Cultural Heritage

For urban development worldwide, the revitalisation of cultural heritage and historical buildings is regarded as a strategy for creating jobs, increasing residents' access to local culture, improving their quality of life, and developing the urban economy. The key factor in the revitalisation of cultural heritage and historical buildings is a strategy for developing the urban economy.

1. Introduction

Historical sites and cultural heritage play a critical role in urban renewal. Urban renewal can be regarded as a catalyst for mobilising tangible and intangible heritage. Moreover, it enables cities to develop a cultural heritage-based leisure tourism industry, which creates jobs, provides a source of income, develops the overall urban economy, increases residents' access to local culture, and improves their overall quality of life [1]. Global success cases of urban and rural development demonstrate that the key factor is the ability to develop perfect local industrial ecosystems.

2. Cultural Heritage

The World Heritage Convention classifies world heritage into cultural and natural heritage sites. Tangible cultural heritage refers to cultural property and buildings with historical, archival, anthropological, archaeological, and artistic values, whereas intangible cultural heritage refers to identifiable representations, knowledge, and skills within specific cultural or social values [2].

Cultural heritage is regarded as a resource for economic development and the creation of activities in cities worldwide [3]. Historical cities have assets possessing both cultural and economic value. The European Commission uses the cultural heritage of cities as key promotional strategies that stimulate short-term and long-term development [4]. This not only extends the lifecycle of heritage but also generates new and different values and supports the development of the local innovation impetus. Cultural heritage enables economic and cycling patterns and can be transformed into new economic, environmental, cultural, and social resources, which are paramount for local and global development.

The preservation and reuse of cultural asset fields are crucial for increasing the reputation and competitiveness of local tourism and the creation of new forms of cultural assets. Historical buildings represent a concrete form of cultural expression that provides an account of past people and things in a particular space. Historical buildings are in line with the goal of economic development if they are integrated with cultural life at the sites of historical buildings. In addition to the cultural connotation and value of the buildings themselves, it is important to reuse historical buildings by taking appropriate measures such as combining traditional historical and cultural memories with the industrial design strategy of 'cultural creativity' and 'innovative experience', identifying the existing cultural elements, proposing relevant plans, creating multi-functional spaces, exerting the spatial, cultural, and thematic advantages, and increasing the depth of content to attract consumers through the design of situational experiences.

3. Local Culture Development

Culture can be used as a force to maintain group relations and is an essential element of a community network [5]. Hence, culture can be defined as a system of meanings including symbols, rituals, values, and ideologies. For residents to turn culture into a fundamental resource of knowledge and dialogue for the formation and maintenance of communities, it is imperative that communities consistently share sources, practice and develop community culture, and maintain a sense of community identity and resources for collective action. Therefore, culture serves to develop a sense of local identity, promotes local solidarity, and influences the confidence of residents in solving problems jointly. Furthermore, the belief in a common ideal arises from the interaction of different opinions [6].

In addition, culture is an important asset that represents urban images and memories and symbolises a sense of local belonging [7]. The sense of identity provided by the local culture can assist individuals in playing different roles. Mobilisation further enables individuals to develop a strong sense of identity with cultural connotations, thus allowing cultural resources to build the sense of cultural identity required for collective action in a community [8].

Examining the current phenomenon of cultural development in Taiwan from the perspective of institutions of cultural and spatial governance reveals that cultural policies play a positive role in fostering local cultural consciousness, leading to cooperation between the public and private sectors with an emphasis on the assistance of governmental plans, the participation of private firms, and the operation of local community organisations, shaping of local cultural images, and regeneration and cohesion of cultural consciousness. To enroot the local cultural industry, it is imperative that people enjoy the culture and feel its distinct, unique characteristics. Building a close link between daily life and the cultural industry is a matter of necessity and the ultimate goal of a cultural industry.

4. Service-Dominant Logic, Cultural Value, and Cultural Services

The revitalisation of cultural heritage and historic areas is in full swing under the guidance of cultural policies in many countries. Thus, numerous appropriate cultural services have emerged. UNESCO defines cultural services as activities aimed at satisfying cultural interests or needs that do not represent material objects per se but usually include supporting measures (e.g., actual cultural behaviours and activities) provided by governments and non-governmental organisations (NGOs, quasi-public institutions, and firms). In the process of sociocultural innovation, the participation of actors enhances the value of innovation and extracts value from a city's resources of material, immaterial, and intangible assets [9]. In turn, this process stimulates a creative atmosphere that enables innovation.

According to service-dominant logic, services are the basis of exchange and represent an entity that applies its knowledge and expertise (e.g., expertise or operational resources) to benefit another entity [10]. The interaction between two entities leads to the co-creation of services that are continuously exchanged to generate value primarily through the active participation of actors and the provision of operational resources for exchange [10]. Cultural value is generated through the exchange of different services or from experiential interactions between actors [11], thus leading to the process of value creation. Accordingly, the connotation of cultural goods shifts from intrinsic value to use value, while value arises from the co-production of actors and active transformation [12][13]. Many studies have argued that actors drive and participate in the process of creating cultural value [14][15]. In this regard, cultural value is created not only by experiencing pleasant additional services but also by actors' participation in the creation of value. Accordingly, cultural value is not predetermined by goods but rather created through the interaction of goods and actors. Customer experience depends not only on the intrinsic value of cultural goods but also on the service experience shaped by service providers.

The interactions between different actors in cultural services can add to their value and consequently expand the boundaries of the concept of 'value'. In particular, service networks can provide more diverse aspects and an actor perspective for cultural goods to boost cultural value. Actors who co-create value in a constellation network share resources through cultural services. The process of value co-creation by actors of cultural services can nourish and multiply cultural values because all actors are committed to sharing their resources. A cultural service system integrates people, technologies, processes, and information [16]. Furthermore, it is self-adaptive through mutually beneficial interactions and resource integration [17], thus promoting resource integration [17][18][19]. In addition to shaping a constellation network for actors, a cultural service system interacts through a platform to co-create value and integrate actors' information and experience [18]. Cultural service ecosystems are formed when the resources of actors are integrated and interconnected through common institutional arrangements and when actors co-create value while sharing the experience of services. A perfect institutional framework for the development of the local cultural industry is built through the sustainable operation of culture and a harmonious network and alliance relationship between diverse actors. In this sense, historical blocks not only shape an interactive environment but also offer a service environment that provides experience, allows experience sharing, re-creates cultural value, and even enhances their cultural value.

Traditionally, cultural heritage is distinguished into tangible cultural heritage and intangible cultural heritage. Tangible cultural heritage includes culturally significant buildings, structures, sites, and places, whereas intangible cultural heritage includes ideas, practices, beliefs, traditions, and values that serve to unite a particular group of people [19]. The above 'intangible' perspective of cultural heritage does not fully convey any conceptual change. Cultural value itself does not exist in cultural goods or services but must be extracted from potential cultural connotations to provide the common value proposition shared by actors, meet their expectations of value co-creation, and strengthen the value-adding process in which potential actors actively participate during value creation. Thus, cultural value is not predefined but emerges from the interactions between actors. However, traditional marketing methods for products and services may not present

cultural value in its entirety and may even be prone to banalising cultural value [14]. Accordingly, it is worthwhile to examine how the actors of historical blocks can interactively extract and increase the cultural value of historical blocks, subsequently developing cultural service ecosystems for historical blocks through resource integration and value co-creation.

References

1. Lak, A.; Hakimian, P. Collective memory and urban regeneration in urban spaces: Reproducing memories in Baharestan Square, city of Tehran, Iran. City Cult. Soc. 2019, 18, 100290.

2. UNESCO. Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage. In Proceedings of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, France, 16 November 1972.

3. Richards, G. Creativity and tourism: The State of the Art. Ann. Tour. Res. 2011, 38, 1225–1253.

4. Della Lucia, M.; Trunfiob, M. The role of the private actor in cultural regeneration: Hybridizing cultural heritage with creativity in the city. Cities 2018, 82, 35–44.

5. Staggenborg, S. Social Movement Communities and Cycles of Protest: The Emergence and Maintenance of a Local Women's Movement. Soc. Probl. 1988, 45, 180–204.

6. Wilkinson, K.P. The Community in Rural America; Greenwood: New York, NY, USA, 1991.

7. Zukin, S. The Culture of Cities; Blackwell: Oxford, UK, 1995.

8. Neuhouser, K. If I had abandoned my children: Community mobilization and commitment to the identity of mother in Northeast Brazil. Soc. Forces 1998, 77, 331–358.

9. OECD. Tourism and the creative economy. In OECD Studies on Tourism; OECD iLibrary: Paris, France, 2014.

10. Polese, F.; Mele, C.; Gummesson, E. Value co-creation as a complex adaptive process. J. Serv. Theory Pract. 2017, 27, 926–929.

11. Barile, S.; Saviano, M. From the Management of Cultural Heritage to the Governance of the Cultural Heritage System. In Cultural Heritage and Value Creation; Golinelli, G., Ed.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland, 2015; pp. 71–103.

12. Lusch, R.F.; Vargo, S.L. Service-dominant logic: Reactions, reflections and refinements. Mark. Theory 2006, 6, 281–288.

13. Vargo, S.L.; Lusch, R.F. Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. J. Acad. Mark. Sci. 2008, 36, 1–10.

14. Barile, S.; Montella, M.; Saviano, M. A Service-Based Systems View of Cultural Heritage. J. Bus. Mark. Manag. 2012, 5, 106–136.

15. Golinelli, G.M. Cultural Heritage and Value Creation; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2015.

16. Maglio, P.P.; Vargo, S.; Caswell, N.; Spohrer, J. The service system is the basic abstraction of service science. Inf. Syst. E-Bus. Manag. 2009, 7, 395–406.

17. Vargo, S.L.; Akaka, M.A. Service-Dominant Logic as a Foundation for Service Science: Clarifications. Serv. Sci. 2009, 1, 32–41.

18. Vargo, S.L.; Lusch, R.F.; Akaka, M.A. Advancing service science with service dominant logic—Clarifications and conceptual development. In Handbook of Service Science; Maglio, P.P., Kieliszewski, C.A., Spohrer, J.C., Eds.; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2010; pp. 133–156.

19. Throsby, D. Cultural Capital. J. Cult. Econ. 1999, 23, 3–12.