

Ingeborg MATEČIĆ***SPECIFIČNOSTI PROCESA VREDNOVANJA MATERIJALNE
KULTURNE BAŠTINE U TURIZMU****SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TANGIBLE CULTURAL
HERITAGE VALUATION PROCESS IN TOURISM**

SAŽETAK: Osnovna svrha rada je kritički analizirati vrijednosti materijalne kulturne baštine kako bi se objasnile specifične karakteristike procesa njezinog vrednovanja u turizmu. Materijalna kulturna baština nositelj je kulturnih usluga koje turisti doživljavaju čija je korisnost prepoznata ne samo kod turista već i lokalne zajednice. S obzirom da materijalna kulturna baština generira dva tipa vrijednosti, u ovom se radu raspravlja i kritički se analiziraju dvije vrste procesa vrednovanja. Rad se osvrće na karakteristike kako neekonomskog procesa tako i ekonomskog procesa vrednovanja. Rezultati istraživanja dobiveni primjenom interdisciplinarnih metoda procijene koristi koju kulturna baština donosi turističkoj destinaciji jednako bi doprinijeli usklađivanju praksi kako upravljanja kulturnom baštinom tako i turističkom destinacijom.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: vrijednost kulturne baštine, kulturna vrijednost, ekonomska vrijednost, ekonomski proces vrednovanja, ne-ekonomski proces vrednovanja

SUMMARY: The main purpose of this paper is to critically analyse the values of tangible cultural heritage in order to present the specific characteristics of its valuation process. Tangible cultural heritage generates cultural services that are experienced by tourists and whose benefits are recognised not only to tourists but also to the local community. Since cultural heritage generates two types of values, two types of valuation process are discussed and critically analysed in the paper. The characteristics of both non-economic and economic valuation processes are reviewed. The results of the research using interdisciplinary methods to evaluate cultural heritage's benefits to a tourism destination should help align cultural heritage management with tourism destination management practices.

KEYWORDS: cultural heritage value, cultural value, economic value, economic valuation process, non-economic valuation process

* Ingeborg Matečić, Ph.D., senior teaching assistant, Faculty of Economics & Business, Department of Tourism Trg J.F.Kennedyja 6, Zagreb, Croatia, e-mail: imatecic@efzg.hr

1. UVOD

Specifičnosti procesa vrednovanja materijalne kulturne baštine odražavaju se u karakterističnim aspektima njene vrijednosti te posljedično koristima koje uvećavaju blagostanje lokalne zajednice i turista. S obzirom da materijalna kulturna baština generira kulturne usluge (MA, 2005; Tengberg *et al.*, 2012; Daniel *et al.*, 2012) moguće je povući paralelu s konceptom usluga koje generiraju ekosustavi (ES) i ekonomskim vrednovanjem koristi tih usluga za ljudsko blagostanje (MA, 2005; TEEB, 2010). Većina kulturnih usluga se "direktno doživljava i intuitivno cijeniti" (Daniel *et al.*, 2012:8812) stoga je teorijski okvir postavljen unutar turističke destinacije i turista. Mnogo je autora proučavalo turistički doživljaj na lokalitetima kulturne baštine (Beeho i Prentice, 1995; Nuryanti, 1996; Beeho i Prentice, 1997; Prentice *et al.*, 1998; McIntosh i Prentice, 1999; Herbert, 2001; Poria *et al.*, 2004; Ung i Vong, 2010; Lee, 2015) te se turizam kulturne baštine većinom shvaća kao proces konzumacije doživljaja (Chen i Chen, 2010). Kulturne usluge definirane unutar ES okvira shvaćaju se kao „nematerijalne koristi koje ljudi uživaju iz ekosustava duhovno se oplemenjujući, kognitivno se razvijajući, razmišljajući, razonodeći se i estetski doživljavajući“ (MA, 2005:40) i uključuju vrijednosti kulturne baštine. Vrijednosti kulturne baštine prepoznate su u „kulturnom krajoliku“ ili kulturološki važnim vrstama (MA, 2005). Ipak, materijalna kulturna baština, bilo da se radi o lokalitetu smještenom u posebnom prirodnom okruženju ili lociranom unutar stare jezgre grada, generira kulturne usluge te pruža turistima i lokalnoj zajednici kulturne doživljaje estetske, vjerske ili duhovne prirode. U tom kontekstu, ekonomska procjena koristi koje kulturna baština pruža ne samo turistima već i lokalnoj zajednici unutar turističke destinacije predstavlja značajan izazov dionicima vezanim uz upravljanje kulturnom

1. INTRODUCTION

Specific characteristics of the tangible cultural heritage valuation process are reflected in the distinctive aspects of its value and consequently benefits which augment both the local community's and the tourist's welfare. As tangible cultural heritage generates cultural services (MA, 2005; Tengberg *et al.*, 2012; Daniel *et al.*, 2012) a parallel is drawn between the concept of ecosystem services (ES) and economic assessment of the benefits that ecosystems provide to human well-being (MA, 2005; TEEB, 2010). As most cultural services "are directly experienced and intuitively appreciated" (Daniel *et al.*, 2012:8812) the theoretical framework is set within the tourism destination and the tourists. Tourism experience at heritage sites has been discussed by many researchers (Beeho and Prentice, 1995; Nuryanti, 1996; Beeho and Prentice, 1997; Prentice *et al.*, 1998; McIntosh and Prentice, 1999; Herbert, 2001; Poria *et al.*, 2004; Ung and Vong, 2010; Lee, 2015) and heritage tourism is mostly perceived as a process of experiential consumption (Chen and Chen, 2010). Cultural services defined within the ES framework are perceived as "nonmaterial benefits people obtain from ecosystems through spiritual enrichment, cognitive development, reflection, recreation, and aesthetic experiences" (MA, 2005:40) which include cultural heritage values. These values are recognized in "cultural landscapes" or culturally significant species (MA, 2005). Nevertheless, tangible cultural heritage being a cultural heritage site placed within a special natural surrounding or located within an old city centre, also generates cultural services providing tourists with cultural experiences weather aesthetic, religious or spiritual. In this context, the economic assessment of the benefits cultural heritage provides not only to tourists but to the local community within a tourism destination represents a major challenge to cultural heritage

baštinom kao i ostalim dionicima u turističkoj destinaciji.

Kontinuirano se vodi rasprava o upotrebi pojma „vrijednosti“ u procjenjivanju koristi materijalne kulturne baštine za ljudsko blagostanje. Mnogi su autori raspravljali o konceptima kulturne vrijednosti s teorijskog stajališta (Connor, 1992; Throsby, 1999; Negus i Pickering, 2004; Schwartz, 2006; Stephenson, 2008; Throsby i Zednik, 2014) i praktičnog stajališta (Avrami *et al.*, 2000; Throsby, 2003; Salazar i Marques, 2005; Tuan, Seenprachawong i Navrud, 2009; Ferretti, Bottero i Mondini, 2014), kao i o konceptima ekonomske, uporabne i neuporabne vrijednosti (Pagiola, 1996; Pearce *et al.*, 2002; Klamer, 2003; Ruijgrok, 2006; Kim, Wong i Cho, 2007; Ecorys, 2012; Dümcke i Gnedovsky, 2013; Dalmas *et al.*, 2015). Međutim, vrijednost se u odnosu na kulturu može jednostavno definirati temeljem „kvaliteta i karakteristika“ koje se odražavaju u predmetima i običajima (Mason, 2002; McMaster, 2008; Scott, 2009). Pojam vrijednosti ima brojna značenja ovisno o kontekstu. Oxfordski engleski rječnik definira vrijednost kao „vrednotu ili kvalitetu mjerenu u odnosu na zadani standard“ ili „normu procjene ili razmjene“ ili „kvalitetu u pogledu važnosti, korisnosti, poželjnosti, itd.“¹. Pojmovi vrednote, razmjene, korisnosti i poželjnosti predstavljaju važne teme u procesu ekonomskog mjerenja vrijednosti kulturne baštine i koristi koje pruža turistima i lokalnoj zajednici u turističkoj destinaciji. Pojam razmjene u kontekstu kulturne baštine podrazumijeva razmjenu obje vrijednosti, uporabne i neuporabne. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) definira vrijednost pomoću „doprinosu pojedine radnje ili predmeta dugoročnim ili kratkoročnim ciljevima ili zahtjevima korisnika“ (2003:216). Ova je definicija namijenjena boljem razumijevanju procesa vrednovanja

management and tourism destination stakeholders.

There is an on-going discussion about the use of the term “value” in assessing the benefits of tangible cultural heritage to human well-being in general. Concepts of cultural value have been considerably discussed by numerous authors theoretically (Connor, 1992; Throsby, 1999; Negus and Pickering, 2004; Schwartz, 2006; Stephenson, 2008; Throsby and Zednik, 2014) and practically (Avrami *et al.*, 2000; Throsby, 2003; Salazar and Marques, 2005; Tuan, Seenprachawong and Navrud, 2009; Ferretti, Bottero and Mondini, 2014) as well as the concepts of economic value, both use and non-use value (Pagiola, 1996; Pearce *et al.*, 2002; Klamer, 2003; Ruijgrok, 2006; Kim, Wong and Cho, 2007; Ecorys, 2012; Dümcke and Gnedovsky, 2013; Dalmas *et al.*, 2015). Thus the fairly simple definition of value in the context of culture is seen in terms of “the qualities and characteristics” reflected in objects or practises (Mason, 2002; McMaster, 2008; Scott, 2009). The notion of value has numerous meanings depending on the context. Value defined by Oxford English Dictionary is a “worth or quality as measured by a standard of equivalence” or “a standard of estimation or exchange” or “quality viewed in terms of importance, usefulness, desirability, etc.”¹ Notions of worth, exchange, usefulness and desirability represent important issues in economic measurement of the cultural heritage’s value and benefits it provides to tourists and the local community in a tourism destination. Exchange in connection with cultural heritage includes both the exchange of use and non-use values. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) defined value as “the contribution of an action or object to user-specified goals, objectives, or conditions” (2003:216). This definition is intended

¹ Oxford English dictionary. Value. Dostupno na: [http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/221253?rskey=qV5CmH&result=1#eid \[13.3.2015.\]](http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/221253?rskey=qV5CmH&result=1#eid [13.3.2015.])

¹ Oxford English dictionary. Value. Available at: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/221253?rskey=qV5CmH&result=1#eid> Accessed 13.3.2015.

s obzirom da daje konkretne odgovore na pitanja definiranja subjekta, predmeta i cilja samog procesa mjerenja. Ona također otvara mogućnosti mjerenja mjerilima dostupnim iz različitih znanstvenih disciplina npr. ekologije, sociologije i antropologije, ekonomije (MA 2003; TEEB, 2010). Cilj rada je definirati vrijednosti kulturne baštine kako bi se kritički analizirale različite metode procesa vrednovanja i prikazala važnost cjelovitog znanstvenog pristupa mjerenju njenih učinaka u turizmu. Također, vrijednost kulturne baštine donosi ekonomske i socio-kulturne koristi lokalnoj zajednici te predstavlja konzumaciju doživljaja turistima. S obzirom da se ponekad interesi tih dviju skupina ne podudaraju, izazov uspješnog i inovativnog pristupa upravljanju kulturnom baštinom još je veći.

2. VRSTE VRIJEDNOSTI KULTURNE BAŠTINE

S obzirom da materijalna kulturna baština generira dvije vrste vrijednosti, neekonomsku (kulturnu) i ekonomsku (uporabnu i neuporabnu), proces vrednovanja zahtijeva holistički pristup. Kako bi se objasnile specifičnosti procesa vrednovanja, bilo ekonomskog ili neekonomskog (kulturnog), potrebno je razumjeti razlike između spomenutih vrsta vrijednosti kulturne baštine. Definirajući tako iste pojmove i vrste vrijednosti brojni su autori koristili različitu terminologiju kao što je intrinzična (Throsby, 2001, 2012; Nijkamp, 2012) i instrumentalna vrijednost kulturne baštine (Navrud i Ready, 2002; Nijkamp, 2012), a neki su dodali i institucionalnu vrijednost kao treću kategoriju (Moore, 1995; Holden, 2004, 2006; O'Brian, 2010). Instrumentalna se vrijednost prepoznaje u važnosti koju kulturna baština ima u društvenom i ekonomskom razvoju (Dümcke i Gnedovsky, 2013:7). Institucionalna vrijednost je povezana s javnim karakterom kulturne baštine i institucijama koje stvaraju povjerenje ili poštovanje na način da potiču

to provide better understanding of the valuation process as it provides specific answers to the respective questions of defining an object, subject and the goal of the measurement process. It also opens up possibilities of the measurements which can include any kind of metric from the various scientific disciplines, e.g. ecology, sociology and anthropology, economics (MA, 2003; TEEB, 2010). The aim of the paper is to identify the values of cultural heritage in order to critically analyse different methods of the valuation process and thus demonstrate the importance of a holistic scientific approach to measuring its performance in tourism. Furthermore, as it generates economic and socio-cultural benefits to the local community and represents experiential consumption to tourists, the challenge for successful and innovative cultural heritage management is even greater as the interests of these two groups are not normally shared.

2. TYPES OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

As tangible cultural heritage generates two types of values, non-economic (cultural) and economic (use and non-use), the valuation process requires a holistic approach. In order to explain the specific characteristics of valuation process, whether economic or non-economic (cultural), it is important to understand the differences between the types of values tangible cultural heritage demonstrates. Thus defining the same notion and types of cultural heritage values as mentioned before, numerous authors have adopted different terms, such as the intrinsic (Throsby, 2001;2012; Nijkamp, 2012) and instrumental value of cultural heritage (Navrud and Ready, 2002; Nijkamp, 2012), and some added institutional value as a third category (Moore, 1995; Holden, 2004, 2006; O'Brian, 2010). Instrumental value is recognized in the importance heritage plays in social and economic development (Dümcke and Gnedovsky, 2013:7). Institutional value

sudjelovanje svojih korisnika (Moore, 1995; O'Brian, 2010:18). Intrinzična vrijednost predstavlja samu srž materijalne i nematerijalne vrijednosti. Jednako kao što je bilo izazovno definirati pojam kulture općenito, zahtjevno je izvući i specificirati različite dimenzije intrinzične vrijednosti kulturne baštine, odnosno njene bazične, nerazdvojive vrijednosti. Osim toga "različite artikulacije baštinske vrijednosti (u smislu povijesnih asocijacija, umjetničkih vrijednosti ili dolara) jesu na nekoj razini iste kvalitete viđene različitim očima" (Mason, 2002:9) i prema tome stvaraju daljnje konceptualne i praktične kontraverze. Uprkos tome nekoliko je autora (Throsby, 2001; Avrami *et al.*, 2000; Mason, 2002; Mason, 2008; O'Brian, 2010; Throsby, 2012) dekonstruiralo kulturnu vrijednost materijalne kulturne baštine u sljedeće karakteristike:

- *Estetska vrijednost* – vizualna karakteristika lokaliteta kulturne baštine; ljepota koja se može interpretirati u širem smislu koristeći i osjetila njuha, sluha i opipa; kvalitete krajolika i okruženja samog lokaliteta dalje doprinose estetskoj vrijednosti lokaliteta kulturne baštine. Generalno se osjećaj blagostanja pripisuje ovom tipu vrijednosti.
- *Simbolička vrijednost* – odražava etnički identitet zajednice; simbolizira iskustva i doživljaje povijesne i kulturne važnosti; predstavlja značenja i ima važnu obrazovnu funkciju.
- *Duhovna/vjerska vrijednost* – odražava sveta vjerska značenja lokaliteta proizašla iz vjerovanja i učenja organizirane religije. K tome, može se doživjeti kao osjećaj strahopoštovanja, ushita, čuđenja, vjerskog priznavanja itd.
- *Društvena vrijednost* – ogleda se u zajedničkim vrijednostima i vjerovanjima koje međusobno povezuju društvene grupe; omogućava i olakšava društvene mreže i veze; doprinosi društvenoj stabilnosti i koheziji u zajednici.

is connected with the cultural heritage's public nature and the institutions which generate trust or esteem in the way they engage their users (Moore, 1995; O'Brian, 2010:18). Intrinsic value represents the core value of tangible or intangible cultural heritage. As it has been challenging to define the notion of culture in general, it is quite demanding to extract and specify the different dimensions of cultural heritage's intrinsic value i.e. inherent and fundamental value. Furthermore "the different articulations of heritage value (in terms of historical association, artistic merit, or dollars) are at some level different expressions of the same qualities, seen through different eyes" (Mason, 2002:9) and thus generate further conceptual and practical controversy. Nevertheless, few authors (Throsby, 2001; Avrami *et al.*, 2000; Mason, 2002; Mason, 2008; O'Brien, 2010; Throsby, 2012) have deconstructed the tangible heritage's cultural value into the following characteristics:

- *Aesthetic value* – the visual characteristic of cultural heritage site; beauty could be interpreted more broadly using other senses like olfactory, auditory and tactile; landscape qualities relevant to the site and its surroundings further contribute to the aesthetic value of the cultural heritage site. The sense of well-being is generally assigned to this type of value.
- *Symbolic value* – reflects a community's ethnic identity; symbolizes events or experiences of historical or cultural importance; stands as a representation of the meaning and presents an important educational function
- *Spiritual/religious value* – reflects religious and sacred meanings of a heritage site originating from the beliefs and teachings of organized religion. In addition, it can be experienced as a sense of awe, delight, wonderment, religious recognition, etc.
- *Social value* – reflected in the shared values and beliefs that bind social groups together; enables and facilitates social connections and networks; contributes

- *Povijesna vrijednost* – intrinzična vrijednost lokaliteta; manifestirana pomoću predmeta, artefakata naslijeđenih iz prošlosti. Dio je suštinske odlike i značenja elemenata baštine.
- *Vrijednost autentičnosti* – ogleda se u jedinstvenim karakteristikama i integritetu lokaliteta.
- *Znanstvena vrijednost* – proizlazi iz znanstvenog sadržaja i istraživačkih praksi.

Pojam ekonomske vrijednosti „roba i usluga bez cijene“, kao što je kulturna baština, proizlazi iz ekonomike okoliša. Koncept „kategorija ekonomske vrijednosti“ iznio je Pagiola 1996. godine. Pagiola tvrdi da ekonomisti okoliša „općenito na sveobuhvatan način sagledavaju vrijednost, koristeći koncept *ukupne ekonomske vrijednosti*“ koja se sastoji od tri vrste vrijednosti, kao što su ekstraktivna ili potrošačka uporabna vrijednost, neekstraktivna uporabna vrijednost i neuporabna vrijednost (1996:2).

Općenito se prethodne dvije zajedno nazivaju uporabnim vrijednostima (Pagiola, 1996:2). Neekstraktivna uporabna vrijednost i neuporabna vrijednost naročito su važne za pitanja vrijednosti kulturne baštine. Neekstraktivna uporabna vrijednost proizlazi iz usluga pruženih unutar lokaliteta, a neuporabna vrijednost se ostvaruje iz koristi koje lokalitet može pružiti, a koje ne obuhvaćaju korištenje lokaliteta ni na koji način (Pagiola, 1996). Pagiola klasificira neuporabne vrijednosti na slijedeći način: **vrijednost postojanja** – vrijednost koju ljudi stječu samom svjesnošću da lokalitet postoji, bez obzira namjeravaju li ga posjetiti ili ne. Ukoliko lokaliteti više ne bi postojali, mnogi bi ljudi imali definitivni osjećaj gubitka. **Vrijednost odabira** – mogućnost uporabe lokaliteta kasnije u vremenu (usporediva s policom osiguranja). **Vrijednost kvazi-izbora** – proizlazi iz mogućnosti da „iako se lokalitet sada čini nevažnim, informacije primljene kasnije mogu nas navesti da ga ponovo uvažimo“ (Pagiola, 1996:3).

Ekonomske vrijednosti lakše se prikazuju s obzirom da su regulirane tržišnim

toward social stability and cohesion in the community.

- *Historic value* – intrinsic to the site; manifested by its artefacts inherited from the past; a part of essential feature and meaning of heritage objects.
- *Authenticity value* – reflected in unique characteristics and integrity of the site
- *Scientific value* – rises out of its scientific content and research practices.

The notion of economic values of “goods and services without the price” such as cultural heritage stems from environmental economics. The “categories of economic value” concept was brought up by Pagiola in 1996. Pagiola argues that environmental economists “generally take a comprehensive look at value, using the concept of **total economic value (TEV)**” which is composed of three types of value, namely, extractive, or consumptive, use value; non-extractive use value; and non-use value (1996:2).

The former two are generally referred to together as use values (Pagiola, 1996:2). Non-extractive use value and non-use value are especially relevant for the issues concerning cultural heritage’s value. The non-extractive use value is obtained from the services provided by the site and the non-use value is obtained from the benefits that a site may provide which do not involve using the site in any way (Pagiola, 1996). Non-use values categorized by Pagiola are as follows: **existence value** – the value that people acquire from the awareness of the site’s existence, regardless of their plans to visit it or not. If the site were not there many people would feel a definite sense of loss. **Option value** – a possibility of a site to be used at a later date (comparable with an insurance policy). **Quasi-option value** – which derives from the possibility “that even though a site appears un-important now, information received later might lead us to re-evaluate it” (Pagiola, 1996:3).

The economic values are easier to illustrate since they are regulated by market

pravilima i izražene u novčanim jedinicama kao što su cijene. „Osnovno načelo pri definiranju vrijednosti javnog dobra, kao što je kulturna baština, nalaže da definicija bude logički sukladna načinu mjerenja vrijednosti privatnog tržišnog dobra. Tržišna dobra imaju tržišnu cijenu, ali ta cijena nije nužno dobar pokazatelj vrijednosti“ (Navrud i Ready, 2002:9). Ponekad cijene ne odražavaju stvarnu vrijednost, pa je tako podcjenjuju ili precjenjuju, primjerice uslijed opterećenja progresivnim porezima, kvotama koje ograničavaju količine isporuke ili nabave i kontrolom cijena (Navrud i Ready, 2002). Općenito, Navrud i Ready definiraju vrijednost koju potrošač dobije koristeći tržišno dobro kao „najveći iznos novca koji je potrošač voljan platiti kako bi si priskrbio takvu robu“ (2002:9). Ključni koncept u utvrđivanju cijene roba i usluga, kao što su okoliš ili kulturna baština, koji ulaze na tržište „indirektno ili nesavršeno“ (Pagiola, 1996:1) zove se koncept spremnosti platiti (WTP) (engl. Willingness to Pay). Navrud i Ready (2002) koriste primjer prodaje automobila kako bi prikazali na koji način se pomoću ovog koncepta utvrđuje vrijednost za potrošača. Stvarna cijena proizvoda je nevažna za potrošačevu vrijednost i neovisna je o potrošačevoj spremnosti platiti manje ili više za taj proizvod. Vrijednost proizvoda za potrošača je onolika koliko je on spreman platiti za njega. Štoviše, ukoliko potrošač dobije proizvod besplatno, potrošačeva vrijednost će i dalje predstavljati iznos novca kojeg je potrošač spreman platiti. Ovakav koncept može se primijeniti na lokalitet kulturne baštine (Navrud i Ready, 2002). Ukoliko je potrošač spreman platiti više za robu ili uslugu od njezine stvarne cijene, razlika između cijene i spremnosti za platiti naziva se potrošačev višak (O’Brian, 2010:15). Osim toga „u slučaju lokaliteta kulturne baštine... uporabna vrijednost koju posjetitelji primaju definirala bi se kao najveći iznos koji je posjetitelj spreman platiti... kako bi ostvario pristup lokalitetu“ (Navrud i Ready, 2002:9). Stoga se ekonomske uporabne vrijednosti utvrđuju unutar individualne

rules and expressed in monetary units such as prices. “The guiding principle in defining what is the value of a public good such as cultural heritage, is that the definition should be logically consistent with how we measure value for private, market good. Market goods have a market price, but that price is not always a good indicator of value” (Navrud and Ready, 2002:9). Sometimes prices do not reflect the real value, understating or overstating it due to burden of distortionary taxes, quotas that limit the quantity supplied or purchased and price controls (Navrud and Ready, 2002). Generally, Navrud and Ready define the value that the consumer gets from using a market good “to be the largest amount of money that the consumer would willingly pay to get the good” (2002:9). The key concept in determining the price of goods and services such as environment or cultural heritage that enter markets “indirectly or imperfectly” (Pagiola, 1996:1) is called willingness to pay (WTP). Navrud and Ready (2002) used the example of a car sale to illustrate how this concept serves to determine the value for the consumer. The actual price of the item is irrelevant for the consumer’s value irrespective of whether the consumer is willing to pay less or more for that item. The value for the consumer is represented by the amount of money he or she is willing to pay. Nevertheless, if the item were given for free, the consumer’s value would still represent the same amount of money he or she is willing to pay. That concept could be applied to heritage sites (Navrud and Ready, 2002). If a consumer is willing to pay more for a good or a service than the actual price, the difference between the price and the willingness to pay is referred to as consumer surplus (O’Brian, 2010:15). Furthermore “for a cultural heritage site... the use value that visitors receive would be defined as the largest amount of money that the visitor would be willing to pay... to gain access to the site” (Navrud and Ready, 2002:9). Therefore, the economic uses of value are

korisnosti i ostvarenja preferencija (Thorsby, 2001:19).

S obzirom da se neuporabne ekonomske vrijednosti teže uočavaju, u tržišnim transakcijama prikazan je njihov detaljan popis zajedno sa varijacijama u značenju. Temeljem spoznaje da „ne postoji tržište na kojem se mogu razmjenjivati prava na [neuporabne] vrijednosti” (Thorsby, 2012:53), važnost njihove precizne specifikacije postaje tim veća. Neuporabne vrijednosti predstavljaju koristi koje ljudi mogu uživati samo temeljem spoznaje da je kulturna baština sačuvana. One mogu biti *altruističke* (koristi iz spoznaje da će lokalitet biti dostupan drugim ljudima na korištenje), *nasljedne* (koristi od očuvanja lokaliteta za buduće generacije), *odabirne* (koristi od mogućnosti postanka posjetiteljem u budućnosti) i mogu imati čistu *vrijednost postojanja* (lokalitet je očuvan i postoji čak i ako nema posjeta) (Navrud i Ready, 2002:9).

Thorsby, s druge strane, razlikuje samo tri tipa koristi koje neuporabna vrijednost javnog dobra može priskrbiti: *vrijednost postojanja*, *vrijednost odabira* i *nasljedna vrijednost*, a o vrijednosti izbora promišlja kao o altruističkoj u samoj njenoj suštini (2012:53). U odnosu na ranije opisane neuporabne vrijednosti sljedeći koncept pridodaje još različitih značenja tom pojmu kao što je „*izbjegavanje rizika* – potencijalni posjetitelji nisu sigurni hoće li ikada posjetiti lokalitet ili spomenik, ali ne žele izgubiti tu mogućnost u bliskoj ili daljnjoj budućnosti. *Potražnja kvazi-odabira* – potencijalni posjetitelji imaju interes posjetiti lokalitet kulturne baštine, ali preferiraju pričekati dok im ne budu dostupne dostatne informacije. *Zamjenska uporabna vrijednost* - žele sačuvati određeno javno dobro netaknuto jer im se sviđa kada drugi mogu uživati u tom dobru” (Nijkamp, 2012:82). Vrijednost izbjegavanja rizika, potražnja kvazi-odabira i zamjenska uporabna vrijednost mogu se poistovjetiti s vrijednošću odabira. Zamjenska uporabna vrijednost altruistička je po svojoj prirodi.

U osnovi je jasno da ukupna ekonomska vrijednost dobra kulturne baštine uključuju

established within individual utility and preference fulfilment (Thorsby, 2001:19).

As non-use economic values are not easily noticeable in market transactions, a detailed list of non-use values and the variations of their meanings is provided. As “no market exists on which the rights to [non-use] values can be exchanged” (Thorsby, 2012:53), the importance of their precise specification becomes even greater. Non-use values represent the benefits human beings may enjoy merely by knowing the cultural heritage is being preserved. They could be *altruistic* (benefits from knowing that the site will be available for the others to use it); *bequest* (benefits from the site preservation for future generations); *option* (benefit from the possibility of becoming a visitor in the future); and could have pure *existence value* (benefit from the fact that the site exists and is being preserved even if there are no visitors) (Navrud and Ready, 2002:9).

Thorsby, on the other hand, differentiates only three types of benefits that a public good's non-use value may provide: *existence value*, *option value* and *bequest value*, and reflects on the option value as being altruistic in its essence (2012:53). As regards the non-use values described so far, this concept may add more various meanings to the notion such as “*risk aversion* – potential visitors are not sure if they will ever visit a given heritage site or monument, but do not want to lose the opportunity to visit it in the near or distant future; *Quasi-option demand* – potential visitors have an interest in visiting the cultural heritage site, but prefer to wait until sufficient information is available; and *vicarious use value* – the non-users want to keep a certain public good intact because they like it when others can enjoy this good)” (Nijkamp, 2012:82). Risk aversion value, vicarious use value and quasi-option demand could be aligned with an option value. Vicarious use value is altruistic by nature.

Fundamentally it is clear that the total economic value of a cultural heritage asset

je obje vrijednosti, uporabnu i neuporabnu. Pearce *et al.* tvrde da je vrijednost odabira uporabna vrijednost što je u suprotnosti s prethodno navedenim kategorijama i opisuju je kao vrijednost koja će biti izvedena iz buduće uporabe lokaliteta kulturne baštine (2002:21). Ovu će vrijednost pojedinac ili grupa ili čak buduće generacije steći u neko buduće vrijeme (Pearce *et al.*, 2002:21; O'Brian, 2010:23). Stoga je vrijednost odabira ona vrijednost na kojoj bi trebali počivati principi održivog razvoja turizma.

3. NEEKONOMSKO VREDNOVANJE MATERIJALNE KULTURNE BAŠTINE

Neekonomsko vrednovanje materijalne kulturne baštine potječe od primjene kvalitativnih metoda koje se u kulturnoj antropologiji koriste kao tehnike vrednovanja. Takve metode služe za procjenu sociokulturnih vrijednosti ili onih neuporabnih vrijednosti samog postojanja na lokalitetima kulturne baštine. Rezultati primjene tih metoda pomogli bi različitim dionicima kulturne baštine u turističkim destinacijama razumjeti složenost društvenih odnosa i kulturne dinamike, uz istovremeno nastojanje da se lokalitet kulturne baštine očuva te da se njime upravlja, kao i da se održavaju usklađeni odnosi između lokalne zajednice i turista. „Kvalitativne metodologije u kulturnoj antropologiji odlikuju se humanističkim i holističkim pristupom (s filozofskog se stajališta tvrdi da se ljudi i ljudsko ponašanje ne mogu razumjeti ili proučavati izvan konteksta svakodnevnog života pojedinaca, svijeta u kojem žive i njihovih aktivnosti)“ (Low, 2002:31). Metodološki gledano, sljedeći pristupi istraživanju mogu se izdvojiti: kognitivni, opservacijski, fenomenološki, povijesni, etnografski te diskurzivni pristup istraživanju. Premda se sve kvalitativne metode mogu primijeniti u vrednovanju lokaliteta kulturne baštine, Low tvrdi da „neki pristupi imaju istaknute prednosti“ (Low, 2002:31). Etnografski i op-

incorporates both the use and the non-use values. Pearce *et al.* argue that the option value is a use value as opposed to the previously specified categories and describe it as a value that will be derived from the future usage of a cultural heritage site (2002:21). This value will be accrued by an individual or by the others, or even by the future generations at some point in time (Pearce *et al.*, 2002:21; O'Brian, 2010:23). Therefore, an option value is the value on which sustainable tourism development principles should rest upon.

3. NON-ECONOMIC VALUATION OF TANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

The non-economic valuation of tangible cultural heritage originates from application of qualitative methods used as valuation techniques in cultural anthropology. These methods serve to assess socio-cultural values or non-use existence values at heritage sites. The results of using such methods would help many different cultural heritage stakeholders in a tourism destination to comprehend the complexity of social relations and cultural dynamics while trying to preserve, and to manage a cultural heritage site as well as maintain a balanced relationship between the local community and tourists. “Qualitative methodologies in cultural anthropology are characterized by their humanism and holism (a philosophical position that argues that humans and human behaviour cannot be understood or studied outside the context of a person’s daily life, life world, and activities)” (Low, 2002:31). Methodologically, this could be summarized into the following approaches to research: cognitive, observational, phenomenological, historical, ethnographic, and discourse analyses. Although all qualitative methods could be applied to the valuation of heritage sites, Low argues that “some approaches have distinct advantages” (Low, 2002:31). The ethnographic and observational approaches were found to

servacijski pristup su najprikladniji za primijeniti na lokalitetima kulturne baštine (Low, 2002:31). Također, oba pristupa su prikladna za istraživanje turista i turističkih aktivnosti na samom lokalitetu kulturne baštine. Ostali pristupi kao što su fenomenološki, povijesni i diskurzivni bit će također objašnjeni i smješteni u kontekst turizma.

Kognitivni pristup predstavlja poseban teoretski i metodološki pristup unutar antropologije, s naglaskom na mentalne procese u sklopu ljudskog postojanja. Taj pristup pruža poveznicu između ljudskih misaonih procesa te fizičkih i idejnih aspekata kulture (D'Andrade, 1995:1). Erickson i Murphy tvrde da takav pristup pripada jednom segmentu antropologije koji se bazira na „Boasovom kulturnom relativizmu pod utjecajem antropološke lingvistike te je usko povezan s psihološkim istraživanjima kognitivnih procesa“ (2003:115). Korijene vuče iz 1950-ih kada su etnografska istraživanja otkrila „starijsjedilačko gledište“ te prigrllila emski pristup antropološkim istraživanjima (Erickson i Murphy, 2003:115).

Taj se pristup stoga alternativno nazivao „etnosemantika, etnoznanost, etnolingvistika i nova etnografija“². Mentalni procesi koji su predmet kognitivnog istraživanja često se odražavaju u jeziku, a spoznaja se percipira kao „skup kategorija koje strukturiraju percepciju pripisivanjem značenja“ (Low, 2002:31). Etnosemantika se „bavi referencijalnim značenjima lingvističkog izražaja u različitim kulturama i jezicima...“³. Semantičko se istraživanje bazira na temeljitim i dubinskim intervjuima, čime se daje

be the most appropriate ones and applicable to heritage sites (Low, 2002:31). Both ethnographic and observational analyses may be applied to tourism activity and tourists to heritage sites. Other approaches, such as phenomenological and historical as well as discourse approaches, will also be described and set within the context of tourism.

The **Cognitive** approach is a distinct theoretical and methodological approach within anthropology that focuses on the mental processes as part of human existence. It provides a link between human thought processes and the physical and ideational aspects of culture (D'Andrade, 1995:1). As Erickson and Murphy argue, being the subfield of anthropology, the cognitive approach to research is embedded in “Boasian cultural relativism, influenced by anthropological linguistics, and closely aligned with psychological investigations of cognitive processes” (2003:115). It may be traced back as early as in 1950s when ethnographers researched and came upon “the native’s point of view,” and thus embraced an emic approach to anthropology (Erickson and Murphy, 2003:115). Therefore, this approach was “alternatively referred to as Ethnosemantics, Ethnoscience, Ethnolinguistics, and New Ethnography.² The mental processes which are the subject of cognitive research and often reflected in language and cognition are perceived “as a set of categories that structure perception through the attribution of meaning” (Low, 2002:31). Ethnosemantics is “concerned with the referential meanings of linguistic expressions across cultures and languages...”³. Semantic research is based on

² The University of Alabama. Department of Anthropology. Anthropological theories. Cognitive Anthropology. Dostupno na: <http://anthropology.ua.edu/cultures/cultures.php?culture=Cognitive%20Anthropology> [15.3.2015]

³ Oxford Reference. International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics (2 ed.) William J. Frawley. Dostupno na: <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195139778.001.0001/acref-9780195139778-e-0353> [15.3.2015.]

² The University of Alabama. Department of Anthropology. Anthropological theories. Cognitive Anthropology. Available at: <http://anthropology.ua.edu/cultures/cultures.php?culture=Cognitive%20Anthropology>

³ Oxford Reference. International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics (2 ed.) William J. Frawley. Available at: <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195139778.001.0001/acref-9780195139778-e-0353>.

doprinos razvoju lingvističkih taksonomija, hijerarhija i pojmova koji opisuju na koji način pojedinac shvaća istraživanu temu (Low, 2000a). Low tvrdi da se prilikom primjene etnosemantike na istraživanje graditeljske baštine ista odnosi na „izmijenjen semantički postupak usmjeren na semantičku strukturu skupine ljudi u odnosu na njihovu lokalnu sredinu... te obuhvaća ulogu koju jezik igra ne samo kao strukturiran ili taksonomski sustav, već i kao simbolička komunikacija o važnim kulturološkim idejama“ (2002:32). Etnosemantika nije prikladan pristup istraživanju turističkih doživljaja na lokalitetima kulturne baštine jer su turisti samo posjetioци odnosno vanjski promatrači lokalne okoline.

Opservacijski pristupi usmjereni su na procese ljudskog ponašanja i njihov opis te se smatraju najmanje invazivnima. Opservacijska istraživanja mogu biti sudjelujuća i ne sudjelujuća. Metoda ne sudjelujućeg promatranja ili opservacije u slučaju turista koji posjećuju lokalitet kulturne baštine može biti donekle problematična. Teško je razlikovati domaće turiste od stranih kao i članove lokalne zajednice koji posjećuju lokalitet u isto vrijeme samo na temelju promatranja. U pogledu lokaliteta kulturne baštine opservacijska metoda može obuhvaćati jednostavno promatranje aktivnosti i analiziranje obrazaca ponašanja, kao i razrađene sustave „time-lapse“ fotografiranja javnih prostora (Whyte, 1980), etnološko-arheološke tehnike (Kent, 1984) te neverbalne komunikacijske strategije za razumijevanje izgrađenih sredina (Low, 2000b; Rapoport, 1982 u Low 2002:32). Whyteovo istraživanje ponašanja pješaka i gradske dinamike pod nazivom „Street Life Project“ predstavljalo je pionirski projekt među ispitivanjima ljudskog ponašanja u gradskim sredinama. Whyte je koristio time-lapse fotografiju za bilježenje kretanja pješaka⁴ pa je primjerice proveo sedam godina snimajući pješake s vrha Roc-

thorough and in-depth interviews which contribute to the construction of linguistic taxonomies, hierarchies of concepts and terms that describe an individual's understanding of the researched topic (Low, 2000a). Low argues that when applying ethnosemantics to the research of built environment it refers to a “modified semantic procedure that focuses on the semantic structure of one group of people in relation to their local environment... and incorporates the role that language plays not only as a structural or taxonomic system but as symbolic communication about important cultural ideas” (2002:32). Ethnosemantics may not be appropriate to research tourist experiences at heritage sites as tourists are merely visitors or outsiders to the local environment.

Observational approaches focus on human behavioural process and their description and they are considered to be the least invasive. Observational research may be non-participatory or participatory. Non-participant observation in the case of tourists visiting a cultural heritage site may be problematic to some extent. It would be hard to differentiate domestic from foreign tourists as well as members of the local community visiting the site at the same time. Observational method in the case of heritage sites could include simple observation of activities and behavioural mapping, as well as elaborate systems of time-lapse photography of public spaces (Whyte, 1980), ethno archaeological techniques (Kent, 1984), and nonverbal communication strategies for understanding the built environment (Low, 2000b; Rapoport, 1982 in Law 2002:32). Whyte's research on pedestrian behaviour and city dynamics, the Street Life Project, was a pioneering project among the studies of human behaviour in urban settings. Whyte used time-lapsed photography to chart the meanderings of pedestrians⁴ and spent seven years filming pedes-

⁴ Project for Public Spaces. William H. Whyte. Dostupno na: <http://www.pps.org/reference/wwhyte/> [5.3.2015.]

⁴ Project for Public Spaces. William H. Whyte. Available at: <http://www.pps.org/reference/wwhyte/>. Accessed 5.3.2015

kefeller centra (Whyte, 1980 u Low, 2002). Rezultati Whyteovog istraživanja pomogli su u izradi skupa načela urbanističkog projektiranja na kojima se proteklih dvadeset godina temelji prostorno uređenje u New Yorku (Low, 2002:32). Etnološko-arheološke tehnike temelje se na etnografskom ispitivanju naroda uz pomoć prikupljanja tradicionalnih arheoloških podataka s lokaliteta arheoloških istraživanja. Low opisuje da se radi o kombinaciji arheologije i „stratifikacijske analize s povijesnim dokumentima i etnografijama lokalnih skupina koje koriste lokalitet slično kao i njihovi lokalni preci“ te objašnjava da je ideja na kojoj se temelji primjena tih tehnika „promatranje izgrađene sredine, svakodnevnog ponašanja te društvenih i ritualnih aktivnosti suvremenih naroda u cilju tumačenja arheoloških nalaza“ (2002:32). Etnološko-arheološke tehnike nisu primjenjive u slučaju stranih posjetitelja lokaliteta kulturne baštine. Na kraju, neverbalne komunikacijske strategije predstavljaju promatranje neverbalnog ponašanja kako bi se projicirao način na koji ljudi doživljavaju pojedini lokalitet (Low, 2002). Kao etnografsko-antropološka terenska metoda, sudioničko promatranje smatra se ključnom metodom ispitivanja u socijalnoj i kulturnoj antropologiji, a obuhvaća „sustavno opisivane događaja, ponašanja i artefakata u društvenoj sredini...“ (Marshall i Rossman, 1989:79). Sudioničko promatranje je proces kojim se istraživačima omogućava aktivno sudjelovanje u aktivnostima ispitivanih ljudi u njihovom prirodnom okruženju te izrada „pisane fotografije“ (Erlandson *et al.*, 1993) predmeta istraživanja. Pruža se kontekst za razvoj smjernica za uzorkovanje i vodiča za razgovore (DeWalt i DeWalt, 1998). Postoje racionalni razlozi primjene metode sudioničkog promatranja. Schensul, Schensul i Lecompte navode njene sljedeće ciljeve:

- prepoznavanje i vođenje odnosa s ispitanicima;
- pomaganje istraživaču da osjeti na koji su način stvari organizirane te koji su im

trians from the top of the Rockefeller Centre (Whyte, 1980 in Low, 2002). Whyte's results of the research helped generate a set of urban design principles that have governed urban public space zoning in New York City for the past twenty years (Low, 2002:32). Ethno archaeological techniques are based on ethnographic study of peoples incorporated with traditional archaeological data collection from on-site excavation. Low describes it as a combination of archaeology and "stratification analysis with historical documents and ethnographies of local groups that may be using the site in ways similar to their local ancestors" and explains that the idea behind using those techniques is "to use observations of contemporary peoples' built environment, everyday behaviour, and social and ritual activities to interpret archaeological findings" (2002:32). Ethno archaeological techniques may not be applicable in the case of foreign visitors of a heritage site. Finally, nonverbal communication strategies represent observation of nonverbal behaviour to project the ways how people perceive a site (Low, 2002). As an ethnographic anthropological fieldwork method, the participant observation is considered to be a key method of study in social and cultural anthropology comprising "the systematic description of events, behaviours, and artefacts in the social setting..." (Marshall and Rossman, 1989:79). Participant observation is the process enabling researchers to be actively involved in the activities of the people under study in their natural environment and to provide "a written photograph" (Erlandson *et al.*, 1993) of the researched subject. It provides the context for development of sampling guidelines and interview guides (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2002). The rationale behind using the participant observation method, according to Schensul, Schensul and Lecompte (1999:91) is as follows:

- to identify and guide relationships with informants;
- to help the researcher get the feel for how things are organized and prioritized, how

prioriteti, na koji način ljudi ostvaruju međusobne odnose te koji su kulturološki parametri;

- ukazivanje istraživaču što pripadnici pojedine kulture smatraju važnim u ponašanju, rukovođenju, politici, društvenim interakcijama i tabuima;
- pomaganje istraživaču da se pripadnici pojedine kulture upoznaju s njime, čime se olakšava istraživački proces i
- pružanje istraživaču izvora pitanja koja će postavljati sudionicima (1999:91).

Ova metoda pruža sociokulturni opis konteksta te kao takva postavlja osnovu za daljnje istraživanje i utvrđuje problematiku zajednice (Low, 2002). Među ostalim metodologijama i tehnikama procjene sociokulturne vrijednosti kulturne baštine predstavlja kvalitetnu specifičnu tehniku. Kada bi se pravilno definirala, mogla bi se koristiti i u turizmu jer se unutar lokaliteta mogu promatrati i strani i domaći posjetitelji.

S obzirom da svaka metoda ima vlastite prednosti i nedostatke, nedostaci ove metode mogu se sažeti u sklopu koncepta subjektivizma. Gotovo da i ne postoji čovjek koji je u stanju percipirati cjelokupnu stvarnost i istinu s obzirom na složenost istih. Johnson i Sackett (1998) tvrde da metoda sudioničkog promatranja predstavlja izvor netočnog opisivanja u istraživanju ponašanja. Ističu da „podaci koje antropolozi prikupljaju ne predstavljaju kulturu jer se većina podataka iz promatranja tih istraživača temelji na individualnom interesu istraživača u pojedinoj sredini ili u odnosu na pojedino ponašanje, umjesto da predstavljaju ono što se uistinu događa u pojedinoj kulturi“ (Johnson i Sackett, 1998:303). Nadalje, rezultati istraživanja često ovise o izboru ključnih kazivača, bilo da su vođe ili marginalni članovi zajednice što dovodi do zamučivanja interpretacija i reprezentacija događaja (DeMunck i Sobo, 1998). U cilju rješavanja tog problema ispitanici se mogu prethodno testirati ili se mogu izabrati oni iskusni koji su upoznati s problemom istraživanja (Kawulich, 2005).

people interrelate, and what the cultural parameters are;

- to show the researcher what the cultural members deem to be important in manners, leadership, politics, social interaction, and taboos;
- to help the researcher become known to the cultural members, thereby easing facilitation of the research process; and
- to provide the researcher with a source of questions to be addressed with participants.

This method provides socio-cultural description of context and as such establishes background for the further research and identifies community issues (Low, 2002). It is a suitable specific technique among other methodologies and techniques to assess the socio-cultural values of cultural heritage. When defined properly, it can be used for tourism purposes too because both domestic and foreign visitors could be encompassed and observed within the site.

As every method has its own advantages and disadvantages this method's disadvantages can be summed up within the subjectivism concept. Hardly any human being has the possibility to perceive the entire reality and the truth being as complex as it is. Johnson and Sackett (1998) argue that the participant observation method is a source of incorrect description in behavioural research. They note that “the information collected by anthropologists is not representative of the culture, as much of the data collected by these researchers is observed based on the researcher's individual interest in a setting or behaviour, rather than being representative of what actually happens in a culture” (Kawulich, 2005:6). Furthermore, the results of the research very often depend on the choice of key informant(s) whether they are community leaders or marginal members of the community, thereby blurring interpretations and representation of events (Demunck and Sobo, 1998). A solution to this problem may be provided by pretesting informants or by selecting the proficient ones who are familiar with the research problem (Kawulich, 2005).

Fenomenološki pristupi obuhvaćaju analitičku metodu putem koje se razumijevaju i riječima opisuju fenomeni na način na koji se pojavljuju u svijesti pojedinih naroda. Cilj ispitivanja nije odvojen od percipiranja te se fenomenološkim pristupima nastoji shvatiti iskustvo. Uz druge teme istraživanja, fenomenološki pristupi lokalitetima kulturne baštine usmjereni su na „mjesto“ te na „način na koji mjesto nadržava iskustvo te na koji način, s druge strane, simbolizira to iskustvo“ (Richardson, 1984:65). Što se tiče dobara kulturne baštine i turizma, dobra kulturne baštine se često pretvaraju u robu kako bi se stvorila iskustvena vrijednost za potrebe turizma. Lokaliteti kulturne baštine kojima se kvalitetno upravlja često se koriste za stvaranje pamtljivih iskustava posjetitelja (Laing *et al.*, 2014:180). U istraživanju usmjerenom na turistička iskustva i shvaćanje načina stvaranja uspješnih turističkih iskustava oko lokaliteta kulturne baštine postoji odstupanje (Hede, 2007; McKercher i Ho, 2006; Laing *et al.*, 2014). Najprikladniji pristup tom istraživačkom problemu je fenomenološki pristup. Metodologija istraživanja koju su razvili McKercher i Ho (2006) najviše se približila rješavanju tog istraživačkog problema. Izradili su skup pokazatelja za procjenu na području kulturnog turizma u cilju istraživanja turističkog potencijala niza kulturno-turističkih objekata u Hong Kongu na način da su u obzir uzeli njihovu kulturnu, fizičku, proizvodnu i iskustvenu vrijednost. „Primjena tih pokazatelja kvalitativan je zadatak gdje istraživač procjenjuje iskustvenu dimenziju s holističkog stajališta postavljajući niz pitanja. Premda se radi o subjektivnoj analizi, ista predstavlja koristan način promatranja pojedinog dobra u cjelini te razmatra nastale izazove i prilike sa stajališta turističkog razvoja i marketinga“ (Laing *et al.*, 2014:183). McKercher i Ho su izradili skup pitanja s ciljem da pripadajući odgovori odražavaju iskustvenu vrijednost lokaliteta kulturne baštine. Iskustvena je vrijednost opisana pojmovima zanimljivog iskustva, sudjelujućeg, angažiranog i/ili zabavnog iskustva, pripa-

Phenomenological approaches involve an analytic method that strives to understand and describe in words the phenomena as they appear to the consciousness of certain peoples. The object of study is not separated from the act of perceiving and phenomenological approaches try to understand the experience. Among other topics phenomenological approaches to heritage sites focus on “place” and on “how place grows out of experience, and how, in turn, it symbolizes that experience” (Richardson, 1984:65). In tourism, heritage assets are commonly commoditized to create the experiential value for tourism purposes. Properly managed cultural heritage sites are often utilized to create memorable visitor experience (Laing *et al.*, 2014:180). There is a gap in the research focused on tourist experience and the understanding of how successful tourist experiences might be created around heritage sites (Hede, 2007; McKercher and Ho, 2006; Laing *et al.*, 2014). A phenomenological approach to that research problem would be the most suitable one. The research methodology developed by McKercher and Ho (2006) came closest to resolving this issue. They established a set of cultural tourism assessment indicators with the aim to investigate the tourist potential of a number of cultural tourism assets in Hong Kong by considering their cultural, physical, product and experiential value. “The application of these indicators is a qualitative task, where the researcher assesses the experiential dimension from a holistic perspective by asking a series of questions. While a subjective analysis, it provides a useful way of looking at each asset as a whole and considering the challenges and opportunities presented from a tourism development and marketing perspective” (Laing *et al.*, 2014:183). McKercher and Ho set up a group of questions the answers to which would reflect the experiential value of the heritage site. Experiential value was described by notions of interesting experience; participatory, engaging and/or entertaining experience; coincided tourists’ expectations; authentic experience; and good quality interpretation

dajućih očekivanja turista, autentičnog iskustva te kvalitetnog tumačenja (McKercher i Ho, 2006:478). Temeljem McKercherove i Hoove metodologije, Laing *et al.* (2014) su razvili pristup kojim se ocjenjuje iskustveni potencijal dobara kulturne baštine u gradu Bendigo u Australiji. Pregledom literature na tu temu odabrali su ključna pitanja u pogledu turističkih iskustava te su im utvrdili karakteristike koje su sljedeće: „(1) osnovna potreba da iskustvo bude ugodno i pamtljivo, (2) poveznica s autentičnošću, (3) nužnost prilagodljivosti dobra različitim potrebama i interesima posjetitelja, (4) važnost sudjelovanja i uključivanja posjetitelja u stvaranju osobne veze, (5) uloga tumačenja kao komponenta pamtljivog turističkog iskustva, 6) je li izgledno da će dobro predstavljati osnovu sporednog ili glavnog turističkog iskustva?“ (Laing *et al.*, 2014:184). Predviđeno je da šesta kategorija pomogne menadžerima destinacije shvatiti iskustvenu vrijednost te pruži okvir za kategorizaciju njihovih dobara kulturne baštine (Laing *et al.*, 2014).

Povijesni pristupi „smještaju pojedini lokalitet, mjesto ili građevinski objekt u kontekst vremena“ te istražuju materijalnu kulturu i njenu evoluciju (Low, 2002:32). Ovaj je pristup važan povjesničarima arhitekture i arheolozima u konzervaciji kulturne baštine. Otkrivaju se vrijednosti iz prošlosti kao i promjene percepcije i konotacija tijekom vremena. Nedostatak povijesnog pristupa je činjenica da ne uključuje vrijednosti sadašnjih korisnika i mišljenje stručnjaka (Low, 2002). Ovakav pristup nije prikladna tehnika vrednovanja lokaliteta kulturne baštine uzimajući u obzir doživljaj turista jer su oni korisnici iz sadašnjosti. Međutim, mogao bi se iskoristiti ukoliko bi se istraživala promjena u percepciji lokaliteta ili društveni i kulturni trendovi pojedine populacije. Low, tvrdi da su etnografski pristupi prikladniji za razumijevanje socio-kulturnih obrazaca ponašanja i kulturnih grupa jer su sveobuhvatniji, uključuju društveni i politički kontekst lokaliteta te imaju mogućnost predvidjeti lokalnu reakciju na projektantsko-planske prijedloge (2002:32).

(McKercher and Ho, 2006:478). Based on the McKercher and Ho's methodology, Laing *et al.* (2014) developed an approach used to evaluate the experiential potential of heritage assets in Bendigo, Australia. They selected the key issues regarding tourist experience based on the literature review on this topic and identified their characteristics, namely: “(1) the basic need for the experience to be enjoyable and memorable, (2) the link with authenticity, (3) the necessity of the asset being adaptable to the different needs and interests of visitors, (4) the importance of participation and engagement of visitors in creating a personal connection (5) the role of interpretation as one of the ingredients of a memorable tourist experience. 6) Is the asset likely to form the basis of a supporting or a peak touristic experience?” (Laing *et al.*, 2014:184). The sixth category should help destination managers understand experiential value and provide the scope for categorisation of their heritage assets. (Laing *et al.*, 2014).

Historical approaches “locate a particular site, place, or built form in its temporal context” and study material culture and its evolution (Low, 2002:32). This approach is very important for architectural historians, archaeologists etc. in conservation of cultural heritage. Past values of the site are revealed as well as the change of perceptions and connotations over time. The disadvantage of the historical approach is that it does not include current users' values of the site and experts' opinions (Low, 2002). This approach is not a suitable valuation technique for cultural heritage sites with respect to the experiences of tourists, who are the present users thereof. Nevertheless, it could be useful if there is a need to investigate a change in a site's perception or social or cultural trends among a given population. Low argues that ethnographic approaches are more suitable for understanding socio-cultural patterns and cultural groups as they are broader, include social and political context of the site and have the ability to predict local response to design and planning proposals (2002:32).

Konačno, **diskurzivni pristupi** ističu značenja govora i konverzacije jer se istima analizira korištenje pisanog, glasovnog ili znakovnog jezika kao i svi važni komunikacijski događaji. „Diskurzivni pristupi razmatraju predmet ispitivanja, tekst, kontekst i tumačenje predmeta u jedinstvenoj kontinuiranoj domeni. Diskurzivni pristupi predstavljaju sam početak istraživanja primijenjenog okruženja zbog poteškoća u prikupljanju podataka, kao i zbog iznimno specifičnih oblika transkripcije i bilježenja“ (Low, 2002:33). Diskurzivni pristupi će se rjeđe upotrebljavati u kontekstu kulturne baštine i turizma. Pokušaj upotrebe diskurzivne analize u izučavanju kulturne baštine nalazi se u analizi Burra povelje (The Burra Charter) i teme društvene inkluzije (Waterton, Smith i Campbell, 2006).

Postoje brojni istraživački problemi u sklopu teme neekonomskog vrednovanja materijalne kulturne baštine. Low je istaknula kvalitativne metodološke pristupe te predložila konkretne istraživačke probleme na koje se te metodologije mogu primijeniti (Tablica 1).

Tablica 1: Primijenjenost istraživanja kvalitativnih metodologija na lokalitete kulturne baštine

Metodološki pristup	Istraživački problem
Kognitivni	Pravila ideali i percepcije
Opservacijski	Ponašanje, zamjetne radnje i mjesta aktivnosti
Fenomenološki	Doživljaj mjesta i događaja
Povijesni	Socijalni i kulturološki trendovi, usporedba lokaliteta
Etnografski	Kulturološke motivacije, norme, vrijednosti, namjere, simboli i značenja
Diskursni	Osnovna značenja govora/konverzacije

Izvor: oblikovano prema Low (2002) *Anthropological-Ethnographic Methods for the Assessment of Cultural Values in Heritage Conservation. U: Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research report* (ed. Marta de la Torre). Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. str. 33

Finally, **discourse approaches** underline the meanings of speaking and conversation as they analyse written, vocal, or sign language use, or any significant communicative event. “Discourse approaches consider the object of study, the text, the context, and the interpretation of the object as one continuous domain. Discourse approaches are only beginning to be used in applied settings because of the difficulty of gathering the data and because of their highly specialized forms of transcription and notation” (Low, 2002:33). Discourse approaches are less likely to be applicable to tangible cultural heritage and tourism. Nevertheless, an attempt to use discourse analysis in heritage studies was made to analyse The Burra Charter and the topic of social inclusion (Waterton, Smith and Campbell, 2006). Discourse analysis would be suitable for intangible cultural heritage research processes.

There are many research problems within the topic of non-economic valuation of tangible cultural heritage. Low highlighted qualitative methodological approaches and suggested specific research problems to which these methodologies can be applied (Table 1).

Table 1: Research appropriateness of qualitative methodologies applied to heritage sites

Methodological Approach	Research Problem
Cognitive	Rules, ideals, and perceptions
Observational	Behaviour, observable actions, and activity sites
Phenomenological	Experience of places and events
Historical	Social and cultural trends, comparison of sites
Ethnographic	Cultural motivations, norms, values, intentions, symbols and meanings
Discourse	Underlying meanings of speaking /conversation

Source: modified from Low, S. M (2002) *Anthropological-Ethnographic Methods for the Assessment of Cultural Values in Heritage Conservation. In: Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research report* (ed. Marta de la Torre). Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. pp. 33

Shema gore navedenih metodoloških pristupa predstavlja pojednostavljenu listu istraživačkih problema i njima prikladnih znanstvenih pristupa od originalne sheme. Unatoč tome, ona označava širok izbor metodoloških pristupa u istraživanju neekonomskih vrijednosti kulturne baštine te daje koristan pregled mogućih istraživačkih problema. Pitanja u vezi sociokulturnih vrijednosti mogu se istraživati na različitim razinama te se mogu primjenjivati različite tehnike. Low je istaknula neke metodologije koje koriste individualan pristup, a neke grupni ili društveni pristup. Metodologija poput kognitivne, fenomenološke i diskursne „odlične“ su kad se primjenjuju na pojedince za otkrivanje individualnih korisničkih iskustava i doživljaja lokaliteta (Low, 2002:33), dok druge metodologije poput povijesne i diskursne „stavljaju na raspolaganje metode kojima se otkriva povijesni značaj i društvene promjene“ (Low, 2002:33). Opservacijske i etnografske metodologije objedinjuju individualni i grupni pristup te se bave temeljnom problematikom na način da utvrđuju „korištenje i nekorištenje lokaliteta“. Služe kao vrijedan pristup otkrivanju i razumijevanju motivacija, normi vrijednosti, namjera i simboličkih značenja na kojima se temelji korištenje i nekorištenje (Low, 2002). Etnografski i opservacijski pristupi služe za rasvjetljavanje sociokulturnih vrijednosti koje kulturna baština pruža lokalnoj zajednici, no i turistima koji te lokalitete obilaze. Nedostatak tih metodologija leži u činjenici da zahtijevaju puno vremena. „Etnografija u kombinaciji s opservacijskim metodologijama zahtijeva provođenje znatne količine vremena na terenu, u pravilu do godine dana ili dulje“ (Low, 2002:33). Moglo bi se zaključiti da kvalitativne metode koje se koriste za procjenu turističkih iskustava te sociokulturnih vrijednosti koje lokalitet kulturne baštine pruža lokalnoj zajednici i turistima predstavljaju prednost u procesu istraživanja takve složene problematike. Predložene kvalitativne antropološko-etnografske metode trebale bi se integrirati u proces procjene vrijednosti

The scheme of the above mentioned methodological approaches represents a more simplified list of research problems and suitable scientific approaches than the original scheme. Nonetheless, it denotes a substantial choice of methodological approaches in the research of non-economic values of cultural heritage and illustrates a useful overview of possible research problems. Issues regarding socio-cultural values could be researched on different levels and different techniques could be applied. Low pointed out some methodologies that have individual approach and some, group or societal approach. Methodologies such as cognitive, phenomenological and discourse, applied on individuals are “excellent for eliciting individual users’ experiences and perceptions of the site” (Low, 2002:33) and others such as historical and discourse “provide methods that uncover historical significance and social change” (Low, 2002:33). Observational and ethnographic methodologies combine both individual and group approaches and address the core issues by identifying “local site use and disuse”. They serve as valuable approaches to discover and understand the motivations, norms, values, intentions, and symbolic meanings underlying that use and disuse (Low, 2002). Ethnographic and observational approaches serve to shed light on the socio-cultural values that cultural heritage provides within local communities as well as to tourists visiting those sites. A disadvantage of these methodologies arises from the fact that they are time consuming. “Ethnography combined with observational methodologies requires considerable time in the field to complete - usually up to a year or more” (Low, 2002:33). It could be concluded that qualitative methods used in assessment of both tourist experience and socio-cultural values that heritage sites provide to the local community and tourists may be particularly useful in the research process of such complex issues. The proposed qualitative anthropological-ethnographic methods should be integrated in the process of value

lokaliteta kulturne baštine. No, potrebno je provesti i postupak ekonomskog vrednovanja materijalne kulturne baštine, a navedene metodologije trebale bi se uskladiti s paralelnim ekonomskim vrednovanjem.

4. EKONOMSKO VREDNOVANJE MATERIJALNE KULTURNE BAŠTINE

Ekonomsko vrednovanje materijalne kulturne baštine proizlazi iz ekonomike okoliša i koncepta usluga ekosustava. Počeci razvoja koncepta usluga ekosustava mogu se pronaći u ranim promišljanjima o odnosu ljudi i okoliša te učincima ekosustava na ljudsku dobrobit. Među najranijim radovima koji povezuju ekonomsku znanost s ekološkim sustavima može se pronaći rad Westmana iz 1977. godine naslova „Koliko vrijede usluge prirode?“ (TEEB, 2010). Kao što ekonomika okoliša koristi ekonomske analize radi bavljenja pitanjima i mjerenjima količine koristi koju usluge ekosustava pružaju ljudima, tako i kulturna ekonomika primjenjuje ekonomska načela kako bi analizirala pitanja vrijednosti u kulturnom sektoru. Jedan od predvodnika koji je povezo ekonomsku teoriju s pojmovima kulture bio je Kenneth E. Boulding. Njegov doprinos razvoju kulturne ekonomike ogleđa se u kritikama upućenim klasičnoj ekonomskoj teoriji u odnosu na socijalne i kulturne fenomene unutar društva. Štoviše, Petrakis je točno primijetio da se „istraživanje odnosa između kulture i ekonomske znanosti sastoji od istraživanja dva različita aspekta ekonomskog sustava...“ (2014:29). Postoje dvije dominantne struje ekonomske teorije na makroekonomskoj razini, neoklasična s marginalnom analizom i formuliranjem cijena uz maksimizaciju koristi i klasična, kombinirajući proizvodnju, potrošnju i distribuciju roba i usluga pomoću prizme različitih oblika društva. Petrakis ističe da kultura u prvom pristupu ne igra važnu ulogu, ali u drugom postaje ključan element i izvor interesa (2014:29). Moglo bi

assessment at heritage sites. However, the economic valuation process for tangible cultural heritage needs to be conducted and the abovementioned methodologies should be aligned with parallel economic valuations.

4. ECONOMIC VALUATION OF TANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

The economic valuation of tangible cultural heritage stems from environmental economics and the concept of ecosystem services. The beginnings of development of the ecosystem services concept could be traced in the early reflections about people-environment interactions and their effects on human welfare. Among the earliest works that link economic science to ecological systems is a paper published by Westman in 1977, entitled “How much are Nature’s Services Worth?” (TEEB, 2010). As environmental economics uses economic analysis to deal with the questions and measurements of the amounts of the benefits that ecosystem services provide to humans, cultural economics applies economic principles to analyse the questions of values in the cultural sector. One of the forerunners in compiling economic theory with the notions of culture was Kenneth E. Boulding (1972). His contribution to the development of cultural economics is reflected in critiques pointed towards classical economic theory as it relates to social and cultural phenomena within the society. Furthermore, Petrakis has accurately noticed that “the study of the relationship between culture and economic science constitutes a study of two different aspects of economic system...” (Petrakis, 2014:29). There are two dominant economic streams of theory on macroeconomic level, the neoclassical one with the marginal analysis and price formulation according to maximization of benefits and the classical one, combining production, consumption and distribution of goods and services through the prism of different forms of society. Petrakis argues that culture in the

se ustvrditi da se kulturna baština kao oblik kulturnog kapitala objašnjava i istražuje unutar teorijskih okvira tradicionalne ekonomske znanosti. Dodatno i usko vezano uz ekonomsko vrednovanje, tržišnu razmjenu te uporabnu i neuporabnu vrijednost kulturne baštine ekonomska je teorija zainteresirana javnom prirodom baštinskih resursa, definirajući ih kao javno dobro. Prema ekonomskoj teoriji javnih dobara, javno dobro se definira kao dobro koje je „bez rivala“ u potrošnji i s „neisključivim“ prednostima (Samuelson, 1954; Hardin, 2013; Stiglitz, 1986; Barton 1999; Navrud i Ready, 2002; Landriani i Pozzoli, 2014). U osnovi to znači da ga može konzumirati svaka osoba, a da se pritom mogućnost konzumacije istog dobra ne umanjuje za drugu osobu, ono je neiscrpivo te ga je nemoguće isključiti iz potrošnje. Nadalje, kulturno dobro može se okarakterizirati kao opće dobro prema njegovoj korisnosti bez obzira na njegovo vlasništvo (Landriani i Pozzoli, 2014). Ideja leži u pretpostavci da se opća dobra mogu koristiti i uživati a da pritom ne trebaju biti isključivo u vlasništvu pojedinca (Landriani i Pozzoli, 2014) ili javnog subjekta. Isključivost vlasništva može ponekad dovesti od zloupotrebe prava. Posljedično tome, javljaju se pitanja zakonske regulative, ulaganja i financiranja dodajući tako više perspektiva na temu procesa vrednovanja materijalne kulturne baštine. Općenito, ekonomisti su se odavno složili da kultura i njene reprezentacije, kao što je kulturna baština, ne prolaze jednako dobro na tržištu kao ostala materijalna dobra i to zbog javnog karaktera. Kulturna baština je meritorno dobro i njezina struktura troškova različita je od običnih tržišnih dobara (Snowball, 2008:23). Snowball zagovara izradu potpuno novog kompleta metoda i indikatora u slučaju kulturnih dobara te smatra da unaprjeđivanje aktualnih tržišno orijentiranih tehnika evaluacije nije najbolje rješenje (2008:23).

Tijekom prošlih desetljeća i početkom 21. stoljeća, potencijal kao i stvarni utjecaj

first approach does not play an important role, but in the second one constitutes a key element and a source of interest (2014:29). A parallel may be drawn by suggesting that cultural heritage as a form of cultural capital is explained and researched by the theoretic notions of traditional economic science. Additionally, and closely related to the economic valuation, market exchange and to use and non-use values of cultural heritage, economic theory is interested in the public nature of cultural heritage resources defining it as a public good. According to the economic “public goods” theory, a public good is defined as a good being “non-rival” in consumption and having “non-excludable” benefits (Samuelson, 1954; Hardin, 2013; Stiglitz, 1986; Barton 1999; Navrud and Ready, 2002; Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). Basically it means that every individual can consume it without reducing its availability to another individual. Furthermore, cultural heritage assets could be categorized as common goods on the basis of its utility and regardless of the heritage’s ownership (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014). The idea behind perceiving heritage assets as common goods is reflected in the assumption that the commons could be used, enjoyed, but not exclusively owned by an individual (Landriani and Pozzoli, 2014) or a public entity. The exclusivity of the ownership can sometimes lead to abuse of rights. Consequently, questions of legal regulations, investments and financing appear, adding more perspectives on the topic of tangible heritage valuation process. In general, economists have long acknowledged that culture with its representations, such as cultural heritage, does not perform as well in the market as other assets due to its public character, i.e. being a merit good its cost structure is different from regular market goods (Snowball, 2008:23). Snowball argues that “rather than refining current market based valuation techniques, an entirely new set of methods and indicators is needed in the case of cultural goods, which... is closer to the original intention of what the study of economics should include” (2008:23).

i funkcije dobara kulturne baštine utjecali su na metode ekonomskog vrednovanja. Od 1980-ih godina vrijednost kulturne baštine utvrđivana je na temelju njenih utjecaja, bilo ekonomskih (npr. Myerscough, 1988) ili socijalnih (npr. Matarasso, 1997). Početkom 21. stoljeća „obje strane, kako središnja državna uprava tako i javno financirani kulturni sektor prepoznaju potrebu jasnog artikuliranja vrijednosti kulture koristeći metode koje se uklapaju u proces odlučivanja središnje državne uprave“ (O' Brian, 2010:4). Međutim, Nijkamp tvrdi da „metodologija koja uključuje razne izravne i neizravne učinke za koje je i nije utvrđena cijena očito nije jednostavna“ (2012:83). Izračun različitih izravnih i neizravnih utjecaja koje kulturna baština polučuje predstavlja indirektno metode vrednovanja. Kako bi se došlo do točnijih procjena vrijednosti kulturne baštine, odnosno ekonomskih koristi proizašlih iz očuvanja kulturne baštine, potrebno je koristiti izravne metode vrednovanja.

Trošak naspram koristi očuvanja kulturne baštine kako bi se procijenila njena vrijednost postao je važan okvir ekonomske analize za donošenje odluka pri upravljanju (HMT, 2003; O'Brian, 2010). Kao što je procjena ekonomske vrijednosti očuvanja kulturne baštine sve više prepoznata kao temeljni dio kulturne politike (Davies, 1994; Darnell, 1998; Nuti, 1998; Pearce i Mourato, 1998; Creigh-Tytle, Dawe i Stock, 2000; Frey, 2000; Throsby, 2001; Maddison i Mourato, 2002; Navrud i Ready, 2002) tako se pojavila potreba pronaći najprikladniji okvir ekonomske procjene. Slijedom navedenog, analiza troškova i koristi definira se kao „analiza koja kvantificira, u novčanom smislu, onoliko troškova i koristi koliko ih je ostvarivih uključujući predmete za koje tržište ne pruža zadovoljavajuću mjeru ekonomske vrijednosti“ (HMT, 2003:4). Dva aspekta ove definicije su od velike važnosti u procesu ekonomskog vrednovanja. To je pojam kvantifikacije troškova i koristi u monetarnim jedinicama i tržište koje ne uspijeva odrediti odgovarajuću mjeru ekonomske vrijednosti. Drugim

The potential as well as the actual impacts or functions of cultural heritage assets have affected the economic valuation methods over the past decades in the beginning of the 21st century. Since the 1980's the value of cultural heritage was determined on the basis of its impacts which were either economic (e.g. Myerscough, 1988) or social (e.g. Matarasso, 1997). However at the beginning of the 21st century “there has been recognition, both within central government and in parts of the publicly funded cultural sector, of the need to more clearly articulate the value of culture using methods which fit in with central government's decision-making” (O' Brian, 2010:4). Furthermore, Nijkamp argues that “the methodology to take account of various - priced and unpriced, direct, and indirect - effects is clearly not straightforward” (2012:83). The calculation of different direct or indirect impacts of cultural heritage therefore represents indirect valuation methods. To be able to come closer to making a more accurate estimate of the cultural heritage value, or more precisely, to the economic benefits accruing from the preservation of a cultural heritage, direct valuation methods should be applied.

Cost versus benefit of cultural heritage preservation in order to estimate cultural heritage' value became a very important framework of economic analyses for making policy decisions (HMT, 2003; O'Brian, 2010). As the estimation of the economic value of cultural heritage preservation has been recognized increasingly as a fundamental part of cultural policy (Davies, 1994; Darnell, 1998; Nuti, 1998; Pearce and Mourato, 1998; Creigh-Tytle, Dawe and Stock, 2000; Frey, 2000; Throsby, 2001; Maddison and Mourato, 2002; Navrud and Ready, 2002) the need to find the suitable economic assessment framework appeared. Following this statement cost-benefit analysis is defined as “analysis which quantifies in monetary terms as many of the costs and benefits of a proposal as feasible, including items for which the market does not provide a satisfactory measure of economic value” (HMT, 2003:4). Two aspects of the definition provid-

riječima, to su robe i usluge kojima se ne trguje na tržištu i stoga nemaju cijenu kao što je npr. povijesni centar grada. Ipak, znatna količina kulturnih roba i usluga se razmjenjuje na tržištu, i to, na tržištu kulturnog turizma, izvedbenih umjetnosti, antikviteta, slika i knjiga (Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002). Na primjer, vrijednosti kulturne baštine ne razmjenjuju se isključivo na tržištu kulturnog turizma već općenito i na turističkom tržištu s obzirom da općeniti tip turista također posjećuje lokalitete kulturne baštine za vrijeme svog „3S“ (sun, sea and sand) odmora. Ti se turisti već nalaze u turističkoj destinaciji i privučeni su kulturnom ponudom (Tomljenović, 2006). Čak i na spomenutim tržištima politike cijena su kontrolirane, nekonkurentne, proizvoljne i cjenovna diskriminacija nije učinkovito provedena (Beltran i Rojas, 1996; Hett i Mourato, 2000; Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002).

Usprkos tome, temeljna načela ekonomskog vrednovanja kulturne baštine proizlaze iz klasične ekonomske teorije gdje je ljudsko blagostanje određeno ljudskim preferencijama. „Korist se definira kao bilo što, što je u mogućnosti povećati ljudsko blagostanje, a trošak kao nešto što smanjuje to blagostanje“ (Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002:53). Mjerenja preferencija odvijaju se na način da se identificira „pojedinačeva maksimalna spremnost platiti za određenu korist (engl. WTP) ili za izbjegavanje troška, ili njihova minimalna spremnost prihvatiti (engl. WTA) kompenzaciju za toleriranje troška ili odricanje od koristi“ (Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002:53). Smatra se da je WTP točnija mjera vrijednosti od izjave samih stavova „jer prisiljava ljude uzeti u obzir činjenicu da ih je zamoljeno žrtvovati dio njihovih ograničenih primanja da bi osigurali promjenu te moraju odvagati vrijednost onoga što im je ponuđeno između ostalih alternativa potrošnje svojih primanja“ (Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002:53). Tržišni ekvilibrij se objašnjava u kontekstu ljudskih preferencija i optimalne količine i cijene. „Potrošači koji su spremni platiti tržišnu cijenu

ed here are of utmost importance in the economic valuation process. Namely, the notion of quantification of costs and benefits in terms of monetary units and market which fails to determine adequate measure of economic value, in other words, goods and services that are not traded in the market and therefore do not have a price, e.g. cultural heritage such as historical town centre. Nonetheless, considerable amounts of cultural goods and services are exchanged in the markets, such as cultural tourism, performing arts, antiques, paintings, and books (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002). For example, cultural heritage values are sold not only on cultural tourism markets but on tourism markets in general since general types of tourists also visit cultural heritage sites while engaged in, for example, on “sun, sea and sand” vacations. These tourists are attracted by cultural offer while already being in a tourism destination but their main motive of travel was not cultural experience (Tomljenović, 2006). Even on those markets the pricing policies are oftentimes controlled, non-competitive, and arbitrary, and price discrimination is not effectively implemented (Beltran and Rojas, 1996; Hett and Mourato, 2002; Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002).

Nevertheless, the basic economic evaluation principles of tangible cultural heritage stem from the classical economic theory that determines human well-being by people's preferences. “A benefit is defined as anything that increases human well-being, and a cost as anything that decreases human well-being” (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002:53). Preference measurements are obtained by identifying “individuals' maximum willingness to pay (WTP) for a benefit or for the avoidance of a cost, or their minimum willingness to accept (WTA) compensation for tolerating a cost or forgoing a benefit” (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002:53). WTP is considered to be a more accurate measure of value than attitudinal statements. The reason is that it “forces people to take into account the fact that they are being asked to sacrifice some of their limited income to secure the change and

robe ili usluge će ju i kupiti: za one koji su spremni platiti točan iznos tržišne cijene i ne više od toga, trošak kupovine robe ili usluge – točnije, novac kojeg su potrošili – jednak je koristi koju dobivaju kupnjom – odnosno blagostanju generiranom od te robe; dok oni potrošači koju su spremni platiti više od cijene isto će tako kupiti tu robu i pribaviti si neto dobit od kupnje, „potrošačev višak“ mjeren viškom WTP-a nad cijenom. Kada cijena robe premaši cijenu koju su ljudi spremni platiti tada ne postoji odgovarajući gubitak blagostanja, jer ljudi jednostavno ne kupuju tu robu“ (Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002:53). Problem ovakve monetarne analize leži u „specifikaciji funkcije potražnje zbog heterogenosti individualnih korisnika, važnosti preostalih (ispuštenih) eksplanatornih varijabli, sinergijskih efekata uzrokovanih ostalim rekreativnim korisnicima (gužve na primjer), procjene vremena (ili vremenske preferencije) i nematerijalnog svojstva kulturne baštine“ (Nijkamp, 2012:83). Međutim neke robe i usluge, kao što su neki tipovi kulturne baštine predstavljaju javno dobro te nisu razmjenjivi na tržištu i stoga ne posjeduju cijenu. Ne posjedovanje cijene ne pretpostavlja ne imanje vrijednosti, ali pretpostavlja probleme njenog izračuna. Jedna mogućnost pri procjeni ekonomske vrijednosti kulturne baštine je usvojiti pristup troška održavanja jer on često „...opravdava financiranje i upravljanje kulturnom baštinom“ (Mourato i Mazzanti, 2002:53). Kritika ovog pristupa ističe da trošak održavanja i očuvanja lokaliteta kulturne baštine može podcijeniti njegove neuporabne koristi pružene zajednici. Kako bi se donijele ispravne odluke u području upravljanja kulturom temeljene na ukupnoj ekonomskoj vrijednosti, potrebno je izvršiti preciznu analizu troškova i koristi koje kulturna baština ostvaruje u turističkoj destinaciji.

5. ZAKLJUČAK

Kulturne usluge koje materijalna kulturna baština pruža i koje turisti konzumi-

must thus weigh the value of what is being offered to them against alternative uses of that income” (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002:53). The market equilibrium is explained within the context of people’s preferences and by an optimal quantity and price. “Consumers who are willing to pay the market price of a good or service will buy it: for those willing to pay exactly the market price and no more, the cost of buying the good or service—i.e., the money they spend—is just equal to the benefit they get from the purchase—i.e., the wellbeing generated by the good; while those consumers who are willing to pay more than the price will also buy that good and get a net gain from the purchase, a consumer surplus measured by the excess of WTP over price. When the price of a good exceeds the price that people are prepared to pay for it, there is no corresponding welfare loss as people simply do not buy that good” (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002:53). The problem of this monetary analysis stems from “the specification of a demand function, because of heterogeneity among individual users, the importance of remaining (omitted) explanatory variables, synergetic effects caused by other recreation users (congestion, for example), the evaluation of time (or time preference), and the intangible nature of cultural heritage” (Nijkamp, 2012:83). However, as some types of cultural heritage represent a public good, some goods and services are not exchangeable on the market and therefore do not have the price. Not having a price does not equal not having a value but equals problems of its calculation. Adopting the maintenance cost approach to the estimation of cultural heritage’s economic value would represent one option since it has “...often justified cultural heritage financing and management” (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002:53). The critique pointed towards this approach is that the cost of maintenance and preservation of cultural heritage site may underestimate its non-use benefits provided to the public. In order to make cultural policy decisions based on total economic value, accurate analysis of

raju doprinose ne samo koristi turista već i lokalne zajednice u turističkoj destinaciji. Izvor kulturnih usluga proističe iz vrijednosti kulturne baštine. Kategorije vrijednosti kulturne baštine pojavile su se prilikom traženja odgovora na pitanja koliko se uspješno ponaša kulturna baština općenito na tržištu pa tako posljedično i na turističkom tržištu, odnosno koja je vrijednost kulturne baštine za turističku destinaciju i kako mjeriti koristi koje pruža turistima i lokalnim zajednicama.

Slijedom toga su proizašle dvije vrste vrijednosti koje kulturna baština generira, ekonomska (uporabna i neuporabna) i neekonomske, kulturne ili socio-kulturne vrijednosti. Kulturne vrijednosti su brojne ovisno kako ih se promatra, međutim mogu biti podijeljene na estetske, simboličke, duhovne/vjerske, socijalne, povijesne, autentične i znanstvene vrijednosti. Ekonomska uporabna vrijednost formirana je unutar pojmova individualne korisnosti i preferencija kao što je koncept spremnosti platiti. Suprotno tome neuporabne ekonomske vrijednosti kulturne baštine nisu transparentne u tržišnim transakcijama, ali su jednako važne kao i ekonomske uporabne vrijednosti. Koristi koje ljudi imaju samo od spoznaje da je kulturna baština sačuvana ogledaju se u neuporabnoj ekonomskoj vrijednosti. Ova vrsta vrijednosti predstavlja ključnu vrijednost u paradigmi održivog razvoja turizma i ne bi se trebala izostaviti pri planiranju i upravljanju održivim razvojem turističke destinacije.

Obje vrste vrijednosti zahtijevaju implementaciju specifičnih tehnika i metoda vrednovanja u istraživački proces. Kako se neke vrijednosti mogu prikazati brojevima, a ostale ne, preporuka je koristiti obje vrste metoda, i kvalitativne i kvantitativne. U slučaju kulturnih vrijednosti, kvalitativne metode kao što su opservacijske, osobito promatranje sa sudjelovanjem, i fenomenološki pristupi kao tehnike vrednovanja koje proističu iz kulturne antropologije jesu najprikladnije u kontekstu turističkih aktivnosti na lokalitetima kulturne baštine. Ekonomsko vrednova-

both cost and benefits should be conducted within tourism destinations.

5. CONCLUSION

Cultural services provided by tangible cultural heritage and consumed by the tourist contribute both to tourists' and local community's welfare in a tourism destination. The source of cultural services originates from cultural heritage values. The categories of cultural heritage value arose while trying to find the answers to the respective questions of how well cultural heritage performs on the market in general and consequently on the tourism market, i.e. what is the worth of cultural heritage for a tourism destination and how to measure benefits that it provides to tourists and local communities.

Therefore, two types of values that cultural heritage generates emerged, economic (use and non-use) values and non-economic values, cultural or socio-cultural values. Cultural values are as many as different points of view, however they could be categorized as aesthetic, symbolic, spiritual/religious, social, historic, authenticity and scientific values. The economic use value is formed within the notions of individual utility and the preferences such as the "Willingness to Pay" concept. On the contrary, although the non-use economic values of cultural heritage are not transparent at all in market transactions they are as important as economic use values. The benefits that people may enjoy merely by knowing that the cultural heritage is being preserved are reflected in the non-use economic value. This type of value represents the core value for the sustainable tourism development paradigm and should not be omitted while planning and managing the sustainability of a tourism destination development.

Both types of values require implementation of special valuation techniques and methods into the research process. As some values can be presented in numbers and others cannot, both quantitative and qualitative methods

nje materijalne kulturne baštine temelji se na klasičnoj ekonomskoj teoriji i monetarnoj analizi koristeći izravne metode vrednovanja za utvrđivanje ljudskih preferencija. Kako bi se uspješno upravljalo kulturnom baštinom u turističkoj destinaciji, potreban je interdisciplinarni pristup procesu vrednovanja i kao takav bi trebao biti i izveden. Rezultati takvog procesa vrednovanja pomogli bi raznim dionicima kulturne baštine i turističke destinacije očuvati i upravljati kulturnom baštinom istovremeno poštujući njene ekonomske učinke i razumijevajući kompleksnosti društvenih odnosa i kulturne dinamičnosti.

should be applied. Regarding cultural values, qualitative methods such as observational, especially participant observation, and phenomenological approaches used as valuation techniques in cultural anthropology could be the most suitable techniques in the context of tourism activities at heritage sites. The economic valuation of tangible cultural heritage stems from classical economic theory and monetary analyses, which use direct valuation methods to determine human preferences. In order to successfully manage a cultural heritage site in a tourism destination, an interdisciplinary approach to the valuation process is required and should be performed. The results of such valuation processes would aid many different cultural heritage as well as tourism destination stakeholders in preserving and managing cultural heritage while respecting the economic impacts and understanding the complexity of social relations and cultural dynamics.

LITERATURA - REFERENCES

1. Avrami, E., Mason, R., De La Torre, M. (2000) (eds) *Values and Heritage Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.
2. Barton, A.D. (1999) A trusteeship theory of accounting for natural capital assets. *Abacus* 35(2), pp. 207–222.
3. Beeho, A.J., Prentice, R.C. (1995) Evaluating the Experiences and Benefits Gained by Tourists Visiting a Socio-Industrial Heritage Museum. *Museum Management and Curatorship*. Vol. 14. pp. 229- 251
4. Beeho, A.J., Prentice, R.C. (1997) Conceptualizing the experiences of heritage tourists: A case study of New Lanark World Heritage Village. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 18. No. 2. pp. 75-87
5. Beltran, E., Rojas, M. (1996) Diversified funding methods in Mexican archaeology. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 23. No. 2. pp. 463-478
6. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology* (pp.301-332) Walnut
7. Chen, C.F., Chen, F.S. (2010) Experience Quality, Perceived Value, Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions for Heritage Tourists. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 31. pp. 29-35
8. Connor, S. (1992) *Theory and Cultural Value*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Creek: AltaMira Press.
9. Creigh-Tyte, S., Dawe, G., Stock, T. (2000) *The White Book. Option Appraisal for Expenditure Decisions*. Technical Paper No.2. London: Finance Division, Department for Culture, Media, and Sport.
10. D'Andrade, R. (1995) *The Development of Cognitive Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
11. Dalmás, L.G., Noël, J.F., Sang, J.T.K. (2015) Economic evaluation of urban heritage: An inclusive approach under a sustainability perspective. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. Vol. 16. No. 5. pp. 681-687

11. Daniel, T.C., Muhar, A., Arnberger, A., Aznar, O., Boyd, J.W., Chan, K.M.A., Costanza, R., Elmqvist, T., Flint, C.G., Gobster, P.H., Grêt-Regamey, A., Lave, R., Muhar, S., Penker, M., Ribe, R.G., Schauppenlehner, T., Sikor, T., Soloviy, I., Spierenburg, M., Taczanowska, K., Tam, J., von der Dunk, A. (2012) Contributions of cultural services to the ecosystem services agenda. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. Vol. 109. No. 23. pp. 8812–8819
12. Darnell, A. (1998) Some simple analytics of access and revenue targets. *Journal of Cultural Economics*. Vol. 22. No. 2–3. pp. 189–196
13. Davies, S. (1994) *By Popular Demand*. London: Museums and Galleries Commission.
14. DeMunck, V.C., Sobo, E.J. (1998) (Eds) *Using methods in the field: a practical introduction and casebook*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
15. DeWalt, K.M., DeWalt, B.R. (1998) Participant observation. In: H. Russell Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*. pp. 259-300. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
16. Dümcke, C., Gnedovsky, M. (2013) *The Social and Economic Value of Cultural Heiritage: literature review*. European Expert Network on Culture. EENC paper.
17. Ecorys (2012) *Economic Value of Ireland's Historic Environment. Final report to the Heritage Council*. Dublin: Heritage Council. pp. 1-94
18. Erickson, P.A., Murphy L.D. (2003) *A history of anthropological theory*. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press.
19. Erlandson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., Allen, S.D. (1993) *Doing naturalistic inquiry: a guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
20. Ferretti, V., Bottero, M., Mondini, G. (2014) Decision making and cultural heritage: An application of the Multi-Attribute Value Theory for the reuse of historical buildings. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. Vol. 15. No. 6. pp. 644-655
21. Frey, B. (2000) Evaluating cultural property: The economic approach. *Journal of Cultural Property*. Vol. 6. pp. 231–246
22. Hardin, R. (2013) The Free Rider Problem. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Available at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/free-rider/>
23. Hede, A.M. (2007) World heritage listing and the evolving issues related to tourism and heritage. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*. Vol. 2. No. 3. pp. 133-144
24. Her Majesty's Treasury (HMT) (2003) *The Green Book: Appraisal and evaluation in central government* London: HMT.
25. Herbert, D. (2001) Literary places, Tourism and the heritage Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 28. pp. 312-333
26. Hett, T., Mourato, S. (2000) *Sustainable management of Machu Picchu: A stated preference approach*. Department of Environmental Science and Technology, Imperial College of Science, Technology, and Medicine, London. Mimeograph.
27. Holden, J. (2004) *Capturing Cultural Value: How culture has Become a Tool of Government Policy*. London: Demos.
28. Holden, J. (2006) *Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy*. London: Demos.
29. Johnson, A., Sackett, R. (1998) Direct systematic observation of behaviour. In: H. Russell Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*. pp. 301-333. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
30. Kawulich, B.B. (2005) Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method [81 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. Vol. 6. No. 2. Art. 43
31. Kent, S. (1984) *Analyzing Activity Areas: An Ethnoarchaeological Study of the Use of Space*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

32. Kim, S.S., Wong, K.K.F., Cho, M. (2007) Assessing the economic value of a world heritage site and willingness-to-pay determinants: A case of Changdeok Palace. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 28. No. 1. pp. 317-322
33. Klamer, A. (2003) Social, cultural and economic values of cultural goods. *Cultural Economics*. Vol. 3. No. 3. pp. 17-38
34. Laing, J., Wheeler, F., Reeves, K., Frost, W. (2014) Assessing the experiential value of heritage assets: A case study of a Chinese heritage precinct, Bendigo, Australia. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 40. pp. 180-192.
35. Landriani, L., Pozzoli, M. (2014) Management and Valuation of Heritage Assets: A Comparative Analysis between Italy and USA. Springer: Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London.
36. Lee, Yi-Ju (2015) Creating memorable experiences in a reuse heritage site. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 55. pp. 155-170
37. Low, S.M. (2000a) *Culture, politics, and the plaza: An ethnographic approach to the study of urban public spaces in Latin America*. In Culture-Meaning-Architecture, ed. K. D. Moore, 233-246. Aldershot: Ashgate.
38. Low, S.M. (2000b) *On the plaza: The politics of public space and culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
39. Low, S.M. (2002) *Anthropological-Ethnographic Methods for the Assessment of Cultural Values in Heritage Conservation*. In: Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research report (ed. Marta de la Torre) Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. pp. 31-48
40. Maddison, D., Mourato, S. (2002) *Valuing Different Road Options for Stonehenge*. In Navrud, S., and Ready, R. (eds). *Valuing Culture Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments, and Artefacts*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK
41. Marshall, C., Rossman, G.B. (1989) *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
42. Mason, R. (2002) Assessing values in conservation planning. In De la Torre (ed.) *Assessing the value of cultural heritage*. Research Report. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. pp. 5-31
43. Mason, R. (2008) Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices.” In *The Heritage Reader*, ed. G. Fairclough, pp. 99–124. Abingdon: Routledge.
44. Matarasso, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament: The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*. London: Comedia.
45. McIntosh, A.J., Prentice, R.C. (1999) Affirming authenticity: Consuming cultural heritage. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 26. No. 3. pp. 589-612
46. McKercher, B., Ho, P. (2006) Assessing the tourism potential of smaller cultural and heritage attractions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 14. No. 5. pp. 473-488
47. McMaster, B. (2008) *McMaster report: Supporting Excellence in the Arts*. London: DCMS.
48. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) (2003) *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: a framework for assessment*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
49. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) (2005) *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis*. Island Press, World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C., USA.
50. Moore, M.H. (1995) *Creating Public Value - Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
51. Mourato, S., Mazzanti, M. (2002) *Economic Valuation of Cultural Heritage: Evidence and Prospects*. In: De la Torre (ed.) *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Research Report. The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles.
52. Myerscough, J. (1988) *The Economic Importance of the Arts on Merseyside*, London: Policy Studies Institute.
53. Navrud, S., Ready, R.C. (2002) (eds) *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying En-*

- vironmental Valuation Techniques*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
54. Negus, K., Pickering, M. (2004) *Creativity, Communication and Cultural Value*. London, Thousand Oakes, New Delhy: Sage Publications ltd.
 55. Nijkamp, P. (2012) *The Economic Valuation of Cultural Heritage*. In: Licciardi, G., Amirtahmasebi, R. (eds) *The Economics of Uniqueness. Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development*. Washington D.C. : The World Bank.
 56. Nuryanti, W. (1996) Heritage and post-modern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 23. No. 2. pp. 249-260
 57. Nuti, F. (1998) Paternalism vs. consumer sovereignty. In *Environmental Resource Evaluation: Applications of the Contingent Valuation Method to Italy*, ed. R. C. Bishop and D. Romano. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
 58. O'Brian, D. (2010) *Measuring the value of culture: a report to the Department for Culture Media and Sport*. Economic and Social Research Council, Arts and Humanities Research Council.
 59. Oxford English Dictionary. Value. Dostupno na: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/221253?rskey=qV5CmH&result=1#eid> [13.3.2015.]
 60. Oxford Reference. International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics (2 ed.) William J. Frawley. Dostupno na: <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195139778.001.0001/acref-9780195139778-e-0353>. [15.3.2015.]
 61. Pagiola, S. (1996) *Economic Analysis of Investments in Cultural Heritage: Insights from Environmental Economics*. Washington DC: Environment Department, World Bank.
 62. Pearce, D. W., Mourato. S. (1998) *The Economics of Cultural Heritage: World Bank Support to Cultural Heritage Preservation in the MNA Region*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
 63. Pearce, D., Özdemiroglu, E., Bateman, I., Carson, R.T., Day, B., Hanemann, M., Hanley, N., Hett, T., Jones-Lee, M., Loomes, G., Mourato S., Sugden R. Swanson, J., Gibbons (2002) *Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques. Summary Guide*. Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions: London.
 64. Petrakis, P.E. (2014) *Culture, Growth and Economic Policy*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
 65. Poria, Y, Butler, R., Airey, D. (2004) Links Between Tourists, Heritage, and Reasons for Visiting Heritage Sites. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 43. No. 1. pp. 19-28
 66. Prentice, R.C., Witt, S.F., Hamer, C. (1998) Tourism as experience: The case of heritage parks. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 25. No. 1. pp. 1-24
 67. Project for Public Spaces. William H. Whyte. Dostupno na: <http://www.pps.org/reference/wwhyte/> [5.3.2015.]
 68. Richardson, M. (1984) Place: Experience and symbol. *Geoscience and Man*. Vol. 24. No. 1-3. pp. 63-67
 69. Ruijgrok, E.C.M. (2006) The Three Economic Values of Cultural Heritage: A Case Study in The Netherlands, *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. Vol. 7. pp. 206-213
 70. Salazar, S. Del Saz, Montagud Marques, J. (2005) Valuing cultural heritage: the social benefits of restoring and old Arab tower. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. Vol. 6. No. 1 pp. 69-77.
 71. Samuelson, P.A., (1954) The Pure Theory of Public Expenditure. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 36, pp.387-389.
 72. Schensul, S., Schensul, J., LeCompte, M.D. (1999) *Essential ethnographic methods*. Book Two of the Ethnographer's Toolkit, JJ.Schensul, & M.D. LeCompte (eds.) Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira press, a divition of Sage publications.

73. Schwartz, S.H. (2006) A Theory of Cultural Value Orientations: Explication and Applications. *Comparative Sociology*. Vol. 5. No. 2. pp. 137–182
74. Scott, C. (2009) Exploring the evidence base for museum value. *Museum Management and Curatorship*. Vol. 24. No. 3. pp. 195-212
75. Snowball, J.D. (2008) *Measuring the Value of Culture - Methods and Examples in Cultural Economics*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
76. Stephenson, J. (2008) The Cultural Values Model: An integrated approach to values in landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. Vol. 84. No. 2. pp. 127-139
77. Stiglitz, J.E. (1986) *Economics of the public sector*. New York: Norton
78. Tengberg, A., Fredholm, S., Eliasson, I., Knez, I., Saltzman, K., Wetterberg, O. (2012) Cultural ecosystem services provided by landscapes: Assessment of heritage values and identity. *Ecosystem Services*. Vol. 2. pp. 14-26
79. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) (2010) *The Ecological and Economic Foundations*. Edited by Pushpam Kumar. Earthscan, London and Washington.
80. The University of Alabama. Department of Anthropology. Anthropological theories. Cognitive Anthropology. Dostupno na: <http://anthropology.ua.edu/cultures/cultures.php?culture=Cognitive%20Anthropology>. [15.3.2015]
81. Throsby, D. (1999) Cultural Capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics*. Vol. 23. No. 1. pp. 3-12
82. Throsby, D. (2001) *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
83. Throsby, D. (2003) Determining the Value of Cultural Goods: How Much (or How Little) Does Contingent Valuation Tell Us? *Journal of Cultural Economics*. Vol. 27. pp. 275-285
84. Throsby, D. (2012) *Heritage Economics: A Conceptual Framework*. In: The Economics of Uniqueness: Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development. The Urban Development Series, (ed) Licciardi, G. Amirtahmasebi R. Washington, DC: The World Bank
85. Throsby, D., Zednik, A. (2014) *Chapter 4 - The Economic and Cultural Value of Paintings: Some Empirical Evidence*. In: Ginsburgh, V.A., Throsby, D. (Eds.) *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*. Elsevier. Vol. 2. pp. 81-99
86. Tomljenović, R. (2006) *Kulturni turizam/ Cultural tourism*. In: Čorak, S., Mikačić, V. (Eds.) *Hrvatski turizam - plavo, bijelo, zeleno/Croatian Tourism – blue, white, green*. Institut za turizam. Zagreb., pp. 119-148
87. Tuan, T.H., Seenprachawong, U., Navrud, S. (2009) Comparing cultural heritage values in South East Asia – Possibilities and difficulties in cross-country transfers of economic values. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. Vol. 10. No. 1. pp. 9-21
88. Ung, A., Vong, T.N. (2010) Tourist experience of heritage tourism in Macau SAR, China. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*. Vol. 5. No. 2. pp. 157-168
89. Waterton, E., Smith, L., Campbell, G. (2006) The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. Vol. 5. No. 4. pp. 339-355, DOI: 10.1080/13527250600727000
90. Whyte, W.H. (1980) *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*. Washington, D.C.: Conservation Foundation.
- Primljeno: 9. studenog 2015. / Submitted: 9 November 2015*
Prihvaćeno: 18. ožujka 2016. / Accepted: 18 March 2016