Cultural heritage in building and enhancing social capital

Monika Murzyn-Kupisz
UNESCO Chair for Heritage and Urban Studies, Department of Economic and Social History, Krakow University of Economics, Krakow, Poland, and Jarosław Działek
Department of Regional Development, Institute of Geography and Spatial Planning, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland

Abstract

Purpose – Culture and cultural heritage are usually included in the general discussions on the construction of social capital and its impact on socio-economic development. Despite that, it seems that there has not been enough in-depth reflection on the typology and diversity of possible links between heritage and social capital. The purpose of this paper is to focus on an important aspect of heritage impact – its role in creating and enhancing social capital.

Design/methodology/approach – The aim of the article is to explain in what ways cultural heritage may constitute a tool, medium or space for enhancing and developing this type of capital. Though the text is mainly of theoretical character, conceptual statements are illustrated with selected cases from Great Britain and Poland, countries which differ significantly with respect to the level of social trust and involvement of residents in non-governmental organisations, yet both reflect well the broad array of impacts of heritage on social capital.

Findings – The article indicates myriad impacts of tangible and intangible cultural heritage on social capital. It points to significant potential of heritage in terms of providing places of encounters and community hubs, sites of social integration and inclusion, functioning as a source of identity and local pride as well as being a reason for common actions, activities of NGOs and volunteers. Attention is paid also to the possible negative effects of heritage on social capital.

Practical implications – It seems necessary to include this aspect of heritage impact in policy making, not only in the field of culture and monument protection but also in other spheres, taking into account both positive and negative potential of cultural heritage with respect to social capital.

Social implications – The article focuses on an important social aspect of heritage impact in the local and regional context, which should be taken into account by managers of heritage institutions and sites.

Originality/value – A new, coherent typology of impacts and links between heritage and social capital is proposed, which may be useful to different level public authorities and organizations and also helpful to practitioners in the field of heritage management, with respect to social implications of heritage projects and activities conducted by them.
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Introduction

Finding convincing arguments for safeguarding cultural heritage, justifying spending public means and stimulating actions of private actors, necessitates a broader than conventional approach to diverse socio-economic benefits created at different spatial scales thanks to its preservation, conservation, contemporary interpretation and usage. The potential of cultural heritage and activities linked to it to exert diverse impacts on contemporary development processes should be taken into account (Cernea, 2001;
Greffe, 2004; Greffe et al., 2005; Bowitz and Ibenholt, 2009; Murzyn-Kupisz, 2010; Pereira Roders and van Oers, 2011; Murzyn-Kupisz, 2012). The following paper focuses on an important aspect of heritage impact that is, its role in creating and enhancing social capital. Though the text is mainly of a theoretical character, conceptual statements are illustrated with selected cases from Great Britain and Poland. The two countries differ significantly with respect to the level of social trust and involvement of residents in non-governmental organizations (Casey, 2004; Czapinski, 2009). At the same time their governments have been undertaking active motions towards developing social capital as reflected in diverse strategic documents (Smolen, 2011; http://cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/seminars/social_capital.aspx).

The concept of social capital has become popular not only among academic researchers but also public authorities. One of the main reasons is its perception as an effective, low-cost tool of social and economic policy (Mohan and Mohan, 2002). Social capital has been the subject of many analyses by major international organizations such as the World Bank (Grootaert and van Bastelaer, 2001) or OECD (2001). Culture and cultural heritage are usually included in the general discussions on the construction of social capital (BetterTogether, 2001; Naylor et al., 2009). Despite that it seems that there is a dearth of in-depth reflection on the typology and diversity of possible links between social capital and cultural heritage (Graham et al., 2009). As follows, the aim of the paper is to explain in what ways cultural heritage, in both its material and immaterial expressions, may constitute a useful tool, medium or space for developing this type of capital. The issue is all the more important since it seems necessary to include this aspect of heritage impact in policy making not only in the field of culture and monument protection but also in other spheres, taking into account both the positive and negative potential of cultural heritage.

The concept of social capital
Social capital has been regarded as one of the most promising recent concepts thanks to which differences in the level of socio-economic development of particular neighbourhoods, municipalities, regions or entire countries may be explained. This new type of capital is understood as an important resource of individuals and social groups impacting on economic growth, democratic practices, quality of governance and quality of life (e.g. health or crime levels). According to Putnam (2000, p. 290) “social capital makes us smarter, healthier, safer, richer, and better able to govern a just and stable democracy”. Coleman, another classic researcher on social capital, points to its role in “facilitating the achievement of goals that could not be achieved in its absence or could be achieved only at a higher cost” (1994, p. 304). This is the essence of social capital understood as “social networks and the norms of trust and reciprocity that flourish through these networks” (Sander and Lowney, 2006, p. 23).

Thanks to a dense network of contacts and mutual trust an exchange between participants of the network of other resources and undertaking joint actions are possible. Apart from the structural (linkages) and normative (trust) aspects of social capital, one may distinguish its two main types. The first, which includes strong ties and personal trust is referred to as bonding social capital, while the second characterised by weak ties and social (or generalized) trust as bridging social capital. The former pertains to family, close friendship or neighbourly relations, the latter to more loose links with acquaintances or members of associations (Gittell and Vidal, 1998). For example, the research of Granovetter (1974) on employment searching strategies showed that best effects were achieved by getting information on available
workplaces from more distant acquaintances. In the context of economic development the bridging capital is often perceived as more valuable as it facilitates access to new resources not available in more closed networks of strong ties. Too much bonding capital may limit creativity, innovativeness and entrepreneurial spirit. This may lead to avoiding contacts with others, which restricts access to sources of external economic and human capital (Portes, 1998).

Still, as stressed by Woolcock (1998) a balance of both forms of social capital which he refers to as “embeddedness” and “autonomy” is most conducive to fulfilling development aims. Bonding capital facilitates community integration, which should lead to better cooperation between its members and greater readiness to sacrifice for others. Since the sole focus on the closest circle of family or neighbours may lead to amoral familiarism, the role of “autonomous” social links is to supplement the benefits stemming from “embedded” links and make up for their negative social and economic consequences. As follows, though “there may be different types of social capital […] collectively they are resources to be optimized, not maximized” (Woolcock, 1998, p. 158). Similar “equilibrium” is needed for the quality of governance (Paxton, 2002). Non-governmental organizations can constitute a tool of control of authorities and stimulate political participation of citizens, however, they would be less valuable without family or neighbour ties. With respect to education and health positive effects of social capital are mainly linked with greater bonding capital. Coleman (1988) analysed the importance of social capital in the context of educational achievements, pointing to the role of strong family and community links which decrease the probability of dropping out of school. Good health, especially mental well-being, is also linked with involvement in different networks. Loneliness leads to greater stress and risk of depression while participation in social networks usually improves overall perception of health and decreases the risk of health problems (Kawachi et al., 2008; Siegrist, 2000).

Consequently, despite some critique (i.e. Portes, 2000; Schuller et al., 2000; Haynes, 2009), both types of social capital may be regarded as useful in socio-economic development and conducive to improvement of the level and quality of life. If so, the question of how this new type of capital may be maintained and its resources increased arises. Is it possible to inspire its development in places less endowed with it? It may be particularly challenging in specific political and geographic contexts such as the post-communist countries in Central and Eastern Europe, where social capital was significantly eroded by decades of communism (Wedel, 2003; Mihaylova, 2004; Dzialek, 2011; Smoleń, 2011).

Wilson (1997, p. 746) points to the fact that social capital does not easily succumb to large-scale social engineering, and rather “is built in a very humble, piecemeal way through countless decisions of individuals about whether or not to get involved, and once involved how to proceed”. Such gradual construction of social capital is also proposed by Sander and Lowney (2006), who give examples of possible activities linked with different stages of social capital development taking into account who they pertain to (individuals, small or larger groups) and the level of trust. The stages are as follows: food and celebration; joint activity around a common hobby; doing a favour; discussion of a community issue; undertaking a joint goal; and relationship building. Step by step, depending on group size, next level activities may be undertaken requiring greater social skills and increasing the level of trust thanks to repeated interactions. The two authors notice that the attempt to build basic, individual relations which may later cumulate in larger scale projects pertaining to the entire community may be most effective. They also stress the need to create public spaces
and sites which make mutual interactions easier such as front porches, sidewalks and public multi-use parks.

The importance of social capital infrastructure for its development is also noticed by Warner (1999, 2001) in the context of the debate on the role of the state in building social capital. Similarly, according to Huntoon (2001) although it is not possible to create social capital through direct activities of public authorities, they may be helpful by indirectly supporting establishment of associations and supporting public institutions under their supervision in opening to new tasks and challenges. Easterling (2008, p. 39) in turn stresses the role of leadership:

Achieving a significant increase in social capital requires a fundamental shift in the community’s attitudes, behaviours, structures, norms, and culture. Such a shift will occur only if influential actors take bold and deliberate steps that directly address the community’s deficits and take full advantage of local resources.

As follows, public authorities at different governance levels should create possibilities to develop social capital that may be used by local actors. Among them, owners and managers of heritage sites and institutions may play an important role. They must, however, be aware of such possibilities and willing to undertake new tasks, going beyond traditionally understood preservation, exhibition or educational functions.

**Links between heritage and social capital**

In the seminal work on social capital focusing on Italian regions, Putnam et al. (1993) pointed to the fact that the resources of social capital are dependent upon long-term historical development processes. The strength of social capital reflected in the density and quality of social links and networks in a given area may thus be its heritage *per se*. The feeling of connectedness, trust and the existence of traditional ways of transmitting skills as well as the wealth of traditional craft, production and agricultural activities may constitute basis for the development of selected industries and creative activities in certain historic regions, being an important asset for local development.

Putnam’s book inspired the BetterTogether initiative (Putnam et al., 2004). It proposes many activities that help to create resources of social capital (BetterTogether, 2001). Special attention is paid to bridging social capital, though it is acknowledged that both types of social capital are equally important and valuable. Their recommendations concentrate on five institutional arenas which should be the focus of activities of actors who want to develop social capital, i.e., the workplace, artists and cultural organizations, politics and government, houses of worship and religious organizations and school, youth organizations and families. The authors stress that:

The arts can nurture social capital by strengthening friendships, helping communities to understand and celebrate their heritage, and providing a safe way to discuss and solve difficult social problems [...] provide a powerful way to transcend the cultural and demographic boundaries that divide us and to find deeper spiritual connections with those like us (BetterTogether, 2001, pp. 29, 31).

Many of the ideas on how to build social capital pertain to cultural heritage and heritage institutions. They may concern oral history recordings of personal or community character; volunteering, creating and participating in events and programmes at local libraries, museums or other heritage institutions; visiting and explaining historic sites (e.g. walking tours of a local historic area); initiating heritage-related community actions for public good such as cleaning up of a local historic park or cemetery or learning
about immaterial traditions of place such as craft through participation in classes, workshops and local folk festivals (www.bettertogether.org/150ways.htm).

Research on the role of heritage institutions in the creation of local identity and feeling of cohesion also points to the fact that museums, libraries and heritage sites may function as “community hubs” – spaces where trust is built and social networks are created. Visiting museums with family or friends, participating in group events during museum visits or consuming their supplementary services (e.g. gastronomy) results in enhancing and initiating links between individuals of both a bonding and bridging type. Although motivations to visit a given heritage site or institution may be diverse, some of the main reasons are usually wanting to accompany other people, show something to family members and friends, as well as hoping for a chance to meet other people (Figure 1). As follows, such institutions may help deepen and strengthen relations between family members or friends. They also present an opportunity to encounter other social groups, at times groups which would normally never meet or have contact with each other. They may help create or enhance the feeling of pride from the municipality and its heritage among the local community (Simon Jaquet Consultancy Services, 2009). They may also provide opportunities for interaction with older persons creating important intra-generational links.

The creation of social capital may be one of the important explicit aims of a given heritage institution which consciously broadens its programme to include activities which stimulate new encounters: clubs, discussions, special events, artistic workshops, organized tours. They may have general character or be intended for specific social groups such as families with children, whereby not only individual family members benefit in educational terms and deepen their family relations (bonding capital) but also meet other persons of similar age (bridging capital). The inclusion of specific local (regional) themes and references in museum expositions allowing for self-identification

![Figure 1.](image)

**Note:** \( n = 294 \)

**Source:** Authors’ own elaboration based on survey conducted by the Castle Museum in 2009.
of visitors with the presented subject develops and provokes dialogue over what they have seen, building the feeling of pride from the locality (region) and thus indirectly enhancing bonding capital (Kinghorn and Willis, 2008). Local community members may, or even should, as stressed by the so-called new museology, actively participate in the creation of narration on historical issues and presentation of their heritage, making sure it reflects not only external professional opinions but also community viewpoints (Sandell and Janes, 2007; Watson, 2007).

Gaining both personal and group benefits linked with social capital is a key motivation for volunteering in heritage-related projects and at heritage institutions. For instance, research on the social impact of projects supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund in Great Britain revealed that participation in such projects gives volunteers a chance to maintain and develop skills, improves their health and feeling of well-being, and last but not least provides an occasion to participate in public life and the life of the local community which leads to its stronger integration and enhancing social capital (Figure 2). Such projects create possibilities to establish links, develop mutual understanding and stimulate exchange of experiences between the older and the younger generations, which is especially important for the perception of quality of life by retired persons (Naylor et al., 2009).

A heritage institution or a site may also be a place where interaction and dialogue between the old (long term) and new inhabitants of a given locality takes place. The latter, who have just moved in, may appreciate its heritage very much but have no knowledge of local networks. The former, despite the initial distrust or even disdain for “outsiders” may after some time admit that it is thanks to “strangers” that they value their local heritage more and more strongly identify with it. At the same time, participation in heritage-oriented activities makes “outsiders” turn into “locals” (Simon Jaquet Consultancy Services, 2009). Persons who engage in discovery and presentation
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**Figure 2.** Single best thing that volunteers gain from involvement in projects supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund

*Source: Naylor et al. (2009, p. 42)*
of heritage for diverse reasons (personal, cultural, social or purely commercial), as part of their amateur or professional activities, may in turn play the role of “heritage brokers” forging links between former and contemporary residents and between locals and tourists (Lehrer, 2010).

Cooperation on heritage projects may integrate many actors and partners at a local or regional level (Allaert and Ludtke, 2007). Such ventures create a chance to start and maintain interactions between diverse age and social groups within a given community. Sometimes the very aim of preventing destruction or preserving a given heritage site may unite many actors around a common aim and at the same time help them to get to know each other, develop trust and stronger links. In addition, although such pressure and action groups may be created informally, they may in time evolve into formal non-governmental organizations.

The number and activities of the third-sector organizations are seen as one of the most important indicators of social capital (van Deth, 2003; Westlund and Adam, 2010). Activities aimed at heritage preservation, promotion or education on heritage-related issues are often the main field of activity of non-governmental organizations. Heritage may also be used in diverse ways during third-sector activities with a different main purpose such as health protection, social integration, helping the disabled, local development or education. On the other hand, relatively many non-governmental organizations explicitly focus on heritage. The substantial number of non-governmental organizations in Poland, including public benefit organizations, working in this field may be a good example (Table I). Such organizations may focus on preserving or promoting a specific site (e.g. a church, a palace or a cemetery); an object (e.g. historic pipe organs, a fountain); support heritage institutions (e.g. a particular museum), focus on a historic area or quarter or on a given heritage type (e.g. industrial, modern architecture, heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Non-profit organizations Number in thousands</th>
<th>Public benefit organizations % of the total number of public benefit organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass media, TV and radio production, press and book publishing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts, painting, sculpture, photography, architecture, design</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts, theatre, music, film</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of monuments and sites of national remembrance, supporting national, regional and cultural traditions</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities related to exhibitions and museums</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: According to Law on Public Benefit Activities and Volunteering passed by the Polish Parliament on 24 April 2003 a “public benefit organisation” is a non-governmental organisation or a different authorised entity which conducts activities for the benefit of the society in general or aimed at a particular social group within the scope of activities pointed to in the Law. Public benefit organizations are entitled to receive 1 per cent of the personal income tax paid by individual taxpayers (cf. www.pozytek.gov.pl)

Source: GUS (2010)
of an ethnic or religious minority). They may promote local traditions, propagate memory of a given historical event or focus on the discovery of multiculturality of a given region and intercultural dialogue. Apart from “soft” measures such as cultural or promotional events, non-governmental organizations may also inspire or conduct projects of restoration and adaptation of heritage sites, manage and make them accessible to the general public. They may be small, local organizations or large and complex institutions active all over a region or a country (e.g. National Trust in Great Britain as the largest voluntary conservation organisation in Europe).

Activities linked to cultural heritage (cultural and educational but also conservation and restoration activities) addressed to different social groups are currently regarded as a chance of social inclusion of persons and social groups in danger of marginalization. Such individuals or groups disadvantaged for different reasons (economic, social, political) may also be excluded from cultural participation and heritage presentation. The heritage of a given social or ethnic group may not be included in the activities of heritage institutions, focusing on dominant, historically important or prominent social and ethnic groups. Its members may not be participating in the process of contemporary cultural creation (exclusion from creation of potential future heritage). Last but not least exclusion may pertain to access to cultural institution and consumption of cultural goods and services (Sandell, 1998, 2002) including financial exclusion (e.g. of unemployed, low income households), physical exclusion linked with the difficulties to access heritage sites and institutions (e.g. for the disabled) or exclusion from access to information on heritage (e.g. digital exclusion). Different social groups may be excluded from activities aimed at preservation, contemporary usage and presentation of heritage not only for economic but also cultural reasons, e.g. the issue of integration of heritage of immigrants representing diverse ethnic and religious groups (Gardner, 2004).

As follows, social integration is presently often one of the main aims of initiating heritage projects or functioning of heritage institutions. Many heritage institutions undertake active motions to cooperate with local residents and broaden the spectrum of their customers. Bourke (2005, p. 74) cites the example of public libraries which, if they are to continue to attract readers, should not only invest in the newest technologies but also be the sites of social capital construction:

If we are truly to be facilitators in a knowledge society libraries have to be visible and active in their communities, constantly looking for new ways to build bridges to the excluded and marginalised. This may mean a change in the way things have always been done in our public libraries. They need to be credible members of their communities, offering opportunities to build the social capital framework and allow all people equal access to those opportunities.

Libraries should try to create networks with other local organizations and institutions, which would enable them to recognize community needs better. They ought to design programmes attractive to young people functioning as “third places” next to schools and homes. Last but not least, they should make use of their potential as meeting venues. The diversity of library audiences in terms of age, professional and social backgrounds they represent surely provides ample opportunities for such enhanced, social capital-creating role (Table II). A good example of such an enhanced role of a library and its impact on the surroundings in Poland is the new library of the University of Warsaw (the so-called BUW) referred to as the “new heart of Warsaw” (Homiński, 2008).

Similarly, in recent years the possible role of museums as agents of social inclusion has been underlined. According to Sandell (1998) a museum may be combating social
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Under 15 years</th>
<th>16-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-60</th>
<th>Youth (not employed)</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Blue collar workers</th>
<th>White collar workers</th>
<th>Other employed</th>
<th>Not employed (retired, pensioners, unemployed)</th>
<th>Total number of readers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' own elaboration based on data provided by Municipal Public Library in Bytom.
inequalities in three principal ways. First tackling the cultural dimension of exclusion – paying attention to the way it conducts cultural activities and projects, their content and accessibility. Next, being an agent of social regeneration encouraging personal development (e.g. diverting young people from offending or criminal behaviour; cooperating with prisons; conducting therapeutic programmes for the disabled and persons with learning difficulties; devising programmes aimed at unemployed, improving their self-esteem and confidence). Finally, playing an even broader role as a vehicle of broader social change providing a forum for public debate, education and persuasion on important issues. Monuments and remembrance sites may also transmit important symbolic messages in terms of social inclusion. Conservation and preservation endeavours may be in turn a chance to involve unemployed persons providing them with new conservation-related skills and possibility to socialize (Murzyn-Kupisz, 2010).

Critics of such trends in the activities of heritage institutions and the popularity of programmes aimed at combating social exclusion point to the hidden instrumental motive of legitimization of heritage and public spending on it among increasingly differentiated national or regional publics who do not necessarily identify with particular collections or sites. The implicit aim of such programmes may be to improve the image of heritage institutions and sites so that they would not only be perceived as elite and serving selected affluent social groups or representing the dominant national narrative while in reality they continue to be “islands” excluded from the local context and social problems. Many cultural institutions are weakly linked with their local communities, while their regular customers often represent specific economically and socially privileged social groups, race or gender (Bettertogether, 2000). Heritage projects may then also be socially regressive, deepen the feeling of exclusion, accentuate differences, enhance higher status and dominance of certain social or ethnic groups (Pedlebury et al., 2004).

Last but not least, historic public sites (squares, streets, historic city centres and parks) are often “natural” spaces of leisure, meetings and encounters, conducive to them with their aesthetics and ambiance. Diverse expressions of heritage and heritage projects may likewise be an important element of the “sense of place”, defining local identity, the reason for local pride and sense of attachment, enhancing the feeling of links between the local community members (Newman and Jennings, 2008). Such a positive impact of heritage sites on the quality of life and well-being of individuals and local communities is confirmed by evaluation studies on the impact of public investments and projects focused on heritage (Tables III and IV). Heritage is also often a catalyst for regeneration of degraded, run-down urban or rural areas (English Heritage, 2005; Murzyn, 2006) including the improvement of their social milieu, strengthening local links, feeling of local pride and belonging. In addition, making use of and strengthening social capital resources of both the bonding and bridging type may constitute an important factor conducive to increasing the authentic engagement of the local community in consultations and participation in decision making on the aims and directions of urban regeneration policy (Cento Bull and Jones, 2006; Blakeley and Evans, 2009). Moreover, in areas undergoing gentrification, new residents with higher levels of social and cultural capital may be more effective in lobbying for infrastructural and quality of life improvements to the benefit of all residents (Butler and Robson, 2001; Hibbit et al., 2001).

Final remarks
Heritage buildings, institutions and sites as well as immaterial heritage may be the main theme and inspiration for the creation and enhancing social capital or the
physical space where such development takes place. As follows, according to the authors among most important types of positive impact and links between cultural heritage and social capital following should be mentioned (Table V):

1. heritage institutions and sites as places of encounters, leisure, interaction and discussion, functioning as “community hubs”;
2. heritage as a constitutive part and an expression of identity, pride, sense of place and belonging at different spatial scales; heritage as the reason for common celebrations and festivities;
3. dense networks of personal and professional links transmitted from generation to generation as the immaterial heritage of place per se;
4. the role of heritage in attracting new residents and supporting their integration with the local community;
5. heritage sites, buildings and institutions communicating important symbolic meanings, promoting social inclusion, tolerance, respect for diversity, including needs and potential of social and ethnic groups in danger of exclusion;
6. heritage objects, sites or traditions as the main aim and reason for undertaking common actions and community integration around an important goal; the importance of heritage for and in the activities of non-governmental institutions; and
7. the use of heritage in broadly understood urban and rural regeneration, impacting not only on spatial planning and physical renewal of built tissue but also social renewal.

Cultural heritage and activities linked with it may, however, sometimes also have disintegrative, negative impact on social capital (Table V). Strong bonding capital in traditional communities may make them avoid external contacts and inspirations, distrustful or even hostile towards outsiders. Heritage institutions may promote the values of prominent social, economic or political groups, becoming tools of domination and control rather than social inclusion. The consequence of previous historic periods may be a lack of will to cooperate, weaker social trust and devaluation of community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% agree strongly</th>
<th>% agree at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt safe during my visit</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was peaceful and gave me a place to relax</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is beautiful/there are beautiful things here</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps me to understand about the history/background of other people</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My visit today inspired me</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a good place to meet friends</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting this site gave me the chance to do more physical activity than I would otherwise have taken</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides a link to my or my family’s history</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has spiritual or religious meaning to me</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mills (2008, p. 13)

Table III.
Social and well-being impact of visits to heritage sites supported by Heritage Lottery Fund in Great Britain
Table IV. Local residents perceptions of the impact of EU ERDF supported infrastructural projects linked with heritage and heritage institutions in the Silesian region in Poland on their municipality and quality of life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of answers “Yes” (in %)</th>
<th>Regeneration of the Upper-Silesian Museum buildings in Bytom</th>
<th>Modernisation of the historic market square in Koniecpol</th>
<th>Restoration of the castle complex in Pszczyna</th>
<th>Construction of a Bison Visitors’ Centre in the historic park in Pszczyna</th>
<th>Renovation and regeneration for cultural purposes of the complex of the Old Habsburg Castle and park in Żywiec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The municipality is better known</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents feel more integrated</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more tourists</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The municipality is more attractive to investors</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents are more proud of their municipality</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The aesthetics and architecture of the municipality improved</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New possibilities of spending leisure time were created</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater interest of residents in local past may be observed</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural offer is broader</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new reason/site the commune can promote itself with has been created</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Murzyn-Kupisz and Gwosdz (2010)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of impact</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Tangible heritage</th>
<th>Intangible heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Bonding within local</td>
<td>1. Historic public spaces (e.g. squares, piazzas, gardens) as spaces of leisure and</td>
<td>2. The impact of heritage on the sense of place, local pride and sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td>encounters providing possibilities to meet, socialize and spend leisure time</td>
<td>Heritage as the reason for common celebrations and engagement in rituals, festivities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging with others</td>
<td>Heritage institutions (e.g. museums, libraries) as community hubs providing bonding</td>
<td>activities and communal gatherings of different type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and bridging opportunities between different age groups, long time and new residents, different ethnic and religious groups; acting as venues for encounters and discussion of community issues</td>
<td>3. Social capital as local/regional heritage: historically developed social links, trust, shared values, existing channels of transmitting skills and networks of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The importance of heritage in attracting new residents who may bring new dynamism to the local community.</td>
<td>4. The importance of heritage in attracting new residents who may bring new dynamism to the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Heritage sites, institutions and heritage oriented activities communicating important messages of social inclusion</td>
<td>5. Heritage sites, institutions and heritage oriented activities communicating important messages of social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>6. Heritage as the reason for cooperation and integration towards a certain common aim (e.g. preserving a heritage site or a local tradition): common actions of both informal (protest groups) and formal character (associations, volunteering at heritage sites and in heritage institutions)</td>
<td>6. Heritage as the reason for cooperation and integration towards a certain common aim (e.g. preserving a heritage site or a local tradition): common actions of both informal (protest groups) and formal character (associations, volunteering at heritage sites and in heritage institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common actions</td>
<td>Importance of heritage for establishment and activities of NGOs</td>
<td>Importance of heritage for establishment and activities of NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Bonding within local</td>
<td>7. The use of heritage in urban regeneration strategies of public authorities</td>
<td>7. The use of heritage in urban regeneration strategies of public authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td>1. Heritage as the reason for local shame having a negative impact on both bonding and bridging possibilities: problems with coming to terms with unwanted, “dissonant” heritage (e.g. because of its bad state of repair, bad image of place it creates; necessity of admittance of “difficult” historic events; existence of negative traditional attitudes)</td>
<td>1. Heritage as the reason for local shame having a negative impact on both bonding and bridging possibilities: problems with coming to terms with unwanted, “dissonant” heritage (e.g. because of its bad state of repair, bad image of place it creates; necessity of admittance of “difficult” historic events; existence of negative traditional attitudes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging with others</td>
<td>2. Heritage inspiring gentrification processes – attracting new, often more wealthy, residents who may polarize the local community and displace former residents</td>
<td>2. Heritage inspiring gentrification processes – attracting new, often more wealthy, residents who may polarize the local community and displace former residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Historically developed social capital of bonding type so strong that there are difficulties or no possibilities of bridging with others: closed, traditional communities who have negative attitudes towards outsiders, are very distrustful or unwilling to create links with others</td>
<td>3. Historically developed social capital of bonding type so strong that there are difficulties or no possibilities of bridging with others: closed, traditional communities who have negative attitudes towards outsiders, are very distrustful or unwilling to create links with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V. Typology of impacts and links between heritage and social capital

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of impact</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Heritage type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tangible heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Lack of or weakness of social capital stemming from the locality’s/region’s history (e.g. an area of ethnic cleansing or with a totally new population settled in it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>5. Heritage institutions and activities as exclusive and forcing selected/dominant elite values upon broader, diverse communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage related projects and institutions as a tool to express and maintain power by dominant political, economic, social or ethnic groups excluding needs and heritage of less affluent groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common actions</td>
<td>6. Heritage as a bone of contention creating and enforcing conflicts rather than inspiring integration within local communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Historic underpinnings of negative attitudes towards common actions for common good (e.g. in post-communist countries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration
oriented, voluntary efforts as in the case of post-communist Central and Eastern Europe, where such initiatives were most often ideologically influenced and involuntary for their participants. At times heritage becomes a bone of contention rather than a reason for community integration. It is a key cause of fierce local conflicts over what should be remembered, preserved and promoted as heritage. Such tensions may lead to a weakening of trust, local ties and networks of cooperation or even break them up totally. Similarly, some types of heritage which may be described as difficult or dissonant heritage (e.g. heritage of atrocity) or its bad state of repair and dilapidation may not be a reason for local pride but rather a reason for shame and a weaker attachment to a given locality (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996; Logan and Reeves, 2009).

Heritage may also, usually indirectly, cause the loss or weakening of social capital due to conflicts between heritage conservation and local development goals, the role it plays in gentrification or its dysfunctional use. First of all different actors may have diametrically opposed visions of local development, ranging from development based on preservation and local use of heritage or development focused on its external (i.e. tourist) users to wishing to completely exclude heritage from local development as a burden rather than a development asset. Urban conservation may in addition be seen as an important aspect of the social class struggle in the city (Lees et al., 2008).

Second, market-led urban regeneration and a process of gentrification that usually accompanies it bring about questions of shared visions between existing communities and newcomers, representativeness and empowerment – ownership of heritage programmes and projects (Jacobs and Dutton, 2000). Heritage and the sense of place it creates often inspire gentrification as historically and architecturally unique quarters are more likely to receive in-moving populations of higher financial, social and cultural status (Howard, 2003). Although gentrification may sometimes help in the creation of bridging social capital, it is much more likely to lead to displacement of many long-term residents, the breakdown of close-knit communities, community resentment and conflict. It may cause the destruction of existing social links and networks (bonding capital), especially in vulnerable working-class or ethnic communities (Atkinson 2000, 2004; Freeman and Branconi, 2004; Slater 2006; Barber and Hall, 2008; Doucet 2009). In addition, during the gentrification processes some aspects of heritage and its narratives may be underlined while some may be sidelined which may lead to the loss of local identification and a feeling of belonging among the remaining members of along settled population. Though public authorities may try to mitigate the negative impacts of gentrification on the local communities promoting so-called “careful urban renewal” (Smith, 1999), the differences in socio-economic status between the newcomers and old-timers and the different visions and symbolic meanings they attach to a quarter may, as mentioned earlier, lead to serious conflicts between them and make it unlikely to create bridging capital. As Shaw states: “Gentrification […] has the capacity to forge selective remembrances that assist in the maintenance and consolidation of increasingly exclusive territories” (Shaw, 2005, p. 71).

Similarly, the use of heritage for the purpose of tourism may destroy its social capital creating and enhancing role, especially if it is not in line with the local socio-cultural context. Not all heritage-related tourism initiatives will cause “culturally integrated effects”, i.e. results which answer the aims and needs of local community (Eversole, 2006). In some cases an isolated aspect of an area’s heritage is chosen and promoted to tourists. This often leads to it losing its symbolic meaning for the local population while non-tourist possibilities for generating income and other uses of
heritage are not taken into account. In others heritage is invented for the purpose of tourists excluding local participation, skills and needs (Eversole, 2006). Tourists may in addition, symbolically or practically (through overcrowding) “take over” public spaces and heritage institutions or even entire quarters making them less symbolically relevant to the local community and less likely to be used as local sites of encounter. The often uneven distribution of costs and benefits from tourism means that selected community members may benefit from it while the local community as such suffers, not only in terms of costs of preservation and infrastructure but also in social terms.

Accordingly, actors creating visions of developing social capital using cultural heritage in a given social, economic, political and geographic context should be aware of both its positive potential and negative impact on the quality and quantity social capital in different spatial scales. From a sustainable development perspective, taking into account the need to preserve heritage for future generations and developing and enhancing social capital, most successful and effective heritage-related endeavours should be conceived and implemented in, at least partial, consensus and cooperation between diverse key stakeholders. As important players among them and considering any heritage-related efforts, public authorities should take into account their diverse potential impacts, including gains and costs in terms of social capital. The issue of social capital should be included as an important aspect of qualitative analysis of heritage projects with respect to their social impact, during cost-benefit analysis of proposed undertakings as well as monitoring and evaluation of already implemented ones. This could not only prevent the carrying out investments that are doubtful or risky in social terms but also provide heritage professionals and decision makers with additional important arguments “for” heritage preservation and conservation efforts.
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