





Almere Heritage Cube

An Assessment Framework for Participatory
Heritage Valorisation in Almere



Colophon

This publication presents the work of a research project for the chair of Heritage & Architecture, department AE+T, Delft University of Technology. The research was funded by the research program 'Ontwerp & Overheid', part of 'Actieagenda Ruimtelijk Ontwerp 2017-2020'.

Editor: Lidwine Spoormans

Authors: Lidwine Spoormans and Deniz Ikiz Kaya

Cover image represents the research method, based on Heritage Cube by Peter Howard

People involved in the project: TU Delft: Lidwine Spoormans, Ana Pereira Roders, Wessel de Jonge, Leeke Reinders, TU Eindhoven: Deniz Ikiz Kaya, Pilots in Almere: Ariadne Onclin, Dick de Jager, Claudia Laumans, Jouke v/d Werf, Like Bijlsma en Joost Tennekes.

In this publication, material that is made by the participating residents of the heritage pilots in Almere is used for analysis. This material is retrieved from the documents produced by the several pilots and is used anonymous. We are thankful for their cooperation and their wonderful contributions. All other images are made by researchers and students from TU Delft.

Published by TU Delft, 2021

Almere Heritage Cube

An Assessment Framework for Participatory Heritage Valorisation in Almere

Content

Introduction	4
4 Pilots	8
Part 1 Almere Heritage Cubes	14
Part 2 Methods of Participation	34
Conclusions & Recommendations	50
References	56

Introduction

This publication presents the Almere Heritage Cube: An Assessment framework for Participatory Heritage Valorisation in Almere. It reports a research project that has been conducted by researchers of Delft University of Technology and Eindhoven University of Technology in 2019-2020. Why Almere? What is an “Almere Heritage Cube”? Almere is representative of post-war heritage inclusive of experimental housing units and neighbourhoods representing the architectural and urban design trends of the post-war period. Although it is relatively young in age, and thus not well acknowledged by both academics and public, it possesses a significant characteristic. Based upon the observations and opinions of the residents, who know Almere best, we aim to explore what are the qualities of the living environments through innovative and participatory processes to preserve them for the future.

New Town, New Heritage

The city of Almere, built in the 1970's and once the agent of a new world, is now at the dawn of the first urban renewal. As in other ‘Groeikernen’ (post-war Dutch new towns built between 1968-1988) the city faces issues as liveability, energy transition and densification. Presently, the Groeikernen are in-between old and new, and are not yet widely recognised as cultural heritage. However, our assumption is that these new towns can be seen as future heritage. We think that exploration of their characteristics, assessment of values and problems, in combination with an increasing awareness among experts, professionals and users, is necessary to prevent a disregard of the Groeikernen legacy.

Because this relatively young stock is not generally recognized as heritage, the definition of heritage is challenged. This regards two aspects: what can be heritage and who can decide what is heritage? Scholars in the heritage discipline discuss a paradigm shift in the heritage field ‘from exceptional to perfectly ordinary’ (Meurs, 2008), or ‘towards 100% heritage’ (Roders, 2020), promoting the exploration of values and possibilities of all existing buildings and areas. The adoption of this ordinary/ 100% approach has led to an open mind in our research project, regarding what can be acknowledged as the heritage of Almere. The second aspect concerns what stakeholders should decide what is valuable. Traditionally, heritage assessment was dominated by experts, mainly focussing on historical values. However, last decades there has been a call for the inclusion of other stakeholders and disciplines, relating to various programs and initiatives such as the ‘Faro Convention’(Council-of-Europe, 2005). This European program emphasises the engagement of heritage communities in decision-making and development

processes to ensure that heritage contributes to the social, cultural and economic dynamics of the communities. In the Netherlands, the 'Omgevingswet' (Environment Act, 2021) obliges municipalities to define the qualities of living environments, including cultural heritage. The municipality of Almere is experimenting with and aims to develop its first heritage policy, based on the integration of expert and resident's values and perspectives. Over the last years, the municipality of Almere has carried out several participatory heritage pilots, aiming to engage citizens in identification of heritage assets and attributes, the significance of these assets, and empowering them in future policy-making.

Case study Almere

Almere was created as a new city on new land reclaimed from the sea. Almere Haven was the first core of this poly-nuclear city, that was built from the late 1960s onwards. The centre was inspired by traditional Dutch towns, surrounded by residential 'woonerf' areas. Haven is remembered, experienced and appreciated to contain Almere's historic identity, but also faces degradation, an ageing population and building vacancy. The main focus of the research project is on Almere Haven. However, one of the researched pilots addresses Almere as a whole. Moreover, contributions of all pilots include other parts of Almere and even beyond.

Research approach

This research aims to contribute to an innovative participatory heritage approach for young heritage by taking civic appreciation as a starting point. It investigates methods to include residents and other stakeholders in the heritage identification and assessment processes. The municipality of Almere is a partner in the project and has already carried out 'participatory heritage pilots' in recent years. We aim to learn from these pilots in several ways: (1) what methods have been used for participation and (2) what stakeholders have been reached to participate? Also, we want to know (3) what types of attributes the participants indicate as heritage and (4) on what level of scale significance is identified. This research evaluates four selected pilots that have been conducted in recent years in Almere and represent different techniques, groups, time frames and organisational parties. We have analysed their methodology and outcomes in order to provide recommendations for implementation in heritage policies.

The research presented in this publication consists of two stages: In the first part, the results of the pilots are analysed by coding and comparing documents from each participatory heritage pilot through content analysis. By applying the model of the Heritage Cube (Howard, 2003), different types of heritage, levels of identity and participating stakeholders are identified. In the second part, the way of participation is investigated. By a survey among organisers and participants of the pilots, the applied methods are assessed and the implemented and desired level of participation is investigated.



Marktgracht Almere, 1979. Photographer Koen Suyk
Nationaal Archief, via WikiCommons

4 Pilots


Almere heritage policy

“For a city like Almere, participation is actually standard. When Almere was built, citizens became more articulate and had a say in spatial planning. Even today, the city is partly built by its own inhabitants, just relating to for example experimental housing. So, it's logical that citizens are also involved in valuing heritage. (...) But participation is very complex. I would like a handbook on how to deal with participation in a way that makes everyone happy. So far, a participation process has never been good. There is always something that could have been better.”(Hoekstra, 2020)

This is quote by the Almere's policy advisor on monuments and archaeology, who is also involved in this research. It is the aim of Almere to make participation the standard in heritage policy, but as is clear from this quote experiments have not led to a satisfactory result. The evaluation of experiments aims to give recommendations for a standard approach or handbook. Four experimental projects on participation in heritage have been selected and analysed. The details of four projects are listed in the tables below (Tables 1-4).

Erfgoedatelier	
Aim	Objective is to involve stakeholders – residents, entrepreneurs, visitors – in the process of collecting and selecting heritage. This pilot explores a method to discuss with them what places they cherish, what places represent the history of their living environment and what buildings have an important meaning. The aim of the organisers was to continue this pilot and contribute to the Urban Vision that is developed by Dienst Stedelijke Ontwikkeling of municipality Almere. However, nor continuation nor real exchange has taken place.
Date/ period	16 September 2018
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roundtable discussion - Mapping of positive (pearls) and negative (coal) areas - Questionnaire of best buildings and places
Scope (intended)	Almere-Haven, neighbourhoods Centrum and De Werven
Participants	15 participants (being non-organisers) Recruited by flyers and 'snowball'-invitations
Sources analysed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report from group discussions (4 groups) - Map of indicated areas (1 concluding map) - Concluding report of project - Media summary
Initiator	Stichting Polderblik
Organiser	Stichting Polderblik, supported by Municipality Almere
Contacted	Jouke van de Werf, member of Welstands Almere and member of Stichting Polderblik
Context	Pilot was linked to an exhibition about the heritage of Almere-Haven and organised in the Open Monuments Weekend 2018.

Table 1. Pilot description for Erfgoedatelier



Erfgoed in Haven	
Aim	The objective for the research by PBL and TU Delft is to investigate the resident's perception of heritage values, based on a Post-65 housing neighbourhood. Choosing a Post 65 case, might help to find 'unprejudiced' or independent opinions by residents. Moreover, developing and testing a method for (young) heritage assessment by residents is part of the research.
Date/ period	Sept 2019 – Dec 2019
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribution of diaries - Short interview at collection of diaries - Group discussions in elderly group and school class
Scope (intended)	Almere-Haven Centre, focus neighbourhoods Centrum and De Werven. However, participants from more neighbourhoods in Almere-Haven have been consulted.
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diaries: 55 - Group discussions: ca. 45
Sources analysed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of codes resulting from the analysis - Code definitions and examples, resulting from the project - Code webs, analysed results - Participant data
Initiator	Delft Technical University (TUD) + Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving (PBL)
Organiser	TUD, department of AE+T, Heritage & Architecture
Contacted	Lidwine Spoormans (TU Delft), Like Bijlsma (PBL)
Context	<p>Research is advertised as part of Havenhart 2.0, because it was organised in the same period. Moreover, the research is related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PhD research Heritage and Architecture, TUD - MSc course (graduation) of Heritage & Architecture, TUD - Research to resident's perception of heritage, PBL

Table 2. Pilot description for Erfgoed in Haven



Havenhart 2.0	
Aim	Collaboration between specialists and 'Havenaren' (residents of Almere-Haven) to create a narrative for the future of Haven. Combining expert knowledge (retail, urbanism, society, housing) and residents' knowledge and experience about Haven will result in a vision for the urban renewal of the 'hart' of Almere Haven, representing the ideas of many Havenaren.
Date/ period	August 2019 – May 2020
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Round table discussion (Werkplaatsbijeenkomsten) - Neighbourhood game (Wijkspel) - Dilemma votes (Dilemmakaarten) Secondary activities, like discussion and inspiration nights (3x) in Corrosia cultural centre, discussion at diner (40 people) Corrosia poster exhibition, photo exhibition, theatre production
Scope (intended)	Scope for renewal is Centre area of Almere-Haven, including neighbourhoods: De Wierden, De Werven, De Hoven and Centrum
Participants	Participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Round table discussion (30 meetings) with diverse group of participants: residents, entrepreneurs, social organisations, and others 2500 invitations by flyers and snowball. Exact number of participants is unknown - Dilemma votes: 129 votes (divided over 5 questions) People informed via website (497 visitors), Facebook (214 followers, 2100 persons reached), Instagram (230 followers)
Sources analysed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports of round table discussions and other activities, retrieved online via Havenhart 2.0 website (17 reports) - Vision document with concluding texts and plans for renewal
Initiator	Municipality of Almere
Organiser	Havenverbond, partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipality of Almere - School: Almeerse Scholengroep - Housing corporations: De Alliantie, GoedeStede, Ymere - Entrepreneurs: Centrumgebied-ondernemers - Care organisations: Zorggroep Almere, Leger des Heils, GGD Flevoland - Social welfare organisation: (volunteer, caregiving, housing, culture): VMCA, Kwintess, De Schoor
Contacted	Claudia Laumans, project manager, hired by DSO Almere for urban renewal Almere Haven
Context	Participatory activities are part of the vision for urban renewal of the 'hart' (centre area) of Almere-Haven

Table 3. Pilot description for Havenhart 2.0



Iconen van Almere	
Aim	Gain attention to the built heritage of Almere, by involving the people of Almere in indicating what is valuable and telling narratives. This is seen as essential for the development of a more differentiated and, above all, more nuanced identity of Almere including the residents' perspective. The aim is that this participation process, in steps, can contribute to the development of a monuments policy for Almere municipality.
Date/ period	Open call for nominations: 28 August - 26 October 2015 Public poll: 8 December 2015 - 25 January 2016
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire, conducted by research panel of O&S (research and statistics of the municipality of Almere) about opinion on monuments and proposed monuments for long list of Icons - Governmental advice on proposed monuments for long list - Open call (in (social) media) for long list (69 icons) - Public poll (online) on long list, resulting in comments and short list (25 icons) - Expert panel (Kunstlinie Almere Flevoland (KAF)) on short list (34 icons) - Announcement of short list on Open Monuments Day - Collect narratives about shortlisted buildings - (Intended: Selection of Icons, to monuments to be protected (by committee of experts and citizens))
Scope (intended)	Almere
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire: 440 (= 15,6% of distributed)), recruited via research panel municipality - Votes on long list (making short list): 1786, recruited via open call on online media
Sources analysed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipal minutes of meetings DSO, reporting about poll, results and decision making (6 documents) - Media announcement of expo and book
Initiator	Municipality of Almere
Organiser	Municipality of Almere
Contacted	Dick de Jager, employee Monuments and archology, municipality of Almere
Context	Icons of Almere was linked to the development of a (national) modernising process for monuments policy. Or in the case of Almere, the first development of a monument policy.

Table 4. Pilot description for Iconen van Almere



Part 1

Almere Heritage Cubes

This chapter presents the first phase of the research. It analyses the outcomes of the pilots investigated, focussing on their heritage significance as reported in the results. The second phase of the research, analysing the method of participation used in every pilot, is presented in Part 2.

Method

Heritage Methods

Traditional methods of assessing heritage significance heavily rely on historical, art historical and archaeological notions defined by professionals, and they are applied basically through disciplinary methods (Mason, 2002, p. 5). These history-based assessments of significance (also known as the heritage values) are still dominating most urban development policies, especially in subnational governance, as local and regional authorities. In the UNESCO World Heritage List, there are examples of wider value systems and implementations, including minorities as stakeholders, but at national or local level this is not standard (Labadi, 2007). Although the field of heritage conservation had been dominated by expert views for decades, mainly covering historic values and related methods, more participatory processes are now supported by administrations at different levels. The conceptualisation of heritage has evolved and expanded extensively over the past three decades, which asks for a broader scope of values and the inclusion of other stakeholders and disciplines. This is specifically relevant for a new town like Almere, since the history-based assessment does not easily apply to its relatively young building stock. Moreover, the municipality of Almere has the ambition to develop inclusive assessment methods, that represent the civic perspective on heritage.

Among scholars and in governmental bodies, there is a call to define methods to assess values of ordinary architectural resources in urban environments. However, despite the wealth of practices, there is limited research today on tools and methods to assess the values of ordinary architecture and urbanism. To identify a broader scope of values and perspectives, this research seeks to learn from experiments conducted in practice. How have the pilots been organised, what methods and participatory activities have been employed? How have organisers and participants experienced these methods and to what extent they think the pilots lead to successful participation? What type of stakeholders have been reached by the different pilots? What type of attributes and values have been mentioned by the participants? Do different stakeholder groups indicate different types of heritage? What scale level the pilots focus on and on what level participants identify with heritage?

Heritage classifications

For this research, the Heritage Cube as developed by Peter Howard (2003), is used as a framework to categorise, compare and discuss the results of the four different pilots. Howard defines heritage as anything that someone wishes to conserve or to collect, and to pass on to future generations. Howard's framework presents the examination of (1) the kinds of things that people conserve and collect, (2) the types of people who do it and (3) the levels of identity at which the activity takes place. These can be regarded as faces of a cube (Howard, 2003, p. 52). (See Figure, Howard's Heritage Cube) Any decision or dispute in heritage management can be imagined as existing somewhere within the cube, as confrontations between fields, between levels and between markets. To be able to identify the different interest and aspects that play a role in decision making, classification can clarify the various positions.

Starting with the first dimension of the cube, the Heritage Fields, Howard questions what can be heritage, what kind of things people wish to conserve or collect, to protect from the ravages of time? His answer is 'everything' (Howard, 2003, p. 53). Although he reckons the limitations of listing the great diversity of things that can have value for people, he identifies seven most significant fields: Nature, Landscape, Monuments, Sites, Artefacts, Activities and People. The definition clearly includes tangible and intangible types of heritage. Also on an international institutional level, UNESCO recognises that all cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage (UNESCO, 2019). Intangible cultural heritage is included in the definitions as 'the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage' (UNESCO, 2018). The second dimension of the cube concerns Heritage Markets. The reason for Howard to distinguish 'markets' is that people who are prepared to devote time, money and effort to heritage want different things from it. This could include legitimation, cultural capital, identity, financial reward or just a living (Howard, 2003, p. 102). The Heritage Markets, or stakeholders, in the framework are Owners, Outsiders, Insiders, Governments, Academics and Media. The documents by UNESCO mention state parties, right-holders and stakeholders, without defining clear categories, although some groups are mentioned in the convention texts. The Faro Convention text that was referred to earlier, defines a heritage community as consisting of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public

action, to sustain and transmit to future generations (Council-of-Europe, 2005). The related action plan distinct four groups in participation, being the active civil society (heritage community), people who can convey the message (facilitators), engaged and supportive political players in the public sector (local, regional, national institutes and authorities) and engaged and supportive stakeholders in the private sector (businesses, non-profit entities, academia, CSOs, NGOs, etc.). The third dimension within which heritage management operates is the level of identity. This concerns the scale level on which Heritage strengthens the identity, which could be at the level of our Home, our Neighbourhood, our Town or County, our Region, our Nation and at the Continental or International level (Howard, 2003, p. 147). According to the used definition heritage as something that people want to save, collect or conserve, it relates directly to identity and self-consciousness. In our research we adapted from the definitions from the Heritage Cube by Howard, by relating them to World Heritage documents and conventions discussed and the specific Almere situation.

Almere Cube

As discussed by Howard (2003, pp. 52-53), the classifications and categories he introduced are open to changes. For instance, heritage significance can be integrated into different levels, such as both regional and national level. Or a person can carry multiple roles, such as both academic and insider, and relate to more markets and have various interests. Also, the number of categories of all dimensions can be extended or reduced for specific cases. Moreover, definitions of categories can be specified per culture, project or case. For our research on Almere heritage pilots, we adapted the Heritage Cube as the Almere Cube, considering some characteristics from both the location and the approach of the pilots. The adaptations have been made during the early stages of the analysis process, so could be regarded as part of the research results. However, since they are reinterpretations of a pre-set model, they are presented in the methods section. Moreover, these terms relate to definitions as used by other heritage organisations like UNESCO. To align and compare terms, the various definitions are presented in Table X.

Additional categories or alternative definitions have been developed relating to specific Almere characteristics. Regarding Heritage Fields, most categories resemble the Heritage Cube, but different from Howard's definition, monuments do not necessarily have a listed status since in Almere this is very rare. In activities, also everyday activities are included, which might not be seen as heritage

traditionally, but are an example the inclusive broad scope that is used in this research. If walking the dog along the water front is valuable to people it could be significant for Almere's heritage. Two Heritage Fields have been added for the Almere Cube. The first is Infrastructure, including both urban logistic concepts and specific fields like parking spaces. The other added category is 'Other', grouping things that could not be represented in the present categories. Also, this left-over category represents the exploring wide view that is the nature of this research. A new Heritage Market is introduced for the Almere Cube, which is Makers. Since Almere is a relatively young town, people involved in the design, policies and building phases of the city are still alive and also involved in some of the pilots. The Makers category includes architects, urban planners and sociologists that were sometimes related to the (local) government. The fact that some of the makers were working for the government and are residents of Almere, illustrates that mixing of Heritage Markets occurs. In these cases, double markets have been identified. The adaption of Identity Levels for the Almere Cube, regards more emphasis on the smaller scale levels and disregarding the Continental and International level that are part of Howard's model. This relates to the aim of the Almere pilots and the young and ordinariness of our subject, which is not recognised as of global significance (yet).

Heritage Fields			
	Heritage Cube (Howard, 2003, p. 54)	UNESCO Operational Guidelines (UNESCO, 2019, pp. 18-19, 27)	Almere Cube
Nature	Nature reserves, zoos, museums, fauna, flora, geology, habitats, air and water	Natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) from the aesthetic or scientific point of view	Natural elements e.g., trees, water, sun, air, animals
Landscape	National parks, AONBs, natural areas, heritage coasts, gardens and parks, cultural and archaeological landscapes, mountain chains, plains and coastlines	Cultural properties that represent the “combined works of nature and of man”. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal	Coherent set of natural/cultural designed/undesigned elements e.g., parks, forest, squares, skylines
Infrastructure			Urban concepts e.g., logistic plan or specific elements e.g., parking spaces
Monuments	Listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas, buildings, transport lines, archaeological remains, sculpture	Architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of OUV from the point of view of history, art or science	Buildings or ensembles, listed and unlisted
Artefacts	Museums, galleries, outdoor museums, museum artefacts, family albums, artworks, ships		Objects e.g., pieces of art, in public space or private objects
Activities	Clubs and societies, legislation, appellation controlee, language, religion, performing arts, sports, diet and drink, calendars, customs, crafts	Traditions, techniques and management systems, language and other forms of intangible heritage	Traditions and events e.g., market or Christmas party, or everyday activities e.g., sports, shopping, walking the dog
People	Atrocity sites, plaques, graveyards, obituaries, saints' relics, heroes, victims, celebrities' possessions		Persons e.g., a known (historic) figure
Sites	National battlefields, historic markers, battlefields, mythical sites, lieux de memoire	Works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of OUV from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view	Locations with a symbolic (historical) meaning or 'lieux de memoires'
Other		Spirit and feeling and other internal/external factors	Anything else mentioned as valuable, e.g. spirit, identity

Table 5. Terminology for heritage fields

Heritage Markets			
	Heritage Cube (Howard, 2003, p. 104)	UNESCO (2019) + Faro Convention (Council-of-Europe, 2005)	Almere Cube
Owners	Especially in built heritage and artefacts. Can include governments and organizations. Drives up market (gentrification). Concerns of privacy, security, finance	Stakeholders from private sector; businesses, non-profit entities	Private home owners, housing corporations, owners of businesses (not necessarily owning real estate)
Insiders	Concerned particularly with activities, with sites and with people. Long-settled locals and club members. Concerned for access but also to exclude outsiders. Often oppose interpretation and pricing. Concerned with person- and event-related histories	Indigenous peoples, (active) heritage community, (heritage) facilitators	People that live and/ or work in Almere
Outsiders	Includes tourists, but also day trippers, educational visits, pilgrims, connoisseurs, all with different agendas, which don't mix well. Concerns for access and interpretation		Visitors or tourists, not living in Almere.
Governments	Governments Primarily fund nature, landscape, built heritage and museum sectors. Levels of government often compete. Concerned for legitimacy and prestige, to show similarity within area and difference from others.	State parties: local, regional, national institutes and authorities	Governmental bodies or employees thereof on local, regional or on national level
Academics	Often 'discover' heritage. Disciplines establish hegemony over types of heritage. Lack resources, so advise governments. Concerned for authenticity and conservation.	Other interested parties and partners (e.g., NGO's) in the identification, nomination, management and protection processes of World Heritage properties.	Researchers and students from academia, or professional experts in the field e.g., real estate advisors, commerce or heritage experts
Makers			Architects, urban planners and sociologists involved in the development of built environment, independent or related to the government
Media	Old agenda for 'newsworthiness' now joined by visual value for films etc.		Written, visual and social media on local, regional or on national level

Table 6. Terminology for heritage markets


Heritage Identity Levels		
	Heritage Cube (Howard, 2003, p. 148)	Almere Cube
International	UNESCO: World Heritage Sites - natural, cultural and cultural landscapes; Ramsar sites etc. Controlled by nation-states	
Continental	European Union, Council of Europe: mainly environmental and built heritage. Conventions; Cities of Culture; routes and networks; fauna reserves. Largely controlled by nation-states	
Nation	National museums, monument protection systems, regalia, honours. Also control levels above and below, with agenda of legitimation	The Netherlands as a nation
Province/ Region	Some confusion between regional and national. Environmental, landscape and built heritage often administered at this level. Also sub-national sports and museums, especially folk museums	Flevoland and the IJsselmeer polders
County/civic	Monuments often administered at this level within national objectives. Also museums, archives, civic events and celebrations, commemorations, sports. Also coasts, and public parks	
City		Almere as a polynuclear town, referring to all cores
Locality	Parish/ward is often responsible for footpaths, fetes, local events, sports clubs, church. The level at which people largely know each other and the heritage is dominated by activities, sites and people	One core of Almere, e.g., Almere-Haven
Neighbourhood	The street, hamlet or block, which often share festivals, commemorations of events and people	Coherent part of the urban fabric indicated by a name (e.g. De Werven).
Hofje, Street or Block		Ensemble of houses that share a collective space, like a courtyard or cul-de-sac-like street
Home	Family routines, graves, photo album, pets. Largely matriarchal agenda. May be geographically dispersed	Residential unit, which includes the garden and sometimes relates to specific rooms or spots inside the home

Table 7. Terminology for heritage identity levels


Analysis

The results of the four pilots that have been conducted in previous years serve as primary data for the research. Since the pilots are very different in their organisation, scope and output, the resulting data varies from conversation reports of round table meetings, blog reports of participatory activities, value-maps made in a workshop, analysed results like code lists and minutes of administrative meetings. All these documents have been coded by TU Delft researchers, using Atlas.ti software package. A code is an issue, topic or concept that is present in the data. Codes are used as topical markers that enable the analysis of a wide variety of data on a specific theme. In this research a deductive coding process was used. In deductive strategies (different from inductive strategies), a pre-set list of codes, based on present theories or concepts, serves as the framework for analysis (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2020, p. 220). In our case, the model of the Almere Cube categories, representing Heritage Fields, Markets and Identity Levels, has been used as the pre-set framework. Often deductive coding serves as the first step, after which refinement of codes anticipating on the nuanced content takes place. Since classification and comparison is the goal of the project, the deductive strategy was the main step. However, some inductive adaptations to the categories have been made in the early stages of the coding, specifying the cube model for the Almere case.

After coding the data, the dataset per pilot has been analysed on the relative distribution over the categories identifying the focus of every pilot. Using the coding software, a quantitative analysis was carried out on the frequency of codes and especially on combination of codes. Tables have been produced that present the cooccurrence of for example the number of codes per heritage field for each pilot. The results provide answers to the questions raised, like what type of stakeholders have been reached by the different pilots, what aspects have been mentioned by the participants and on what level they identify with these aspects? This allows for a comparison of the pilots, and relating the resulting focus to their participatory activities. As a second analytic step, the dataset of all pilots combined have been studied. The cooccurrence of codes of the different faces of the cube shows the relation between fields, markets and identity levels. Based on this comparison, it can be discussed how for example different stakeholder groups indicate different types of heritage or what is the dominant level on which stakeholders identify with heritage. In this chapter, the highlights per pilot and the characteristics of the categories as applied to Almere are discussed.



Heritage Cube (Howard, 2003)



Almere Cube, inspired by Howard's heritage Cube (Spoormans, 2020)

Results

Heritage fields per pilot

The results of Erfgoedatelier are spread over the fields, but predominantly focus on architectural and large-scale levels, like landscape, monuments and infrastructure. This relates to the questions and activities employed in the pilot. One method in this pilot is a questionnaire asking for the best buildings and places of Haven, relating directly and exclusively to the heritage fields monuments and landscapes. An urban map was used as a method in the round table discussions to indicate 'pearls and coals' (positive and negative spots) of Haven. Logically, the large scale of this map has led to large scale answers.

Erfgoed in Haven represents a relatively equal distribution across the heritage fields. The diaries used consist of seven questions with various formats about different scale levels, from the rooms in the house, the top 3 of nice neighbourhoods, the everyday routes and routines in Almere Haven, up to the character of Haven on a postcard. Moreover, the diary was open for various types of answers, like physical aspects, more abstract qualities or notations, activities etc. This pilot shows that asking specific questions about the different scales and aspects not only directing to 'buildings' alone, leads to a broader scope of answers. The high number in 'Other' is striking, which in this case is mostly relating to identity.

Havenhart 2.0 shows two 'over'-represented categories: activities and landscape. The high representation of Landscape is in line with the other pilots, which indicates the strong values that are attached to it in the Almere context. Activities however, is more difficult to explain. Relating to the activities of the pilot, the round table sessions opened up the discussion to what matters in peoples' daily lives and what they want to keep or change for the future of Haven. The fact that Activities are an important part of that is an interesting outcome that requires more study on the method (why so many activities mentioned, by whom, what activities etc)

Iconen van Almere has two dominants with most important is Monuments. This is a direct result of the aim of the pilot and the way the question/ poll is organised, asking for 'the icon' of Almere. Although the responses could have been addressing any Heritage Field, this pilot makes clear that asking for Icons results in the rather traditional interpretation of the icon, represented by buildings. However, the large share of Landscape underlines the importance of the Almere landscapes. The largest number of all pilots in Artefacts. Apparently, 'Iconen van Almere' also links to Artefacts. 'Collect narratives' as in the aim of the project, does not speak from the documents analysed. Although the aim is to develop a more differentiated

nanced identity of Almere, this does not seem to translate to a more differentiated perspective on the definition of heritage.

Comparing the heritage fields of the different pilots, as presented in the table, it becomes clear that Landscape is the absolute winner in the Heritage fields, with the high percentage of more than 23% in every pilot. This mainly refers to the natural landscape and might be related to the specific green qualities and landscape setting of Almere. However, it could also be influenced by the applied methods for participation, as was suggested in Erfgoedatelier. The field Infrastructure only has a relevant score in Erfgoedatelier, which might be linked to the stakeholders involved. The heritage fields Sites and People have an overall low score, which might be related to the young history of Almere but also due to the methods asking for buildings specifically. People as a field, if mentioned, mostly relates to the ‘pioneers’, that are very specific for Almere. Also, memories about personal relatives, related to an urban place, are mentioned as valuable.

	Erfgoedatelier	Erfgoed in Haven	Havenhart 2.0	Iconen van Almere
Nature	6%	12%	7%	4%
Landscape	23%	26%	27%	33%
Infrastructure	18%	3%	7%	4%
Monuments	20%	12%	6%	41%
Artefacts	7%	5%	2%	12%
Activities	15%	11%	33%	2%
People	4%	8%	8%	0%
Sites	5%	3%	2%	3%
Other	1%	19%	7%	2%

Table 8. Heritage fields per pilot

Identity Levels per pilot

As clear from the table showing the identity levels per pilot, Erfgoedatelier has a clear focus on the local level of the Core, logically relating to 'Erfgoed Almere-Haven' having Almere Haven as the subject of study.

Although the pilot Erfgoed in Haven also has Haven as the scope, the dominance of answers is on the level of the home and the hofje/ street. To some extent this can be related to the diary method employed, including questions on the smaller scale. However, these questions also addressed higher identity levels as the city, but they are not largely presented in the answers. This might be related to the Insiders as the dominant heritage market, having their main interest in their own living environment. Havenhart 2.0 is aiming at a vision for the urban renewal of Haven, which explains the focus on Haven as a Core. However, more responses on City level could have been expected in which the identity of Haven is positioned in relation to Almere as a whole. The pilot Iconen van Almere aims at the scope of the City of Almere, which is clearly reflected in the answers. This pilot represents the higher identity levels, which is logical for its aim of defining a differentiated identity of Almere in the broader context.

The overall analysis of the identity levels of the pilots shows that three out of four pilots focus on Haven (Core) and play in the lower scale levels. Iconen van Almere is the exception in this sample of pilots, representing the higher identity levels. The heritage identity levels are as expected and intended, with exception for Erfgoed in Haven, that intended to evaluate different scale levels but has a dominance of responses on the home level.

	Erfoedatelier	Erfoed in Haven	Havenhart 2.0	Iconen van Almere
Nation	3%	0%	1%	10%
Province	5%	0%	2%	10%
City	16%	7%	5%	67%
Locality/ Core	58%	19%	66%	5%
Neighbourhood	13%	9%	10%	10%
Hofje/ Street/ Block	4%	26%	9%	0%
Home	3%	38%	7%	0%

Table 9. Identity levels per pilot

Heritage Markets per pilot

As the table above shows, the stakeholders involved in pilot Erfgoedatelier are spread over markets, although with some dominant groups. Notable in this pilot is the relatively large representation of Makers, which might be related to the organiser Polderblik, that is a foundation that manages and provides access to the archives of the 'godfathers and mothers' of Almere, in other words the Makers. The respondents of pilot Erfgoed in Haven are only insiders and a few owners. The owners in this case are insiders too, since these are mainly shop owners. The limited representation of other stakeholders/ markets is in line with the aim of this pilot to investigate the residents' perception of heritage values. Correspondingly, the applied methods used focus on residents mainly. The pilot Havenhart 2.0 includes more different heritage markets in their activities. Although insiders are dominant in this pilot too, there are some representatives of outsiders and governments. Also, relatively many academics are involved here, which are mainly professionals in this case. The large share of insiders and academics/ experts also relates to the organisation of the pilot, in which both residents (insiders) and Havenverbond as organising party that includes local experts are represented in the results. The Iconen van Almere pilot shows a distribution over insiders (represented by the public poll) and academics and makers (involved in the expert poll).

Regarding the overall representation of stakeholders, the Insiders are the largest group in every pilot. Insiders in these pilots are predominantly residents of Almere in all pilots. This is also the group aimed at in the participation ambitions of every participatory pilot. However, it could be questioned if focus on present residents alone is wise, regarding for example future interventions, urban developments or urban identity. Media as a market is generally underrepresented in the pilots, but in Icons of Almere media and social media has played an important role. However, in the cases Media as a market was coded, in most cases a resident was also involved in media leading to a 'double role'.

	Erfgoedateller	Erfgoed in Haven	Havenhart 2.0	Iconen van Almere
Owners	1%	10%	9%	9%
Insiders	57%	90%	51%	22%
Outsiders	8%	0%	9%	9%
Governments	4%	0%	8%	9%
Academics	3%	0%	23%	22%
Makers	25%	0%	0%	13%
Media	3%	0%	0%	17%

Table 10. Heritage markets per pilot

Comparative analysis of the 4 pilots

The previously discussed results are combined per heritage pilot project and presented in the four 'Almere Heritage Cube's', see Figure. Regarding the different faces of the cubes, we can have an overall impression of the pilots. For the Erfgoed in Haven pilot the markets reached are very limited (insiders only) and also the identity levels have a clear focus, on the home and lower levels. But its distribution over the heritage fields is very wide, ranging from nature and landscape to also activities and other. The pilot Iconen van Almere shows the opposite. It is rather limited in the heritage fields addressed (mainly landscape and monuments) but many stakeholders are represented. The Havenhart 2.0 pilot is very specific in all faces of the cube. It has two dominant categories in each part, with a dominance of activities as a striking result in the heritage fields. It would require more research to find out how this is related to the way the pilot was organized. It might be linked to the structure, the topics discussed or the methods of the roundtables. However, it could also be influenced by the medium of blogposts or even the writers of the reports, having a focus on activities. If the four cubes would be combined, all fields, markets and levels, would be covered.







Figure 1. Almere Heritage Cubes.

Top left: Erfgoedatelier, Top right: Erfgoed in Haven

Bottom left: Havenhart 2.0 Bottom right: Iconen van Almere

For the following comparisons, results of all chapters have been combined. This allows for an in-depth analysis of the relations between the 'faces' of the Cube.

Fields x Identity Levels

The first obvious conclusion looking the scheme, is the dominance of the Core as the Identity Level for all heritage fields. This is previously explained by the focus on Almere Haven in 3 out of 4 pilots. Many buildings, urban or natural locations, activities etc are mentioned that identify Almere Haven, like e.g., Havenkom, Corrosia, the canals, the market, shopping and houses. More surprisingly, on the smallest identity level of the home, many heritage fields are represented. Nature in this scheme mainly relates to the private garden or the nature in close proximity or within sight of the house. Monuments and artefacts on this level, are the house itself and items or furniture inside the individual house. The match People and Hofje, applies to neighbours being the most significant field on this level. The match infrastructure and Province relates to the connection by highways and public transport to surrounding regions. The field Other in all Identity Levels refers to identity mostly, like the village atmosphere or green character on core level and the ordinary or cosy identity of the Hofje and the home.

Markets x Fields

Owners mention the events organised in Haven as important activities and opportunity in branding, like 'Zomer in Haven', specialised retail or culinary events. Also, Outsiders mention events like 'Havenfestival', shopping but also tourism relating to Landscapes such as in green areas and the harbour. Governments and Academics both have their highlights in Landscapes and Monuments, referring to green, blue and urban landscapes and the list of significant buildings that could/should become monuments, like the church Goede Rede, Corrosia, the canals, but also the oldest housing areas like the Werven or private villa's in Almere. Although the makers, like the Insiders, have a broad scope of fields they find significant, they are the stakeholders that relate most to Infrastructure, indicating the original logistic concepts that do or do not function in the contemporary situation.

Markets x Identity Levels

Although all heritage markets have the highest 'score' on level of the Core, it is clear that Insiders represent the broadest distribution over the identity levels with an emphasis on the smaller scales. The fact that Insiders are the largest share of all participants, this spread over the levels and over the previously mentioned fields is significant in all other results.

	Nature	Landscape	Infrastructure	Monuments	Artefacts	Activities	People	Sites	Other
Owners	0%	27%	18%	9%	0%	36%	0%	0%	9%
Insiders	9%	24%	5%	18%	6%	16%	8%	4%	10%
Outsiders	0%	45%	5%	5%	0%	40%	5%	0%	0%
Governments	2%	39%	9%	33%	9%	4%	0%	2%	2%
Academics	7%	39%	7%	18%	7%	13%	1%	2%	5%
Makers	10%	19%	29%	10%	6%	13%	0%	10%	3%
Media	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 11. Heritage fields x Heritage identity levels

	National	Province	City	Locality/ Core	Neighbourhood	Hofje/ Street/ Block	Home
Nature	0%	3%	5%	50%	8%	8%	26%
Landscape	0%	2%	9%	68%	9%	4%	9%
Infrastructure	0%	10%	5%	74%	7%	5%	0%
Monuments	2%	0%	5%	65%	5%	5%	18%
Artefacts	0%	0%	16%	63%	0%	0%	21%
Activities	0%	3%	7%	66%	3%	11%	10%
People	0%	0%	0%	57%	11%	25%	7%
Sites	6%	0%	6%	89%	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	0%	10%	49%	8%	14%	20%

Table 12. Heritage markets x Heritage fields

	Nation	Province	City	Locality/ Core	Neighbourhood	Hofje/ Street/ Block	Home
Owners	0%	0%	15%	77%	8%	0%	0%
Insiders	1%	1%	10%	45%	10%	15%	17%
Outsiders	4%	4%	17%	67%	4%	0%	4%
Governments	13%	0%	0%	63%	25%	0%	0%
Academics	0%	0%	4%	84%	8%	0%	4%
Makers	3%	3%	3%	77%	13%	0%	0%
Media	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 13. Heritage markets x Heritage identity levels

Part 2

Methods of Participation

This part chapter focuses on the analysis of the participation methods, tools and processes employed in every pilot as part of the heritage identification and valorisation activities held in Almere. In this chapter,

Introduction

Heritage Governance and Participation

Governance in the cultural heritage sector has undergone a substantial transformation over the last two decades. It has shifted from being a centralized and expert-based administration towards more inclusive and participatory process, recognising the decision-making power of a wider array of stakeholders, including the civil society. In its definition of heritage governance, UNESCO highlights that it aims “to align as nearly as possible the interests of individuals, of cultural heritage, and of society” (UNESCO, 2013: 74). The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development also indicates the necessity “to ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels” (UN SDG target 16:7, 2015).

At the policy level, the Faro Convention adopted by the European Council (2005) places the heritage communities at the centre of governance, and sets the standards for decentralisation of national dominance and to ensure effective participation of the civil society in the decision-making processes. The Netherlands launched an investigation into the ratification of the Faro Convention in 2019, and the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (RCE) initiated a “Erfgoedparticipatie Faro / Faro Heritage Participation” program. Activities in the program promote collaboration with heritage organizations and implementation of pilot projects to develop participatory methods and instruments that the policy makers, decision makers and heritage communities can put to work in practice (RCE, 2019). The results will also provide a recommendation for the Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science in regards to the ratification of the Faro Convention.

Research Aim, Objectives and Context

The Almere Municipality, in collaboration with various experts, research institutions and heritage organizations, has already tested a number of stakeholder engagement and public participation techniques that ensure the participation of a broad range of stakeholders, including citizens and local community groups, in the decision-making process for heritage valorisation and management of the city of Almere, as discussed in Part 1. The comparative assessment of these practices and methods tested in Almere within the framework of participation and the Faro Convention are studied in this chapter. This will make a significant contribution to examine the best performing participation methods and will provide a set of recommendations for the improvement of existing practices. These recommendations will provide a set of guidelines for effective participation and stakeholder engagement in heritage protection and management initiatives employed by heritage organizations, local administrative bodies and the governmental organizations.

In this context, this research first examines the four heritage activities implemented in collaboration with the Municipality of Almere from the years 2015-2019, and assess their participatory methods and instruments from the subjective perspectives and reflections of the participants based on four main aspects:

1. Heritage Markets - Participant profile: The participants represent different stakeholder groups (referred as Heritage Markets in Part 1) engaged in the participatory activities that are involved to a certain extent with the cultural heritage of Almere. These stakeholders include: property owners, business owners, residents, visitors, developers, financial actors (investors, entrepreneurs etc.), national governmental bodies (i.e. RCE), local administration (Municipality of Almere etc.), experts, academic scholars, makers (architects, urban planners, designers etc.) and media.
2. Participatory methods involved: These include the participatory methods that are employed for each of the four activities that are used to engage the participants. A wide variety of methods are utilised at this stage, which vary significantly for each of the activities. These methods and the activities that use them involve: questionnaires, interviews, focus group meetings / roundtable discussions, committee meetings, co-mapping, diaries, oral history, games, voting/polls, social media. The methods and activities specifically used in each pilot is extensively described in the 4 pilot descriptions.
3. Degree of participation: The degree of participation framework is adapted from the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) model, which has already been used and tested in a number of studies (Li et. al., 2019; De Leiuem

and Arthure, 2016). This framework presents five degrees of participation that are sequenced from lowest to highest degrees as follows: 1- Inform (to provide the community with relevant and objective information), 2- consult (to obtain community feedback), 3- involve (to work directly with the community), 4- collaborate (to partner with the community), 5- empower (to place final decision-making and management in the hands of the community).

4. Involvement in heritage process: This category defines the process of heritage management and valorisation in which the participants are involved in with these activities. This process includes five steps: 1- identifying heritage buildings, sites and landscapes; 2- determining heritage values of Almere; 3- assessing the heritage significance; 4- development of heritage buildings; 5- development of urban heritage strategy for Almere.

Following the assessment of the participatory activities based on these four categories, the subjective opinions of the participants are collected and analysed within the framework of the Faro Convention. For this purpose, the twelve principles adopted in the Faro Convention are introduced to participants and their personal evaluations of their significance and importance are collected. These principles categorised under Articles 7-13 the Faro Convention include (EC, 2005):

- Developing democratic participation with the involvement of citizens and civil society
- Implement a shared responsibility
- Encourage a sense of belonging to a community
- Improve the living environment and encourage a high quality of architectural and urban design
- Bring together objectives related to economic efficiency, social cohesion and ecological balance within heritage-led strategies
- Determine the public interest in heritage to stimulate right investment for its preservation
- Enhance the social and economic value of heritage
- Allowing dialogue and promoting consensus setting between different stakeholders
- Managing cultural diversity and mutual understanding
- Encouraging public authorities and NGOs to pursue cultural heritage policies
- Engaging public and private actors to raise awareness of the economic potential of cultural heritage
- Enhancing more cohesive societies.

In addition, the tools that are provided within the Faro Convention Action Plan (EC, 2018) to encourage and promote effective participation of citizens in heritage-related decision-making process are also presented to the participants in order to evaluate whether they regard these tools as effective strategies. These tools include:

- Presentation of good practices
- Inspirational talks by high political actors
- Local meetings with different stakeholders
- Stakeholder engagement workshops
- Networking with similar initiatives
- Constituting a platform for the exchange of experiences
- Guidelines and toolkits developed by the local administration
- Education and raising awareness campaigns for different societal groups
- Activities to promote learning about heritage

The purpose of this chapter is to further contribute to understand the view of Almere citizens and stakeholders on public participation and the means to enhance it. The outcomes might also contribute to the recommendations that will be provided to the Dutch Ministry regarding the adoption of the Faro Convention to the national context. In this part of the report will initially introduce the survey that has been used to collect data from participants and the data analysis process is explained in the methodology sub-section. Then, the results of these twofold survey will be presented in detail, and a set of recommendations will be provided as a guideline to policy makers.

Methods

Data collection

For the assessment of the participation level and performance in all the activities, data is collected through the conduct of a twofold survey that is shared with both the participants and the organizers of the four activities. The survey is designed as two separate questionnaires addressing the participants and the organizers of the activities separately, and the first part of the survey is slightly changed to address two separate groups of respondents. It is designed by using the Limesurvey software and shared with the organizers of the activities to be filled in and disseminated among the participants via digital means of communication. The communication team of the Municipality of Almere also shared the survey for participants on their social media accounts in order to reach the participants who took part in the Iconen van Almere activity.

The first part of the survey aims to collect the subjective performance analysis of participants and organizers regarding the participatory process of the four activities that they are engaged with. In this part, they are asked which activity they participated in, which stakeholder group they represent, which participatory methods they are involved in and at what level did they find them effective, their degree of participation based on the IAP2 model, what are their suggestions for improvement of these activities, and the steps they are involved in heritage valorisation process. For these questions, the respondents were provided multiple choices where they can select more than one answer. For analysing the effectiveness of these activities, they were provided a Likert scale where score of 1 represented least effective and 5 represented most effective. As for the suggestions of improvement, personal reflections of the respondents are collected in text format of their narrative.

In the second part of the survey, the questions aimed to collect the personal views on the principles of the Faro Convention and the tools suggested as part of the Faro Convention Action Plan. The respondents are provided the list of principles and actions and were allowed to select multiple choices. In this way, the subjective evaluations of respondents would present the local contextual approach dominant within a group of citizens in Almere.




Figure 2. Participant profile/Heritage Markets and quantity for each activity

In total, 20 full responses are collected to the online survey. 12 of the respondents were the participants and 8 of the represented the organizers. Figure 2 presents the survey participant profile and the heritage markets they represent for each of the four activities. Accordingly, we had the highest number of responses from the ones engaged in the Iconen van Almere activity (45%, 7 responses from participants and 2 from organizers), followed by Erfgoed in Haven (30%, 5 responses from organizers and 1 participant). As for the other two activities, we had only one response from a participant of the Erfgoedatelier and none from the organizers of the Havenhart 2.0. This distribution of responses shows that the communication of the survey on the social media accounts for the participants of Iconen van Almere has reached more interested participants than the other means of communication tried out for the other three activities. It also aligns with the higher number of participants engaged in this pilot.

Data analysis

As for the analysis of the data collected, a mixed methodology of qualitative and quantitative methods is employed. Descriptive statistical analysis is used to analyse the quantitative data gathered from the multiple-choice questions to define the participant profile, the activities and steps involved and to identify the principles and actions regarded as the most effective within the Faro participation framework. For the Likert scale question asking about the effectiveness of activities, the average mean is calculated in order to identify which participatory methods employed within each activity is evaluated as the most effective. As for the written suggestions for improvement, content analysis is employed, which have contributed to the recommendations at the end of the report.

Results

The analysis of the data gathered from the survey contributed to the deduction of results regarding the participatory activities, as well as the opinions on the principles and actions promoted by the Faro Convention. These results later contributed to the deduction of more generalizable conclusions and recommendations.

Heritage Markets / Participant profile

The respondents represent a wide variety of stakeholder groups, as presented in Figure 2. The largest stakeholder group participated in the survey is the insiders, including the residents (95%), followed by property owners (60%) and business owners (45%). This outcome is accurate as all of the participants, and most of the organizers are also citizens of Almere. Organizers mostly represent the local administration, experts and/or the makers (all three groups make up 38% of the organizers individually), in addition to being residents themselves.

Participatory methods involved

As presented in Figure 3, different participatory methods are employed to engage the citizens in each of the activities, which are further acknowledged by the outcomes of the survey. For the Erfgoedatelier, regarding the survey results, roundtable discussions and interviews have been the main participatory methodology. For the Erfgoed in Haven project, co-mapping and dairies are used to collect the daily engagement and narratives of the participants with the heritage properties, supplementary to interviews and focus group discussions. For the Havenhart 2.0 activity, a number of methods have been utilized, including committee meetings, focus groups and games. Lastly, the Iconen van Almere activity used ICT-based tools and the social media to identify the most significant heritage buildings of the city, such as online voting and polls communicated through the social media accounts of the Municipality.

Effectiveness of participatory methods

For the subjective performance analysis of the participatory methods employed as part of the activities, the average means of the effectiveness rates given by the different groups of responses are calculated (see Table 14). As a result, the methods that are highly assessed by both participants and organizers had been interviews (4,7/5 by participants, 4,5/5 by organizers) and committee meetings (4,4/5 by participants and 5/5 by organizers). Roundtable discussions are rated

equally by both organizers and participants with a rate of 4/5. In general, the rating of participants had been slightly over the one of organizers, indicating a lower appreciation by organizers. The lowest ranking is for online voting and polls, and the reasons for these lower assessments are justified in the feedback provided in the comments.




Figure 3. Participatory methods used to engage the participants

	Participants	Organizers
Invullen van enquête	4,3	3
Interview of gesprek	4,7	4,5
Ronde-tafel-gesprek	4	4
Commissie-/ beleidsvergadering	4,4	5
Op kaart aanduiden (mapping)	4	3,2
Invullen van dagboek	4,7	3,25
Meedoen aan een spel	4,3	
Stemmen (ja/nee)	3,5	4
Verkiezing (ranglijst)	3,7	3
Acties op sociale media	4	

Table 14. Average means of effectiveness rates for participatory methods

Suggestions for improvement

In Table 15, the feedback provided by the participants and organizers are listed. As a result of the content analysis, in sum, the following suggestions are drawn for the improvement of the activities:

- No feedback is received for the Havenhart 2.0 activity.
- Erfgoedatelier – The participant asked for a follow-up process to be informed about the results of the activity. The organizer focused on the participant profile and suggested a broader representation. In addition, his/her feedback also asked for a wider area in Almere Havencentrum to be assessed.
- Erfgoed in Haven – Received feedback from all the 4 organizers. Their suggestions concentrated on a follow-up process to engage with the citizens more than once in order to discuss the results with them and conduct further assessment. It is also suggested to reach a wider group of citizens.
- Iconen van Almere – This activity received the most negative feedback, specifically concerned with the conduct of the online voting/polls to identify the icons of Almere. Both the participants and the organizers indicated that the voting process has not been fair and just, and that there had been a biased approach towards the selection of certain buildings in the first phase.

Activity	Participants' comments	Organizers' comments
Erfgoedatelier	- Feedback of the results could be better. No follow-up process.	More participants to obtain greater representativeness; larger area that Almere Havencentrum can be appreciated in greater contact; more diverse composition of participants.
Erfgoed in Haven		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback round based on the results. Now there has been a one-off action, diaries and (group) conversations and data have been analysed. It would be good to discuss these results with participants, to test them and to draw further conclusions and actions from them. - Project has no instrumental aspect, participation is not an objective. It concerns the inventory of user ratings. - Reach wider demographic audiences. - Engage with residents several times, not just at the start of the project.
Havenhart 2.0		
Iconen van Almere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I was very disturbed by 'icons of Almere' and what happened in practice. The police station only got 1 vote. That seems very clear to me. However, after that there was a hobby club that lobbied behind the scenes to get this building on the list, which also succeeded. I find that strange and an unfair way of working. As an option to the questions is "strengthening togetherness". However, there was a kind of riot on the Internet between supporters of that building and opponents. Definitely not togetherness. - It was actually a kind of beauty pageant. You could nominate first, everything was longlisted. That is a good start, although the police station, now a monument, did not even make that list. Voting went weird. The winner has let all his friends vote. A project with an appealing name is more likely than a project without (appealing name). Social media played a big role. Unknown buildings or projects do not get enough votes anyway. I also understood that the final ranking in the book was further tampered with. It was a great idea. The implementation can be much purer. - Consultation without information is not effective. consulting as a final destination is half participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It turned out that the question put forward was not only taken up by genuinely interested parties, but also by action groups that misused the "icons" argument for other interests. For example, it turned out that the Waterhout campsite received a lot of votes from abroad (campsite visitors), there were votes for the preservation of the swimming pool in Haven and for the preservation of a 13-in-a-dozen wooden walkway that was closed due to wood rot. People from a particular neighbourhood also obviously used multiple email addresses to cast the same vote. Finally, one particular architect mobilized his circle of acquaintances to get one of his objects high on the list. - Residents could choose favourite buildings via the municipality's website. The range was therefore less wide. Experts were able to provide binding advice on the buildings and objects to be included. This led to discussions about the term 'Icon' and controversies in decision-making, causing delays. The group of experts could have been expanded with Almere architects and policymakers in order to obtain a more nuanced picture. The input of the client (the municipality) was added later. That could have been done immediately.

Table 15. Participants' suggestions for improvement

Degree of participation

In terms of degree of participation (Figure 4), the opinions of participants and organizers seem to differentiate for the Erfgoedatelier and Iconen van Almere activities. For the Erfgoedatelier, for instance, a single participant thinks that he/she has only been consulted in the process, whereas the organizer claims the activity consults, involves and collaborates with the participants. As for the Iconen van Almere activity, the participants mostly think that they have been consulted and involved in the process (80%), whereas one organizer also thinks they have been collaborated with as well. In addition, Havenhart 2.0 is the only activity where all the responding participants agree that they have been consulted, informed and collaborated with during the process. Erfgoed in Haven is the only project with only two degrees of participation where both the participants and the organizers agree that the respondents were only informed and consulted during the process.

Involvement in heritage process

Regarding the heritage valorisation process, the steps that the participants and organizers assume that they are involved in vary according to each activity. For the Erfgoed Atelier, both one participant and one organizer who responded to the survey agree that the activity involved the participants at every step. Concerning the Erfgoed in Haven activity, all the respondents agree that the activity involved identification of heritage assets and attributes, where only half of the participants and organizers think that the development of value-based policies have been achieved by the activity. For the Havenhart 2.0 activity, one participant thinks that he/she is involved in the identification of heritage assets, as well as the development of an urban heritage strategy for the city. Lastly, for the Iconen van Almere project, all the respondents assume that they participated in the identification of the heritage assets. About half of the respondents think that they have been involved in all the five steps. In sum, 85% of the respondents think that the activity they participated in is concerned with the identification of the heritage assets, 60% in identification of the heritage values, 45% in assessment of heritage significance and in development of value-based policies, whereas 35% think that they contributed to the development of an urban heritage strategy for the city.




Figure 4. Degree of participation assessment




Figure 5. Distribution of involvement in heritage process for activities

Faro Principles and Actions

Within the framework provided by the Faro Convention, the subjective evaluation of the citizens of Almere on its main principles and the actions recommended are presented in the figures below. Regarding the principles, the respondents are asked about their opinion on whether identification of shared heritage values and priorities through public participation contribute to these principles. In terms of actions, they are asked whether they find them helpful.

According to the results, the principles that are rated highest are concerned with: i) encouraging a sense of belonging to a community (75%), and ii) determining the public interest in heritage to stimulate right investment for its preservation (75%), followed closely by (iii) managing cultural diversity and mutual understanding (70%), and (iv) improving the living environment and encourage a high quality of architectural and urban design (65%). The principle that is rated as least relevant is xii) bringing together objectives related to economic efficiency, social cohesion and ecological balance within heritage-led strategies (25%). This result indicates that the citizens of Almere can understand and acknowledge the connection between cultural heritage and the living environment, cultural diversity and sense of community. However, the role of cultural heritage as an economic, social and ecological driver of sustainability is still not well acknowledged.

In regards to the actions provided in the Action Plan, the citizens of Almere evaluated local meeting with different stakeholders (85%), educative activities about heritage (65%), and stakeholder engagement workshops (60%) as the most helpful tools. In contrast, networking with similar initiatives (30%), and guidelines and toolkits developed by the local administration (30%) are considered as the least beneficial tools. This clearly shows that the citizens are more in favour of participatory and educative activities.




Figure 6 & 7. Assessment of Faro Convention principles and actions

Conclusions & Recommendations

Heritage definitions

The results of the pilots differ significantly in their definitions of what is heritage, both regarding the types of heritage (fields) as the scale level that is addressed (identity level), as discussed in Part 1. One explanation is the type of activities and the way questions are posed. Erfgoedatelier is most explicit in using the word heritage, heritage policy and heritage experts in their documents, reflected in monuments and landscapes as the dominant fields. In the pilot Iconen van Almere, both the public and the expert poll list monuments and landscapes and some artefacts. The poll results show that when asking for icons, the responses contain a rather traditional interpretation of icon, indicating buildings dominantly. The pilot Erfgoed in Haven mentions heritage ('erfgoed') in the title and the diary introduction text explaining the term in relation to Almere. But the questions per day speak about favourite spot, everyday routes or a postcard 'greetings from ...'. These more general questions about qualities open up to responses outside the traditionally heritage fields. This approach shows that the application of a diversity of formats and addressing various scale levels in this pilot, result in greater diversity in heritage fields and identity levels. The Havenhart 2.0 documents do not mention the term heritage at all and the word 'identity' is mentioned once, only in the vision that results from the pilot. And although the questions and methods applied addressed various fields, when generally asking what matters to people in their living environment, activities prove to have important values. All four pilots intend to explore the essential qualities of Almere (Haven), but relating to heritage terms or not seems to have an influence on the resulting fields, indicating that terminology matters.

A survey executed in the early phase of the pilot Iconen van Almere respondents are asked 'Are there buildings, places, objects, stories or traditions in Almere that should be conserved?'. Although the responses are confirmative on all fields (buildings 75%, places 80%, objects 70%, stories 60%, traditions 50%) the intangible fields like stories and traditions have not been addressed in the follow-up poll. This leads to a second explanation of the differences in heritage definitions. Our research indicates that various stakeholders (markets) use different scopes of what can be heritage. Especially the insiders like residents and the makers involved in the development of the areas have a much broader view on valuable fields, addressing both tangible as intangible heritage fields. Governments, academics and experts on the other hand predominantly mention the tangible heritage like buildings and landscapes. This could be related to the definitions by heritage institutions like UNESCO and ICOMOS listing buildings, sites and cultural/

natural landscapes as heritage. Although intangibles like traditions and language are mentioned as attributes that can express cultural values (UNESCO, 2019), the focus of nomination is on tangible assets as the objects for preservation. However, heritage valorisation is not focussed on conservation alone, but can also serve as a driver for social, economic or ecological future developments.

Parties involved in the organisation of participatory heritage valorisation should be aware of the use of terminology and the effect on the results. If the intention is the identification of significant buildings and sites according to more traditional heritage frames, applying heritage terminology nudges participants in this direction. If aiming for a broad scope, including intangible heritage, the various heritage fields should be addressed in the questions asked. The interviewers seem to use a narrower scope than their interviewees. So, if participation in heritage valorisation is taken seriously, the organising parties, often governments, academics and experts, should adapt their definitions. To respect the participants' opinions and assessments, they should widen the heritage scope, even if this expands, changes or even undermines existing heritage definitions, methods and policies. The exploration of young heritage, like in Almere, and related heritage policies is an opportunity to develop a new approach that balances tangible and intangible heritage, various scale levels and thereby represents the stakeholder groups involved.

Almere Heritage

Landscapes are the absolute winner in the Heritage contest. Although this research intends to evaluate participatory methods and was not meant to list specific Almere heritage, this conclusion speaks from all results. Regardless of method, identity level or market, landscape as a heritage field comes out as very significant for Almere, especially on the level of Almere-Haven as a core. Moreover, it is in the top list of Icons in Almere, differentiating the traditional understanding of an icon.

Participatory Processes of Heritage Valorisation

In Part 2, the participatory activities implemented for the valorisation and appreciation of the architectural and urban heritage in the city of Almere are assessed by the participants and organizers of these activities. In addition, the principles and actions adopted by the European Faro Convention is evaluated by the citizens of Almere in order to contribute to the better alignment of the heritage policy in Almere with the Faro Convention principles. Table 16 presents an overview of the participatory methods employed in the pilots, the heritage markets/ stakeholders engaged, the heritage fields / levels, their evaluation on performance assessed by the survey respondents and reasons, along with suggestions for improvement. In this context, the results and outcomes deduced from this study will inform the local decision makers and national policy makers on what participatory methods of heritage appreciation and valorisation to use and when.

Based on the evaluation of survey respondents, interviews, committee meetings, roundtable discussions and questionnaires are rated to be more effective with a positive performance rate than the digital tools of public engagement. The diaries are also considered effective by participants but the organizers think that this method needs further improvements. The poorly assessed online voting and polls were developed through the use of social media domain. The reasons for this poor evaluation are expressed in the written feedback provided by both the participants and the organizers. In sum, the voting process did not seem to be fair, just and balanced. Games and co-mapping activities are also found relatively effective by participants. Thus, a more diverse and balanced representation of public and follow-up processes are suggested.

For all the four activities, the respondents considered that they were informed and consulted. Erfgoed in Haven rated the lowest degree of participation, and Havenhart 2.0 activity rated the highest with all the participants agreeing to have been collaborated with, in addition to consultation and involvement. For all conducted pilots, the identification of heritage assets and values was perceived as the most common purpose of engagement. The higher degrees of participation are less common and Iconen van Almere was the only activity where the respondents thought that they have been involved in all the five steps. Regarding the Faro Convention principles and actions, it is deduced that the economic, social and environmental benefits of heritage protection and participation are needed to be better acknowledged. Citizens find participatory and educative activities more helpful.

Based on the conclusions drawn from the study, several recommendations to support and enhance participatory practices in heritage-related decision making can be deduced: Participatory methods that bring together a variety of stakeholders needs to be supported. When engaging residents, a diverse and balanced representation of the local community groups need to be ensured. For roundtable discussions, committee meetings, co-mapping and gaming activities, the participants demanded to be informed more about the results, hence follow-up processes need to be integrated into the planning of the activities. Also, regarding the poor evaluation of the online voting and polls, the process needs to be designed to be just, fair and well balanced. The citizens declared a higher interest towards more participatory and educative activities to be provided by administrators or experts, rather than formal guidelines or policy documents. Lastly, the evaluation on the principles of the Faro Convention clearly shows that raising awareness among the stakeholders and citizens about the role of cultural heritage in promoting and supporting economic development, social cohesion and ecological sustainability is necessary.

Limitations and further research

The pilots evaluated in this research are comparable by the used analysis method, as they all consider Almere heritage, took place in recent years and provided detailed data in written reports. Moreover, they have used both corresponding and complementary methods, making comparison relevant. However, it should be noted that on some aspects the four pilots vary extensively. The duration of the activities of Erfgoed atelier was one afternoon, whereas Havenhart 2.0 on the other hand was a 10-month project based on many roundtable meetings. Nevertheless, the smallest project Erfgoedatelier represents most codes in the analysis (Erfgoedatelier 159, Erfgoed in haven 124, Havenhart 2.0 122, Iconen van Almere 105). The focus on heritage in Erfgoedatelier might be an explanation for this disbalance. Also, the organisers and authors of the pilot documents, having a heritage background, have an influence on the output. A similar inequality can be found in the responses of the survey, discussed in Part 2. The response rate is relatively low in general and Erfgoedatelier and Havenhart 2.0 have 8 and 9 responses, whereas Erfgoed in Haven and Iconen van Almere have 21 and 22 responses. The disbalance of codes, time frames and survey responses should be considered in concluding on the collective results. But more importantly, it is an invitation for other researchers to repeat and extend our research in different towns for different municipalities and contribute to assessment frameworks and methods for participatory heritage valorisation.

Participatory methods	Heritage markets/ stakeholders	Degree of participation	Evaluation on performance	Recommendation for improvement	Suggestions for use
Questionnaires	Residents, entrepreneurs, makers, visitors	Consult	Average	Higher number of participants	Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), identification of indicators and informing policy making
Interviews		Inform, Consult	Good	Wider representation of all stakeholder groups	Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), significance, identification of indicators
Roundtable discussions / focus groups	Residents, entrepreneurs, experts, NGOs	Inform, Consult, Involve	Good	Wider representation of all stakeholder groups	Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), significance, development of heritage strategies
Committee meetings	Entrepreneurs, experts	Inform, Consult, Involve	Good	Informing about results and involve in follow-up processes	Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), significance, development of heritage strategies
Co-mapping	Residents, entrepreneurs, experts	Consult, Involve, Collaborate	Average	Informing about results and involve in follow-up processes	Identification of heritage assets, development of urban heritage strategies
Diaries, oral history	Residents	Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate	Good		Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), significance
Games	Residents, entrepreneurs, NGOs	Consult, Involve	Good	Informing about results and involve in follow-up processes	Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), significance
Voting / polls	Residents, makers, experts, visitors	Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate	Average	The voting process needs to be just, fair and well balanced	Identification of heritage assets, attributes (values), significance, identification of indicators, development of heritage strategies
Social media	Residents, makers, experts, visitors, social media followers	Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate	Average	Reaching a wider audience, better communication	

Table 16. Scoring on average mean of effectiveness rate. Good: 4-5/5, Average: 3-4/5, Poor: Lower than 3

References

Council-of-Europe. (2005). Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society. Faro, Portugal

Council-of-Europe. (2018). 12 Principles of Good Democratic Governance and Toolkits. Retrieved from: <https://rm.coe.int/brochure-12-principles-of-good-governance-and-current-tools-on-good-go/16808b1687>.

De Leiuen, C., & Arthure, S. (2016). Collaboration on whose terms? Using the IAP2 community engagement model for archaeology in Kapunda, South Australia. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 3(2), 81–98.

Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). Qualitative research methods.

Hoekstra, A. (2020). Monumentenambtenaren over Faro: alles draait om draagvlak. Retrieved from <https://erfgoedstem.nl/monumentenambtenaren-over-faro-alles-draait-om-draagvlak/>

Howard, P. (2003). *Heritage - Management, Interpretation, Identity*. London: Continuum.

Labadi, S. (2007). Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 7.

Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Pereira Roders, A., van Wasamael, P. (2019). Community participation in cultural heritage management: a systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices. *Cities*, 96, 102476.

Mason, R. (2002). *Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices*. Retrieved from Los Angeles:

Meurs, P. (2008). *Building in the Stubborn City*. Delft: VSSD.

Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed (RCE). 2019. Magazine Faro Convention Meeting: de rol van erfgoed bijmaatschappelijke vraagstukken. Retrieved from: <https://www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/publicaties/publicaties/2019/01/01/faro-convention-meeting-heritage-as-a-means-for-societal-challenges>.

Roders, A., U. Pottgiesser. (2020). 100% heritage for a more sustainable future. Retrieved from <https://www.tudelft.nl/en/2020/bk/100-heritage-for-a-more-sustainable-future/>

UNESCO. (2018). *Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Retrieved from Paris:

UNESCO. (2019). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Retrieved from Paris:

