

**Literature Review:
Historic Environment, Sense of Place, and Social Capital**

Commissioned for English Heritage

Completed June 2009

by

**Dr Helen Graham, Dr Rhiannon Mason and Andrew Newman
International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies (ICCHS)
Newcastle University**

Contact Details:

International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies (ICCHS)
School of Arts and Cultures
Bruce Building
Newcastle University
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 7RU,
United Kingdom

<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/sacs/icchs/>

Telephone: +44 (0)191 222 7419

Fax: +44 (0)191 222 5564

Email:

- Helen Graham (h.graham@ncl.ac.uk)
- Rhiannon Mason (rhiannon.mason@ncl.ac.uk)
- Andrew Newman (andrew.newman@ncl.ac.uk)

Literature Review: Historic Environment, Sense of Place and Social Capital

Executive Summary

This literature review considers whether it is possible to identify relationships between the historic environment, sense of place and social capital. It asks the following questions:

1. What theories can we find to explain the relationship between sense of place, historic environment and social capital?
2. What evidence can we find to explain the relationship between sense of place, historic environment and social capital?
3. What is the quality of this evidence and these theories? If international, how applicable are they to the UK?
4. Are there any key studies which are of particular relevance to this project?
5. What conclusions can we draw from this literature review to inform the questions to be asked in the research undertaken by CURDS?

Key points:

We have found no major studies which directly link all three components: 'historic environment', 'sense of place' and 'social capital'. However, there are promising links between: 1) the historic environment (often referred to more broadly as heritage) and sense of place, and 2) between sense of place (as developed through heritage) and social capital.

1. Links between historic environment (heritage) and sense of place

The links between historic environment and sense of place are most clearly made through research that links *place distinctiveness* (what makes a place distinctive), *place continuity* (the way a place supports people's sense of continuity) and *place dependency* (how a place enables people to realise their goals) to a *sense of place*. However, it is notable that other factors – such as relationships with people within a place – might be as, or even more, important as an indicator of a sense of place than the built environment. There is no single theory of 'sense of place'. Rather, it is understood in many different ways within the academic literature.

One of the most challenging issues here is to ascertain how people understand the 'historic environment' or 'heritage', how they value it, and how such values are shaped by official bodies such as councils and heritage organisations. Moreover, definitions and perceptions may change over time because of factors relating to that individual (how long they have lived in a place) or because of involvement in an activity or event which prompts them to revisit and change their prior perceptions. A sense of personal history and community heritage is certainly understood in the literature as being linked to a strong sense of place.

It is also worth noting that Heritage and Museums Studies have drawn attention to the range of different factors (including class and ethnicity) which impact on people's engagement with heritage. This literature would suggest that there is a spectrum of people's engagement with the historic environment. This could range from walking past a monument to visiting or volunteering at a local heritage site.

2. Links between sense of place and social capital

Social Capital is a term which refers to benefits in terms of wellbeing, good health and civil engagement which are generated through the interactions between people. Links between 'social capital' and 'sense of place' – and its specific subsets place attachment and place dependency' can be traced in three different ways. Firstly, links can be traced through the relationship between place attachment and outcomes such as higher levels of self-esteem or pride in a place. Secondly, heritage-specific studies have seen the exploration of the past as a means to support shared values and citizenship. One widely shared conclusion is that more active forms of engagement – actively creating, exhibiting, and participating – has better outcomes in terms of social capital. Thirdly, it is also possible to see a link between place dependency and social capital through the kind of social interactions a place facilitates. 'Place dependency' might include heritage-specific interactions, but might include the historic environment facilitating non-heritage specific activities.

Social Capital comes in different forms. Where 'bonding' capital is 'exclusive' and maintained within certain groups, 'bridging' and 'linking' capital is generated through links between groups. It is also important to note that the role of place within these different types of social capital is yet to be fully determined. However, thinking about place and social capital together immediately raises tensions between ideas of rootedness and mobility (both social and geographical), which are indelibly linked to class.

Methodologies

The complexity of these terms – both on their own and when placed in relationship to each other – strongly suggests that research in this area needs to draw on a nuanced and multi-disciplinary approach involving both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. One of the weaknesses of current research is that projects tend to operate within closed disciplinary fields and do not take into account insights from other traditions. This matters because considering the relationship between the 'historic environment', 'sense of place' and 'social capital' requires an understanding of multiple factors. Some of these factors can be measured, which is an approach favoured by psychology, some can be articulated in a more open-ended interview, as often used in sociology and human geography. Others, however, are more about how people live their lives on a daily basis and in a more unconscious way, (which has been approached via human geography's use of phenomenology). This approach emphasises how people enter the world through experience while anthropological methodologies describe people's lives in context using ethnographic approaches.

Social and environment psychology have developed and used scales and questions for the measurement of 'place attachment', 'place identity' and 'place dependency' and these are included in the appendix. They have obvious relevance for survey-type studies but should be used with an awareness of the qualifications outlined above and below in the full document.

One further observation is that as a research framework 'sense of place' may enable all sorts of previously unseen relationships to emerge. However, it is important not to forget all the considerable research on audiences and visitor patterns, demographics, motivations, identity, and capital which has been carried out within museum, gallery, and heritage studies. To our knowledge there has been no real cross-over between these approaches and this is an obvious gap in the literature.

A methodology for exploring the connections between the 'historic environment', 'sense of place' and 'social capital' should therefore:

- 1) Delineate and seek to understand the historic environment as it works on an individual, social and place-level.
- 2) Avoid prejudging what an individual or group might define and value (or not) as 'historic environment' or 'heritage' and seek to understand how and why respondents define and value such things for themselves.
- 3) Capture the multiple ways in which place is interacted with and experienced in daily life – both consciously and less consciously and not prejudge the scale at which people's sense of place is operating – i.e. to be wary of presuming that we already know what counts as local or 'my place' for people and groups.
- 4) Be aware that sense of place has been approached very differently in different disciplines and has been subdivided in some disciplines into different components of 'sense of place' – place attachment; place identity; place dependence.
- 5) Understand that places can be thought of as made up of a range of quite different types of factors which extend from the built environment to people's emotional and psychological engagement with place.
- 6) Consider both the role of the historic environment in sense of place but also other factors such as social networks and relationships between people.
- 7) Explore the contradictions in social capital as it relates to place and social mobility and cultural and economic capital.

Conclusions:

Historic environment and sense of place

- That the historic environment contributes towards a distinctive sense of place and a sense of continuity which can support a greater sense of people's self-esteem and place attachment. However, the values attached by people to what might be termed 'historic environment' will be multiple, changeable and will not necessarily map onto those identified by official bodies. The historic environment should also be understood as a setting for people's daily lives, giving rise to a less conscious experience of place.
- There are a range of factors – not linked to the built environment – which affect place attachment including relationships with other people, crime and social mix in an area.
- 'Sense of place' as place attachment and social networks seem linked in a virtuous cycle (though there is disagreement about which comes first and which is more important).
- Social networks may be more important than the built environment in generating place attachment and some forms of social capital. Certain types of historic environment may help to support social activities and enable personal motivations by providing safe and attractive public spaces.

Sense of place and social capital

- A key way of understanding the relationship between 'sense of place' and 'social capital' is through the relationship between 'place attachment', 'self-esteem' and shared pride.

- Heritage has been linked to offering opportunities for the development of both a stronger sense of place and social capital. The more actively people are involved in heritage or place-shaping activities the greater the social capital developed.
- Social capital could also be linked to ‘place dependency’, as people meet others through shared interests and activities.
- Not all social capital is necessarily ‘good’ – a fact that also relates to ‘sense of place’ and place attachment. Thinking about social capital alongside place makes visible a tension between, on the one hand, ‘bonding’ social capital and stability and ‘bridging’ and ‘linking’ forms of social capital and mobility.
- This tension can also be traced across the forms which social capital interactions take and their relationship to class. Bonding capital is often associated with working class communities and linked to socialising, local and community-level participation whereas ‘bridging’/‘linking’ capital is often linked to the more mobile middle classes and more formal civil participation (Lewicka 2005). One question revolves around how heritage agencies might generate links between these two pathways.

Implications for the historical environment and social capital

- The historic environment can enable interactions which might produce social capital in three key ways:
 - 1) via the opportunity for sharing knowledge about the past;
 - 2) via active involvement in heritage-type activities
 - 3) as a site which supports other kinds of unrelated interactions, for example dog walking or as a landmark where people might meet.
- It is clear that the more actively people are involved in place shaping, including active engagement in heritage – and the greater the opportunities for bridging and linking forms of social capital – then the more likelihood there is of social capital outcomes such as citizenship, well-being and broadening of horizons. In 1) and 2) above arguably the emphasis is placed on the heritage activity whereas in 3) it may not be although the activity may equally produce social capital. It may or may not be possible ‘move’ people from the position of being more interested in opportunities for socialising to being more interested in the historical value itself but it depends on whether this is seen as desirable or beneficial.

Future Research Areas

There is scope for further exploration of the links between the historic environment, sense of place and social capital using in-depth qualitative approaches.

English Heritage could consider funding research on active place-shaping projects, using in-depth interviews. A more ambitious project would be to carry out an ethnography project in different parts of the UK to seek to understand how the historic environment and heritage activities might figure within people’s daily lives.

About the study

This literature review was researched and written by: Dr Helen Graham, Dr Rhiannon Mason and Andrew Newman of the International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies, Newcastle University, June 2009. A methodology for this literature review is included in the appendix.

Introduction

The **Historic Environment, Sense of Place and Social Capital** literature review is presented in four sections.

1. The review opens with a summary of recent relevant policy in order to outline expected links between the research title's three key terms and to provide a focus for the discussion of the academic literature.
2. The second section outlines the key concepts and debates relating to the three key terms in the research title.
3. The third section specifically presents existing research relating to the interconnection between the historic environment and sense of place, and between sense of place and social capital.
4. The final section draws out the implications of the literature review for the 'Sense of Place, Historic Environment and Social Capital' research project.

Section1: Policy Context

- *Place*

The key context for the 'Sense of Place, Historic Environment and Social Capital' research project is the clear emergence of 'place' as a conceptual framework in national and local government social and cultural policy. A series of documents – most significantly the Lyons Inquiry into Local Government which reported in March 2007 – have stressed the importance of place, as Sir Michael Lyons put it on the launch of the report: 'Local government's place-shaping role – using powers and influence creatively to promote the well-being of a community and its citizens – is crucial to help improve satisfaction and prosperity through greater local choice and flexibility' (Lyons online). This has led to a greater emphasis on local government's role in generating 'local belonging' (DCLG 2009a), and as a focus for economic intervention (DCLG 2009b). The growing interest in a holistic idea of 'place' may well be in recognition that while numerous person-based policies and numerous place-based policies have been introduced since 1997 they tend to have been developed separately. This has led to a situation where 'no more than one or two initiatives have explicitly sought to exploit the logical synergies between people and place' (Griggs et al 2008, p. xix).

In practice the new emphasis on 'place-shaping' can be found in a raft of government policy measures which lay much greater emphasis on building 'greater public trust and accountability' (DCLG 2009). While building trust is seen as likely to emerge via community involvement in local decisions-making, promoting empowerment is understood as likely to be generated through shared interests, history, geographical features and key buildings and symbolic events (DCLG 2009a). Culture and heritage are understood as key methods of generating belonging – and the historic environment (even in its narrowest definition) is explicitly evoked (DCLG 2009a, p. 19). A strong and empowered community – it is believed – is likely to be more welcoming of others (DCLG 2009a).

The current policy direction can also be related to a range of long standing activist campaigns concerned with 'local distinctiveness' and active grass roots involvement such as Common Ground (Common Ground online) or the various strands of the environment and green movements.

- *Place and Heritage*

The recent DCLG policy focus on 'place' explicitly evokes heritage and the historic environment as suggested above. Yet the link between the historic environment and 'place-shaping' has a longer trajectory in a number of policy documents from DCMS and in the organisational policy literature dating back to at least 2000 (EH 2000a, EH 2000b; DCMS 2001; DCMS 2002).

English Heritage is one of a number of agencies seeking to demonstrate the importance of place to wider social outcomes. The 'Power of Place' – as the 2000 report put it – is understood as stemming from the belief that 'the historic environment has the potential to strengthen the sense of community and provide a solid basis for neighbourhood renewal' (EH 2000b p. 23). Much like the broader approaches to place-shaping, emphasis is placed on the importance of people being actively involved in defining heritage and in their ability to participate in 'decisions affecting' the historic environment (EH 2000b, p. 23). Key elements of the *Power of Place* findings – validating engagement, promoting area characterisation and strengthening integration – were subsequently drawn out in case studies provided by the Campaign to Protect Rural England, National Trust and Heritage Link (Gathorne-Hardy 2004).

More recently, the work of place-shaping in the context both of the historic environment and urban renewal has been taken up by English Heritage through the idea of 'characterisation' which is defined in the following way:

What underlies [characterisation] is a desire to capture our overall feeling for the totality of a place – not just to collect facts about who built that building, what style it is, whether it is rare, what an archaeological site can tell us about our predecessors or how a designed park reflects 18th-century taste, but about what the place as a whole means to us.

(Grenville and Fairclough 2004-5, p. 2)

More recently, CABE and English Heritage have focused on notions of local character and identity via a participatory process termed 'townscape and heritage appraisals' (2008). The appraisals approach a shared understanding of '*genius loci*' or the 'spirit of place' via working with local people to map specific character areas, develop an assessment of the significance of these areas and identify future planning recommendations. For example the use of this process in Salford led to the 'Chimney Pot Park' project, which retained historic frontages but with newly designed interiors (EH and CABE 2008, p. 7).

The relationship between distinctive place and stronger communities is being currently supported via the launch of the *Living Places* portal – a partnership project between the Arts Council England, the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), English Heritage, the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). The social impact of distinctive places and active participation in place-shaping is seen as enabling both identity ('self-knowledge and a sense of shared purpose') and agency ('the ability to act') (*Living Places* online).

- *Social capital*

It is notable that 'social capital' as such is not mentioned in the recent raft of DCLG or DCMS policy statements/ guidance. Instead 'community cohesion', 'citizenship', 'well-being', 'inclusive communities', 'community empowerment', 'identity' and 'agency' are more likely to be used (see

also the Manchester Sense of Place project n.d.). In all likelihood this is because social capital is not generally conceived as an end in itself but rather a means of achieving aims such as individual health, well-being and strong, welcoming communities. That said, the idea of social capital is clearly at work in the understanding of place-shaping. Current policy-focused research projects clearly show this link through their focus on social capital and neighbourhoods (see Hothi et al 2007; Steuer and Marks 2008).

Key ideas underpinning current policy:

- Places are better if they are distinctive.
- Places are likely to be more distinctive and more welcoming if communities are actively engaged in shaping their places.
- Distinctive places enable strong but not exclusive identities.
- Strong and confident communities are welcoming to new people.
- Culture, history, heritage and the historic environment can enable people to learn about their area and the more actively people are involved in shaping local culture and heritage the stronger 'their sense of local identity' is likely to be.
- Community interaction increases well-being.

Section 2: Academic Disciplines and Methodologies and Definitions of key terms

The key ideas in the policy literature tend to be asserted, rather than represented as derived from evidence. Although links made in the policy do have reference points within the academic literature, the specific arguments generated through academic research are not visible in the policy as such. For these reasons a review of the academic literature will allow us to investigate and expand upon many of the key ideas within the policy literature as well as identify areas which require further research.

We begin with the debates surrounding the definition of the historic environment, we then move onto discuss social capital and finally 'sense of place' – the most contested of the key terms.

What is the historic environment?

Central to recent definitions of 'historic environment' has been the link between the tangible as buildings and objects and the intangible as our memories and imaginations. Here are two recent definitions:

1. The historic environment is all the physical evidence for past human activity, and its associations, that people can see, understand and feel in the present world. It is the habitat that the human race has created through conflict and co-operation over thousands of years, the product of human interaction with nature. It is all around us as part of everyday experience and life, and it is therefore dynamic and continually subject to change. At one level, it is made up entirely of places such as towns and villages, coasts or hills, and things such as buildings, buried sites, and deposits, fields and hedges; at another level it is something we inhabit, both physically and imaginatively. It is multi-faceted, relying on an engagement with physical remains but also on emotional and aesthetic responses and on the power of memory, history and association.(English Heritage, 2000a)
2. England's historic environment is one of our greatest national resources... From prehistoric monuments to great country houses, from medieval churches to the towns of the industrial revolution, it is a uniquely rich and precious inheritance. But it is about more than bricks and mortar. It embraces the landscape as a whole, both urban and rural, and the marine

archaeology sites around our shores. It embodies the history of all the communities who have made their home in this country. It is part of the wider public realm in which we can all participate. (Tessa Jowell, Secretary of State for Culture, Media, and Sport & Stephen Byers, Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions in DCMS 2001)

It is immediately notable that these broad definitions of the historic environment may not be that different from 'heritage' in its more general sense, which has also been recently expanded beyond material culture to include intangible elements such as oral history, music and dance (UNESCO n.d.). Yet, in the context of this study it does seem important to retain some distinction between the built and natural environment and all heritage practices. In recognition of this we use 'historic environment' to refer to the built and natural materiality of place, and 'heritage' as the broader term, taking in both the material and the intangible.

Whether concerned with the built environment or other heritage practices, the key issue of recent times has been who gets to define historic environment/heritage. Academic definitions of heritage have tended to emphasise the negotiated and *in process* nature of the construction of what counts as heritage. Key writers have retained the strong recognition – expressed forcefully in the late 1980s – (Hewison 1987; Wright 1985) – that defining heritage is bound up with elite power, specifically the power of experts, what Laurajane Smith has referred to as 'authorised heritage discourse' (2006, see also Dicks 2000; Waterton 2005).

Both Graham et al (2000, see also Ashworth et al. 2007) and Smith (2006) argue that, as Smith puts it, 'heritage itself becomes a resource of power . . . because of its representational power, but also because it is a process of meaning making where the ability to challenge and change received 'expert' and authorized notions of history and heritage can be worked out and enacted' (2006, p. 298). Traditionally, the ways in which societies have identified what counts as 'heritage' and how they go about trying to protect it have perpetuated these value judgements. In other words heritage does not already exist out there in the world. In one sense, we create what we think of as heritage through the process of identifying and recognising it for the purposes of managing, preserving and promoting it. At the same time, it is important not to over-simplify the complexity of heritage. Writers such as Graham et al. (2000; see also Ashworth et al. 2007) stress the everyday, personal and non-official aspects of heritage and caution against seeing it in a monolithic fashion - in other words something which is *only* controlled by social elites or institutions. In practice, heritage is subject to both elite/institutional and personal/unofficial influence; it depends on the case in question (Mason and Baveystock, 2009).

Much academic work on heritage of the last decade has focused on the issues outlined above and the implicit cultural politics of the heritage sector. At the same time it is fair to say that there have been some challenges to traditional perspectives from within the public sector, for example, since the creation of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) in 1994 as Robert Hewison and John Holden have recently acknowledged (2004). As the former HLF Chair Dame Liz Forgan's explains – '[the] HLF doesn't define heritage. Instead we ask people to convince us what it is that they value enough from the past to want to hand on to future generations' (2008, p. 7) (see also Roberts et al, 2007, pp. 4-15). In Hewison and Holden's terms, it has been the HLF's refusal to impose a fixed definition which has contributed to a shift in the very definition of heritage (2004, pp. 11-17). At the same time it is important to recognise that this responsive approach may result in the new definitions of heritage being determined by those who are in a position to make a case for their agenda and mobilise the right resources to their cause. Defined in this way, heritage may not be more representative of those less powerful groups.

Approaches such as those adopted by HLF are not the only reason for changing definitions of heritage in the UK. More broadly many commentators have pointed to a marked increase in public interest in vernacular (ordinary) histories and the heritage of everyday life (Urry 1994; Dicks 2000). This can be seen in the popularity of television programmes such as *Who Do You Think You Are?* and family history, as well as the enthusiastic take-up of initiatives such as Heritage Open Days. Practitioners influenced by ideas relating to social history, cultural diversity, social inclusion, outreach and access have also contributed to a reframing of what counts as heritage and such initiatives have been actively pursued in the museum sector over the last ten years. Two heritage examples would be the listing of Brick Lane in London in recognition of its significance to the local community (Gard'ner 2004) and the 'local list' initiative which, via local authorities, encouraged members of the public to nominate buildings to be considered for protection (for a local example see Newcastle City Council online). While Gard'ner's article on Brick Lane is one example of considering ethnicity in the context of the historic environment, there have been more studies exploring how ethnicity impacts on engagement with heritage and the museum sector more generally – the key emphasis being on ensuring that the diversity of Britain's heritages are represented and that communities are actively engaged in making decisions over heritage (Arts Council 1999; MLA 2003; see also Mason and Baveystock 2009).

As these recent trends suggest, the debate over the meanings of both 'historic environment' and 'heritage' reveals a kind of continuum. Few are saying now that heritage and the historic environment only refers to certain kinds of recognisably 'old' buildings which are unproblematic understood by all who visit them or walk by them. Instead, varying degrees of agency are attributed to people – from an interpretative co-production (Hooper-Greenhill 1994, 2000; Sandell 2008) (where the meaning of the historic environment is made by the interaction between say building and user) towards a stronger emphasis on the, sometimes overt, political negotiation over 'heritage' (Graham et al. 2000; Smith 2006). The emphasis on active involvement in definition and decision-making about the historic environment was prefigured by the ecomuseum and community heritage movements (e.g. Corsane et al. 2009) which take a 'thick' approach to cultural heritage, seeing buildings and objects as best understood within their wider contexts of use, both practical and symbolic.

A final point is that the historic environment is not always preserved and cared for, and the role of the historic environment in developing a positive sense of place can be variable on this basis. In other words, historic buildings which have fallen into disrepair may contribute to a negative sense of place. Conversely, investment in a run-down local environment can lead to gentrification which will have an impact on an area's ability to develop different forms of social capital, as we will discuss below.

Key ideas:

- The historic environment will be defined here as referring to buildings, streetscapes and landscapes. Heritage is used as a more inclusive term, taking in material and intangible heritage.
- Heritage is recognised as being linked to power. In the UK, there are many examples where heritage agencies have been working with individual and communities to define heritage and find ways of communicating its importance. However, some researchers question to what extent control really has shifted.
- Certain aspects of the historic environment may be less well cared for than others and this variability will affect the historic environment's ability to support positive social outcomes. It is also important to note that investment and gentrification will impact on the kinds of social capital generated.

What is social capital?

While the term 'social capital' is often traced back to the early 20th century (Putnam 2000, p. 19); it has come to its current prominence in academic and policy debates via French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's use of the term and, most especially, the Harvard Professor Robert Putnam's 2000 *Bowling Alone*, which made the idea very obviously policy relevant. Yet, it is important to note that Bourdieu and Putnam evoked the term 'social capital' in related yet also distinct ways. Bourdieu used social capital to draw attention to the ways in which differentiation and inequality in society is preserved via social means (1997, pp. 51-53). To give a very simplified example, some elite jobs have tended in the past to be won based on who you know rather than what you know. By contrast, Putnam's policy-friendly definition has emphasised how social capital can be generated for all social groups through social interactions which happen within community and friendship networks. For Putnam, the extent and type of interactions can provide individuals with access to a range of benefits such as well-being, good health and civic engagement. Putnam's definition of social capital is different from economic capital (how much you have) and cultural capital (how much you know), though the three are related, as Bourdieu would argue.

Putnam identifies two types of social capital: bonding and bridging. Where bonding is 'exclusive' and maintained within certain groups, bridging capital links groups (2000, p. 22) – a point Bourdieu also drew attention to through his argument that the wider the group within which you generated social capital the better the accumulation (1997, p. 52). This has been added to by Michael Woolcock who delineates bridging capital as distant ties with people who are still 'like you' and 'linking social capital which reaches out to people in different situations (2001: 13-14). Put simply, the main implication is that increased bridging and linking capital should enable those who begin with fewer resources to access the benefits enjoyed by those with greater levels of economic capital. Evidently, this has direct implications for issues of social mobility in society and for those concerned with providing the greatest number of people with the greatest equality of opportunity in life irrespective of where they start out. For these reasons, it has been taken up extensively by politicians and policy makers alike.

However, a range of concerns have been raised about Putnam's use of social capital. Putnam himself noted the dangers of 'bonding' social capital as being exclusive and as raising the spectre of the 'tyranny of community'. Putnam also explores in detail whether there is a specific conflict – an argument made also by Zygmunt Bauman (2001) – between bonding and tolerance and whether loss of community is the price we pay for a more tolerant society. However, Putnam does ultimately dismiss this argument by arguing 'social capital is reinforcing', 'those that reach out to friends and family are often the most active in community outreach as well' (2000, p. 362).

Concerns of an equally fundamental nature have been raised concerning whether understanding socialising and civic participation as directly and intimately linked is helpful (Forrest and Kearns 2001; Lewicka 2005). Forrest and Kearns have, for example, offered a breakdown of social capital into its constitutive aspects, empowerment, participation, associational activity and common purpose supporting networks and reciprocity, collective values and norms, trust, safety, belonging (2001, p. 2140). In addition, the decline in community Putnam describes in the USA, does not have a direct parallel in the UK. While some UK civic organisations (the example given is the Women's Institute) are on the decline, single issue groups are increasing in size (NOS 2001, p. 3). The differences between the US and UK in terms of community reactions to diversity are also emerging in Putnam's most recent study due to be published at the end of 2009 (Clark 2009). In the context of the current review, it is notable that 'place' is not a particular focus but it is clear that Putnam imagines a range of free and accessible spaces within which social capital interactions might take place.

Key ideas:

- Ideas of capital are bound up with the importance of engaging with others e.g. socialising, volunteering, voting.
- Social networks seem to make the individual healthier and more able to cope with trauma.
- Social capital offers benefits not only to the individual involved directly but society as a whole.

What is Sense of Place?

The term 'sense of place' is widely used – yet often used to refer to slightly different conceptualisations of place (Shamai and Ilatov 2005). There are two broad differences in the use of 'sense of place' in the academic literature. In the first, sense of place or *genius loci* is used to explore all of different aspects – including topographical, built environment and people's own experiences – which make up the 'character' or local distinctiveness of a specific place. In the second, 'sense of place' has been used to lay a greater emphasis on the way in which people experience, use and understand place, leading to a range of conceptual subsets such as 'place identity', 'place attachment', 'place dependency' and 'insiderness'.

Academic Disciplines and Methodologies

Unlike the other key terms, 'sense of place' – and 'place' and 'identity' more broadly – have been explored by different disciplines drawing on different and sometimes directly conflicting – theoretical and methodological traditions.

For example humanist geography from the 1970s and early 1980s has been, and remains, very influential in linking a 'sense of place' with the idea of the rooted and healthy self. This draws on a philosophical tradition called 'phenomenology' which approaches place through experience 'exactly as it appears'. The key conceptual contribution of phenomenology is to argue that buildings, streets or landscapes do not exist completely externally to the way people use and enjoy them on an everyday basis. A phenomenological approach is also keen to allow people themselves to describe the importance of place to them, rather than impose categories – like pride – in advance through questioning.

While influenced by the ideas generated via the human geography movement, environmental and social psychology have been interested in turning these ideas into indicators which can be explored in quantitative terms and can be used to produce positivist knowledge. More recently, this positivist approach has been adopted by practice-based disciplines such as forestry and leisure management. Discussion about the indicators use to measure place can be found further down in this section.

In contrast, social anthropology has been interested in the complex nature of places in daily lived experience which they approach through what is call 'thick' description. 'Thick description' aims to understand individual people's behaviour by locating it within wider contexts. So rather than using an interview format where the interviewer asks questions and the interviewee answers them, social anthropologists record the daily interactions which make up people's lives through making recordings or taking field notes. Because of this they are sceptical about the desire to measure as this is seen as taking specific comments or action out of their more complex contexts. Indeed, the esteemed anthropologist Clifford Geertz argues 'to study place or, more exactly, other's sense of place, it is necessary to hang around with them – to attend to them as experiencing subjects . . . No one imagines some sort of dataset to be sampled, tabulated, and manipulated' (1996, p. 240). In

short, Geertz sees 'sense of place' as a highly qualitative, complex and involved concept that cannot be reduced to a quantitative calculation.

Human geography, social and environment psychology and social anthropology represent the starkest disciplinary and methodological differences in approaching 'sense of place'. However, these differences raise important philosophical questions which will run throughout the literature review. In short, at stake in these philosophical questions is the kind of knowledge produced and how we think about social experience. Social anthropologists would criticise social psychology approaches for reducing the complexity of everyday life to a dataset and allowing us only to see what can most easily be seen about our lives. Human geographers would be concerned about the imposition of categories in advance of how people themselves would use such ideas themselves in their daily life and how they both consciously and unconsciously experience place. By contrast social psychologists have developed surveys to consider sense of place and might well put greater importance on the size of the sample, the careful management of variables and the usability and comparability of concepts.

It was in recognition of these different disciplinary approaches that the Institution of Field Archaeologists, in a report for the National Trust, recommended a cross-disciplinary approach to the researching of historic environment and sense of place (IFA and AT 2004). The need to recognise the contributions of different methodological approaches and the possibilities generated by relating theoretical debates and empirical research is also reflected in an influential study – *Globalization and Belonging* (2005) – by Mike Savage, Gaynor Bagnall and Brian J. Longhurst which explores the importance of the local as a key aspect of globalization in and around Manchester.

The disciplinary differences – which are responding to very real and important epistemological disagreements – makes drawing comparable judgements about discrete pieces of research difficult and largely unproductive. Rather than compare unlike with unlike, we have developed a three pronged critical strategy in approaching the breadth of research on 'sense of place'. Firstly, we draw attention to what is at stake in the different approaches. Secondly, we only comment on the quality of research as it compares to other comparable projects (see Section 3). After all, a bigger sample is not indicator of quality for the social anthropological interested in subtlety and the nuanced and shifting use of ideas of place in everyday life. Thirdly, and in recognition of the need for a practical indicator, we have referred to how influential a study has been within and, where relevant, beyond its own field.

- *Sense of place as genius loci*

The term *genius loci* is most associated with architecture and is being increasingly used in urban design, where it is being mobilised to refer to 'the sum of all physical as well as symbolic values in nature and the human environment' (Jiven and Larkham 2003, p. 70). The Norwegian architect Christian Norberg-Schulz identified four levels which make up *genius loci*: the topography of the earth's surface; the cosmological light conditions and the sky as natural conditions; buildings; symbolic and existential meanings in the cultural landscape (quoted Jiven and Larkham 2003, p. 70).

The notion of local character as produced through the sum of its parts has been used by academic disciplines linked to practice. This can be seen in urban design's concern with authenticity and its relationship with new developments (Ouf 2001); in urban regeneration in terms of the impact of the symbolic and iconic buildings (Miles 2005; see also Graham 2002); in marketing's focus on place-branding (Trueman and Cornelis n.d.; Skinner 2008); or the interest in 'place-shaping' within public art projects (Pollock and Sharp 2007). The key idea being that places can be actively shaped to encourage a more defined 'sense of place' with which people can more actively engage.

- *Sense of place as lived experience*

While the majority of theorists do take into account the materiality (as above) of place – whether that be topographical features or buildings – there has been a greater emphasis in human geography, social anthropology and social and environmental psychology on how people themselves draw together the different elements which make up place. Key here is the idea that ‘place’ is not defined in advance of people creating place through their own use and understandings.

For example, John Agnew (human geography) has argued that ‘place’ is helpfully thought about as made up of different, but always interrelated, aspects: ‘location’, which refers to fixed co-ordinates on earth – literally where somewhere is – and ‘locale’, which points to the material settings – such as the built/natural environment – within which social relations are conducted (1987). However, Agnew specifically reserves ‘sense of place’ to refer to the subjective and emotional attachments people have to place. In a social anthropological tradition sense of place is evoked precisely to explore the difficult to grasp, livedness of place (Stewart 1996) – places as they are experienced through everyday life.

Drawing on philosopher Martin Heidegger’s interest in spiritual unity between humanity and things, humanist geographers of 1970s and 1980s were very concerned about what they perceived as an increasing sense of ‘placelessness’ and erosion of rootedness and people’s attachments to place (Relph 1976; Tuan 1974). Using Heidegger’s philosophical methodology referred to as phenomenology, Relph and Tuan emphasised how people inhabit place in a way which was not through conscious thought but through their bodies, feelings and experiences.

Building on and critiquing Relph and Tuan’s work, the psychological importance of place identity – and place attachment – has been explored at length in the social psychology literature. In a classic article Harold Proshansky, Abbe K. Fabian and Robert Kaminoff set out a much used definition of ‘place identity’:

What emerges as place-identity is a complex cognitive structure which is characterized by a host of attitudes, values, thoughts beliefs, meanings and belonging to particular places. . . . Place-identity as a cognitive sub-structure of self-identity consists of an endless variety of cognitions related to the past, present and anticipated physical settings that define and circumscribe the day-to-day existence of the person. (1983, p. 62)

In developing their argument Proshansky et al. identify various different subsets including ‘recognition function’ (recognition linked to self-identity); ‘meaning function’ (ways in which place defines behaviour); ‘expressive-requirement function’ (tastes and preferences for certain places), ‘mediating-change function’ (where discrepancies between self-identity and place emerged) and ‘anxiety and defence function’ (relating to the way people learn what to avoid and how they understand when they are in place and out of place) (1983, pp. 66-76).

The extensive range of subsets has been subsequently adapted into the arguably more usable ideas of ‘place attachment’ and ‘place dependency’. There is, however, very little agreement on *how* place identity, place attachment and place dependency interrelate. Here are three different examples of how place identity, place attachment and place dependency have been related:

- Bradley Jorgensen and Richard Stedman have argued that a ‘sense of place’ is best understood as made up of place attachment (which they see as relating to an emotional engagement with place), place dependence (which they see as conative, that is directed

towards action) and place identity (which has a more a cognitive, and sense making bearing) (2006).

- David R. Williams, Michael E. Patterson and Joseph W. Roggenbuck have instead seen 'place attachment' as an overarching concept with 'place dependency' and 'place identity' as its subsets (1992)
- Others have argued that 'place attachment' comes before 'place identity' (Hernandez et al 2007).

At stake in these debates is the relative importance of conscious and unconscious experience – and how they might be related – in understanding people's engagement with place.

Place attachment

Irrespective of the debates over what comes first, it can be said that 'place attachment' has been used to refer to the strong bond that exists between people and places (Low and Altman 1992). As M. Vittoria Giuliani argues such a bond might relate to 'place' in terms of buildings and topographical features. Alternatively, this place attachment bond might relate to people who are associated with that place for an individual or group (1991). Either way place attachment is understood as developing over time (Giuliani and Feldman 1993).

The relationship between place attachment and identity has been further elaborated by Clare Twigger-Ross and David Uzzell (1996) in a study of twenty people living in London's Surrey Docks, an area which has been redeveloped following the decline of 'Britain as a maritime power' (1996, p. 209). They identify three principles of place identity – which we will explore in greater detail when considering the evidence for the link between sense of place and the historic environment: 1) distinctiveness (the way people use place to distinguish themselves from others); 2) continuity (concept of self preserved over time, where places allows a sense of continuity throughout the life course) and 3) self-esteem (using place to create a positive evaluation of yourself). An example of this is the link between self-esteem and living in a particularly high status neighbourhood. This study is explored in greater detail below (see p. 24).

It is now widely accepted that 'place attachment' can form at a variety of geographic and spatial scales (see Nazer 2004). This means that the 'place' someone is attached to could be as local as a home or a street or as big as a country or even the whole planet. This suggests the importance in devising research questions which allows participants to define their own sense of scale.

Place dependency

Place dependence is also sometimes referred to in the social and environmental psychology literature as 'functional attachment' and refers to the ways in which a place allows us to achieve our goals or carry out certain activities (Schreyer et al. 1981; Stokols and Shumaker 1981). Some researchers have emphasised the importance of cityscape/landscape of place in creating possibilities for place dependency (e.g. Williams and Vaske 2003). Place dependency has been linked to place identity via the idea of self-efficacy developed by Kalevi Mikael Korpela (1989). Both place dependency and 'self-efficacy' tend to be used to described the ways in which an individual will form stronger attachments to place when that place enables them to achieve their personal lifestyle goals.

Measuring place attachment

'Place identity', 'place attachment' and 'place dependency' have been measured by a number of researchers working in social psychology. There are two widely recognised scales. The first comes from Shamai (1991) and has been adapted by David R Williams (2000) and in later work by Shamai and Ilatov (2005). Shamai and Ilatov argue for the importance of including what they call a 'bipolar' measure – leaving room for both positive and negative feelings about place. Williams works with two scales one geared at a place attachment measure specifically for tourism or recreation place (2000, p. 5) and a broader 'sense of place measure' (2000, p. 5). Both of these measures are widely quoted in the social and environmental psychology literature. Both measures are included in Appendix 1.

Broadly both Shamai and Kellerman 1985 scale and Shamai's 1991 scale attempt to break down the different scales of 'sense of place'. What these scales seek to gauge is a sense of 'how much' people say they are engaged with a place. It is less clear how these scales allow us to understand what – for example – 'belonging to a place' – might mean for the participant. Shamai and Ilatov use a unidimensional scale which is 'composed of one component of scaling' – which directly asks respondents questions which are on the scale to be analysed. They consider their approach to be more effective for understanding 'sense of place' than more 'complicated structures' which ask multiple questions from numerous scales. Shamai and Ilatov argue that the benefit of their approach is that it avoids pre-imposing 'the researcher's conceptions on the subjects' (2004, p. 471). Yet the problem of the multiple ways in which people might understand the indicators within even their simplified scale remains.

In contrast Williams – in an unpublished note on his approaches to scales – shows how he built on Shamai's approaches but clearly tends towards the multidimensional approach Shamai and Ilatov criticise. Although aiming to explore tourist areas, the type of questions which seeks to explore the range of subsets of 'sense of place' – e.g. place identity, place dependence – identified above might well be useful in the context of the CURDS study. For example, a range of statements are used to probe kinds of identification and the different types of uses of a specific place.

In terms of measuring both place and social capital, Maria Lewicka argues that it very important not to conflate different elements, suggesting that while there appears to be conceptual similarities between civic involvement and place attachment, using each as indicators of the other 'leads to conceptual overlaps that are not easy to disentangle' (2005, p. 392).

These debates draw attention both to the multiple dimensions of 'sense of place', how they might relate to other scales – such as social capital – and to the problematic of determining what participants might mean by key terms.

Another technique for approaching the measurement of place is via the perceived value of places as expressed through house prices. This methodology works through identifying a number of variables and then comparing areas (Cheshire and Sheppard 2004a). Deriving from the perspectives of economics and urban studies, a Canadian study has explored the effect of house prices of property being in a location designated as a heritage area and found no clear premium (Sharp 2006).

Key ideas

- Sense of place has been approached very differently in different disciplines, with social and environmental psychology being the most interested in fusing the qualitative and

experiential emphasis on phenomenology with the possibility of positivist and quantitative knowledge production about place.

- Places – as *genius loci* – can be thought of as being made up of a range of factors which include the topographical, the cosmological, the built environment and people’s emotional and psychological engagement with place.
- Place identity can be used to refer to the way in which place is a subset of every individual’s self identity.
- Place identity has been understood as helpful when delineated by its relationship with concepts of place attachment and place dependency – although there is no consensus on the definitions of the three terms or how they relate.
- Place can operate at a range of scales – from the local to the national and beyond. It is, therefore, important that researchers do not to predetermine the scale in question but allow participants themselves to define the place with which they identify.
- There are a range of scales which have been developed to measure place. Examples chosen for the Appendix explore the differences between a unidimensional and multidimensional approach. Both raise the problem of determining how participants themselves understand the questions.

Section 3: Specific theories and evidence

Having defined and reviewed the key concepts we now move to whether there is any academic evidence for any link between the three components: historic environment, sense of place and social capital.

The first point to make is that there are no studies which explicitly and incontrovertibly prove that there is a direct link between all three.

The sections below explore the links between first the historic environment and sense of place, then sense of place and social capital. This second section includes the small number of studies which link heritage more broadly with sense of place and social capital.

Theories and evidence linking the historic environment and sense of place

Theories and evidence linking the historic environment and sense of place have tended to be made through the following concepts: the importance of distinctiveness, continuity, place dependence and active place-making.

- *Place Distinctiveness*

A key idea which links these studies is the extent to which heritage and historic environment support a sense of place distinctiveness – a sense of specialness which is identified in many studies (especially those working in a phenomenological tradition) with a sense of place (e.g. Relph 1979). Distinctiveness of place as it relates to the historic environment has been a concern of a number of studies from heritage studies, urban development and public art.

In a detailed and influential study, Laurajane Smith argues that ‘dominant ideas about the heritage values of “authentic material culture” and the “built environment” are being rewritten and redefined within a cultural process that privileges the performativity of “doing” and “being”, rather than the possession of, or association with, material objects’ (2006, pp. 237-8). Significantly, in one of her UK case studies – Castleford, Yorkshire – the perceived lack of distinctiveness of the built

environment did not impact on a self-created generation of a sense of place via heritage practices. In other words, although local people did not initially rate their local built environment as particularly distinctive they did ultimately see their area as having a heritage value after they had been involved in a heritage activity. This, Smith argues, is because 'heritage' became redefined through their activities: 'a complex cultural interaction between people, place and memory that both centres on and is the process of the maintenance and creation of community identity and cohesion' (2006, p. 272). In this case the built environment itself was important inasmuch as it supported heritage-related community initiatives, but this was only one aspect of a more complex process of people generating their own 'heritage'.

In Castleford the success of the group came from doing heritage for themselves. In Bella Dicks' study of the development of the Rhondda Heritage Park – on the site of a closed mine in South Wales – she draws attention to the difficulties of negotiating a sense of place distinctiveness which takes into account both its importance for the local community and for the desired tourist market:

To exhibit place as community for both the tourist gaze and for the celebration of local vernacular identity means representing it as a contradictory mixture – simultaneously traditional and modern, industrial and post-industrial, vanishing and enduring, self and other. (2000, p. 123)

The importance of the historic environment in generating tourist interest – and therefore economic benefit – is widely acknowledged on one level (Graham et al 2000, p. 157; Graham 2002) but, as Brian Graham argues, remains under researched (2002, p. 1015). A body of research from Marketing Studies explores the active significance of place as something that potential visitors can understand and aspire to visit (Trueman and Cornelius n.d.). Additionally, there is a long standing interest in the ways in which historic character – and a place's distinctiveness – is preserved in the context of new developments. John Pendlebury, in the context of a study of Newcastle's Grainger Town, outlines three different approaches to urban development each of which approach the management of a city's perceived 'sense of place' differently:

- *The Society for the Protection on Ancient Buildings tradition* for which 'the retention of historic fabric is of paramount importance and can be best encapsulated by the phrase "conservative repair"' but also encourages new buildings to be of their time (1999 p. 424)
- *The urban morphology approach* sees development in a broader historic context and new buildings should respect historic materials and kerb lines (1999 p. 425)
- *The visual management approach* which is 'more orientated towards to aesthetic and urban design considerations'. This approach can lead to 'heritage' style – pastiche – new buildings (1999, p. 425).

The work on place making – found in urban regeneration studies and public art studies – is potentially significant for considering the role of the historic environment in terms of supporting distinctiveness; this has been linked to 'selling' areas as well as supporting place identity and self esteem. In new estates, or in regeneration areas, local authorities and other government agencies have undertaken active place-marking for these reasons.

Active place-marking has included repurposing existing key buildings or building in relation to the perceived atmosphere of a place; something Steven Miles argues only works if it reflects and takes into account already-existing locally-held views of a place (2005). Similar issues are addressed in a growing body of literature on the role of public art projects in urban regeneration and what Venda Pollock and Joanne Sharp call 'place ma(r)king' (2007). Pollock and Sharp's work focus precisely on the way 'public art should be able to generate a sense of ownership forging the connection between

citizens, city spaces and their meaning as places through which subjectivity is constructed' (2007, p. 1003). Pollock and Sharp studied a public art work by Stephen Hurrell in a brand new estate in Ayr. They argued that because of the participatory methodology Hurrell used – which drew on local people's own histories – the art work was more meaningful than the demarcation provided by the 'heritage' markers of the town's city walls. Although it should be noted that they do not use a comparator project to support this claim (2007, p. 1076).

'Place distinctiveness' has also unsurprisingly been linked to ideas of local pride, something which will be explored in greater detail in the account of the links between sense of place and social capital.

- *Place Continuity*

Beyond explicit links that have been made between the historic environment and sense of place, there is also the broader focus on place as a setting for less conscious, daily experiences. So, while the overt negotiation over meaning is a key aspect of the development of sense of place, Smith is also keen to draw attention to the pre-representational engagement with place – in other words *how a place feels*. One of the key ways in which the preservation of the historic environment contributes towards sense of place is through creating a sense of material continuity. This links in strongly with work influenced by the phenomenological tradition which see place first and foremost as entered through embodied experienced (e.g. Casey 1996). One early contribution to this is Rowles's study of older people in an Appalachian town in West Virginia, USA. He immediately draws attention to a sense of 'insiderness' (1983), which he sees as having physical, social, psychological and /autobiographical dimensions. This material continuity – the fact that the setting for people's lives has stayed the same – has been noted to act as a prompt for telling local stories (Bird 2002) and for telling personal stories, though both Rowles and Cathrine Degnen (2005) also show that even when buildings have gone such sites can still be used to occasion memories. To put it another way, a place which is preserved retains a coherence which supports both an ongoing sense of place but also creates a setting for people's own intangible heritage in the form of memories.

- *Place dependency*

There are fewer studies which explore the ways in which the historic environment might link to ideas of place dependency. The *Power of Place* study – and the Mori poll it presented – clearly showed that people think heritage is useful for learning about the past, and that schools should be active users of heritage sites. The same could be said for the way in which the process of producing local heritage enabled the active development of a sense of community in Castleford, not simply nostalgia for the community which came before (Smith 2006). Similarly, Emma Waterton, in a view of a community project on the Hareshaw Linn in Northumbria National Park, showed the importance of the Linn for local people's lives, including being able to pick wild fruit and 'live off the land' and to 'learn about nature' (2005, p. 316).

A growing literature on forestry and leisure management has attempted to link people's type of relationship with place – with a range of behaviour indicators, e.g. people's views on landscape management, environmentalism and trail erosion. In a study of Vilas County, Wisconsin, USA, Robert C. Stedman conducted a 16 page mail survey with villa owners. He was interested in the difference between place attachment (in his definition being an emotional bond between people and their environment) and what he calls 'place satisfaction', which – like 'place attachment' – is the extent to which a specific place meets people's specific needs. Using a 5 point likert scale he argues that strong place attachment made people more likely to actively fight to preserve an area. In contrast, strong indicators of place satisfaction made people less concerned to ensure its preservation (2002,

pp. 577-278). Other studies have also seen a correlation between place attachment and environmental protection (Walker and Ryan 2008).

The implications of this for heritage agencies might be to consider the different ways in which people are using sites and how these different uses might then link to people's perception of the importance of that site's role in their lives. To put it simply: are people supportive of their local castle and surrounding area because of its historical significance or because it offers them a safe and beautiful public space where they can walk their dog? If it is the latter then it might be that initiatives could then be targeted to encourage the dog walkers to engage in the site's history further and therefore increase their attachment. Similarly, it would be interesting to disentangle whether people might value a historic monument like Grey's Monument in Newcastle more because of its specific aesthetic and historical qualities or because it is part of a public space which provides opportunities for social interactions. In other words, elements of the historic environment might provide safe, accessible, and open meeting places which can be easily navigated because they act as iconic place markers. Again, this will vary considerably from case to case.

- *Other factors in generating a sense of place*

To summarise, a number of studies from different disciplinary backgrounds point to the built environment or landscape as being significant in generating a sense of place distinctiveness. Economists have also attempted to consider the range of variables affecting house prices. Although the historic built environment is yet to be used as a variable for analysis, the emphasis in the literature is on the role of perceptions of crime, proximity to amenities and especially being within certain state school catchment areas (Cheshire and Sheppard 2004b; Clapp and Ross 2004). While age of house is perceived as playing a small factor, Cheshire and Sheppard find that proximity to good school can affect price by up to 30% (2004b, p. F394).

However, much work points to the other factors that people say makes a place special for them – specifically the *people* living in a place rather than the place itself. This links to another point of disagreement in the literature over whether long standing residents or new comers have stronger place attachment. Both Rowles (1983), and more recent UK studies, have argued that older people and those who have lived in an area longer have a stronger place attachment (Livingstone et al 2008), However, Steve F McCool and Steve R. Martin (1994) found that newcomers actually emphasise place over social connections. The rationale offered is that newcomers were not as yet socially embedded and therefore less likely to have strongly defined networks of people.

Perhaps most relevant because of its UK focus and its recentness is a recent study by Mark Livingstone, Nick Bailey and Ade Kearns (2008). This study emphasises that a range of factors affect place attachment, other than the built environment or social networks. A major focus of Livingstone et al.'s research was 'social mix', meaning the different kinds of class and ethnic diversity in an area. They found that social mix itself was not a factor in increasing/decreasing place attachment but that rapid changes – and particularly rapid changes in ethnic mix – may have a greater impact in terms of lessening place attachment (though they are not sure whether this has only a short term impact) (2008, p. 3).

In their study two key factors leading to an erosion of place attachment were crime and a high population turnover. They argue that this, in turn, has the effect of eroding trust. Others studies have also noted that crime reduces place attachment, while high neighbourhood levels of home ownership are likely to generate a strong sense of place (see also Brown et al. 2003). The over-riding finding of Livingstone et al.'s research is that social cohesion leads to place attachment, thus suggesting that place attachment and social capital might work in a virtuous circle. Indeed, Lewicka –

via a study of a representative sample of 1328 people in three regions in Poland – argues that it is not place attachment but social ties which increase civil participation (2005) but that the three are intimately linked and mutually reinforcing.

Studies do note that place attachment is not necessarily always positive for individuals. Whether a strong sense of place is always positive directly relates to whether all social capital is ‘good’ social capital and this will be explored in the following section.

Key ideas:

- The historic environment supports place distinctiveness
- The historic environment can be used as a focus for sharing knowledges about the past
- The historic environment should also be understood as a setting for people’s daily lives, giving rise to less conscious meanings.
- There are a range of factors – not linked to the built environment – which affect how people experience a ‘sense of place’ including relationship with other people, crime and social mix in an area.

Theories and evidence linking sense of place and social capital

The key theories which were used above to link the historic environment and sense of place – specifically place distinctiveness, place continuity and place dependency – also have relevance for linking sense of place and social capital. This is the case in spite of the fact that the majority of the social and environmental psychology research explored above is primarily interested in the impact of place attachment at an individual level. In psychology research the proposed ‘good’ outcomes are psychological – it is about the opportunity for the self to experience efficacy, continuity, distinctiveness in the form of difference from others and a sense of uniqueness. Social capital, as outlined above is, however, not an individualistic concept. Social capital might enable good outcomes for individuals but it is developed precisely through interactions with others. That said, because of the increased focus on social capital as a means of enabling individual outcomes (which might nevertheless in Putnam’s sense have wider social benefit), these psychology-based categories can be useful. They allow us to take into account the individual- and social- level of interaction. This section is broken down to consider four aspects:

- the ways in which a strong sense of place is linked to self-esteem, which has been a focus of a range of government policy.
- heritage-specific opportunities for generating social capital via a ‘sense of place’
- active place-making via heritage.
- less specific place-dependent opportunities for social capital-type interactions.

Self-esteem

A key concern for social psychology has been to link place attachment with the production of identity – specifically someone who experiences efficacy, continuity, distinctiveness in the form of difference from others and a sense of uniqueness (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell 1996).

In a widely quoted study, Korpela uses a ‘cognitive self-theory of personality’ to emphasise the need for a coherent story in self-production. Through his research with young people who wrote essays about their favourite places, he argues that places act to maintain a sense of self specifically via ‘regulating the pleasure/pain balance’, supporting self-esteem and ‘one’s characteristic sense of self’ (1989, p. 245). The importance of place in generating a sense of self has also been recently explored

in Savage et al.'s study of the local implications of globalization in Greater Manchester. This study looked at how people themselves choose where to live as a way of expressing an aspect of their sense of identity and how this enables them to realise certain career or social goals, a phenomenon they refer to as 'elective belonging' (2004).

Twigger-Ross and Uzzell's study of London's dockyards pick up similar themes and strongly draws attention to the link between place attachment and self-esteem. For some of their respondents, self-esteem was related to coming to live in what they perceived to be a desirable area, for others it was physical characteristics like the greenness and the sense that visitors were 'surprised . . . pleasantly' (1996, p. 216). 'Sense of place' can then be seen as supporting the production of self via – as Twigger-Ross and Uzzell put it – distinctiveness, continuity, self-esteem and the idea of self-efficacy, as discussed above (1996). To put it simply, the argument is that living in a place which is distinctive is one element which allows you to tell a coherent life story.

In a similar vein, Uzzell used place attachment scales from social psychology in order to link place and identity in a study of Guildford Museum. Through conducting interviews with 120 respondents – including both visitors and non-visitors – he concluded that the museum was 'successful at communicating a sense of place and sense of identity to its visitors' (1995, p. 226):

Both the motivations to visit, and the kind of benefits derived from visiting a museum (or many kinds of heritage sites) can be seen in terms of individuals seeking to identify with a place and, as a consequence, to derive a positive self-image from that identification. (1995, p. 227)

The implications of Uzzell's study is that heritage and museums which offer visitors an opportunity to identify with place may have positive benefits for people's sense of self. At the same time it is important to note that there could be philosophical and anthropological concerns over the way ideas such as place attachment and self-esteem are drawn in this research. Arguably this focus on visitors and on speaking with them immediately after their visit dislocates people from their wider, daily and less conscious context and reducing experience to key indicators.

Another concern is that venue-based studies offer little opportunity for understanding how engagement with place relates to other aspects of people's lives. There is likely to be a difference between the ways that someone will respond when prompted to think about place in the context of a museum and how they experience place unprompted on an everyday basis. The benefits of an approach which looks at place in the context of people's overall lives can be seen in Savage et al.'s Greater Manchester study which interviewed people at length in their homes to gain a holistic understanding of their lives.

Uzzell's study points us towards the individual outcomes of heritage and sense of place. At the same time a critical reading of his work also allows us to see pointers towards the need to understand the relationship between individual outcomes – such as self-esteem – and social level outcomes. It also highlights the difference between conscious engagements with place and less conscious engagements with place as part of daily life.

- *Heritage-specific opportunities for social capital*

John Pendlebury, Tim Townshed and Rose Gilroy have argued in a key article that there are two ways in which built heritage can contribute towards social inclusion: 1) through its intrinsic historical nature and 2) as a place where regeneration can occur, perhaps given additional lustre because it is historic (2004, p. 27). The first suggests the importance – as discussed above – of the historic environment essentially as a learning tool, which may have impacts on place attachments and links to the strong focus on schools provision in recent years. The second, however, points more towards

the possibilities for economic regeneration opened up by an especially prestigious historic environment.

However, social capital requires a different focus – not on knowledge itself, or the money that might come in but specifically on the interactions between people. These different elements – learning, economic regeneration, and social capital – are not at all mutually exclusive. The importance of an understanding of local history and a sense of how local people already understand their city is seen by Miles as an essential underpinning for the large scale iconic developments. If done well, this form of responsive regeneration, has the potential to ‘reinvigorate the relationship between cultural, place and personal identity *and* offer a permanent legacy’ (2005, p. 921) at the same time as making places (in this case ‘NewcastleGateshead’) marketable externally. It might, then, be possible to see the historic environment as having benefits both in terms of social and economic capital.

A number of studies have explored the implications of museums and their heritage work for social capital and social exclusion. In a study of Glasgow Museums and Tyne and Wear Museums, and using interviews and focus groups, Andrew Newman and Fiona McLean link heritage-making to outcomes such as citizenship and combating of social exclusion. They argue that museums can support identity building through validating places which are important to local people (2006, p. 62). For one participant, for example, a new sense of the links between past and future made her feel ‘part of something’ (2006, p. 54).

Richard Sandell also makes links between museum encounters and impacts on an individual, community and society-wide level (2002). Sandell has since argued that museums and their representation of the past can place an important role in opening up debate around inequality and prejudice (2007). Both Newman and McLean and Sandell draw attention to the need for further research and that research on museums and capital is, as Newman and McLean put it, ‘in its infancy’ (2004, p. 169). This remains the case today.

- *Active place making / participation*

A number of studies have drawn attention to the implications of different levels of involvement in heritage activities and place-shaping activities. In a study based on Glasgow Museum’s Open Museum which drew on interviews with people who had previously been involved in projects, Jocelyn Dodd, Helen O’Riain, Eilean Hooper-Greenhill and Richard Sandell found that ‘the more focused the experience was on the needs of the individuals, the greater the impact’ and moreover that ‘it is partnership exhibitions that offer an opportunity for museum partners not simply to respond to existing resources but to shape new ones’ (2002 p. 42). This was seen as giving more institutional validation to people’s experiences.

Laurajane Smith’s concluding argument to her 2006 book is that ‘the issue is control’ and suggests heritage ‘becomes a resource of power in these wider negotiations because of its representational power, but also because it is a process of meaning making where the ability to challenge and change received “expert” and authorized notions of history and identity can be worked out and enacted’ (2006, p. 298) (see also Waterton 2005). These active sorts of engagements link directly to the citizenship agenda (see also Newman et al. 2005) by enabling people to make decisions about their own heritage and could, in theory, act as a bridge to other forms of civil participation.

- *Place dependency and social capital*

The above example focused on the distinctive contribution of the historic environment as historic. However, it is also important to consider the extent to which the historic environment can become a

locale for non-heritage specific 'social capital' interactions. A key finding of a number of recent reports funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has been that people's sense of community is often composed of quite fleeting encounters e.g. in a local shop, in a park (Robertson, Smith and McIntosh 2008). In a report by Nicholas Dines, and Vicky Cattell with Wil Gesler and Sara Curtis on the impact of public spaces in London's East End they found that different forms of public space were valued both for their ability to alternatively give people quiet reflective time (see also Holland et al 2007) and to generate possibilities for social contact (2006).

- *Is all social capital good social capital?*

This question could be added to by asking 'is a strong sense of place always good'? Indeed, when the framework of 'place' is introduced some of the tensions within social capital become clearer.

As a number of recently studies have shown, 'bonding' social capital makes living in deprived communities possible. People can look out for each other and support each other using their own close networks (MacDonald et al 2005). Livingstone et al. (2007) have shown that these close and supportive networks are enabled by a relatively stable local community. This is backed up by other studies which have shown that working locally rather than commuting positively affects how actively someone is involved both in terms of socialising and more formal community and civic participation (Putnam 2000, Ch. 12).

At the same time, recent studies have drawn attention to the problematic nature of 'bonding' social capital if it is invested in a very small locality and within a segmented social group. The argument here is that lack of mobility and having few social links beyond a given locality restricts young people's opportunities (Green and White 2007; MacDonald et al. 2005). As this suggests, bonding social capital and the kind of inward population movement which might broaden out neighbourhood-based social networks are likely to be in contradiction. In short, what allows you to *get by* might be destroyed by the shifts in population which might – in theory – ultimately allow you to *get on*.

The other contradiction here is pointed to by Lewicka. According to Lewicka bonding social capital and its community-level socialising and participation can be linked to working class communities who are relatively static and committed to locality. Conversely, civil participation at the other end of the social capital spectrum tends to be associated with the more mobile middle classes. Lewicka argues for breaking down the concept of social capital into the 'socio-emotional path' – local social capital and neighbourhood ties – and the 'cultural path' – cultural capital plus, she argues, 'an interest in one's own roots' – to reflect these different kinds of activities and the different economic and cultural capital associated with them (2005). She argues that while there is an assumption in the research that there is likely to be a progression from place attachment to neighbourhood ties to civil participation, the direction could also be reversed. In other words, it might be possible via involvement in civil participation to develop a stronger place attachment. Lewicka's findings might have implications for using the historic environment – via specific and focused community engagement activities – to support movement between these two paths.

Yet as already discussed – and in a way which mirrors concerns over 'too much' place attachment – there is considered to be 'a dark side' to social capital (Putnam 2000). The concern is over the way in place attachment might lead to too much bonding social capital at the expense of bridging or linking forms of social capital (e.g. Green and White 2007). Although there is no current research which focuses on the role of the historic environment in bridging and linking capital in this way (and Newman and McLean found 'bonding' forms of capital more in evidence 2004b, pp.490-495), it is clear that the Museum, Libraries and Archives Generic Social Outcomes framework has included

ideas of bonding, bridging and linking and some innovative projects are attempting to put this into practice. One example is Tyne and Wear Museums Heritage Lottery Funded Culture Shock project which aims to collect 1000 digital stories of contemporary life in the north-east and actively engages with the idea of 'linking' social capital by bringing groups together to share their work (MLA online).

It is worth noting that in the UK context, government policy – such as the recent Department of Communities and Local Government *Guidance on Building a Local Sense of Belonging* (2009) – does not assume a homogenous community but rather a multicultural one which is constantly welcoming new comers. This suggests that the idea of 'bonding' as being 'like you' needs to be imagined in more complex ways and, maybe, as constantly changing. For example, do people bond with people who are the same ethnicity, sex or religion? Or people who share their interests? Or have the same job or read the same newspaper? In a society which aims to understand identity as complex and multiple and communities as diverse then 'bonding', 'bridging' and 'linking' might become harder to disentangle and certain interactions might move between each designation over time.

One of the other 'dark sides' to social capital, and to which Putnam draws attention, is the possible relationship between the decline of community and increasing tolerance. Clearly the Department of Communities and Local Government would hope that is not the case, though the research evidence to back that up does not yet exist. Another important tension within 'social capital' is signalled by the growing body of research on the importance of economic equality for the outcomes attributed to social capital (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009). The difference between 'bonding', 'bridging' and 'linking' capital – or, to relate it to other government social policy terms, between social inclusion and social mobility – might put at stake the very benefits which Putnam generally attributes to all forms of social capital.

Key ideas:

- Place attachment has been linked to individual indicators such as self-esteem.
- The historic environment has the potential to link to the kinds of interactions which might generate social capital in three ways: 1) engagement in history itself and sharing this with others, 2) the possibilities of active place-making and 3) the historic environment as enabling people to realise their goals (this may be heritage-specific or unrelated, e.g. dog walking).
- Not all social capital is necessarily 'good' – a fact that also relates to 'sense of place'/place attachment. Thinking about social capital alongside place makes visible some of the tensions in social capital as an idea and between the different tendencies of social capital towards stability (bonding) and mobility (bridging and linking).

Conclusions:

We have found no major studies which directly link all three components: 'historic environment', 'sense of place' and 'social capital'. However, there are promising links between: 1) the historic environment (often referred to more broadly as heritage) and sense of place, and 2) between sense of place (as developed through heritage) and social capital.

Links between historic environment (heritage) and sense of place

- That the historic environment contributes towards a distinctive sense of place and a sense of continuity which can support a greater sense of people's self-esteem and place attachment. However, the values attached by people to what might be termed 'historic environment' will be multiple, changeable and will not necessarily map onto those identified by official bodies.

The historic environment should also be understood as a setting for people's daily lives, giving rise to less conscious experience of place.

- There are a range of factors – not linked to the built environment – which affect place attachment including relationships with other people, crime and social mix in an area.
- 'Sense of place' (as place attachment) and social networks seem linked in a virtuous cycle (though there is disagreement about which comes first and which is more important).
- Social networks may be more important than the built environment in generating place attachment and some forms of social capital. Certain types of historic environment may help to support social activities and enable personal motivations by providing safe and attractive public spaces.

Links between sense of place and social capital

- A key way of understanding the relationship between 'sense of place' and 'social capital' is through the relationship between 'place attachment', 'self-esteem' and shared pride.
- Heritage has been linked to offering opportunities for the development of both a stronger sense of place and social capital. The more actively people are involved in heritage or place-shaping activities the greater the social capital developed.
- Social capital could also be linked to 'place dependency', as people meet others through shared interests and activities.
- Not all social capital is necessarily 'good' – a fact that also relates to 'sense of place' and place attachment. Studies have argued that strong 'bonding' social capital might limit aspiration and mobility. Additionally, connections have been drawn between the decline in community and increasing levels of tolerance.
- Thinking about social capital alongside place makes visible a tension between, on the one hand, 'bonding' social capital and stability and 'bridging' and 'linking' forms of social capital and mobility. This tension can also be traced across the forms which social capital interactions take and their relationship to class. Bonding capital is often associated with working class communities and linked to socialising, local and community-level participation whereas 'bridging'/'linking' capital is often linked to the more mobile middle classes and more formal civil participation (Lewicka 2005). One question revolves around how heritage agencies might generate links between these two pathways.

Implications for researching the historical environment and social capital

- The historic environment can enable interactions which might produce social capital in three key ways:
 - 1) via the opportunity for sharing knowledge about the past;
 - 2) via active involvement in heritage-type activities
 - 3) as a site which supports other kinds of unrelated interactions, for example dog walking or as a landmark where people might meet.
- It is clear that the more actively people are involved in place shaping, including active

engagement in heritage – and the greater the opportunities for bridging and linking forms of social capital – then the more likelihood there is of social capital outcomes such as citizenship, well-being and broadening of horizons. In 1) and 2) arguably the emphasis is placed on the heritage activity whereas in 3) it may not be although the activity may equally produce social capital. It may or may not be possible ‘move’ people from the position of being more interested in opportunities for socialising to being more interested in the historical value itself but it depends on whether this is seen as desirable or beneficial.

Methodologies

The complexity of linking the historic environment, sense of place and social capital strongly suggests that research in this area needs to draw on a nuanced and multi-disciplinary approach involving both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. One of the weaknesses of current research is that projects tend to operate within closed disciplinary fields and do not take into account insights from other traditions. This matters because considering the relationship between the ‘historic environment’, ‘sense of place’ and ‘social capital’ requires an understanding of multiple factors. Some of these factors can be measured, which is an approach favoured by psychology, some can be articulated in a more open-ended interview, as often used in sociology and human geography. Others, however, are more about how people live their lives on a daily basis and in a more unconscious way, (which has been approached via human geography’s use of phenomenology). This approach emphasises how people enter the world through experience while and anthropological methodologies describe people’s lives in context using ethnographic approaches.

Social and environment psychology have developed and used scales and questions for the measurement of ‘place attachment’, ‘place identity’ and ‘place dependency’ and these are included in the appendix. They have obvious relevance for survey-type studies but should be used with an awareness of the qualifications outlined above.

One further observation is that as a research framework ‘sense of place’ may enable all sorts of previously unseen relationships to emerge. However, it is important not to forget all the considerable research on audiences and visitor patterns, demographics, motivations, identity, and capital which has been carried out within museum, gallery, and heritage studies. To our knowledge there has been no real cross-over between these approaches and this is an obvious gap in the literature.

A methodology for exploring the connections between the ‘historic environment’, ‘sense of place’ and ‘social capital’ should therefore:

1. Delineate and seek to understand the historic environment as it works on an individual, social and place-level.
2. Avoid prejudging what an individual or group might define and value (or not) as ‘historic environment’ or ‘heritage’ and seek to understand how and why respondents define and value such things for themselves.
3. Capture the multiple ways in which place is interacted with and experienced in daily life – both consciously and less consciously and not prejudge the scale at which people’s sense of place is operating – i.e. to be wary of presuming that we already know what counts as local or ‘my place’ for people and groups.
4. Be aware that sense of place has been approached very differently in different disciplines and has been subdivided in some disciplines into different components of ‘sense of place’ – place attachment; place identity; place dependence.

5. Understand that places can be thought of as being made up of a range of quite different types of factors which extend from the built environment to people's emotional and psychological engagement with place.
6. Consider both the role of the historic environment in sense of place but also other factors such as social networks and relationships between people.
7. Explore the contradictions in social capital as it relates to place and social mobility and cultural and economic capital

Future Research Areas

There is scope for further exploration of the links between the historic environment, sense of place and social capital using in-depth qualitative approaches.

English Heritage could consider funding research on active place-shaping projects, using in-depth interviews. A more ambitious project would be to carry out an ethnography project in different parts of the UK to seek to understand how the historic environment and heritage activities might figure within people's daily lives.

Bibliography

Agnew, J. (1987) *The United States in the World Economy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Altman, I. and S. M. Low (ed.) (1992) *Place Attachment*. New York: Plenum Press.

Arts Council England (1999) *Whose heritage?: The Impact of Cultural Diversity on Britain's Living Heritage*. London: Arts Council England

Ashworth, G., B. Graham and J. Tunbridge (2007) *Pluralising Pasts: heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto.

Bauman, Z. (2001) *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Oxford, Polity.

Bird, E. S. (2002) 'It Makes Sense to Us: Cultural Identity in Local Legends of Place', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 31: 519-547.

Bourdieu, P. (1997) 'The forms of capital' in A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, A. Stuart Wells (eds) *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, B., D. D. Perkins and G. Brown (2003) 'Place attachment in a revitalizing neighbourhood: Individual and block levels of analysis', *Journal of Environmental Analysis* 23: 259-271.

Casey, E. (1996) 'How to Get From Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena' in S. Feld and K. H. Basso (eds.) *Senses of Place*. Santa Fe: New Mexico School of American Research Press.

Commission for the Built Environment (2007) *Cabe and the Historic Environment* London: Commission for the Built Environment Available at <http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/cabe-and-the-historic-environment.pdf> (accessed 28/03/2009)

Common Ground (online) *Common Ground*. Available at: <http://www.commonground.org.uk/>(Accessed 3.6.09)

Cheshire, P. and S. Sheppard (2004a) 'Introduction to feature: The price of access to better neighbourhoods', *The Economic Journal* 114 (November): F391-396.

Cheshire, P. and S. Sheppard (2004b) 'Capitalising the Value of Free Schools: The Impact of Supply Characteristics and Uncertainty', *The Economics Journal* 114 (November): F397-F424.

Clapp, J. and S. Ross (2004) 'Schools and Housing Markets: An Examination of School Segregation and Performance', *The Economics Journal* 114 (November): F425-F440.

Clark, Tom (2009) 'Mixed blessing', *The Guardian*, Society Supplement, 1st April. Available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2009/apr/01/ethnic-diversity-uk-us-obama> (accessed 2.4.09)

Corsane, G., P. Davis and D. Murtas (2009) 'Place, local distinctiveness and local identity: ecomuseum approaches in Europe and Asia' In M. Anico and E. Peralta (ed.) *Heritage and Identity: Engagement and Demission in the Contemporary World*. London: Routledge, pp. 47 – 62

Degnen, C. (2005) 'Relationality, place, and absence: a three-dimensional perspective on social memory', *The Sociological Review* 2005, 53(4), 729-744.

Department of Culture, Media and Sport (2001) *The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future*. Available at: http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/publications/4667.aspx (accessed 28/03/2009)

Department of Culture, Media and Sport (2002) *People and Places: Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment*. Available at: http://www.cep.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/people_and_places.pdf (accessed 28/03/2009).

Department of Communities and Local Government (2009a) *Guidance on building a local sense of belonging*. Available at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/1112832.pdf> (accessed 28/03/2009).

Department of Communities and Local Government (2009b) *Why Place Matters and Implications for the Role of Central, Regional and Local Government: Economic Paper 2*. Available at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/citiesandregions/whyplacematters> (accessed 17/05/2009).

Dicks, B. (2000) *Heritage, Place and Community*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Dines, N. and V. Cattell with W. Gesler and S. Curtis (2006) *Public spaces, social relations and well-being in East London*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Dodd, J., O'Riain, H., Hooper-Greenhill, E., Sandell, R. and the Heritage Lottery Fund (2002) *A catalyst for change: the social impact of the Open Museum*. Leicester, RCMG.

English Heritage (2000a) *Government Review of Policies Relating to the Historic Environment [details of review]*. Available online <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/discovery/heritage-review/consultation/index.asp> (accessed 21.3.09).

English Heritage (2000b) *Power of Place: the future of the historic environment*. London. Available at <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/contKnowledgeItem.528> (accessed 21.3.09).

English Heritage and Commission for the Built Environment (2008) *Character and Identity: Townscape and heritage appraisals in housing market renewal area*. Available at <http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/character-and-identity> (accessed 21.3.09).

Forgan, Liz (2008) 'Britishness – a values based approach is not enough'. Available at http://www.thersa.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/120394/Transcript-Dame-Liz-Forgan.pdf (accessed 21.3.09).

Forrest, R. and A. Kearns (2001) 'Social Cohesion, Social Capital and Neighbourhood', *Urban Studies* 38 (12): 2125-2143.

Gard'ner, J. M. (2004) 'Heritage Protection and Social Inclusion: A Case Study from the Bangladeshi Community of East London', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10 (1): 75-92.

Gathorne-Hardy, F. (2004) *Recharging the Power of Place: Valuing Local Significance*, A Joint Campaign to Protect Rural England, National Trust and Heritage Link report.

Geertz, C. (1996) 'Afterword' In *Senses of Place* S. Feld and K. H. Basso (eds.). Santa Fe: New Mexico School of American Research Press.

Giuliani, M. V. (1991). Towards an analysis of mental representations of attachment to the home. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 8, 133-146.

Giuliani, M. V. & Feldman, R. (1993). Place attachment in a developmental and cultural context. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 13, 267-274.

Graham, B (2002) 'Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture?', *Urban Studies* 39 (5-6): 1003-1017.

Graham, B., G. J. Ashworth, and J. E. Tunbridge (2000). *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London, Arnold.

Green, A. E. and R. J. White (2007) *Attachment to place, social networks, mobility and prospects of young people*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Grenville, J. and G. Fairclough (2004-5) 'Characterisation: Introduction', *Conservation Bulletin* 47: Winter: 2-3.

Griggs, J., A. Whitworth, R. Walker, D. McLennan and M. Noble (2008) *Person- or place-based policies to tackle disadvantage?* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Hernandez, B., M. Carmen Hidalgo, M. Esther Salazar-Laplace and S. Hess (2007) 'Place attachment and place identity in natives and non-natives', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 27: 310-319.

Hewison, R. (1987) *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen London.

Hewison, R. and J. Holden (2004) *Challenge and Change: HLF and Cultural Value*. London: Demos.

Holland, C., A. Clark, J. Katz and S. Peace (2007) *Social Interactions of Urban Public Places*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2000) *Museums and the interpretation of visual culture*. New York: Routledge.

Hothi, M., N. Bacon, M. Brophy and G. Mulgan (2007) *Neighbourliness plus empower = wellbeing?: Is there a formula for happy communities?* London: Young Foundation.

Institute of Field Archaeologists and Atkins Heritage for the National Trust (2004) *Measuring the Social Contribution of the Historic Environment*.

Jiven, G. and P. J. Larkham (2003) 'Sense of Place, Authenticity and Character: A Commentary', *Journal of Urban Design* 8 (1): 67-81.

Jorgensen, B. S. and Stedman, R. (2001) 'Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore property owners' attitudes toward their properties', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 21(3): 233-248.

Kaltenborn, B. P. and D. R. Williams (2002) 'The meaning of place: attachments to Femundsmarka National Park, Norway, among tourists and locals', *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 56, 189-198.

Kim, J. and R. Kaplan (2004) 'Physical and Psychological factors in Sense of Community: New Urbanist Kentlands and Nearby Orchard Villages', *Environment and Behaviour* 36 (3): 313-340.

Korpela, K. M. (1989) 'Place-Identity as a product of environmental self-regulation', *Journal of Environment Psychology* 9: 241-256.

Kneafsey, M. (1998) 'Tourism and Place Identity: A case-study in rural Ireland', *Irish Geography* 31(2): 111-123.

Kyle, G., A. Graefe, R. Manning and J. Bacon (2004) 'Effects of place attachment on users' perceptions of social and environmental conditions in a natural setting', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 24: 213-225.

Kyle, G., A. Graefe, R. Manning (2005) 'Testing the Dimensionality of Place Attachment in Recreational Settings', *Environment and Behaviour* 37: 153-177.

Lewicka, M. (2005) 'Ways to make people active: The role of place attachment, cultural capital, and neighbourhood ties', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 25: 381-395 .

Living Places Portal. Available at: <http://www.living-places.org.uk/index.php?id=43> (accessed 28/03/2009).

Livingstone, M. and N. Bailey and A. Kearns (2008) *People's Attachment to Place: The Influence of Neighbourhood Deprivation*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Lyons, Sir M. (2007) Place-shaping: a shared ambition for the future of local government. Available at: <http://www.lyonsinquiry.org.uk/> (accessed 21.3.09).

Lyons, Sir M. (online) 'Lyons Inquiry: Final Report and Recommendations'. Available at: <http://www.lyonsinquiry.org.uk/> (accessed 21.3.09).

Manchester City Council (n.d.) *Manchester: Sense of Place* Available at: http://www.manchester.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?fileID=1012 (accessed 21.3.09).

McCool, S. and S. Martin (1994) 'Community attachment and attitudes towards tourism development' *Journal of Travel Research* 32(3): 29-34.

MacDonald, R., T. Shildrick, C. Webster and D. Simpson (2005) 'Growing up in Poor Neighbourhoods: The Significance of Class and Place in the Extended Transitions of "Social Excluded" Young Adults', *Sociology* 39: 873-891.

Mason, R. and Baveystock, Z. (2009) 'What role can digital heritage play in the re-imagining of national identities?: England and its ICONS' In M. Anico and E. Peralta (eds.) *Heritage and Identities in the Twenty-First Century*. London and New York: Routledge: 15-28.

Miles, S. (2005) "'Our Tyne": Iconic Representation and the Revitalisation of Identity in NewcastleGateshead', *Urban Studies* 42 (5/6): 913-926.

Mohan, J. and L. Twigg (2007) 'Sense of Place, Quality of Life and Local Socioeconomic Context: Evidence from the Survey of English Housing, 2002/03', *Urban Studies* 44 (10): 2029-2045.

Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (2003) *Holding up the Mirror: Addressing cultural diversity in London's museums*. London: MLA.

Nanzer, B. (2004) 'Measuring Sense of Place: A Scale for Michigan', *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 26 (3): 362-382.

National Office Statistics (2001) *Social Capital: A review of the literature*. London: National Office Statistics.

Newcastle City Council (n.d.) 'Local List of Sites of Local Architectural or Historic Interest'. Available at: <http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/core.nsf/a/locallisthome> (accessed 31.03.09).

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2004a) 'Presumption, policy and practice: the use of museums and galleries as agents of social inclusion in Great Britain', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2), 167-181.

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2004b) 'Capital and the Museum Experience', *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7(4), 480-498.

Newman, A., McLean, F. and Urquhart, G. (2005) 'Museums and the active citizen: tackling the problems of social exclusion', *Citizenship Studies*, 9(1), 41-57.

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2006) 'The Impact of Museums on Identity', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(1), 49-68.

Ouf, A. and M. Salah (2001) 'Authenticity and the Sense of Place in Urban Design', *Journal of Urban Design* 6 (1): 73-86.

Patterson, M. E. and D. R. Williams (2005) 'Maintaining research traditions on place: Diversity of thought and scientific progress', *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25: 361-380.

Pendlebury, J. (1999) 'The conservation of historic areas in the UK: A case study of 'Grainger Town', Newcastle upon Tyne', *Cities* 16 (6): 423-433.

Pendlebury, J., T. Townshend and R. Gilroy (2004) 'The Conservation of English Built Heritage: A Force for Social Inclusion?', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10 (1): 11-31.

Pollock, V. L. and J. P. Sharp (2007). "Constellations of identity: place-ma(r)king beyond heritage." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25: 1061-1078.

Proshansky, H. M., A. K. Fabian and R. Kaminoff (1983) 'Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 3: 57-83.

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Relph, E. (1976) *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion, Lt.

Roberts, S, K. Emerick, A. Drake, B. Willis-Brown, P. Cullen, K. Condy and P. Burke, J. Sell, K. Clarke (2007) 'Communities and Heritage', *Conservation Bulletin* 55: 4-13.

Robertson, D., J. Smyth and I. McIntosh (2008) *Neighbourhood identity: Effects of time, location and social class*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Rowles, G. D. (1983). "Place and Personal Identity in Old Age: Observations from Appalachia." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 3: 299-313.

Samuels, I. and J. Clark (2008) *Character and Identity: Townscape and heritage appraisals in house market renewal areas*. London: English Heritage and Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment.

Sandell, R. (2002) *Museums, Society, Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Sandell, R. (2007) *Museums, Prejudice, and the Reframing of Difference*. New York: Routledge.

Savage, M., G. Bagnall and B. J. Longhurst (2005) *Globalization and Belonging*. London: Sage.

Schreyer, R., Jacob, G., and White, R. (1981) 'Environmental meaning as a determinant of spatial behavior in recreation' In *Proceedings of the applied geography conferences* 4: 294-300.

Shamai, S. (1991) 'Sense of place: An empirical measurement', *Geoforum* 22 (3): 347-358.

Shamai, S. and Z. Ilatov (2005) 'Measuring Sense of Place: Methodological Aspects', *Tijdschrift voor Economiche en Sociale Geographie* 96 (5): 467-476.

Sharp, C. (2006) House prices in a heritage area: the case of St. John's, Newfoundland.(Report), *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*. Article date: 1 January 2006.

Sharp, J. and V. Pollock (2005) 'Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration', *Urban Studies* 42 (5/6): 1001-1023.

Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Spice, N. (2008) 'Places of Exclusion and Inclusion: Asylum-Seeker and Refugee Experiences of Neighbourhoods in the UK', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34 (3): 491-510.

Stedman, R. C. (2002) 'Towards a Social Psychology of Place: from Place-Based Cognitions, Attitude, and Identity', *Environment and Behaviour* 34: 561-581

Stewart, K. (1996) 'A place on the side of the road' in S. Feld and K. H. Basso (eds.) *Senses of Place*. Santa Fe: New Mexico School of American Research Press.

Steuer, N. and N. Marks (2008) *Local Wellbeing: Can we measure it?* London: Young Foundation with New Economics Foundation.

Stokols, D. and S. A. Shumaker (1981) 'People in places: A transactional view of settings' in J. H. Harvey (ed.) *Cognition, social behavior, and the environment*. N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1974) *Topophilia: a study of environmental perception, attitudes, and values*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977) *Space and place: the perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Trueman, M. and N. Cornelius (not published) 'Identity and a Sense of Place: Accessing Intangible economics to built city brands'.

Twigger-Ross, C. L. and D. L. Uzzel (1996) 'Place and Identity Processes', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 16: 205-220.

Urry, J. (1994) *Consuming Places*. London: Routledge.

Unesco (n.d.) 'Intangible Heritage'. Available at:
http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=34325&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (accessed 1.4.09).

Uzzell, David L. (1996) 'Creating Place Identity Through Heritage Interpretation', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 1: 219-28.

Walker, A. J. and R. L. Ryan (2008) 'Place attachment and landscape preservation in rural New England: A Main case study', *Landscape and Urban Planning* 86: 141-152.

Waterton, E. (2005) 'Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11 (4): 309-325.

Westbury, P. (2007) *A Sense of Place: What Residents Think of Their New Homes*. London: Commission for the Built Environment.

Wilkinson, R. and K. Pickett (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better*. London: Allen Lane.

Williams, D. R. (2000) 'Notes on Measuring Recreational Place Attachment' (unpublished). Available at: www.fs.fed.us/rm/value/docs/pattach_notes.pdf (accessed 14.06.09).

Williams, D. R., M. E. Patterson and J. W. Roggenbuck (1992) 'Beyond the Commodity Metaphor: Examining Emotional and Symbolic Attachment to Place', *Leisure Sciences* 14: 29-46.

Williams, D. R. and S. L. Stewart (1998) 'Sense of Place: An Elusive Concept That Is Finding a Home in Ecosystem Management', *Journal of Forestry* 96(5): 18-23.

Williams, D. R. and J. J. Vaske (2003) 'The Measurement of Place Attachment: Validity and Generalizability of a Psychometric Approach', *Forest Science* 49 (6): 830-840.

Woolcock, M. (2001) *The place of social capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes*. ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research 2 (1) 11-17.

Wright, P. (1985) *On Living in an old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain*. London: Verso.

Appendix 1: how to measure place

From Shmuel Shamai and Zinaida Ilatov (2005) 'Measuring Sense of Place: Methodological Aspects', *Tijdschrift voor Economiche en Sociale Geographie* 96 (5): 467-476.

Shamai and Ilatov give a recent account of Shamai's development of place measures.

A four level scale of sense of place was used by Shamai with Kellerman (1985).

The levels used were:

- (1) not having sense of place
- (2) knowledge of the place
- (3) belonging to a place
- (4) attachment to a place

In later work Shamai (1991) developed a scale which 'distinguishes among seven levels in an ordinal scale':

- (0) not having any sense of place
- (1) knowledge of being located in a place
- (2) belonging to a place
- (3) attachment to a place
- (4) identifying with the goals of the place
- (5) involvement in a place,
- (6) sacrifice for a place.

From Williams, Daniel R. (2000) 'Notes on Measuring Recreational Place Attachment' (unpublished). See bibliography for URL.

Table 1. Frequently Used and Recommended Items for Measuring Place Attachment specifically used by Williams to explore tourist or recreation places

- *Place Dependence*

No. Item

- | | |
|--|---|
| 08 | No other place can compare to this area |
| 13 | I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting any other |
| 07 | Doing what I do here is more important to me than doing it in any other place |
| 05 | I wouldn't substitute any other area for doing the types of things I do here |
| 14 | This is the best place for what I like to do |
| 37 | No other place can compare to this area for what I like to do in my spare time |
| 51 | I can't imagine a better place for what I like to do. |
| 35 | This place makes me feel like no other place can |
| (Items used in some studies that load sometimes on dependence) | |
| 32 | This is my favorite [sic] place to go during my free time |
| 10 | The things I do here I would enjoy just as much at another site |

- *Place Identity*

Identity/Importance

- | | |
|----|--|
| 11 | I feel like this place is a part of me |
| 22 | This place means a lot to me |
| 06 | I am very attached to this place |
| 09 | I identify strongly with this place |

- 12 I think a lot about coming here
- 30 This place is very special to me
- 01 This place says a lot about who I am
- 02 I would prefer to spend more time here if I could

Identity Expression

- 26 My use of this place allows others to see me as I would really like them to see me
- 45 I can relate this place to other parts of my life
- 33 Because of my lifestyle, this place is important to me
- 50 When I am here, others see me the way I want them to see me
- 39 Visiting this place helps me attain the life I strive for
- 44 You can tell a lot about a person by whether they visit this place
- 38 This place is for me
- 15 I use this place to help define and express you I am inside
- 16 A visit to this place is a bit like giving a gift to oneself

Centrality

- 32 This is my favorite place to go during my free time (loads also on dependence)
- 04 This place plays a central role in my lifestyle
- 52 I find that a lot of my life is organized around this place
- 17 One of the major reasons I now live where I do is that this place is nearby
- 03 I enjoy doing the types of things I do here more than in any other area
- 29 Most of my friends are in some way connected with my use of this place

Satisfaction

- 59 Coming here is one of the most enjoyable things I do
- 61 Coming here is one of the most satisfying things I do
- 58 I get greater satisfaction out of visiting this place than I do out of work

Identity Items Used in Other Studies

- 18 I feel no commitment to this place
- 40 The time I spent here could just as easily have been spent somewhere else

Williams second approach to measuring place attachment is what he calls the "sense of place" measure. He suggests that 'the advantage is that it can examine places at multiple geographic scales, unlike the place attachment measure above which focuses on tourist or recreation places' (2000, p. 5)

Below is a table, provided by Williams, showing how his additions relate to Shamai's attachment levels.

Level (Shamai, 1991) Item	
(0) Not having any sense of place	I would rather be (live) somewhere else
(1) Knowledge of being located in a place	I have no particular feeling [love] for this place
(2) Belonging to a place	I do not really feel like I am from this place
	I (always) feel like I belong here
(3) Attachment to a place	I am emotionally attached to this place
(4) Identifying with a place	I identify with the goals of this (community)
	I identify with the lifestyle and values of the people who live (come) here
(5) Involvement (investment) in a place	I have (am willing to) invest(ed) my heart and soul in this place
(6) Sacrifice for a place	I would make (have made) personal sacrifices to save/protect/preserve/maintain this place

Williams developed the following variations:

I have negative feelings for this place
I have no particular feeling for this place
I do not think of myself as being from this place
What happens in this place is important to me
I have an emotional attachment to this place – it has meaning to me
I am willing to invest my talent or time to make this an even better place
I am willing to make financial sacrifices for the sake of this place
In a more recent survey this was modified as follows:
I have no particular love for this place
I sometimes feel like I do not belong in this place
What happens in this place is important to me
I have an emotional attachment to this place – it has meaning to me
I identify with the physical landscape of this place
I identify with the lifestyles and values of the people who live here
I am willing to invest more time or effort to make this an even better place
I am willing to make greater financial greater to make this an even better place

Appendix 2: Literature Review Methodology

The following databases were searched

- Web of Knowledge, SwetsWise and Wiley Interscience
- An additional google search using key terms was conducted.

The following terms were searched

Key term 1: Sense of place

sub-themes and links:

- Place attachment – theories, strength of
- Place dependence and its relation to place attachment etc.
- Sense of place/place attachment/place dependence + belonging, identity
- Sense of place/place attachment/place dependence + historic environment/urban environment/cityscapes/rural environment, heritage (listed or otherwise)

Key term 2: Historic Environment

Sub-themes and links:

- Built Environment
- Heritage
- Urban/rural environment in terms of heritage
- Listed buildings
- Historic cityscapes
- Historic Environment etc. + sense of place/ place attachment etc.
- Historic Environment + social capital
- Historic Environment + social capital + sense of place

Key term 3: Social capital:

Sub-themes and links:

- Bonding/Bridging social capital and sense of place/place attachment/place dependence
- Social capital + sense of place/citizenship/community cohesion
- Social capital and historic environment

The following were also searched:

Key relevant organisational websites and publications in sector:

- English Heritage (EH)
- National Trust (NT)
- Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA)
- Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
- Museums, Libraries and Archives (MLA)

Key relevant charitable foundations/think-tanks

- Joseph Rowntree
- IPPR
- Demos
- Leverhulme
- British Academy

- Young Foundation
- New Economics Foundation

Research Council UK (RCUK) sites:

- Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)
- Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)

Government and local authority websites (units dealing with community relations/cohesion/c
<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/sacs/icchs/apital/citizenship>:

- Communities and Local Government (CLG)

Contact details:

International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies (ICCHS)
School of Arts and Cultures
Bruce Building
Newcastle University
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 7RU,
United Kingdom

<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/sacs/icchs/>

Telephone: +44 (0)191 222 7419

Fax: +44 (0)191 222 5564

Email:

- Helen Graham (h.graham@ncl.ac.uk)
- Rhiannon Mason (rhiannon.mason@ncl.ac.uk)
- Andrew Newman (andrew.newman@ncl.ac.uk)

If you would like this document in a different format, please contact
our Customer Services department:
Telephone: 0870 333 1181
Fax: 01793 414926
Textphone: 01793 414878
E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk