhaps more recently, commercial actors who created specific thinking, speaking, and acting about heritage conceptualization and accordingly heritage management practices. These actors not only define heritage but in a way also impose a conceptualization of heritage on other groups or communities. Within the domain of heritage, including communities' understandings of heritage, has become an integral part of heritage management. This counts for both material and immaterial heritage as Watson and Waterton (2010, 2) state that "community engagement with heritage is more overtly linked with cultural distinctiveness, identity, and nationalism, or exists as an articulation of ancestral links with important places, traditions and narratives". Hence, many scholars in the field of heritage are studying issues of community involvement (e.g. Mydland and Grahn 2012, Parkinson *et al.* 2016). These scholars note that communities' understanding of heritage can emphasize a broader range of meanings, including also immaterial aspects and that heritage becomes a cultural tool that communities and individuals use to express, facilitate, and construct a sense of identity, self, and belonging. In fact, this means that there are as many understandings of heritage as there are communities or individuals who express this understanding of heritage. There is also literature to be found about the link between immaterial and material heritage and communities. Murzyn-Kupisz and Działek (2013) for example investigate the importance of heritage (being it material or immaterial) in creating and enhancing social capital, as they call it. Social capital is defined as a concept to define the socio-economic development of particular groups, communities, or neighbourhoods. A heritage community can thus best be defined as those who signify material and immaterial heritage.

Reference list

- Anderson, Benedict. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Back, Les. (1996). *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture: racisms and multiculturalism in young lives*. (Vol. 2). London: UCL Press Limited.
- Brint, Steven. (2001). *Gemeinschaft Revisited: A Critique and Reconstruction of the Community Concept*. *Sociological Theory*, 19(1), 1-23.
- Crooke, Elizabeth (2010). *The politics of community heritage: motivations, authority and control*. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1-2), 16-29.

Howarth, Caroline. (2001). Towards a social psychology of community: A social representations perspective. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 31(2), 223-238.

Murzyn-Kupisz, Monika & Jarosław Działek. (2013). Cultural heritage in building and enhancing social capital. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 3(1), 35-54.

Mydland, Leidulf & Wera Grahn (2012). Identifying heritage values in local communities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18(6), 564-587.

Parkinson, Arthur, Mark Scott & Declan Redmond. (2016). Competing discourses of built heritage: lay values in Irish conservation planning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22(3), 261-273.

Watson, Steve & Emma Waterton. (2010). Heritage and community engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1-2), 1-3.

Waterton, Emma & Laurajane Smith. (2010). The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1-2), 4-15.

Immaterial Heritage

Karim van Knippenberg

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; karim.vanknippenberg@ugent.be

Hanne Van Gils

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; hanne.vangils@ugent.be

Short definition

In addition to the definition of material cultural heritage, and in response to the criticism on the materiality of heritage, scholars started to put attention to the immaterial values related to heritage. The term immaterial heritage (or intangible heritage, a term which is used more frequently in academic literature) was originally coined in order to problematize the focus of official heritage management on material things. In other words, there is a distinction between the material aspects of heritage and the immaterial and social aspects of heritage. Although material and immaterial aspects of heritage are related and linked, they represent different things. Immaterial and social aspects can best be defined as practices – such as traditions, festivals, language, and expressions – which are signifiers of a culture and manifestations of social memory.

Key discussion around the term

The concept of cultural heritage has been broadened over the years since objects that were not part of the traditional, chronological and geographical concept of heritage have been given the statute of heritage, and since a more integral approach towards heritage has been adopted more and more (Vecco 2010). Parallel to this extension process, the selection criteria of cultural heritage have also changed: while initially the historic and artistic values were the only parameters, other additional ones have now been added: the cultural value, its value of identity, and the capacity of the object to interact with memory (Vecco 2010, 324).

This development has also made it possible to recognize intangible cultural heritage, which was ignored for a long time (Gruzinski 1993). This acknowledgment of the importance of immateriality can be interpreted as a step in the direction of overcoming a Eurocentric perspective of heritage. Indeed, it must for example be remembered that material cultural heritage is of limited importance in many cultures. The Voodoo temples in Western Africa are for instance rebuilt regularly; these temples, of recent origins, are built with simple materials and regularly moved in the city; they do not have the forms that make them the object of aesthetic valorization (Vecco 2010).

Moreover, the concept of immaterial heritage extends the conceptualization of material heritage as new parameters to define heritage are added. Indeed, non-material aspects of culture – such as language, literature, and cultural practices, that are important aspects for local communities' identity are now more highlighted (Harrison and Rose 2013). Immaterial heritage is thus recognized within communities, groups, or individuals that create, maintain, and transmit it. Immaterial heritage is about practices, but it is also closely related to the production of both collective and individual memory and performs social work which helps to build community and identity (Harrison 2010). Logan (2007) defines intangible heritage as "heritage that is embodied in people rather than in inanimate objects". Thus, the concept of immaterial heritage allows us to understand aspects of heritage related to memory or identity, which would not have been captured by a material- or object-oriented heritage approach alone.

But at the same time, the distinction made between material and immaterial aspects of heritage is counterproductive with regard to capturing the hybridity of heritage. Indeed, such a clear separation between the material and immaterial could be seen to strengthen the materiality of heritage. In other words, it does not allow for a blurring of the two distinct groupings (Cleere 2003). Indeed, although material and immaterial aspects can be two distinct aspects for some communities or individuals, the two distinct aspects can also add up, or interact. Fairclough et al. (2008) for example mention an example of representations of heritage objects in books and movies, which form an additional layer of value for people, who for example visit a particular heritage object they know from a movie. Fairclough et al. (2008) therefore argue that there is a rather complex relation between immaterial aspects of heritage, material aspects, and memory in general. In other words, the meaning and value of heritage are produced in the interaction of humans and material heritage objects.

Nevertheless, the division between material and immaterial aspects of heritage is often recognized within national heritage policies, although mostly referred to differently (i.e. movable or cultural, and immovable or built heritage). Although social and immaterial aspects of heritage are mentioned in heritage policy, this doesn't mean that conservation is also equally dealing with immaterial aspects of heritage. Yet, international conventions, such as the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage have had some impact. They recognize immaterial heritage as "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 recognize as part of their cultural heritage". Based on this convention, countries updated their national policies and their regulations by including intangible heritage, albeit often separate from tangible heritage, and not necessarily also protecting it.

Taking immaterial and social aspects of heritage into account fits within the goal of Open Heritage to not only focus on listed heritage assets but also to incorporate those places that have a symbolic or practical significance for local heritage communities. By doing so the notion of immaterial and social aspects of heritage helps us to connect to local actors whose understanding of heritage can

be recognized, in particular by incorporating practices of manifestations of social memory.

Reference list

Cleere, Henry. (2002). The uneasy bedfellows: universality and cultural heritage. In R. Layton, P. Stone & J. Thomas (Eds.), *Desctruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Graham., Harrison, Rodney., Jameson, John., & Schofield, John. (2008). *The heritage reader*. London: Routledge.

Gruzinski, Serge. (1993). *Protection of the intangible cultural heritage: Survey and new prospects*.

Harrison, Rodney. (2010). What is heritage? In R. Harrison (Ed.), *Understanding the politics of heritage* (pp. 5-42). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Harrison, Rodney. (2013). Intangible heritage and cultural landscapes. In R. Harrison (Ed.), *Heritage : critical approaches* (pp. 114-140). Milton Park, Abingdon; New York: Routledge.

Logan, William. (2007). Closing Pandora's Box: Human Rights Conundrums in Cultural Heritage Protection. In H. Silverman & D. F. Ruggles (Eds.), *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights* (pp. 33-52). New York: Springer New York.

Vecco, Marilena. (2010). A definition of cultural heritage: From the tangible to the intangible. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 11(3), 321-324.

Inclusiveness

Shan-Ti Tsai

Georg-Simmel Center for Metropolitan Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Markus Kip

Georg-Simmel Center for Metropolitan Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany; markus.kip@gsz.hu-berlin.de

Short definition

Inclusiveness is an outcome that results from methods a process of social inclusion that relates not only to participation in decision-making but also, inclusion in every phase, from problem-definition, conception, design to management. Social inclusion seeks to recognize diversity and to overcome institutionalized, structural, or personal impediments to the participation of people because of their self-identity or ascribed identity (such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, abilities, class, and so on). Inclusiveness thus specifically addresses individuals or groups who were previously not included or who were excluded to participate in and influence decision-making in processes and actions (Bicchi 2006; Reynal-Querol 2005; Ibarra 1993). To be included, all members must be able to share and have equitable access and not compete for power and resources (Smith et al. 2012). Inclusiveness is used as a term across disciplines including education, sociology, psychology, politics, and economics. Important debates revolve around how institutionalized, structural, and personal impediments are conceived, how they are to be overcome, and thus what the criteria for an inclusive process are.

Key discussion around the term

Inclusiveness is closely related to social inclusion which is an affirmative action to change social structures, institutional circumstances, and habits that lead to or have led to social exclusion. The focus on social inclusion stems partly from the worldwide attention to growing income and wealth inequality, and its social and political consequences (Bordia Das 2016). The core concept of social inclusion is often developed based on Amartya Sen's capabilities approach (Sen 2000), which highlights the need for inclusive policies, and argues that every person must be provided with the capabilities to lead the life they have reason to live. The capability approach is a moral framework and proposes that social arrangements should be evaluated primarily given the freedom it allows for people to promote or achieve self-development.

In terms of conceptual clarification, the debates around inclusiveness border with other concepts such as social integration (Khan et al. 2015), both ostensibly aiming to make societies more cohesive. Following the UN Expert Group Meeting

on Promoting Social Integration in 2008, social integration has been defined as “the process of promoting the values, relations, and institutions that enable all people to participate in social, economic and political life based on equality of rights, equity and dignity” to make a “society for all” in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play (Ferguson 2008). Against such focus on values and institution-buildings, the concept of social integration has been criticized for turning a blind eye on its implied (cultural and socio-economic) presuppositions, thus becoming compatible with politics of cultural homogenization (Khan et al. 2015). By contrast, social inclusion tends to bring the focus more on the process of improving the terms of participation in society for people who are disadvantaged based on age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or another status, through enhanced opportunities, access to resources, voice and respect for rights.

Tools and methods for inclusion have been advocated particularly by international organizations such as the UN and the World Bank to reduce the international issue of unequal economic and social resources. UN studies have also provided a framework of indicators for analyzing and measuring social inclusion (Atkinson and Marlier 2010). According to the World Bank (2013), social inclusion is the process in which the social and economic opportunities of disadvantaged people are improved and their ability to take part in society and their dignity are affirmed. Studies and projects thus mainly focus on how to achieve social inclusion in various fields. Most of the related studies emphasize that reaching social inclusion requires a broader and deeper knowledge of exclusion and its impacts. Such perspective, however, has been criticized from various perspectives, including postcolonial, feminist, and Marxist approaches that conceive of institutionalized, structural, and personal impediments on the basis of structural conflicts, and thus propose different, more politicized solutions than the World Bank (Bergeron 2003). As Kaasila-Pakanen (2015) argues, proposed organizational fixes are often insufficient to address the complex processes in which identities and otherness continue to be constructed in inclusion and diversity programs thus ultimately reproducing inequalities.

Reference list

Atkinson, A.B. and E. Marlier. 2010. *Analysing and Measuring Social Inclusion in a Global Context*. United Nations publication, New York.

Bergeron, S. 2003. “Challenging the World Bank’s narrative of inclusion.” In: *World Bank Literature*, edited by Amitava Kumar, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp.157-171.

Bicchi, F. 2006. ‘Our size fits all’: Normative power Europe and the Mediterranean. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(2), 286–303.

Bordia Das, M. 2016. “Social Inclusion in macro-level diagnostics: reflecting on the World Bank Group's early systematic country diagnostics. “*World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (7713). Access online: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2811361

Ferguson, C., 2008. Promoting social integration. *Report commissioned by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) for the Expert Group Meeting on Promoting Social Integration, Helsinki, Finland, July 8-10, 2008*. Access online: <http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/se6.pdf>

Ibarra, H. 1993. Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 56–87.

Kaasila-Pakanen, A.L., 2015. "A postcolonial deconstruction of diversity management and multiculturalism." In: *The Oxford handbook of diversity in organizations*, edited by R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Henttonen, and A.J. Mills, pp.175-194.

Khan, S., Combaz, E. & McAslan Fraser, E. 2015. *Social exclusion: topic guide*. Revised edition. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Reynal-Querol, M. 2005. "Does democracy preempt civil wars?" *European Journal of Political Economy*, 21(2), 445–465.

Sen, A. 2000. "Social Exclusion: Concept, Application, and Scrutiny" Social Development Papers no. 1; Asian Development Bank. Access online: <https://www.think-asia.org/bitstream/handle/11540/2339/social-exclusion.pdf?sequence=1>

Smith, A. N., Morgan, W. B., King, E. B., Hebl, M. R., & Peddie, C. I. 2012. "The ins and outs of diversity management: The effect of authenticity on outsider perceptions and insider behaviors." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(S1), E21–E55.

World Bank. 2013. *Inclusion Matters: the Foundation for shared prosperity*. World Bank Publications. New York.

Jobs and Business Opportunities

Joep de Roo

Eurodite, The Netherlands; deroo@eurodite.eu

Alina Tomescu

Eurodite, The Netherlands; tomescu@eurodite.eu

Short Definition

Adaptive heritage reuse projects contribute to creating jobs and business opportunities, by introducing new uses which combine commercial and societal activities. By fostering, directly or indirectly, new job opportunities, adaptive reuse projects can catalyze wider social and economic improvements since they potentially cover a wide range of job typologies: from those related to readapt, repair and maintain heritage sites, to those related to culture, social services or tourism.

Community-led adaptive reuse projects face the challenge to improve the social and economic situation of marginalized communities, by developing their skills to help their integration into the labor market.

Key discussion around the term

As the Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe report (CHCfE Consortium, 2015, 21) shows, cultural heritage is a significant creator of jobs across Europe, covering a wide range of types of job and skill levels: from conservation-related construction, repair and maintenance through cultural tourism, to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and start-ups, often in the creative industries. Adaptive heritage reuse shows the same potential, [as research by Historic England](#) and the [National Lottery Heritage Fund](#) highlights. In particular, this research shows how heritage-led regeneration, including the commercial and non-commercial adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, creates and sustains jobs by covering a wide range of types of jobs and skills. However, heritage-led regeneration risks feeding into processes of gentrification, commodification, and touristification. Another point of debate is the quality of the jobs created or the business opportunities that are opened up. What incomes and income security do they provide for the individuals? What do the working conditions look like? What kind of social significance and individual benefits come along with the products and services provided? Is the competition for these jobs and business opportunities mediated by a broader sense of collaboration within the community? This aspect highlights that the use of heritage to foster job and business opportunities could not be considered just in terms of its 'positive' impacts, as various publications show (e.g. Pendlebury et al., 2019; Scott et al., 2018; Veldpaus and Pendlebury, 2019). So, whilst adaptive reuse can create jobs and promote the development of SMEs, it is important to understand who benefits from these opportunities and if the projects hold together urban effects

(improvement of the built environment) and economic effects (increase in property value) with those social-related.

Reference list

CHCfE Consortium (2015) Cultural heritage counts for Europe: full report. eds. Giraud-Labalte, Claire, Pugh, Katrina B., Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, Sneška, et al. Krakow: International Culture Centre.

Pendlebury, John, Scott, Mark, Veldpaus, Loes, van der Toorn Vrijthoff, Wout, and Redmond, Declan (2019) 'After the Crash: the conservation-planning assemblage in an era of austerity'. *European Planning Studies*, : 1–19.

Veldpaus, Loes, and Pendlebury, John (2019) 'Heritage as a Vehicle for Development: The Case of Bigg Market, Newcastle upon Tyne'. *Planning Practice & Research*, 0(0): 1–15.

Historic England. 2020. "HERITAGE AND THE ECONOMY 2020".
<https://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/heritage-and-economy/>.

Open Heritage

Katarzyna Sadowy

PragaLAB, OW SARP, Warsaw, Poland; katarzyna.sadowy@ohpraga.pl

Hanna Szemző

Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary, szemzo@mri.hu

Dominika P. Brodowicz

PragaLAB, OW SARP, Warsaw, Poland; dominika.brodowicz@ohpraga.pl

Maciej Czeredys

PragaLAB, OW SARP, Warsaw, Poland; maciej.czeredys@ohpraga.pl

Short definition

The term OpenHeritage is the result of the slow transformation of the project's acronym into something more meaningful in the process of project-related research and activities. The term describes an open concept of what constitutes heritage, an equally open approach about who is entitled to define what heritage is and who can be trusted to safeguard it. By putting openness into its center the concept emphasizes the multitude of opportunities in evoking and reinterpreting the relation between heritage and community. It describes heritage not as an asset defined by specialists only, but as a collection of buildings, complexes, spaces, ideas and practices that have a symbolic or practical importance for local or trans-local heritage communities.

Key discussion around the term

The term "OpenHeritage" was created in the OpenHeritage project. However, its meaning is deeply tied to the processes and debates in the field of heritage studies. As such it relies on the concept by Harrison (2013) where heritage items are understood as complex assemblages. An assemblage is a set of interconnected elements organized around the heritage object; it consists, besides the object itself, of places, persons, things, ideas and practices, which are essential for defining and maintaining the significance of the heritage item. They are seen as an embodiment of identity (or parts of an identity) of socio-cultural categories. Thus, take away from any heritage object its natural or architectural environment, the physical arrangements of accessing it, the different groups of personnel managing and running the given site, the various captions or labels meant to name objects and explain broader contexts, or the knowledge needed to produce these explanations, and you get something different. Therefore, the mere *conservation* of the object itself is not enough for keeping it for the future *as a heritage item*; its significance will be lost unless sufficient provisions are made for the sustainability of the whole assemblage.

The role of local communities and their relation to the heritage item, their activity in maintaining and looking after it is thus a crucial element of the heritage itself. Taking this as a starting point, and acknowledging the complexities intertwined with this realization, opening up heritage seeks to empower communities in the process of adaptive reuse. From a governance perspective, OpenHeritage means a model, which calls for cooperation and coalitions, the integration of resources and the exploration of innovative financial models. Although applicable everywhere, it is particularly designed for underused and abandoned sites in marginalized areas, as it offers there a new process of engagement. This process of transforming abandoned cultural heritage sites becomes an opportunity for increased community cohesion and social integration, the appearance of innovative bottom-up economic activities and the creation of employment possibilities.

The term OpenHeritage exists outside of the project as well, with less specific contexts. There are some previous mentions of it, mostly related to the discussions around open-source ideas, connected to digital heritage, or digitizing a monument.

Reference list

Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.

Participation

Volodymyr Kulikov

Central European University, Budapest, Hungary - Vienna, Austria;
KulikovV@ceu.edu

Dóra Mérai

Central European University, Budapest, Hungary - Vienna, Austria;
Meraid@ceu.edu

Short Definition

Participation is the act of taking part (becoming involved) in an activity or event and of shaping its course. In the heritage domain, participation is understood as an active involvement of stakeholders within a range of heritage processes and projects.

Key discussion around the term

In politics, the term refers to mechanisms for the public to express opinions and influence decisions. In business and finance, it means the ownership of a part of the assets (equity participation), partaking in decision-making processes, or profit-sharing. In media, participation refers to the model when an audience can play an active role in the process of collecting, processing, and disseminating content. In the heritage domain, participation is defined as the active involvement of stakeholders within a range of heritage processes and projects (Neal 2015). It can also be an instrument to shape and direct individual behavior by governmental policy and professional organizations: for example, to promote certain sectors within or outside the heritage realm (Neal 2015, 346). Terms like "involvement," "engagement", "collaboration", and "empowerment" are often used in the literature to indicate different forms of participation (Rowe and Frewer 2005).

Participation by the public may happen in various organizational forms. It can be initiated by formal institutions such as local governments or professional heritage organizations. Alternatively, it can be a bottom-up initiative when citizens decide to take independent actions outside the formal channels established by the formal agents (Head 2007, 444). The impact of participation on decision-making also varies. Sherry Arnstein developed the model of the "ladder of citizen participation," illustrating how the empowerment of the public can happen at various levels (Arnstein 1969, 217). Three levels and eight rungs constitute the ladder. The first level, "disempowerment," is non-participation. The second level includes three kinds of tokenism. The only power the public is given here is the right to be heard. The upper level presents three degrees of citizens' power. At this level, heritage professionals and local governments expand their roles from

regulators to facilitators. The highest rung of the ladder is “citizen control” wherein the public gains full decision-making.

In the following decades, scholars and public government bodies developed alternative typologies which modify the one suggested by Arnstein in some respect. For example, the Council of Europe in 2009 identified four levels of engaging civil society: information, consultation, dialogue, and partnership. (Council of Europe, 2009). The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) developed another popular typology of public participation. Their “Spectrum of Public Participation” defines five forms of public participation ranging from the weakest to the strongest in terms of impact on decision-making: 1) Informing provides the public with the information; 2) Consulting is used to obtain the public’s feedback; 3) Involvement assumes working directly with the public through a dialog; 4) Collaborating is the type of participation where the public is a partner in each aspect of the decision-making process; 5) Empowerment means that the final decision making is handed over to the public (IAP2, 2).

All these models are based on a traditional ontology of vertical (top-down or bottom-up) planning. Boonstra and Boelens (2011) suggest going beyond Arnstein’s hierarchical participation model and embrace a “horizontal” approach. According to the latter, there isn’t necessarily a qualitative difference between various kinds of involvement, but their efficiency and applicability depend on the specific context. While in some cases, it is the dialog or even citizen control that is the most fruitful approach, there are situations where providing information in a transparent manner is the best way to involve a community.

Nina Simon too argues in her book on the participatory museum (2010) that all types of participation are important and museum curators should not focus exclusively on “creators” (who produce content), but also on “critics” (who submit reviews, rate, comment), “collectors” (who aggregate content for personal or social consumption), and “joiners.”

By embracing participation, the actors learn from each other, build trust, make better decisions, and establish legitimacy. However, participation also entails some typical challenges. In the museum sector, critics mention the risk of “undermining knowledge, dumbing down, perpetuating banality and mediocrity, and false democratization” (Salaman, Cunningham, and Richards).

The so-called representation problem refers to the situation when citizen participation involves only a small proportion of the population (community), so the decision is skewed to the perspective of a certain group of interest. Moreover, under certain conditions, participation can be costly, time-consuming, and ineffective. Besides, participatory governance can also be critiqued, especially due to the (often non-conscious) processes of in- and exclusion. Participation is easily made pointless if the decision is ignored and it can even cause conflicts between “professionals” and “the public” (Irvin and Stansbury 2004, 58).

The above-mentioned side effects of participation can be eliminated by targeting low-cost and high-benefit indicators, for example, by making those projects attractive for volunteers which benefit as large segment of the community as possible or by engaging those representatives of the community who have a particularly strong influence (Irvin and Stansbury 2004, 62; Simon 2016). These are ways to create some kind of “creative scaffolding” for participation where the role of heritage expert is facilitation.

Reference list

Arnstein, Sherry R. “A ladder of citizen participation.” *Journal of the American Institute of planners* 35, no. 4 (1969): 216-224.

Boonstra, Beitske, and Luuk Boelens. “Self-organization in urban development: towards a new perspective on spatial planning.” *Urban Research & Practice* 4, no. 2 (2011): 99-122.

Head, Brian W. “Community engagement: participation on whose terms?.” *Australian Journal of Political Science* 42, no. 3 (2007): 441-454.

Council of Europe (2019). Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process Revised. Adopted by the Conference of INGOs on 30 October 2019 <https://rm.coe.int/code-of-good-practice-civil-participation-revised-301019-en/168098b0e2>. Accessed March 22, 2021.

IAP2 (Institute for Public Participation). n.d. “Public Participation Pillars” https://cdn.ymaws.com/sites/iap2.site-ym.com/resource/resmgr/files/IAP2_Federation_-_P2_Pillars.pdf. Accessed March 22, 2021.

Irvin, Renee A., and John Stansbury. “Citizen participation in decision making: is it worth the effort?.” *Public administration review* 64, no. 1 (2004): 55-65.

Neal, Cath. “Heritage and participation.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, pp. 346-365. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2015.

Rowe, Gene, and Lynn J. Frewer. “A typology of public engagement mechanisms.” *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 30, no. 2 (2005): 251-290.

Salaman, Anna, Cunningham, Andrea, and Polly Richards. n.d. “Participation on Trial – Is it always a good thing?” <https://museum-id.com/participation-trial-anna-salaman-andrea-cunningham-polly-richards>. Accessed March 22, 2021.

Simon, Nina. *The Participatory Museum*. Santa Cruz, California: Museum 2.0, 2010.

Simon, Nina. *The Art of Relevance*. Santa Cruz, California: Museum 2.0, 2016.

Public-Private-People Partnerships

Karim van Knippenberg

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; karim.vanknippenberg@ugent.be

Beitske Boonstra

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; Beitske.Boonstra@UGent.be

Hanne Van Gils

Ghent University, Gent, Belgium; hanne.vangils@ugent.be

Short definition

People-Public-private-partnerships (4P's) aim towards more people-oriented and inclusive citizen-driven innovations for complex and wicked urban challenges and emphasize the role of people as a substantial partner within formal and informal partnerships for urban and spatial (re)development (UNECE, 2018). People, in this case, concerns communities, interest groups, NGOs, neighborhood associations, end-users, as well as rational consumers (Irazabal, 2016; Kuronen et al., 2010). The emphasis on people also includes a recognition of the self-organizing capacities of civil society actors and the interest to design, implement and manage collective goods in a democratic fashion and with the goal of ensuring a good fit to the local needs of people.

Key discussion around the term

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) are cooperations between public and private stakeholders based on the presumed ideal of an equal distribution of labor, costs and benefits. Such PPPs are however criticized for being insufficient in bringing about desired and expected public outcomes, especially in wicked challenges that include many diverse actors, interests, and perspectives. Within PPPs, public sector actors often still focus overwhelmingly on serving and supporting the private interests to the detriment of public interests and easily overlook the interests and needs that live within society, especially those of groups who are less well-represented or equipped with (legal, financial, etc.) resources (Irazabal, 2016). Moreover, traditional urban development is sequential and hierarchical, moving from government to developers to end-users, and as PPPs usually focus on an a priori equal distribution of labor, costs and benefits, direct end-users or customers are relatively absent (Irazabal, 2016).

The sequential aim of People-Public-private-partnerships (4P's) is then to (re)consider the distribution of costs and benefits in urban partnerships and to include people much more substantially in collaborative planning (Irazabal, 2016). Indeed, 4Ps strives for a more horizontal approach, both incorporating formal and informal relationships between and among public entities, private companies, and citizens. Such formal and informal arrangements might include

contracts, memoranda of understanding, mutual agreements, supply agreements, etc. (Marana et al., 2018).

Last but not least, it is argued that 4Ps can create more desirable living environments and improve participation and communicative planning. A precondition for successful 4Ps and the involvement of people is that they are backed up institutionally, methodologically, and financially (Kuronen et al., 2010). The concept of 4Ps has gained significant attention with regard to various spatial planning issues and different geographical locations. Ahmed & Ali (2006) for instance analyzed waste management in Bangladesh and consider PPPP's as a means to improve the accountability and service quality of both public and private sectors in dealing with complex urban challenges. Analyzing infrastructure development in Hong Kong, Ng et. Al. (2013) notes that PPPP's can moderate the risk of unforeseen oppositions, build clear responsibilities and rights, and create opportunities for public inputs. Akintoye et al., (2015) adds to this that PPPPs also incorporate more informal social relationships, and thus not only build sustainable infrastructure itself but also build more resilient communities in the face of potential disasters.

Reference list

Ahmed, Shafiul, & Ali, Syed (2006). People as partners: Facilitating people's participation in public-private partnerships for solid waste management. *Habitat International*, 30(4), 781-796.

Akintoye, Akintola., Matthias Beck., & Mohan Kumaraswamy (2015). *Public Private Partnerships: a global review*. London: Routledge.

Irazabal, Clara. (2016). Public, Private, People Partnerships (PPPPs): Reflections from Latin American Cases. In Ammon Lehavi (Ed.), *Private Communities and Urban Governance* (pp. 191-214) London, Springer.

Kuronen, Matti, Junnila, Seppo, Majamaa, Wisa, & Niiranen, Ikka (2010). Public-private-people partnership as a way to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from residential development. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 14(3), 200-216.

Marana, Patricia, Labaka, Leire, & Sarriegi, Jose Mari. (2018). A framework for public-private-people partnerships in the city resilience-building process. *Safety Science*, 110, 39-50.

Ng, Thomas., Wong, James., & Wong, Kelwin. (2013). A public private people partnerships (P4) process framework for infrastructure development in Hong Kong. *Cities*, 31, 370-381.

UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe). (2018) *Guiding Principles on People-first Public-Private Partnerships in support of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals*.

Regional integration

Federica Fava

Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy; federica.fava@uniroma3.it

Short Definition

Regional integration incorporates local developments into a larger territorial framework, contributing to the environmental, social, and economic sustainability of adaptive reuse practices of cultural heritage. Regional integration involves multi-stakeholder agency by orienting different resources and divergent interests towards common territorial development goals. Heritage-related values to a (cultural) site are strategically used to overcome territorial disparities, creating benefits, such as attractiveness and place-based identity and strengthening connections with the surrounding areas.

It is a comprehensive process through which heritage-related values to a (cultural) site are up-scaled to a larger territory, by creating benefits and strengthening connections between people and their surrounding environment. Such integration builds on commons-oriented governance, alternative ideas of ownership, and circular economy via bottom-up adaptive reuse.

Key discussion around the term

Although regionalism has drawn forth a rising interest in several fields of studies, e.g. from social science, to governance and urban planning, regional integration stems from the fields of international political economy and EU integration (Börzel 2016, 63-41). Despite the differences characterizing each sector, it is worth mentioning that integration theories mainly emerged from a European context, making European studies and eurocentristic perspectives on the matter the main reference to measure integration in other parts of the world (Ibid.; Laursen 2010). However, a fresh line of inquiry into the 'social' dimensions of regionalism has been recently exploring the nexus between regional integration and welfare, showing the possibility to impact on the (national and international) territory in terms of social and regional development (Riggirozzi 2017, 661-675).

In general, the debate around regionalism and regional integration has focused on two main directions. The social constructivist notions of "new regionalism" or neoregionalism criticize the state-oriented approach of the "old" ones (rationalist) by including, in the definition of a region, more spontaneous processes. The emphasis is thus on "informal sectors, parallel economies, and non-state coalitions" (Laursen 2010, 3), namely in the social construction of a region and including also actors such as those of civil society, often neglected in the study of regionalism (De Lombaerde et al 2010, 23). Accordingly, De Lombaerde et al. (2010, 22) stress that "region is a polysemous concept": it embraces a highly variable spatial scale, from supranational, to subnational

cross-border regions, challenging the very existence of comparative regionalism studies.

Due to city-centered regional development, and with respect to the OpenHeritage focus, it is worth mentioning the metropolitan scale of regional integration as the key level to evaluate economic disparities (Psycharis, Kallioras, and Pantazis, 2020) and spatial variations (Wan 2019). Already in the late 80s Vartiainen (1987, 126-117) states "territorial integration" is a seminal concept in approaching neoregionalism through spatial policy and planning. By adopting a restricted geographical approach, the author aims at clarifying the meaning of territorial integration, an attempt he develops through the concept of territoriality. It emerges as a local-based perspective, conceptualizing the regional system "in both a physico-functional sense and a socio-cultural sense". Therefore, locality - "the arena for our everyday life and experiences" - is assumed as the basic element of the regional system (Ibid., 121).

Alongside economic and political aspects, the territorial dimension, particularly through the idea of territorial cohesion, featured in thinking on European integration from the start, supporting the bridge between the concept of (policy) integration and balanced territorial development (Gallez 2018). For instance, the Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020 mainly stresses regional integration in terms of territorial connectivity "for individuals, communities and enterprises" (priority 5) and "ecological, landscape and cultural values of regions" (priority 6). Consequently, in the document the term "integration" couples with "inclusion", defining a strategy to assure sustainable development objectives (European Commission 2011).

All these aspects are particularly relevant to evaluate the role adaptive heritage reuse might have in the field of regional integration. As is known, cultural heritage is increasingly considered a crucial driver of territorial development, and related social and territorial aspects have been integrated into European documents e.g. the *European Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century* or in strategical approaches such as the Historic Urban Landscape. Maybe not surprisingly, then, cultural heritage policies are among those sectoral policies deemed as most integrated with spatial planning (Nadin et al. 2020), showing additional facets and opportunities in terms of regional integration.

Reference list

Börzel, Tanja A. 2016. "Theorizing Regionalism: Cooperation, Integration, and Governance." In *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism*, edited by Tanja A. Börzel, Thomas Risse, 63-41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Lombaerde, Philippe et al. 2010. "Problems and Divides in Comparative regionalism." In *Comparative Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*, edited by Finn Laursen, 39-21. London: Routledge.

European Commission. 2011. *Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions*. Online: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/communications/2011/territorial-agenda-of-the-european-union-2020.

Gallez, Caroline. 2018. "Enhancing territorial integration through public policies? Insights from intermunicipal cooperation in France". J. Farinós Dasí. *Territory and States. Essentials for coordination of Spatial Planning Policies in XXI st Century*, *Tirant Humanides*, 189-163.

Laursen, Finn 2010. "Regional integration: some introductory Reflections." In *Comparative Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*, edited by Finn Laursen, 3-21. London: Routledge.

Nadin, Vincent, Dominic Stead, Marcin Dąbrowski, and Ana Maria Fernandez-Maldonado. 2020. "Integrated, adaptive reuse and participatory spatial planning. trends across Europe". *Regional Studies*, HAEAD-OF-PRINT: 1-13.

Psycharis, Yannis, Kallioras, Dimitris and Pantazis Panayotis. 2020. Regional Inequalities in Central and Eastern European Countries: The Role of Capital Regions and Metropolitan Areas. In *Economic Development and Financial Markets: Latest Research and Policy Insights from Central and Southeastern Europe* edited by Śliwiński, Adam, Polychronidou, Persefoni, Karasavvoglou, Anastasios. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Riggirozzi, Pia. 2017. "Regional Integration and Welfare: Framing and Advocating Pro-Poor Norms through Southern Regionalisms." *New Political Economy* 22, no. 6, 661-675, DOI: 10.1080/13563467.2017.1311847

Vartiainen, Perttu. 1987. "The Strategy of Territorial Integration in Regional Development: Defining Territoriality Geoforum." *Geoforum* 18 (1): 117-126.

Wan, Yiliang et al. 2019. "Quantifying the Spatial Integration Patterns of Urban Agglomerations along an Inter-City Gradient." *Sustainability* 11, no. 18. Online: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11185000>.

Resource integration

Andrea Tönkö

Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary, tonko@mri.hu

Hanna Szemző

Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary, szemzo@mri.hu

Short definition

Resource integration means the process of choosing, managing and integrating different types of financial and non-financial resources with the aim to create new values. Successful integration is the result of a sound managerial process and the application of an innovative inclusive business model.

Resource integration builds on the idea that actors produce, exchange, and integrate resources with other actors to realize outcomes that they cannot achieve alone. Actors in the resource integration process include both people (such as customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders within a network of relationships), and policies or government bodies. This definition implies that resources do not have a value in themselves, but value is created collaboratively in interactive configurations of mutual exchange.

Resource integration can serve as an effective tool in cultural heritage management as it improves awareness and involves citizens, organizations, and other stakeholders in cultural heritage preservation, reuse and related activities. Bringing together the actors (stakeholders and policies) through involvement processes, it can also contribute to strengthening regional integration.

Key discussion around the term

The great diversity of heritage forms and the recognition of intangible cultural heritage expanded the notion of cultural value and raised the need for a new approach in financing and management, necessitating a model which places value co-creation at its center (Barile and Saviano, 2014). Value co-creation builds on the idea that actors produce, exchange, and integrate resources with other actors to realize outcomes that they cannot achieve alone (Overkamp et al., 2018). The concept of resource integration needs to be understood as part of the value co-creation process.

The possibilities of value co-creation are always influenced by the specific social and cultural contexts (Chandler and Vargo, 2011). Another precondition of the process is that actors who interact with and through the system are allowed and able to integrate these resources with the ones that they already have access to. From a cultural heritage management point of view, it is important to stress that the exchange and integration of resources do not require ownership of all the resources, only access to them. Resources can also be accessed through lending or renting. Integration always takes the form of process(es), co-operation/collaboration and/or experiencing. As the collaborations are usually

voluntary, the actors need to recognize the benefit from participation. If the benefit is not evident to the actors, then collaborative activity is highly unlikely (Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2012).

To make the interpretation of resource integration and value co-creation even more relevant to the field of cultural heritage management, an integrated approach can be applied combining the governance and management methodology with the Viable System Approach (VSA). VSA is considering organizations and individuals as viable (open) systems. Some core concepts of the VSA include relationships, interaction, structure, system, consonance, resonance and relevance. With this integrated approach it is possible to describe and analyze organizational and operative management solutions that aim to foster resource diversification (public, private, public-private partnerships, civic initiations - crowdfunding) and develop a high level of consensus based on participation.

Reference list

Barile, Sergio, and Marialuisa Saviano. 2014. "Resource Integration and Value Co-creation in Cultural Heritage Management." In *Management of Cultural Products: E-Relationship Marketing and Accessibility Perspectives*, ed. by Lucia Aiello, 58–82. Hershey PA: Business Science Reference.

Chandler, Jennifer D., and Stephen L. Vargo. 2011. "Contextualization and Value-In-Context: How Context Frames Exchange." *Marketing Theory* 11, no. 1: 35–49.

Kleinaltenkamp, Michael, et al. 2012. "Resource Integration." *Marketing Theory* 12, no. 2: 201–205.

Overkamp, Tim, et al. 2018. "Resource Integration as a Perspective on Value in Interaction Design." In *Proceedings of the 32nd International BCS Human Computer Interaction Conference, July 2018*, article no. 79. Swindon UK: BCS Learning & Development Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.14236/ewic/HCI2018.79>

Social Innovation

Martina Bosone

Institute for Research on Innovation and Services for Development of
National Research Council (IRISS-CNR), Naples, Italy,
m.bosone@iriss.cnr.it

Antonia Gravagnuolo

Institute for Research on Innovation and Services for Development of
National Research Council (IRISS-CNR), Naples, Italy;
a.gravagnuolo@iriss.cnr.it

Short definition

In general, social innovation is understood as the expression of certain ideas in products, services, or models, with the aim of proposing innovative activities and services to respond to the unmet needs of society (The Young Foundation 2012). However, the objective of the action is not always purely socially motivated, but rather fosters new relationships or collaborations between all those who have an interest in participating in the innovation process and contributing to its diffusion. Thus, it can arise from formal and informal partnerships between actors from different sectors, fostering the active collaboration and integration between different skills, derived from government, business, and the nonprofit world, and transforming traditional organizational and management models. Therefore, social innovation is a way to transform innovative theoretical principles and research in a more pragmatic way to develop and deploy effective solutions to challenging social, economic, and environmental issues in support of social progress (PHI Foundation 2016).

Key discussion around the term

Social Innovation is relevant to civic initiatives of adaptive reuse of cultural heritage because it is *"indispensable in maintaining social vitality, encouraging civilians' enthusiasm to participate in social affairs, and helping form a sense of self-governance"* (Keping 2012).

"Social Innovation thus contributes to the betterment of individuals and communities. In the longer term and if it is carried out by sufficiently influential social movements, Social Innovation can be a source of social transformation and an engine of change. Social Innovation must be considered a strategic resource for all countries that want to think about the development of society in a new way. Turning to Social Innovation today is a concrete way to respond to the difficulties of the moment and try to solve some of the problems of our society"(PHI Foundation 2016).

Apparently, social innovation has gained and retained a lot of interest throughout the years. Policymakers, academics and researchers, foundations and organizations, and generally individuals share a mutual interest in expanding their knowledge to address social issues.

In the European scenario, many culture-led urban regeneration experiences are highlighting the importance of multi-stakeholder cooperation to elaborate a common development vision based on the generation and regeneration of cultural values through innovative approaches. The diffusion of new business models, collaborative governance, and impact financing is demonstrating the great potential of systemic approaches and integrated methodologies (European Commission 2014; Fusco Girard and Cerreta 2001) to identify this latent capacity of innovation to reactivate and re-generate cultural heritage and cultural knowledge production. In this perspective, it is necessary to take into account some challenges for the success and sustainability of such initiatives, such as questions related to their actual capacity to interpret and respond to local demand for economic, cultural, and social services, or how and whether these new forms of partnership have transformed informal initiatives into economically sustainable activities (Daldanise, Oppido, and Vellecco 2018).

Experiences to date clearly demonstrate that when different actors cooperate synergistically and their interests converge towards the common good, it is possible to support and implement cultural and social innovation. In the case of cultural heritage, this is transformed into the ability to give new life to degraded, abandoned, or under-used spaces' also creating new job opportunities and new forms of social inclusion (Fusco Girard 2018; 2021). Despite the interest and the increasing consideration of the term, there is a growing need for shared or common definitions of social innovation, as its interpretation changes depending on the point of view (Balamatsias 2018):

- pragmatic approach: social innovation as *"innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are predominantly developed and diffused through organizations whose primary purposes are social"* (Schwarz et al. 2010);
- systemic approach: social innovation as a *"complex process through which new products, processes or programs are introduced, leading to a deep change in daily routines, resources' streams, power relations or values within the system affected by the innovation"* (Westley and Antadze 2010);
- managerial stance: social innovation as a *"new solution to a social problem which is more effective, efficient, sustainable or fairer compared to existing solutions, and which generates value primarily for society instead of single individuals or organizations"* (Phills, Deiglmeier, and Miller 2008);
- critical approach: social innovation is conceived as a process of "empowerment and political mobilization" targeting a bottom-up transformation of the functioning of a social system, in terms of stakeholders and in terms of distribution of material and immaterial resources (MacCallum et al. 2012);
- economic approach: social innovation defined as *"conceptual, process or product change, organizational change and changes in financing, and new relationships with stakeholders and territories"* (Noya 2009);
- comparative approach: social innovation perceived as being *"distinctive both in its outcomes and in its relationships, in the new forms of cooperation and collaboration that it brings. As a result, the processes, metrics, models and methods used in innovation in the commercial or technological fields, for example, are not always directly transferable to the social economy"* (Caulier-grice, Mulgan, and Murray 2010);
- universal approach: social innovations are defined as *"new solutions (products, services, models, markets, processes etc.) that simultaneously meet a social*

need (more effectively than existing solutions) and lead to new or improved capabilities and relationships and better use of assets and resources. In other words, social innovations are both good for society and enhance society's capacity to act." (The Young Foundation 2012).

Reference list

Balamatsias, G. 2018. "Social Innovation. 8 Most Popular Definitions." Social Innovation Academy. 2018. <https://www.socialinnovationacademy.eu/8-popular-social-innovation-definitions/>.

Caulier-grice, Julie, Geoff Mulgan, and Robin Murray. 2010. "The Open Book of Social Innovations. Social Innovator Series: Ways to Design, Develop and Grow Social Innovations." *The Young Foundation* 30 (8).

Daldanise, Gaia, Stefania Oppido, and Immacolata Vellecco. 2018. "Creative Adaptive Reuse of Cultural Heritage for Urban Regeneration." *Urbanistica Informazioni* 278 s.i. (Special Issue): 6–9.

European Commission. 2014. "Towards an Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage for Europe." Bruxelles.

Fusco Girard, Luigi. 2018. "Discourse of Professor Luigi Fusco Girard at the European Parliament High-Level European Parliament Conference 'Cultural Heritage in Europe: Linking Past and Future.'" In *European Parliament Conference "Cultural Heritage in Europe: Linking Past and Future."* <https://www.clicproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/CLIC-Luigi-Fusco-Girard-Discourse-at-the-European-Parliament.pdf>.

Fusco Girard, Luigi. 2021. "The Circular Economy in Transforming a Died Heritage Site into a Living Ecosystem, to Be Managed as a Complex Adaptive Organism." *Aestimum* 77: 145–80. <https://doi.org/10.13128/aestim-9788>.
Fusco Girard, Luigi, and Maria Cerreta. 2001. "Il Patrimonio Culturale: Strategie Di Conservazione Integrata e Valutazioni." *Economia Della Cultura, Rivista Trimestrale Dell'Associazione per l'Economia Della Cultura* 2: 175–86. <https://doi.org/10.1446/12766>.

Keping, Yu. 2012. "No Title Growing Importance of Social Innovation." *China Daily*, 2012. https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2012-02/08/content_14556640.htm.

MacCallum, Diana, Frank Moulaert, Jean Hillier, and Serena Vicari Haddock. 2012. *Social Innovation and Territorial Development. Social Innovation and Territorial Development*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315609478>.

Noya, A. 2009. "Transforming Innovation to Address Social Challenges." *OECD*. Paris. <https://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/44076387.pdf>.

PHI Foundation. 2016. "Cos'è La 'Social Innovation'?" 2016.
<https://phifoundation.com/cose-la-social-innovation/>.

Phills, James A, Kriss Deiglmeier, and Dale T Miller. 2008. "Rediscovering Social Innovation." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 6 (4).

Schwarz, Michael, Geoff Mulgan, Simon Tucker, Rushanara Ali, and Ben Sanders. 2010. "Social Innovation: What Is It, Why It Matters and How It Can Be Accelerated." *Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship*, no. May.

The Young Foundation. 2012. "Social Innovation Overview: A Deliverable of the Project: 'The Theoretical, Empirical and Policy Foundations for Building Social Innovation in Europe' (TEPSIE), European Commission – 7 Th Framework Programme." *Proyecto TEPSIE*. Brussels. <http://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/TEPSIE.D1.1.Report.DefiningSocialInnovation.Part-1-defining-social-innovation.pdf>.

Westley, Frances, and Nino Antadze. 2010. "Making a Difference: Strategies for Scaling Social Innovation for Greater Impact." *Innovation Journal* 15 (2).

Transferability

Markus Kip

Georg-Simmel Center for Metropolitan Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany; markus.kip@gsz.hu-berlin.de

Short Definition

Transferability refers to the process of using insights from a particular case to understand other cases or to apply this knowledge in other settings. The challenge of transferability relates particularly to situations that are complex and multilayered, sometimes referred to as “ill-defined”, given a great or unknown number of influencing factors and non-linear relationships among them. Non-linearity is typical for real-world social situations. Under such circumstances, any attempts at transferability require a close understanding of the specific contexts from where insights are learned and to where they are to be applied. Expertise for transferability allows identifying the key elements in each situation in order to draw analogies (based on similarities) as the basis for transferring theoretical or applied knowledge.

Key discussion around the term

Transferability is a key term in transdisciplinary science discussion (Adler et al. 2018; Polk 2014; Hadorn et al. 2008) and applies to fields that engage in empirical research (sociology, psychology, etc.) as well as fields that apply knowledge (social work, engineering, etc.). Transferability in relation to adaptive reuse of cultural heritage considers what kind of lessons can be learned from case studies and how the transfer of these insights might support an interested audience to better understand their own situation and options or to inspire them to experiment or develop their practice.

A broadly accepted view on science holds that findings and insights from case studies are scientific to the extent that they are generalizable and may also help to explain or even predict similar phenomena elsewhere Krohn (2008: 369). From this perspective thus, “the less circumstantial and conditional an achieved piece of empirical knowledge is, the higher its scientific value” (Krohn 2008: 369). The ideal experimental situation in the natural sciences allows for a causal analysis in which the relationship between an independent and dependent variable could be formulated. Krohn (2008: 369) refers to “nomothetic knowledge structures” as general laws that can be abstracted from the concrete, while “ideographic knowledge structures” pay particular attention to the concrete and its singularity. Case studies in transdisciplinary projects on adaptive heritage reuse such as at OpenHeritage are highly circumstantial and conditional, given their historically and geographically specific sites, problems and responses, and a distinct set of actors involved. Any attempt to generate generalized knowledge from case studies requires such a degree of abstraction that the knowledge would hardly be of any use to the people involved to address the practical

challenges of these case studies. Generalizations in the humanities and social sciences also risk imposing particular experiences (from the Global North) as universally applicable insights or practices elsewhere (Robinson 2011). In order to apply knowledge, concrete situations and conditions need to be taken seriously and local expertise is necessary for this process.

Reference list

Adler, Carolina, Gertrude Hirsch Hadorn, Thomas Breu, Urs Wiesmann, Christian Pohl 2018. "Conceptualizing the transfer of knowledge across cases in transdisciplinary research." *Sustainability Science* 13 no. 1: 179-190

Hadorn, Gertrude Hirsch, Holger Hoffmann-Riem, Susette Biber-Klemm, Walter Grossenbacher-Mansuy, Dominique Joye, Christian Pohl, Urs Wiesmann, and Elisabeth Zemp, eds. 2008. *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*. Dordrecht: Springer

Krohn, Wolfgang. 2008. "Learning from Case Studies" In *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*, edited by Gertrude Hirsch Hadorn, Holger Hoffmann-Riem, Susette Biber-Klemm, Walter Grossenbacher-Mansuy, Dominique Joye, Christian Pohl, Urs Wiesmann, and Elisabeth Zemp. 369-383. Dordrecht: Springer

Polk, Merritt 2014. "Achieving the promise of transdisciplinarity: a critical exploration of the relationship between transdisciplinary research and societal problem solving." *Sustainability Science* 9 no. 4: 439-451.

Robinson, Jennifer (2011): Cities in a World of Cities: The Comparative Gesture. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(1): 1-23.