

Governance of cultural heritage: towards participatory approaches

Sakarias Sokka, Center for Cultural Policy Research CUPORE, Finland

Francesco Badia, University of Bari, Italy

Anita Kangas, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Fabio Donato, University of Ferrara, Italy

DOI: 10.3389/ejcmp.2023.v11iss1-article-1

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes participatory governance in relation to heritage. Based on previous studies on the implementation of participation and theoretical discussions considering the participatory governance of cultural heritage, we found four types of cultural heritage governance, with differing weights with regard to public authorities, civil society, markets, and citizens. Governmental, corporatist, service-led, and co-creative cultural heritage governance types were identified, which reflect the shifts in participatory approaches to governance from state-centered activities to the proliferation of civil society, and from professionally dominated to more citizen-based activities. According to our analysis, culture and heritage can be conceptualized as instruments for the transformation of attributes and competencies, and they work as mediums to cultivate recognition between institutions and citizens. This includes not only seeking consensus in decision making but also respecting the nuances and values of different heritages.

Keywords:

governance

participation

cultural heritage

co-creation

public policy and management

Introduction

The subject of participatory governance has recently gained prominence in the fields of public policy and management. The basis of participatory governance is favoring and promoting the direct participation of citizens in the public decision-making processes. The growing relevance of participatory approaches is consistent with the evolution of the concept of governance in the current context of public administration, especially in Europe (Bouckaert, 2017). This implies the possibility of considering a new research agenda for public sector governance, where participation could play a crucial role. The opportunity to develop participatory methods in public administration is strictly connected with the possibility that these methods will emerge to solve problems between different, and sometimes conflicting, "public values" (Nabatchi, 2012).

Concerning the development and spread of participatory approaches to governance, Frank Fischer (2006) has construed two prominent shifts: a) from state-centered activities to a proliferation of civil society organizations that deliver services and offer various forms of support to economic and social development and b) from professionally dominated to more citizen- or client-based activities, often taking place within the new civil society organizations. Despite much of the rhetoric surrounding the discussion of participation, experiences with new forms of participatory governance show participation to be neither straightforward nor easy. A closer look shows that citizen participation is a complicated and uncertain business that needs to be contextualized, and carefully thought out in advance (Fischer, 2000). It must be carefully organized and facilitated and even cultivated and nurtured, yet without too rigorous a priori specifications (Johanson et al., 2014).

In this article, participatory approaches appear to be particularly appropriate for the application of cultural heritage policy and management. Relevant international institutions have claimed the importance of community engagement in cultural heritage management and development since the beginning of this century. The Budapest Declaration on World Heritage (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO, 2002), the Intangible Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 2003), the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (UNESCO, 2005), and the Faro Convention of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe,

2005) represent some of the milestones observed along this path. An actual application of participatory methods for cultural heritage presents relevant difficulties, and there is a concrete risk of observing an expectation gap, similar to those highlighted in the literature concerning the effectiveness of democracy (Flinders, 2014). For these reasons, this paper aims to identify different conditions for the adoption of participatory approaches in the context of the governance of cultural heritage.

Different policy sectors' contexts produce distinct kinds of governing practices and procedures that have an impact on the level of citizen participation and affect the definitions of cultural heritage and the types of governance. For example, the international context of cultural policy shows a quite varied situation of national regimes, in terms of institutions, types of funding, and modes of organization (Dubois, 2015; Mulcahy, 2006).

The analysis draws on perspectives of participatory governance from earlier studies on the implementation of participation and will contribute to the theoretical discussions considering the participatory governance of cultural heritage. The paper is structured as follows. The next section will introduce the basic concepts used in this analysis. In the following section, four types of cultural heritage governance are identified in relation to the possible interrelation of the elements of the traditional/hybrid definitions of cultural heritage and the lower/higher levels of citizen participation. The paper will end with some concluding remarks, highlighting ideas for future research.

Basic Concepts

Governance for Citizens

Governance is a complex term with some ambiguity traits, and it is often linked to the promotion of democracy and the fight against corruption (Rose-Ackerman, 2017). The concept of governance is traditionally differentiated from that of government because the former relies on the system of relations between governmental entities and the societal system whereas the latter seems to convey a more coercive power exercised by the public authority (Kooiman, 2003; Peters, 1996; Rhodes, 1997). In this analysis, governance is considered "as governing with and through networks and their cooperative behaviour" (Rhodes, 2007, pp. 1245–1246).

Based on the findings of previous research, the extent to which citizens become involved in the

creation of heritage should have a strong impact on the success of governance processes. Also, academics and professionals in cultural management advocate multi-stakeholder governance models and the multi-level management of cultural resources (Bonet and Donato, 2011; Kickert, 1997; Li et al., 2020). In these governance systems, there is often a significant degree of autonomy of the actors involved, and the state can only steer the governance networks imperfectly (Stoker, 1998). The varieties of cultural heritage governance that this paper proposes reflect different types of governing with differing weights with regard to public authorities, civil society, markets, and citizens.

Previous empirical research reports and articles on governance have identified several important aspects of what it requires. These include constitutional legitimacy, administrative competence, accountability, transparency, and public participation (Ackerman, 2004; Blair, 2000; Cuthill and Fien, 2005; Fung and March, 2001; Kim et al., 2005), which imply attributions like capacity and autonomy but also performance and results (Fukuyama, 2013; Rotberg, 2014). A significant debate about governance regards the development of the conditions for "good" governance. Specifically, since 1989, the World Bank has established conceptual references for the key elements that constitute good governance (Woods, 2000). The concept of good governance is also explicitly noted, in these terms, by the International Monetary Fund, which defines good governance aspects as "the transparency of government accounts, the effectiveness of public resource management, and the stability and transparency of the economic and regulatory environment for private sector activity" (IMF, 1997, p. 3). Later, the OECD (2007, p. 336) defined good governance as follows: "Good governance is characterised by participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, effectiveness, equity, etc." Good governance has thus become closely related with participation, which, in this context, has also become an instrument, for example, for the World Bank's "own agendas" (Fischer, 2006, p. 22).

The complexity of good governance can also be easily applied to the main contemporary, transformative challenges facing cultural policies: the call for redefinitions of culture, the desire for easier access to culture and art, and the widening of the borders of cultural fields (Bonet and Négrier, 2018; McGuigan, 2016; Stage, Eriksson, and Reestorff, 2020). The same ideas can be detected in the governance of cultural heritage (Poirrier, 2003; Shipley and Kovacs, 2008). This

relates to the struggle between the transformative and the functionalist roles that culture and heritage policy has in society, when heritage, tradition, art, philosophy, religion, education, and advertising can be used by dominant groups to make their dominance appear normal and natural to the heterogeneous groups that constitute the society (Williams, 1961, 1967, 1974).

Ultimately, good governance is rooted in trust as it rests upon interaction, negotiation, and resource exchange. This can involve different arenas: governmental arenas, where decisions carry the authority of the state; non-governmental arenas, in which self-organizing citizens make decisions; and new kinds of arenas, where governmental and non-governmental actors meet to debate and possibly act and decide together (Somerville and Haines, 2008). Good governance can be pursued through the enhancement of community-based decision making at a local level. It can contribute to improving resource allocation, increasing community commitment, reasserting community identities, and strengthening community groups and their voices, which all contribute to the development of new collaborative actions, which, in turn, can increase the success rate of governance (Cuthill and Fien, 2005).

Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage

Heritage can be how "very selective material artefacts, mythologies, memories, and traditions become resources . . . [that] are selected according to the demands of the present" (Graham, 2002, p. 1004). A heritage regime is the result of socio-historical, political, and cultural processes of classification (definitions, hierarchies, inclusion, and exclusion), labelling, and support. The identification of heritage is based on an active choice about which elements of culture are deemed worthy of preservation as an "inheritance" for the future. These decisions are generally made by state authorities and international organizations (Blake, 2000; Salazar, 2010). According to Višna Kisić (2014), heritage as a process connects three interdependent categories: firstly, (re)production as a process of the creation or preservation of a desired image of the world; secondly, values as a process of the reflection, recognition, and formulation of desires and choices and as the intended result of creation; and thirdly, identities of new social structures as forms of shaping and representing values. To recognize such categories, institutions and official bodies need to encourage dialogue about values and allow social actors to take part in decisions about

heritage (Turnpenny, 2004).

A concrete attempt to delineate the concept of cultural heritage emerges from the Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies, the result of the World Conference on Cultural Policies "Mondiacult" in 1982:

The cultural heritage of a people includes the works of its artists, architects, musicians, writers and scientists and also the work of anonymous artists, expressions of the people's spirituality, and the body of values which give meaning to life. It includes both tangible and intangible works: languages ..., rites, beliefs, historic places and monuments, literature, works of art, archives and libraries. Every people therefore has a right and a duty to defend and preserve its cultural heritage, since societies recognize themselves through the values in which they find a source of creative inspiration (UNESCO, 1982, secs. 23–24).

As an international organization, UNESCO has a very special kind of actorhood. Funded by its member states, it is a high-level forum for intellectual engage, that creates vocabulary to be disseminated on national level, and sets international normative standards (conventions, recommendations, and declarations), that policymakers can follow when (re)formulizing policy domains. (Alasuurari & Kangas 2020.) The definition of cultural heritage by "Mondiacult" has been further developed through the report *Our Creative Diversity* (World Commission of Culture and Development, 1996), the *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* (UNESCO, 2001), and the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (UNESCO, 2003). Therefore, the consideration of cultural heritage regards both its tangible and intangible dimensions (Vecco, 2010), also in its digital expressions. In the frame of the 2003 Convention, intangible heritage is defined (article 2) as "oral traditions and expressions, including language ..., performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, traditional craftsmanship." The newest theme for local stakeholders emphasizes many ways to get indigenous peoples better involved in the Convention (UNESCO, 2019).

There are systematic differences in how people do, make, and say things, and thus, different cultures exist (Cahoone, 2005). The richness of cultural phenomena and practices derives substantially from hybridity, which is a characteristic feature of cultural heritage: hybridity as such refers to variety, combinations, and mixtures, which also makes it impossible to define the moment when a "hybrid" begins (Kuutma, 2013). Consequently, cultural heritage is characterized by a multiplicity of

contexts and meanings, changing through time and across space, resulting in a processual production of heritage.

The link across time and space makes heritage a constructor of agreed-upon rules for a community, and the identification of cultural heritage can be regarded as a political act. Hence, cultural heritage is a value-laden concept, vulnerable to becoming co-opted by ideology. The phrase "participatory governance of cultural heritage" has gained popularity in recent years (EU, 2018; Voices of Culture, 2015). However, previous research also suggests that participatory governance has become a new orthodoxy in a sense that policy innovations, like participatory budgeting and citizen assemblies, are often celebrated without closer consideration of what kind of arrangements the realization of participatory governance requires (Richardson, Durose, and Perry, 2019).

As the UNESCO official documents (UNESCO, 1982, 2001, 2003) illustrate, the governance of cultural heritage requires the involvement of a range of local stakeholders, normally represented by associations that accompany an object or monument and provide the sense of being part of a group (Blake, 2000). In this view, the development of cultural heritage is based on the joint discovery of the community's own identity, and local actions, like associational memberships and cooperatives, are important for the development of the political capacities of citizens (Fischer, 2006; Holmes and Slater, 2012). Previous research suggests closely scrutinizing the processes that are concerned with the regulation, mediation, and negotiation of cultural and historical values and narratives (Waterton and Smith, 2009). It calls for dialogue where the inclusiveness of heritage definitions is discussed and diversities in communities are heard (Apaydin, 2018; Williams, 1961; Zamarbide Urbaniz, 2019).

It seems to be necessary to investigate both what (e.g., defining and adopting cultural heritage) is done and how (the processes and practices). This is particularly true in the context of the governance of cultural heritage so as to understand the varied contextual landscape that such governance is bound to. At the local level, the quality of governance rests both on rules of deliberation and the impact of new political space deliberation on decision-making processes (Farrington, 2011), which imply "using discursive techniques to identify appropriate policy choices for given circumstances," as Clive Gray (2012, p. 507) writes. The underlying idea of exposed concepts in the field of governance can be expressed in the search for a "new"

form of governance, based on tools and processes that enable participation (Bingham, Nabatchi, and O'Leary, 2005; Skelcher and Torfing, 2010).

Participatory Governance Logics, the Role of Citizens, and Functions of Institutions

As illustrated above, the participatory governance of cultural heritage refers to organizing and joining collaborative ventures aimed at intercepting, extracting, processing, and transforming knowledge to make it useable in decision-making processes. Recently, researchers have developed new categorizations to depict how such processes are intertwined with different governance logics and what it means for the nature and form of citizen participation in the processes. In a current analysis of different citizen roles, governance logics, and institutional functions of participatory governance, the researchers formed four distinctive logics for local participatory governance: instrumental, interest-based, deliberation-based, and functional (Danielsson et al., 2018). Instrumental logic is based on vertical relations and the top-down implementation of policy goals, where decision making relies on "the parliamentary chain." The other three logics are based on horizontal relations, where interests are mediated and articulated (interest-based), reflected via reasoning together (deliberative), or co-produced and coordinated (functional).

Citizens can lead their own lives with recognition and develop a sense of belonging to a community based on linguistic, religious, national, or ethnic identity, among other factors that appear to be connected with the definition of cultural heritage (Kangas, 2004). Each of the four logics above grants citizens different roles. According to the instrumental logic of participatory governance, citizens vote, take part in political party activities, and contribute to the top-down implementation of policies. Instrumental logic can be detected in the use of instruments like user surveys, which follow vertical implementation structures. In interest-based participatory governance, citizens participate actively in a role where they represent either their own or group (or both) interests. Interest-based logic leads to the use of instruments like participatory budgeting and the gathering of citizens' suggestions. In the deliberative model, citizens participate and provide learning in dialogues and public conversations. Deliberative logic is realized through citizen panels and dialogue councils. Finally, according to the functional logic of participatory governance, citizens contribute

knowledge and other resources to solve problems efficiently. Functional logic comes alive in governance networks (Danielsson et al., 2018).

Political participation also has diverse dimensions at the individual level. According to Ekman and Amnå (2012), manifest forms of political participation include both parliamentary and extra-parliamentary forms of political action, which happen via voting, political parties, partaking in demonstrations, etc. In addition, they refer to "latent forms", where engagement in activities within the sphere of civil society is important.

Since its beginnings, research on participation has stressed the importance of bottom-up perspectives and empowering protocols (Arnstein 1969). Rather than just being a process of creating shared knowledge, participation is a process where people give meaning to themselves and their relationships with others and can discuss differences, boundaries, and ways of belonging in everyday life; their formal and informal practices can meet and alter each other. Sherry Arnstein's definition of citizen participation delineates participation as a categorical term for citizen's power (1969). From a Freirean perspective, participation is a dynamic and transformative process of dialogue, which enables people to realize their potential and be engaged in their own welfare (Freire, 1972; see Fischer, 2006).

Per Gustafson and Nils Hertting (2017) found that people choose to participate for substantially different reasons. Based on empirical analysis, they produced three distinct types of motives for participation – common good, self-interest, and professional competence, and stated that "both common good and self-interest motives speak for the democratic potential of participation" and "democratic learning and networking ... [can] be an integral part of the meaning that certain groups of participants attribute to participatory governance" (2017, p. 546).

Participatory processes differ in terms of who is included (i.e., broad involvement versus small groups or interest groups) and who is encouraged to become actively involved (Irvin and Stansbury, 2004). Much depends on how much power a political system is willing to grant the people (Thomas, 1995). Participatory governance is a complicated effort, and citizen participation "needs to be carefully thought out in advance," as Fischer writes (2006, p. 22). Obvious questions regarding participatory governance are still whose voices and how many voices the governance system can recognize and on what terms. In the sense of participatory governance, the practices adopted by institutions are essential questions for a working

democracy. To what extent can people participate and influence politics that affect their own lives? New methods of citizen participation can also increase bureaucracy and lead to inefficiency (Farrington, 2011). Possible disadvantages in terms of participation include the heterogeneity of actors, their potentially differing ambitions, and the fact that the means they have at their disposal to take part in participation do not always lead to empowerment.

Examination of Participation in Cultural Heritage Governance

The aim for this article is to analyze participatory approaches in the governance of cultural heritage. This article also calls for further research in the field, especially to test these observations in different territorial areas and local context (Adell, Bendix, Bortolotto & Tauschek, 2015; Zamarbide Urbaniz, 2019). Next, based on the above-expressed theoretical framework and research dealing with participation and governance in cultural fields, the authors delineate four types of cultural heritage governance and discuss their readiness in terms of participatory governance approaches. The types are formed via the use of two axes, one expressing the heritage definition (a vertical line moving from the institutionalized definition of heritage to the hybrid one) and another expressing the level of citizen participation (a horizontal line covering low to high citizen participation). The four types reflect

different types of governance with differing weights regarding public authorities, civil society, markets, and citizens. By analyzing which understanding of heritage these different types adopt and how participatory the processes that produce the heritage definitions are, the aim is to deepen the understanding of participatory heritage governance. All this also relates to the role that heritage has in society: in its institutionalized form, heritage's meaning is cemented by established institutions and more or less taken as normal and natural, whereas hybridity may bring up disputes based on heterogeneity that challenge this institutionalized understanding (cf. Williams, 1961, 1967, 1974).

The two axes form quadrants that describe the types of cultural heritage governance:

- 1) governmental,
- 2) corporatist,
- 3) service-led, and
- 4) co-creative types of cultural heritage governance.

Governmental

Different governance systems vary in how they induce and respond to information from society ("feedback") and in their capacities to reply to this information ("adaptability") (Duit and Galaz, 2008). The governmental type of cultural heritage governance implies an institutionalized definition of cultural heritage and a lower rate of citizen participation. Incomplete transparencies in terms of the administration




FIGURE 1. Types of cultural heritage governance

processes and limited citizen participation can both result from an exclusively defined notion of cultural heritage (Paquette, 2012; Waterton and Smith, 2009). Traditionally, cultural heritage policy and management have often been controlled by governmental bodies. This goes hand in hand with the legitimizing function of the power relations of cultural policy. Even in democratic societies, the culture of the elite becomes legitimized and hegemonic when administrators and experts make exclusive decisions about representations and reformations of culture, and when funding reflects power relations in society that may have consequences for the preservation of these relations (Sokka and Kangas, 2007; Feder & Katz-Gerro, 2012).

This type of governance can be compared to "fragile governance" (see Duit and Galaz, 2008): it can become focused on representing traditional hierarchies and face difficulties in accumulating new knowledge, adapting to new circumstances, and achieving collective actions, which makes it poorly equipped to handle change. As a result, citizen may find it difficult to join top-down generated processes and question the motivation and authenticity of public officers, who in turn can be afraid and insecure about what to expect after a potential change. Moreover, public officials often claim that there is no money for the necessary changes (Kangas and Sokka, 2015).

The lack of accountability is a common claim when attempts to develop participatory governance are criticized. Citizen participation and engagement require structural support for public action that backs grassroots community development and simultaneously reduces the tendency to create governmental hierarchies (Somerville and Haines, 2008). Public participation and good governance principles are important to create legitimacy, voice, and direction in heritage governance. People need to have opportunities and means to indicate their likes and dislikes to create accountability between them and the administration that governs: such instruments could include instituted public meetings, regular opinion surveys (including their collaborative evaluation), and formal grievance procedures (Blair, 2000).

At an organizational level, traditional top-to-bottom bureaucracy presents obstacles to empowerment-based participation. Due to the complex issues and rapidity of change in modern societies, politicians and public officials can face increasing difficulties in effectively managing the diversity of interests of local residents (Ackerman, 2004; Cuthill and Fien, 2005). In the context of social care (Braye and Preston-Shoot,

1995), some barriers to empowerment processes were listed. One of these relates to the organization of public services and the administration's relationship with residents. Public officers may fear the loss of their status and power, the insufficiency of their professional skills, and the eventual denial of their expertise. This makes them suspicious of their "clients'" emerging competences and emphasizes the mechanisms that reinforce (jurisdictional) power through legislation and administrative terminologies. These considerations seem to be expandable to cultural heritage.

The governmental type of heritage governance represents both low citizen participation and the hegemonic vision of heritage. As such, the competence and accountability of the administration can be questioned as it does not produce open, participatory, and democratic protocols and the free transfer of knowledge. To sum up, although this type of governance is still present in the context of cultural heritage management and policy, it does not appear to be suitable for responding positively to the current demands. It represents the instrumental logic of participatory governance, where citizens vote, take part in political party activities, and contribute to the top-down implementation of policies.

Corporatist

The corporatist type of cultural heritage governance implies an institutionalized definition of cultural heritage and a higher rate of citizen participation. Corporatist governance refers to controlled collaboration between the state and civil society, where established civil society organizations form intermediary structures between the state and the citizens. Corporatism can be identified in many policy areas (Öberg et al., 2011; Torpe, 2014). In corporatist settings, the structural preconditions that make voluntary organizations possible are important indicators of the overall "democratic infrastructure" of society (Torpe, 2014, p. 215). Despite this fact, corporatism is also a matter of benefits: it can be seen as a mutually beneficial exchange between interest groups and government, where "some actors control something that others desire" (Öberg et al., 2011, p. 365). Within its institutionalized arenas, the state can privilege some organizations over others and grant them the status of group representatives in the process of policymaking.

In many cases, interest groups and selected professionals have taken part in the formation of cultural

policy processes that create cultural heritage without the broader inclusion of local residents (e.g., Sokka and Kangas, 2007). The same problem is known to exist within other sectors. For example, in participatory environmental governance, public meeting attendees and committee members can be members of professional groups and strongly affiliated to interest groups, which leads to a lack of accountability in the eyes of citizen (Parkins and Sinclair, 2014).

Once again, the question of who has a voice is relevant because it reflects the inclusive and exclusive patterns embedded in the administrative structures. It is not guaranteed that attempts to develop governance through collaboration with civil society enhance participation. The selection of interest groups can be biased and exclusive, leading to a model of cultural heritage governance that, in principle, is a version of elitism. These problems are also emerging in some fields often related to cultural heritage management, like tourism, where the adoption of the correct empowerment of residents is crucial (Timothy, 2007). For cultural heritage, the level of the success of participatory practices can vary consistently in connection with the specific situation of the site or the local area and depending on the history and tradition of the representative groups (Chirikure, Manvanga, Ndoro, and Pwiti, 2010).

In this type of governance, the roles of citizens become defined by instrumental logic. Due to its controlled collaboration between the state and civil society, corporatist governance maximizes stability, but as an exclusive model, it is not flexible with regard to changing circumstances when collaboration with selected interest groups leads to the partial transfer of knowledge and poorly organized feedback (cf. Duit and Galaz, 2008). This can generate an assorted outlook in terms of cultural heritage, which engages the selected actors but does not fulfill the very ideas of changing boundaries, interactions, and negotiations within the networks that are identified to help in creating good governance (Rhodes, 2007). The success of governance seems to be dependent on opening up the process beyond the already established civil society organizations (Ackerman, 2004).

Service-led

The service orientation of cultural heritage governance implies a hybrid definition of cultural heritage and a lower rate of citizen participation. Governance has been piloted through the development

of service delivery models. For example, during the 1980s and 1990s, Australian governments attempted to develop an interface between the government and the community by following the private sector focus on improving customer services (Cutchill and Fien, 2005). This implies a need for balance between the requests of clients and beneficiaries of public services and the economic and efficient use of public resources.

Public managers are operating in a context where client (and citizen) needs are not made explicit as clearly as in a market system but where they must still be interpreted and possibly satisfied (Moore 1995). The service delivery perspective is targeted "for" the community, but it easily neglects community capacity building – the civic engagement – that can only be achieved by working with communities (Cutchill and Fien, 2005).

British experiences show how the use of markets has created tensions when the members of networks started to rival for contracts instead of aiming at cooperative behavior (Rhodes, 2007). In the end, the rivalry of participants can limit the diversity of cultural expressions when the actors try to maximize their individual utility through market-based selection processes, where only the fittest survive (Duit and Galaz, 2008). Annika Agger and Dorthe Lund (2017) noted how a service-oriented approach makes it hard to engage citizens in the production of public services as a group and limits citizen input regarding service improvement. Even if citizens participate and provide learning in dialogues and public conversations, the problem is that they are much more than customers: marketization allows a citizen to "exit" if they wish but does not provide active participation in decision-making and definition processes (Ackerman, 2004). Such governance can therefore be defined properly as service-led, echoing the shift from citizens to consumers (Clarke et al., 2007). The move towards a "contract culture" in service production has not increased civic participation as it posits the community organizations as parts of hierarchical governance rather than as cooperative partners (Somerville and Haines, 2008, p. 66).

Concerning cultural heritage governance, these topics typically emerge in the field of museum management and governance, where the public authority needs to balance the development of a correct managerial approach for the museum with the necessity of the integration of audiences within the museum (Croke, 2010). This necessity is related to the multiplicity of values associated with cultural heritage. At organizational level, the aim is to provide a service

to satisfy audiences' needs while at societal level participation can have public-good nature (Vecco et al. 2017). David Throsby (2010) identifies several cultural values to be added to heritage: aesthetic, spiritual, social, historical, symbolic, authenticity, and locational. That complexity alone is enough to indicate that any planning and policy instruments are not likely to be successful unless they engage the local population in the "ownership" of heritage. In principle, there is room for the diversity of heritage definitions in service-oriented governance, but this model does not actively support citizen participation. To accomplish this is not simply a matter of adapting predefined heritage and adjusting existing administrative patterns: it is also about fostering cultural understanding and taking part in decisions that (re)produce governing organizations and administrative formations (Kangas and Sokka, 2015).

Co-creative

There are also good experiences of co-management models that allow marginalized groups to take part in leading heritage administration (Paquette, 2008). The co-creative type of cultural heritage governance implies a hybrid definition of cultural heritage and a higher rate of citizen participation, where citizens contribute knowledge and other resources to solve problems efficiently.

In the functional logic of participatory governance, there are many alternative views to co-creation. It has been widely used to demonstrate a shift in thinking from organizations as definers of value to a more participatory process where people generate and develop meaning together with organizations. In the research literature, co-creation has mainly referred to innovation and value creation, which takes place as a collaborative process that involves different types of actors: a process where citizens are regarded as valuable contributors, but their precise role has remained rather unclear (Lund, 2018).

One of the many roots behind the idea of co-creation is participatory design, which was developed to involve workers in the development of systems in a workspace setting with designers in the 1970s (Holdgaard and Klasttrup, 2014). In the context of management studies, the concept of co-creation was introduced in the works that addressed the concept of co-production, investigated in both the private (Ramírez, 1999) and public sectors (Ostrom, 1996) through the development of flexible and cooperative

relations between organizations, which can be carried out through forms of so-called co-opetition (Li et al., 2020; Nalebuff and Brandenburger, 1997). The concept of co-creation is sometimes also used interchangeably with the concept of co-production, which, however, is here seen as more service- and product-oriented and often more concerned with cost reduction than value creation (Lund, 2018).

In the context of the public sector, co-creation has assumed a specific focus on the involvement of external stakeholders (Bovaird and Löffler, 2012). With regard to the provision of public services, this leads to rethinking the processes of the creation of public value (Moore, 1995). In this sense, co-creation, co-production, and co-governance are terms often used in contexts where the public sector and non-profit organizations cooperate, especially in the field of social services and welfare (Bode, 2006). In public settings where complex problems are addressed, co-creation can be subdivided into co-implementing, co-designing, and co-initiating – each of which distinguishes different approaches to citizen engagement (i.e., at which points of the processes citizen are active and how active they are). Of these sub-dimensions, the dimension of co-initiator refers to the most active yet also the most resource-demanding citizen role (Lund, 2018).

Co-creation is not just about the creation of things but also about interpretation and meaning-making, which is always co-created via social interaction (Ind and Coates, 2013). That is how the value-based definition of co-creation has developed to pay ever-stronger attention to the co-creation of experiences. The concepts of personalization, engagement, and co-production illustrate a broad view of co-creation, where personal experiences, the sense of connectivity and involvement, and taking part throughout the service experience are pivotal components. In marketing research, it is taken to refer to the self-directed path that consumers choose to take: it is about tailoring the experience to meet individual needs (Minkiewicz, Evans, and Bridson, 2014). In the context of the public sector, the experience-based knowledge of citizens has become valued in finding answers to "wicked" societal problems (Agger and Lund, 2017).

Frequently, even co-creative processes stem from institutional (organizational) needs. Experience, however, has not been the traditional focus of heritage organizations, and only little empirical research has been carried out regarding the drivers and inhibitors of co-creation (Minkiewicz et al., 2014). According to previous research, there, nevertheless, is a need

for tailor-made methods and facilitating processes in co-creation to minimize "the importance of power differences and support rational argumentation rather than interest-based advocacy" (Agger and Lund, 2017, p. 11). It is important not only to pay attention to output and effectiveness but also to include marginalized citizens to maintain the legitimacy of co-creative processes.

A Danish study illustrates how co-creativity has often been understood in a rather limited and unclear way. When the "outside partners" of art and heritage institutions (museums) remain "visitors" rather than actual partners who have a voice, their participation becomes stripped from its democracy origin – despite claims of enhancing participation (Holdgaard and Klastrop, 2014). One research study considering participation in cultural services in Finland found that people do not see themselves as having much power: residents feel unable to influence decision making concerning local cultural activities (Kangas and Sokka, 2015). In another Finnish project (Kangas, 2017), action research was conducted to strengthen the opportunities for existing, possibly even hidden, local cultures to engage in participative co-creation. The starting point was at the very grassroots level, trying to reach the people who had never taken part in cultural activities. It illustrated how artists and anthropologists can activate grassroots participation. Participation was also strengthened when the directors of different sectors facilitated change in their own domains, generated positive attitudes towards participation, and publicly expressed this (cf. Sani, 2015). Participation was enhanced by connecting the activation of people to the idea of finding universal points of identification and common denominators, with special features that may even be subject to debate among members of local communities. In contrast to knowledge determined by elites, participative processes can activate knowledge agreed upon by a community, and both innovators and adapters are needed in such processes (Ind and Coates, 2013). Another case study from Korea (Hong and Lee, 2015) demonstrates how shared goals and visions between all partners – local residents, public institutions, experts, and even tourists – are vital for the successful implementation of co-creation.

To avoid the most obvious governance failures, it is important to note that governance is date- and place-specific (cf. Paquette, 2012). Due to collaborative action, the co-creative mode is apt to detect changes early and create flexible decision-making procedures (Duit and Galaz, 2008). The co-creative governance of

heritage is, however, not likely to succeed without the acceptance and adoption of participatory structures. It requires support to back grassroots community development. Furthermore, attention should be paid to reducing the tendency to create extensive hierarchies – both within the political system that grants legitimacy to the actors and the civil society that creates and maintains the channels for expressions of individual and interest-group opinions (Somerville and Haines, 2008). In a public setting, processes of co-creation also require leadership that "can navigate in conditions of shared power and voluntary engagement, where participants cannot be ordered to collaborate but must be convinced of the merits of collaboration" (Agger and Lund, 2017, p. 10; see also Ansell and Gash, 2012).

Conclusions

This article aimed to identify different tools for participatory approaches in the context of the governance of cultural heritage. Following R.A.W. Rhodes (2007), governance was defined as governing through networks and the cooperative behavior of the same. Different models and their applications were recognized. The authors implement this approach to cultural heritage by asking how heritage becomes defined in different governance frames and which kinds of roles different modes of heritage governance allow citizens to play.

The analysis identified knowledge about contextual power structures and attentiveness to different voices in different phases of decision making and implementation as important prerequisites of citizen participation (including both more direct and latent forms of political participation). Based on this, obvious questions for participatory governance are regarding whose voices and how many voices the governance system can recognize and on what terms. Also, the practices adopted by institutions are essential questions for a working democracy in this perspective.

Against this backdrop, four types of cultural heritage governance were identified, that reflect different types of governing with differing weights with regard to public authorities, civil society, markets, and citizens: 1) *governmental*, 2) *corporatist*, 3) *service-led*, and 4) *co-creative*. As such, the four types indicate the shifts in participatory approaches to governance from state-centered activities to the proliferation of civil society and from professionally dominated to more citizen-based activities (see Fischer, 2006), which can also be detected in more official recommendations for

creating new participatory practices (cf. UNESCO).

Traditionally, the first and second, governmental and corporatist forms in relation to the governance of heritage have been the prevailing types in the cultural and heritage sectors. Of these, *the governmental type* implies the institutionalized definition of heritage and a low level of citizen participation and appears not to be suitable for responding positively to the demand for enhanced participation. It represents the instrumental logic of participatory governance, where a citizen may vote, take part in political party activities, and contribute to the top-down implementation of policies, but is excluded from other parts of the heritage process. *The corporatist type* of cultural heritage governance implies an institutionalized definition of cultural heritage and a higher rate of citizen participation. Corporatist governance refers to controlled collaboration between the state and civil society, where established civil society organizations form intermediary structures between the state and citizens. The structural preconditions that make voluntary organizations possible are important for democracy, but corporatism is also a matter of benefits. Within its institutionalized arenas, the state can privilege some organizations over others and grant them the status of group representatives in the processes of policymaking. Due to its controlled collaboration between the state and civil society, corporatist governance maximizes stability but is not flexible with regard to changing circumstances.

The third type, the *service orientation* of cultural heritage governance implies a hybrid definition of cultural heritage and a lower rate of citizen participation. In principle, there is room for diversity in heritage definitions in service-led governance, but this model does not actively support citizen participation. The service delivery perspective is targeted "for" the community, but it posits the community organizations as parts of hierarchical governance rather than as cooperative partners and easily neglects civic engagement, which limits citizen input to service improvement, echoing the shift from citizens to consumers.

Our fourth type, the *co-creative governance of cultural heritage*, implies a hybrid definition of cultural heritage and a higher rate of citizen participation, where citizens contribute knowledge and other resources to solve problems efficiently. Culture and heritage can be conceptualized as instruments for the transformation of attributes and competencies; at best, they can work as mediums through which it is possible to cultivate recognition between institutions and citizens and even

create a sense of identity among citizens and those who are excluded from formal citizenship. This includes not only seeking consensus in decision making but also respecting the nuances and values of different heritages.

The co-creative governance of heritage is not likely to succeed without the adoption of participatory structures in an administration that supports grassroots community development. In the co-creative type, citizens and other stakeholders take part in the formation of processes like goal setting and strategy definition, proceeding to a more active engagement of the users of public services. According to this type, it becomes important not only to pay attention to output and effectiveness but also to include marginalized citizens to maintain the legitimacy of co-creative processes.

The co-creative type aims to motivate community members to take part in heritage processes and requires interaction between professionals, managers, stakeholders, and members of the communities that the heritage definitions affect. Due to collaborative action, the co-creative mode is apt to detect changes early and create flexible decision-making procedures. In the public setting, processes of co-creation also require leadership. Participatory governance needs grassroots initiatives but can only work effectively if the local government is active in enabling partnership building and guaranteeing the rules of the game, which strengthens the legitimacy of actions.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, John. 2004. "Co-governance for Accountability: Beyond 'Exit' and 'Voice.'" *World Development* 32 (3): 447–463.
- Adell, Nicolas, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortoletto, and Markus Tauschek. 2015. 'Introduction. *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*.' In *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*, ed. Nicolas Adell, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortoletto, and Markus Tauschek, Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 7–24. Available online at: <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/32470/610380.pdf?sequence=1>

- Agger, Annika, and Dorte H. Lund. 2017. "Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector. New Perspectives in the Role of Citizens?" *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration* 21 (3), 17– 37.
- Alasuutari, Pertti, and Anita Kangas. 2020. "The global spread of the concept cultural policy." *Poetics* 82 (2020). Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2020.101445>
- Ansell, Chris, and Alison Gash. 2012. "Stewards, Mediators, and Catalysts: Toward a Model of Collaborative Leadership." *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal* 17 (1), 2–21.
- Apaydin, Veysel. 2018. 'Critical Community Engagement in Heritage Studies.' In *Encyclopedia of Global Archeology*, ed. Claire Smith. Springer, Cham. Available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51726-1_3348-1
- Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35 (4): 216–224.
- Bingham, Lisa B., Tina Nabatchi, and Rosemary O'Leary. 2005. "The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government." *Public Administration Review* 65 (5): 547–558.
- Blair, Harry. 2000. "Participation and Accountability at the Periphery: Democratic Local Governance in Six Countries." *World Development* 28 (1): 21–39.
- Blake, Janet. 2000. "On Defining the Cultural Heritage." *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 49 (1): 61–85.
- Bode, Ingo. 2006. "Co-Governance within Networks and the Non-Profit-For-Profit Divide. A Cross-Cultural Perspective on the Evolution of Domiciliary Elderly Care." *Public Management Review* 8 (4): 551–566.
- Bonet, Lluís, and Fabio Donato. 2011. "The Financial Crisis and its Impact on the Current Models of Governance and Management of the Cultural Sector in Europe." *ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy* 1 (1): 4–11.
- Bonet, Lluís & Emmanuel Négrier. 2018. "The participative turn in cultural policy: Paradigms, models, contexts." *Poetics* 66 (February 2018), 64–73.
- Bouckaert, Geert. 2017. "Taking Stock of 'Governance': A Predominantly European Perspective." *Governance* 30 (1): 45–52.
- Bovaird, Tony, and Elke Löffler. 2012. 'From Engagement to Co-production: How Users and Communities Contribute to Public Services.' In *New Public Governance, the Third Sector and Co-Production*, ed. Victor Pestoff, Taco Brandsen, and Bram Verschuere. NY: Routledge, 35–60.
- Braye, Suzy, and Michael Preston-Shoot. 1995. *Empowering Practice in Social Care*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cahoone, Lawrence E. 2005. *Cultural Revolutions: Reason Versus Culture in Philosophy, Politics and Jihad*. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press. Available online at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/j.ctt1wf4csh>
- Chirikure, Shadreck, Munyaradzi Manyanga, Webber Ndoro, and Gilbert Pwiti. 2010. "Unfulfilled Promises? Heritage Management and Community Participation at Some of Africa's Cultural Heritage Sites." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1–2): 30–44.
- Clarke, John, Janet Newman, Nick Smith, Elizabeth Vidler, and Louise Westmarland. 2007. *Creating Citizen-Consumers: Changing Publics and Changing Public Services*. London: Sage.
- Council of Europe. 2005. *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*.
- Crooke, Elizabeth. 2010. "The Politics of Community Heritage: Motivations, Authority and Control." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1–2): 16–29.
- Cuthill, Michael, and John Fien. 2005. "Capacity Building: Facilitating Citizen Participation in Local Governance." *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64 (4): 63–80.

- Danielsson, Marianne, Nils Hertting, and Erik-Hans Klijn. 2018. 'Tricky for Good Reasons. Institutionalizing Local Participatory in Representative Democracy.' In *Local Participatory Governance and Representative Democracy: Institutional Dilemmas in European Cities*, ed. Nils Herttig and Clarissa Kugelberg. NY: Routledge, 18–48. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315471174>
- Dubois, Vincent. (2015). Cultural Policy Regimes in Western Europe. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, 2nd edition, Volume 5*, ed. N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10419-2>
- Duit, Andreas, and Victor Galaz. 2008. "Governance and Complexity — Emerging Issues for Governance Theory." *Governance* 21 (3): 311–335.
- Ekman, Joakim, and Erik Amnå. 2012. "Political participation and citizen engagement: Towards a new typology." *Human Affairs* 22 (3): 283–300.
- EU (2018). *Participatory governance of cultural heritage*. Report of the OMC (open method of coordination) working group of member states' experts. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Available online at: <https://op.europa.eu/fi/publication-detail/-/publication/b8837a15-437c-11e8-a9f4-01aa75ed71a1>
- Farrington, Conor. 2011. Putting good governance into practice III: measuring intrinsic and instrumental empowerment in local government contexts. *Progress in Development Studies* 11 (2), 151–161.
- Feder, Tal, and Tally Katz-Gerro. 2012. "Who benefits from public funding on the performing arts? Comparing the art provision and the hegemony–distinction approaches." *Poetics* 40 (2012), 359–381.
- Fischer, Frank. 2000. *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment. The Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durhan and London: Duke University Press.
- Fischer, Frank. 2006. "Participatory Governance as Deliberative Empowerment: The Cultural Politics of Discursive Space." *The American Review of Public Administration* 36 (1), 19–40.
- Flinders, Matthew. 2014. "Explaining Democratic Disaffection: Closing the Expectations Gap." *Governance* 27 (1): 1–8.
- Freire, Paulo. 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2013. "What is governance?" *Governance* 26 (3), 347–368.
- Fung, Archon, and Erik Olin Wright. 2001. "Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance." *Politics and Society* 29 (1), 5–41.
- Graham, Brian. 2002. "Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture?" *Urban Studies* 39 (5–6): 1003–1017.
- Gray, Clive. 2012. "Democratic cultural policy: democratic forms and policy consequences." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18 (5), 505–518.
- Gustafson, Per, and Nils Hertting. 2017. "Understanding Participatory Governance: An Analysis of Participants' Motives for Participation." *American Review of Public Administration* 47 (5): 538– 549.
- Holdgaard, Nanna, and Lisbeth Klastrup. 2014. "Between Control and Creativity: Challenging Co-Creation and social Media Use in a Museum Context." *Digital Creativity* 25 (3): 190–202.
- Holmes, Kirsten, and Alix Slater. 2012. "Patterns of Voluntary Participation in Membership Associations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41 (5): 850–869.
- Hong, Soon-Goo., and Hyun-Mi Lee. 2015. "Developing Gamcheon Cultural Village as a tourist destination through co-creation." *Service Business* 9 (4), 749–769.
- IMF (International Monetary Fund). 1997. *Good Governance. The IMF's Role*. International Monetary Fund.
- Ind, Nicholas, and Nick Coates. 2013. "The Meanings of Co-Creation." *European Business Review* 25 (1): 86–95.
- Irvin, Renée A., and John Stansbury. 2004. "Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the

- Effort?" *Public Administration Review* 64 (1): 55–65.
- Johanson, Katya, Hilary Glow, and Anne Kershaw. 2014. "New modes of arts participation and the limits of cultural indicators for local government." *Poetics* 43 (2014): 43–59.
- Kangas, Anita. 2004. 'New Clothes for Cultural Policy.' In *Construction of Cultural Policy*, ed. Pirkkoliisa Ahponen and Anita Kangas. Helsinki & Jyväskylä: Minerva Kustannus, 21–41.
- Kangas, Anita 2017. *Removing Barriers - Participative and Collaborative Cultural Activities in KUULTO Action Research*. Cupore webpublications 44. Helsinki: Cupore. Available online at: https://www.cupore.fi/images/tiedostot/2017/cupore_kuultoresearch_final.pdf
- Kangas, Anita, and Sakarias Sokka. 2015. 'Cultural Access and Activation: Civic Participation in Local Sustainable Communities.' In *Culture and Sustainability in European Cities: Imagining Europolis*, eds. Svetlana Hristova, Milena Dragičević Šešić, and Nancy Duxbury. London & NY: Routledge, 141–153.
- Kickert, Walter J. M. 1997. "Public Governance in the Netherlands: An Alternative to Anglo-American 'Managerialism'." *Public Administration* 75 (4), 731–752.
- Kim, Pan Suk, John Halligan, Namshin Cho, Cheol H. Oh, and Angela M. Eikenberry. 2005. "Toward participatory and transparent governance: Report on the Sixth Global Forum on Reinventing Government." *Public Administration Review* 65 (6), 646–654.
- Kisić, Višna. 2014. 'Sustaining, or evolving values in order to sustain? A (paradoxical) relationship of cultural sustainability and heritage.' In *Culture and sustainable development at times of crisis*, ed. Milena Dragičević Šešić, Mirjana Nikolic & Ljiljana Rogac Mijatovic. University of Belgrade, 84–103.
- Kooiman, Jan. 2003. *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage Publication.
- Kuutma, Kristin. 2013. 'Between Arbitration and Engineering: Concepts and Contingencies in the Shaping of Heritage Regimes.' In *Heritage Regimes and the State*, ed. Regina F. Bendix, Aitua Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press, 21–36.
- Li, Ji, Sukanya Krishnamurty, Ana Pereira Rodes, and Pieter van Wesemael. 2020. "Community participation in cultural heritage management: A systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices." *Cities* 96 (2020). Advance online publication: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102476>
- Lund, Dorthe H. 2018. "Co-creation in Urban Governance: From Inclusion to Innovation." *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration* 22 (2), 3–17.
- McGuigan, Jim. (2016). *Neoliberal Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Minkiewicz, Joanna, Jody Evans, and Kerrie Bridson. 2014. "How Do Consumers Co-Create Their Experiences? An Exploration in the Heritage Sector." *Journal of Marketing Management* 30 (1–2): 30–59.
- Moore, Mark H. 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2006. Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches. *The Journal of Arts Management* 35 (4), 319–330.
- Nabatchi, Tina. 2012. "Putting the 'Public' Back in Public Values Research: Designing Participation to Identify and Respond to Values." *Public Administration Review* 72 (5): 699–708.
- Nalebuff, Barry J., and Adam M. Brandenburger. 1997. "Co-opetition: Competitive and Cooperative Business Strategies for the Digital Economy." *Strategy & Leadership* 25 (6): 28–33.
- Öberg, Per Ola, Torsten Svensson, Peter Munk Christiansen, Asbjørn Sonne Nørgaard, Hilmar Rommetvedt, and Gunnar Thesen. 2011. "Disrupted Exchange and Declining Corporatism: Government Authority and Interest Group Capability in Scandinavia." *Government and Opposition* 46 (3): 365–391.

- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2007. *Glossary of Statistical Terms*. Available online at: <http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/download.asp>
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1996. "Crossing the Great Divide: Synergy and Development." *World Development* 24 (6): 1073–1087.
- Paquette, Jonathan. 2012. From Decolonization to Postcolonial Management: Challenging Heritage Administration and Governance in New Zealand. *Public Organization Review* 12 (2): 127–138.
- Parkins, John R., and A. John Sinclair. 2014. Patterns of Elitism within Participatory Environmental Governance. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 32 (49), 746–761.
- Peters, B. Guy. 1996. 'Models of Governance for the 1990s.' In *The State of Public Management*, ed. Donald F. Kettl and H. Brinton Milward. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 15–44.
- Poirrier, Philippe. 2003. "Heritage and Cultural Policy in France Under the Fifth Republic." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9 (2): 215–225.
- Ramírez, Rafael. 1999. "Value Co-Production: Intellectual Origins and Implications for Practice and Research." *Strategic Management Journal* 20 (1): 49–65.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. 1997. *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Buckingham: Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. 2007. "Understanding Governance: Ten Years On." *Organization Studies* 28 (8): 1243–1264.
- Richardson, Liz, Catherine Durose, and Beth Perry. 2018. Three tyrannies of participatory governance. *Journal of Chinese Governance* 4 (2), 123–143.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 2017. "What Does 'Governance' Mean?" *Governance* 30 (1): 23–27.
- Rotberg, Robert I. 2014. Good Governance Means Performance and Results. *Governance* 27 (3), 511–518.
- Salazar, Noel. 2010. 'The Glocalisation of Heritage Through Tourism: Balancing Standardisation and Differentiation.' In *Heritage and Globalisation*, ed. Sophia Labadi and Colin Long. London & NY: Routledge, 130–147.
- Sani, Margherita. 2015. *Participatory governance of cultural heritage. EENC Ad hoc question*. April 2015. Available online at: <http://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2538.pdf>
- Shiple, Robert, and Jason F. Kovacs. 2008. "Good Governance Principles for the Cultural Heritage Sector: Lessons from International Experience." *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society* 8 (2): 214–228.
- Skelcher, Chris, and Jacob Torfing, J. 2010. "Improving democratic governance through institutional design: Civic participation and democratic ownership in Europe." *Regulation & Governance* 4 (1), 71–91.
- Sokka, Sakarias, and Anita Kangas. 2007. "At the Roots of Finnish Cultural Policy: Intellectuals, Nationalism, and the Arts." *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (2): 185–202.
- Somerville, Peter, and Nathan Haines. 2008. "Prospects for Local Co-Governance." *Local Government Studies* 34 (1): 61–79.
- Stage, Carsten, Birgit Eriksson, and Camilla Møhring Reestorff. 2020. "Understanding cultural participation through participation – inventiveness, multivalence and epistemic modernisation." *Cultural Trends* 29 (1), 19–34.
- Stoker, Gerry. 1998. "Governance as Theory: Five Propositions." *International Social Science Journal* 50: 17–28.
- Thomas, Johan C. 1995. *Public Participation in Public Decisions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Throsby, David. 2010. *Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Timothy, Dallen J. 2007. 'Empowerment and Stakeholder Participation in Tourism Destination Communities.' In *Tourism, Power and Space*, ed. Andrew Church

- and Tim Coles. NY: Routledge, 199–216.
- Torpe, Lars. 2014. "Corporatism and Social Trust: Bringing Voluntary Organizations 'Back In.'" *Journal of Civil Society* 10 (2): 204–218.
- Turnpenny, Michael. 2004. "Cultural heritage, an ill-defined concept? A call for joined-up policy." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10 (3), 295–307.
- UNESCO. 1982. *Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies*.
- UNESCO. 2001. *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*.
- UNESCO. 2002. *The Budapest Declaration on World Heritage*.
- UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
- UNESCO. 2005. *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*.
- UNESCO. 2019. *Living Heritage and Indigenous Peoples. Brochure on Living Heritage and Indigenous Peoples*. Available online at: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/Brochure-indigenous-people-201904-EN.pdf>
- Vecco, Marilena. 2010. "A Definition of Cultural Heritage: From the Tangible to the Intangible." *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 11 (3): 321–325.
- Vecco, Marilena, Andrej Srakar, and Michele Piazzai. 2017. "Visitor attitudes toward deaccessioning in Italian public museums: An econometric analysis." *Poetics* 63 (2017), 33–46.
- Voices of Culture. 2015. Brainstorming Report. Participatory Governance in Cultural Heritage (July 2015). Structured Dialogue between the European Commission and the cultural sector. Available online at: http://www.voicesofculture.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/2.Brainstorming_Report_Participatory_Governance.pdf
- Waterton, Emma, and Laurajane Smith. 2009. 'There Is No Such Thing as Heritage.' *In Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*. ed. Emma Waterton and Laurajane Smith. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 10–27.
- Woods, Ngaire. 2000. "The Challenge of Good Governance for the IMF and the World Bank Themselves." *World Development* 28 (5): 823–841.
- World Commission of Culture and Development. 1996. *Our Creative Diversity*.
- Williams, Raymond. 1961. *The Long Revolution*. Chatto & Windus.
- Williams, Raymond. 1967. The idea of a common culture. In *From Culture to Revolution - the Slant Symposium*, 1967, ed. Terry Eagleton & Brian Whicker.
- Williams, Raymond. 1974. Communications as cultural science. *Journal of Communication* 24 (3), 17–25.
- Zamarbide Urbaniz, Alba. 2019. *Buffers beyond boundaries. Bridging theory and practice in the management of historical territories*. ENCATC Book Series. Cultural Management and Cultural Policy Education, Vol. 6. Peter Lang.

To cite this article:

SOKKA, S.; BADIA, F.; KANGAS, A.; DONATO, F. (2021). Governance of cultural heritage: towards participatory approaches. *European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 11 (1), pp. 4-19.