This is a repository copy of *The significance of values:heritage value typologies re-examined*.

The Significance of Values: Heritage Value Typologies Re-Examined

L. Harald Fredheim* – Department of Archaeology, University of York, York, UK

lhf506@york.ac.uk

+44 (0) 1904 323901

Department of Archaeology

University of York, King's Manor

York, YO1 7EP

United Kingdom

Manal Khalaf – Department of Architecture and Interior Design, University of Bahrain

mjkhalaf@uob.edu.bh

+973 17876064

Department of Architecture and Interior Design

University of Bahrain

PO Box 32038

Kingdom of Bahrain

A critical discussion of value typologies for heritage conservation and management is offered, from the perspective of objects- and urban conservation, in light of a review of published literature on heritage values. It is suggested that value typologies are often designed and implemented without understanding the implicit consequences of the inclusion and omission of 'values'. It is also suggested that typologies often fail to prompt the necessary questions to develop satisfactorily detailed understandings of heritage significance, resulting in decisions being based on implicit, rather than explicit, value assessments in practice. Mindful of the problems associated with 'universalising' context specific typologies, a broad framework for assessing and communicating significance is proposed. In order to encourage holistic approaches, the framework is designed to combat the false dichotomies of cultural/natural and tangible/intangible heritage; it is hoped this will make the framework widely applicable. Without downplaying the necessity of diverse participation in assessing significance, the framework is designed to identify aspects of weakness and preference in cases where adequate consultation is not possible.

Key words: heritage values, value typologies, cultural heritage, critical heritage studies, conservation management

Introduction

From a position of relative obscurity in the early 1990s, values-based approaches to heritage conservation have come to dominate academic and professional discourses (Clavir 2002, 42-44). Values-based approaches have been adopted to an increasing range of categories of cultural heritage including archaeological and historic objects (Muñoz Viñas 2005; Appelbaum 2007; Cane 2009; Russell and Winkworth 2010), modern art (Schädler-Saub and Weyer 2010), archaeological sites (Teutonico and Palumbo 2002; Australia ICOMOS 2013), historic buildings (Clark 2001; Feilden 2003; Orbaşlı 2008; Stubbs 2009) and urban and rural landscapes (Mason 2006; English Heritage 2008; Stephenson 2008; Worthing and Bond 2008). For the purpose of this discussion, a values-based approach is defined as one that seeks to identify, sustain and enhance significance, where significance is understood as the overall value of heritage, or the sum of its constituent 'heritage values'. Common to all these approaches is the emphasis on understanding how the heritage in question is valued, often formalised in a statement of significance, in order to manage, use and conserve it appropriately (Figure 1). Values-based theory thereby calls into question the notion that what is valuable about heritage is self-explanatory and uncontested.

In light of recent critiques of values-based approaches (Poulios 2010; 2014; Rudolff 2006; Walter 2013), this article explores weaknesses at the very core of values-based theory. However, rather than proposing the abandonment of the values-based paradigm, it is suggested that values-based approaches fail because decisions are based on incomplete understandings of heritage and its values. It will be demonstrated that in order to capture the full range of ways in which heritage is valued, the full extent of the heritage in question must first be identified. The case of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple is used to demonstrate the inadequacy of existing frameworks for assessing the significance of complex heritage sites. The following is a critical review of established value typologies for heritage in light of the authors' studies of the applicability of typologies for urban landscapes and objects in collections, where practical applications of values-based approaches remain in their relative infancy. In an effort to avoid appropriating the identified weaknesses of established typologies, this article deconstructs the discourse of cultural significance and introduces a framework for communicating interpretations of heritage that arrests the implicit value-judgements that shape conservation decisions.

Values and value typologies

While the origins of formalised values-based approaches within heritage management practices and policies are often traced to the original Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1979), the values-based paradigm did not gain traction among objects conservators until the twenty-first century. Since then, it has increasingly been asserted that 'the meanings and values attached to objects … provide the very reason for conservation' (Pye 2001, 57), that 'societies retain objects because they have value for the members of that society' (Caple 2009, 25) and 'are preserved because they have values' (Appelbaum 2007, 86). Conservation is now widely considered an inherently values-based activity that can be understood as an

expression of values (Richmond and Bracker 2009). Due to the implications of assertions that values are mutable social-constructs (Avrami, Mason, and de la Torre 2000; Pearson and Sullivan 1995, 168), values-based approaches are often dismissively labelled as relativistic and post-modernist, as aptly identified by de la Torre 'value has always been the reason underlying heritage conservation. It is self-evident that no society makes an effort to conserve what it does not value' (2002, 3). Understood as efforts to maintain and enhance significance, all conservation decisions are the product of a series of value judgements. It is because conservators rarely make these value-judgements explicit that conservation decisions often are difficult to rationalise and communicate. The promise of values-based theory is that by assessing perceived values, implicit conservation decisions can be made explicit, enabling informed and strategic decision-making that can be communicated and interrogated effectively (cf. Duckor *et al.* forthcoming). So what are these 'values' that are thought to constitute heritage significance?

Heritage values are considered plural in recognition of the fact that heritage is considered significant for a range of different reasons. A wide range of possible heritage values have been suggested, a small selection of which are featured in Table 1. Such lists of heritage values that are thought to encompass heritage significance are known as 'value typologies'. They are most commonly used in assessments of significance for heritage management plans and conservation policy documents. In attempting to be inclusive, some typologies are very long, while others are presented as incomplete lists, merely giving examples of possible values without making an effort to present a complete typology. The sense that a comprehensive, universally applicable value typology is an impossibility is increasingly evident in the literature, though few are as brash as Rudolff, who suggests the range and disparity of proposed typologies 'illustrates that any attempt to categorise all values is determined to fail' (2006, 60).

If the language of heritage values is incapable of capturing the full range of ways in which heritage is valued, values-based approaches cannot be expected to result in appropriate conservation decisions. While values-based approaches continue to permeate heritage discourse, such criticisms of value typologies can therefore not go unanswered. Although typologies perform crucial legislative roles in formally designating heritage in some contexts, such as in Australia where the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013) and the work of the Heritage Collections Council (Heritage Collections Countil2001; Russell and Winkworth 2010) has institutionalised value typologies, this is not generally the case elsewhere. For the successful application of values-based approaches to contexts where typologies are not externally determined, a critical review of established typologies and reassertion of the significance of typologies is timely.

In her book, *Uses of Heritage*, Smith introduces the concept of the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD), which exposes the predisposition of heritage professionals for tangible, elite 'heritage' and the associated widespread belief that heritage can only be properly interpreted by experts (2006). While the AHD is much discussed within Heritage Studies, it is not a familiar concept to most practicing conservators, whose professional literature remains largely concerned with technical and scientific issues. Conservation is one of the few heritage

processes by which heritage is deliberately modified and changed, thereby facilitating selected future uses of heritage, often inevitably at the expense of others. Conservation seeks to enhance that which is valued; conversely, interpretations that are not 'authorised' may be delegitimised (Stephenson 2008, 129; cf. Emerick 2014, 225). Performed within the AHD, conservation thereby operationalises implicit professional preference and may cause the impoverishing (Dakin 2003, 190; Sully 2007, 36; cf. Abu-Khafajah and Rababeh 2012) of heritage. As heritage continues to be recognised as increasingly complex and traditional tangible/intangible and cultural/natural heritage divides are increasingly regarded as artificial and untenable (cf. Bergdahl 2012; Borrelli and Davis 2012; Brown 2010; Burke and Smith 2010; Harrison 2015), value typologies must capture the complexity of holistic interpretations of heritage (cf. ICOM 2002; ICOMOS 2007 §3.4, 3.5) if they are to facilitate appropriate heritage management.

The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, where Fredheim (2015) has conducted fieldwork, is an example of a complex case that calls for a holistic interpretation of heritage. The Middle Temple is one of the four English Inns of Court that hold the exclusive right to call their members to the Bar as barristers and has been synonymous with both organisation and place for centuries (Lloyd 2013). While the estate encompasses a large number of buildings and open spaces, the Middle Temple also has grandly decorated interiors with extensive collections of art, furniture, armour and silver. Arguably, the most famous piece of furniture is the 29 feet long Bench Table made of a single oak tree, granted by Queen Elizabeth I, from Windsor Forest, which was moved in through the window and constructed *in situ* (Dean 2000; Whitelaw 2013). Unlike the buildings, the collections are not formally protected and generally continue to be used. Arguably, the continued use of the Middle Temple as an Inn of Court constitutes an integral part of its heritage. Conserving the Middle Temple appropriately, therefore involves considering the significance of traditional practices at the Middle Temple, alongside its buildings, collections and urban context. Existing value typologies have not been designed to accommodate such heritage diversity. Established approaches to objects conservation would recognise the value of the historic interiors and collections and regard their continued use as a threat, thereby marginalising and delegitimising the significance of the traditional use of the Middle Temple. A holistic framework for heritage significance is required in order to appreciate how measures enacted to conserve one part of the Middle Temple may affect the significance of another; different categories of heritage cannot always be treated separately.

Identified uses and requirements of value typologies
For the conservation of urban heritage, the ability of a typology to effectively capture and communicate the view of both professionals and non-professionals is especially important, due to the range of stakeholders affected by conservation decisions (Orbasli, 2000). The ways in which different stakeholders consider and express values is likely to vary considerably (Pearson and Sullivan 1995, 308-309; Stephenson 2008). An effective typology for urban heritage must therefore have the capacity to 'symmetrically' (Schofield 2009) group similar values that are expressed differently in order to create common expressions of significance for all stakeholders. The urban environment is continuously changing, both physically and

socially; a value typology for urban heritage must reflect and respond to this changing nature (UNESCO 2010). Despite including detailed frameworks for data collection and analysis, and being designed specifically for the conservation of places and the historic environment, neither the revised Burra Charter (2013), nor English Heritage's Conservation Principles (2008) address time and change satisfactorily (Khalaf 2015, 44-45). Neither typology provides a framework for dealing with time and change, which are embedded qualities in urban heritage. For example, if the values of a certain historic area were identified today and again in twenty years, and certain differences were reported, what do each of these value sets mean to the value of the place? Would they stand together or would the new overwrite the old? Given the subjective and mutable nature of heritage values, assessments of significance must be recognised as time- and context-specific. Typologies must therefore address how past assessments of significance relate to those made in the present.

The requirements identified for urban heritage above also apply to objects in collections. Here, statements of significance can be used by conservators to understand what is perceived to constitute damage, thereby facilitating the establishment of appropriate preventive policies and interventive treatments (Fredheim 2013). Although the range of stakeholders may be less obvious, connecting with communities and demonstrating relevance is becoming increasingly important, especially for collections in public institutions. Within objects conservation, identified values are often 'potential' values. Archives are often established based on the assumption that something will be valuable in the future. Conservators are therefore not only tasked with facilitating use according to present values, but also potential future uses in light of potential future values. Typologies implicitly elevate those values that feature prominently and marginalise those that do not. It is therefore vital that typologies are flexible, as heritage values change it is unlikely that making longer typologies will be sufficient; furthermore, longer lists are impractical, overly complicated and ultimately unsuccessful at inclusivity (Rudolff 2006, 60).

Interactions between heritage professionals and cultural economists have highlighted that not only do they describe and measure the value of heritage differently, what they mean by the word 'value' is different. An overview of the terms used by different authors and their meanings is provided in Table 2. While economists suggest that value is generated through interacting with heritage, as the benefits generated by use (Carman 2005, 50), most heritage professionals speak of heritage having value also when it is not in use. These 'potential' values can be realised through use as 'instrumental' values. Carman adds 'accounting' values as a third dimension, which is the market value of heritage. He notes that, following Baudrillard's social exchange (1981) and Bourdieu's convertible forms of capital (1984), 'accounting' values are also at least in part derived from potential values. Typologies that include values from multiple value dimensions, such as both cultural and economic values, present values that incorporate each other as separate, and thereby count some values twice.

To summarise, a value typology should be short, yet inclusive, use accessible language, minimise overlap between values and provide a mechanism for reviewing and integrating past assessments of significance. The value typologies used in assessing significance have implications for how significance will be recorded. Even where statements of significance are

not formalised, perceptions of what should and should not be recognised as significant will influence decision-making. Rudolff suggests that 'the immense variety of value categories offered in academic and non-academic writings in the heritage field, illustrates that any attempt to categorise all values is determined to fail' (2006, 60). If this is the case, the values-based paradigm is fundamentally flawed. Conservation theory must therefore either come to grips with values, or, as has been suggested by Walter (2013), move on.

A typological framework for holistic values-based approaches
It has been suggested above that heritage should be defined as that which is identified to be of heritage significance and that significance should be understood as the sum of identified heritage values. It follows that nothing can be identified as heritage without an assessment of significance being made, however implicit or informal. When deconstructing assessments of significance, it becomes clear that three stages of assessment are inevitably present. These stages relate to the identification of what the heritage in question is, why it is valuable and how valuable it is. The second of these stages, identifying why heritage is valuable, is often what is meant by a statement of significance and is where value typologies tend to be applied. It will, however, be demonstrated that one of the reasons value typologies often fail to capture the full range of ways in which heritage is valued is that they are based on incomplete interpretations of what is perceived as heritage.

A critical aspect of the typological framework for assessing and communicating significance outlined below is therefore the identification of *features of significance*. Identifying the significant features of heritage answers the question of *what* heritage is; this is different from answering *why* heritage is valuable. Within our framework, the values that make something heritage are broken down into *aspects of value*. The third stage involves assessing degrees of significance according to *qualifiers of value* (Figure 2). This is also a crucial stage of assessing significance, and is where power relations and the dissonant nature of heritage are the most obvious (cf. Smith 2006; Waterton 2010; Abungu 2012, 68), as some interpretations are deemed more significant or legitimate than others. While no less integral to assessments of significance, degrees of significance are essentially beyond the scope of the present discussion, which focuses on typologies; *qualifiers* will only be discussed in relation to how they are often conflated with *aspects* of value.

Features of significance
Asking what constitutes the heritage in question identifies features of significance. This stage is often oversimplified as a result of the common assumption that heritage conservation refers exclusively to 'tangible heritage'. Statements of significance tend to consist of a list of the tangible features of the heritage in question, followed by a description of why each is considered valuable. It is perhaps more obvious that a landscape consists of both tangible and intangible features of significance than that the same is true of objects; we suggest that all heritage can be conceptualised as dialogical (Harrison 2015, 27-28) landscapes, where, after Taylor, 'anything that embodies what is valued as heritage, whether this is an object, collection, song, building, oral tradition, or landscape' is termed a heritage 'site' (2015, 66). The Middle Temple may be considered an urban heritage site, made up of buildings, open spaces, stories and traditions, each of which are sites in their own right. A room within a

building, or even a single object within a room may similarly be considered a site. The story of the origin of the Bench Table in Middle Temple Hall is part of the table as a heritage object, alongside the four planks from which it is made, the traditional ways in which it continues to be used and its current appearance; the Bench Table is the site that embodies the various values attributed to each of these, and many other, significant features of the table.

Stephenson proposed the Cultural Values Model (2008) in response to the perceived mismanagement of heritage landscapes in New Zealand and the failure of established value typologies to fully capture the values of landscapes. Although designed exclusively for landscapes, the typology questions the boundaries we create to demarcate and define heritage, which is equally problematic in the case of individual objects. Stephenson's typology breaks with traditional typologies in an attempt to more fully capture how heritage is perceived by both experts and non-experts. She divides heritage into, 'forms', 'relationships' and 'practices' (or 'processes'). 'Forms' encompass the physical, tangible and measurable features of the landscape/townscape such as any structures, spatial arrangements, open spaces as well as natural and artificial features. 'Relationships' cover the meaning, interpretations and significance generated by the relationship between the human and the landscape/townscape; this includes identity, memories, sense of place and spirituality, while 'practices' encompass traditions, activities and events including human and natural systems (Stephenson, 2008).

The Cultural Values Model allows for the capturing of tangible, intangible and natural features of landscapes within a single typology. Dividing heritage in this way cuts across disciplinary boundaries and the simple language used facilitates the gathering and integrating of both expert and non-expert interpretations. Limiting the number of categories to three while allowing their composition to vary, adds simplicity and gives the typology the required flexibility to facilitate change over time as new relationships, forms and practices are identified as significant features of the heritage in question. The temporality and changing nature of heritage is further developed through the concept of 'embedded' values, as distinguishable from those that are identifiable on the 'surface' by observing present forms, practices and relationships. Over time, surface values may become embedded, giving past interpretations of significance a role in the present.

The typology proposed by Stephenson (2008) as briefly outlined above does fulfil many of the requirements we have identified and allows 'dialogical' (Harrison 2013, 2015; Harrison and Rose 2010) and 'symmetrical' (Schofield 2009) approaches by recognising the interplay between tangible and intangible features and respecting various ways of knowing. By specifically including 'relationships' and 'practices', it prompts the consideration of the intangibles that define, connect and sustain heritage. Although it might be claimed this was accomplished through the Burra Charter decades ago, it has been demonstrated this was not the case in practice, even in Australia where the Charter was created (Pearson and Sullivan 1995, 309; Truscott 2000, 2004; Canning and Spennemann 2001; Byrne, Brayshaw, and Ireland 2003; Smith 2004, 2006; Waterton, Smith, and Campbell 2006). Stephenson hypothesises that continued 'interactions between valued forms, practices and relationships' (2008, 136) sustain heritage, which is supported by the detrimental impact of the loss of such

interactions often lamented in the literature (cf. Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2003, 22; Bouchenaki 2007; Rodwell 2007; Bergdahl 2012; Harrison 2013, 216). Furthermore, if, as Harrison suggests (2013, 2015), heritage exists in dialogue between human and non-human actors, practices and relationships may be considered the vehicles by which human and non-human actors dialogue; it is not difficult to imagine that if heritage features are estranged, dialogue will break down and heritage lose its meaning. This suggests that the application of typologies designed within the AHD (Smith 2006), which invariably are based on an understanding of the primacy of 'fabric' (Emerick 2014), can lead to unsustainable heritage practices where tangible forms of heritage become disconnected from 'practices', 'relationships' and the communities that value them.

We recommend the application of the Cultural Values Model to a wider range of heritage categories and have therefore adopted it as the first stage of our typological framework. This is because individual buildings and objects are also involved in practices and relationships (cf. Byrne *et al.* 2011). By identifying these as part of heritage sites, values-based approaches to heritage conservation can become more flexible, pragmatic and ultimately appropriate. In contexts where heritage is still in use (Poulios 2010; 2014), uses of heritage can be identified as 'processes' worthy of conservation alongside tangible 'forms'. Ideally, the Cultural Values Model would be applied on a number of scales, as sites within sites, as suggested in the case of the Middle Temple. In the context of our proposed framework, the real power of the typology lies in its ability to identify and arrest professional preference for tangible significant features, which is ingrained in the AHD.

Aspects of value
While the potential for applying the Cultural Values Model to other types of heritage is compelling, it does not identify *why* features are significant. Conservation neither attempts to, nor is it fully capable of, preventing change. Rather, conservation should be regarded as a process concerned with preserving and enhancing qualities of heritage, or *aspects* of value. In so doing, conservation can facilitate the use of, and drawing of benefits from, heritage in the present and future (cf. Watson 2009; Harrison 2013; Emerick 2014; Zetterstrom-Sharp 2015). While using Stephenson's Cultural Values Model provides a more balanced and complete understanding of heritage, the results generated must be augmented by asking why the identified relationships, forms and practices are significant. We suggest that this is answered by the identification of *aspects of value* for each *feature of significance*. These aspects can be associative, sensory, evidentiary or functional.

Associative aspects of value are those that express significant connections. These can be connections to people, events, places, practices, traditions, stories, objects and so forth. This covers much of what has been termed 'historical' in other typologies, which among other things somewhat confusingly conflates history and memory. It should, however, be noted that almost all traditional 'values' can have associative aspects. The term 'associative' also indicates that these aspects of value can be identified by experts or non-experts and that connections can be of significance even where they are widely regarded as fictional.

Sensory aspects of value are sources of sensory pleasure. These can be distinguished from sensory stimuli that are considered significant for evidentiary, associative or functional qualities, which need not be pleasurable. Although aesthetics can relate to senses other than sight, it is most usually used with regard to vision and is often connected to the expert judgements of architects and art historians as opposed to being regarded as purely subjective, as is 'beauty' (Heinich 2011); 'sensory' is therefore preferred. This is a deliberate attempt to avoid the implicit bias of Western sensory models, which heavily favour sight (Classen 1990; cf. Howes 2006, 166). To the five traditional senses, one might add the intellectual or metaphorical, as in poetry.

Evidentiary aspects of value are those that provide evidence for conducting or communicating formal or informal research. This is not termed 'scientific', because evidence is not used exclusively by the sciences. While evidentiary aspects of value tend to be highlighted by experts in fields such as architecture, archaeology and art history, the potential of heritage to provide evidence for something is often valued very strongly also by other professionals and non-experts. One might assume the traditional aesthetic value category would primarily consist of sensory aspects, many should, however, be considered evidentiary.

Functional aspects of value do not necessarily contribute toward regarding something as heritage. Nevertheless, for heritage still in 'use', these functional aspects keep heritage from becoming 'rubbish' (Thompson 1979) and are thereby often crucial to justifying preservation. The functional aspects of libraries and train stations perpetuate 'processes' that in turn establish and sustain 'relationships' and valorise 'forms' of heritage. Failure to recognise and conserve functional aspects of heritage can have catastrophic consequences for heritage. Functional aspects of value should not, however, be conflated with benefits of use derived from other aspects of value. Archaeological objects in collections could be perceived to function as educational tools; in this context, the word 'function' has a different meaning, as the educational benefits are likely to be derived from evidentiary, associative and sensory aspects of value.

Aspects of value should be identified for each feature of significance from stage 1 of Figure 2, in order to explicitly identify why each feature is significant. This roughly corresponds to English Heritage's 'relate identified heritage values to the fabric of the place' (2008, 37), the major difference being that the 'fabric' of heritage consists of forms, relationships and practices. This is essential in order to understand how changes are likely to affect the significance of heritage. In the case of the Bench Table from the Middle Temple, its origin story is considered of associative value because it mentions Queen Elizabeth I and is of evidentiary value for historical research. The four planks could be said to have sensory value, as they have a pleasing surface to both look at and touch, evidentiary value for studies of artisanship and dendrochronological dating and are of considerable functional value as the Bench Table remains the table of honour during formal dinners.

These categories were chosen on the basis of a survey of published typologies, some of which are presented in Table 1. Instrumental and accounting values were omitted, as they are

derived from potential values and are not considered until stage 3 of Figure 1, where they feature in cost/benefit analyses. Like Stephenson's Cultural Values Model, and in direct opposition to the trend of making typologies longer (cf. Orbaşlı 2008; ICOMOS NZ 2010), only four categories are proposed. As suggested by Byrne *et al*. (2003), the categories should not be perceived linearly; no assumption is made that each category is of equal importance. Calls for increased respect in heritage management suggest that discourses interpreting the meanings of the past should be treated equally; including forms of knowing less often espoused by professionals (cf. ICOMOS 1994; Byrne 1995; Lowenthal 1998; Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2003; van Zanten 2004; Lemonnier 2012). There is therefore no category earmarked for 'social' or 'communal' values, because, while appearing to include non-expert values, the inclusion of these categories has tended to separate and marginalise these values in practice (Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2003; Waterton 2010). This is also often the case with 'spiritual' values, which can be regarded as superstitious and irrelevant by secular professionals. It is therefore essential that significance is communicated by someone who believes in or fully understands the interpretation described (de la Torre and Mac Lean 1997, 7). The resulting typology is not without weaknesses, but we believe it is superior to published alternatives. This is because the four aspects speak to *why* something is considered heritage on a fundamental level, rather than how, or by whom, heritage is identified and used.

The use of categories that cut across professional discourses implicitly requires a level of interrogation of interpretations of significance, but ultimately the resulting statement of significance is created by the user, not the typology. It is little wonder that if archaeologists assess significance, their perspective is likely to be discernible in the statement of significance produced (Waterton and Smith 2009; Emerick 2014), a point that could equally be made with regard to planners and urban conservation. It should be clear that sensory stimuli can have evidentiary, social and functional value, and that associations can be analysed as evidence. These relationships between aspects of value are not problematic as long as they are identified. It should also be noted that *anything* could potentially have evidentiary value in the future; 'the difference between "historical" and "historic" is an historian' (Howard 2009, 51). This familiar dilemma to the conservator is beyond the scope of this discussion. It does, however, remind us that a statement of significance is one interpretation made at a specific time, not a timeless objective synthesis of every interpretation possible.

Qualifiers of value

It is widely recognised that aspects of value often are in conflict; efforts to sustain or enhance one may damage another. In objects conservation, this is particularly evident in the conservation of composite objects (Tjelldén and Botfeldt 2008). An essential aspect of an actionable statement of significance is a consideration of degrees of significance, which attempts to answer the question of which features and aspects of value are the most significant. It has already been suggested that quantitative assessments of significance are problematic; however, qualitative or semi-quantitative assessments are necessary (Kapelouzou 2012, 177). As with the other stages of the outlined framework, if degrees of significance are not addressed explicitly, they will be implicitly. Assessments of degrees of

significance are extremely complex and are therefore very difficult to deconstruct. This is essentially beyond the scope of the present discussion, but a few points should be mentioned with regard to how qualifiers of value relate to aspects of significance.

Some of the 'values' listed in Table 1, can be better understood as qualifiers of value; three of these are 'authenticity' (Throsby 2001; Keene 2005), 'rarity' (Appelbaum 2007; Orbaşlı 2008; Szmelter 2010) and 'condition' (Pye 2001). Following the Nara Document, authenticity has come to be seen by professionals as a measure of reliability, credibility or truthfulness of heritage (ICOMOS 1994, §13; cf. ICOMOS NZ 2010, 9) with regard to the relationships from which its values arise, and could thereby apply to at least some aspects of 'intangible' heritage (Blake 2002, 74). Although authenticity, defined in this way, may not be equally relevant to all aspects of value, or all stakeholders, it is crucial for research concerned with evidentiary aspects of value as it speaks to the quality of the evidence; it can also qualify the perceived value of associations and sensory experiences. Condition can be understood as a measure of past damage and vulnerability to damage in the future. Due to the recognition that damage is a values-based term (Hales 2014; Strlič *et al.* 2013), condition qualifies significance and should not be considered a heritage value. Similarly, things only become heritage indirectly by virtue of their rarity, such as by the functional value of species diversity or potential evidentiary values for research, but aspects of value are regarded as more valuable if they are rarer.

The relationships between aspects and qualifiers of value are often complex. Qualifiers can perhaps be best understood as multipliers; they are not sources of significance, but they can cause perceptions of significance to increase or decrease. As the condition of an object worsens, affected aspects of value generally decrease. Rarity, on the other hand, may be perceived to dramatically increase the significance of aspects of value, as is often the case with heritage that is regarded as 'irreplaceable' (Throsby 2002, 110; Staniforth and Lloyd 2012, 293; Wahlen 2010) and therefore 'infinitely' valuable (Michalski 1990, 39; Carman 1995, 24). It is important to recognise that qualifiers alone do not determine degrees of significance. An heirloom may be valued primarily based on memories and associations with certain people. The degree to which it is valued will therefore depend primarily on the strength of these associations, not only their rarity. The relationships between aspects and qualifiers of value are often close enough that their assessment, by necessity, becomes iterative in practice.

Conclusion

The examination of published heritage value typologies in this article suggests that values-based theory rests on an incomplete understanding of values. New value typologies continue to be proposed without thorough consideration of their implications for information gathering, synthesis and communication, or the actual requirements placed on statements of significance by conservation practice. The growing body of value typologies is symptomatic of a discipline increasingly concerned with critical reflection and introspection, but which rarely gives typologies the critical attention they deserve. Currently, established value typologies are under-fire for favouring out-dated Western expert interpretations of heritage; a critical review and reframing of the values-based heritage discourse is therefore necessary.

In light of the deficiencies of established typologies and the diversification of conservation practice, a framework for assessing and communicating significance has been proposed that can capture the significance of complex heritage sites, such as the Middle Temple. We suggest that all interpretations of heritage, including those that remain implicit, are the product of a series of value judgements that we have broken down into three stages. In order to facilitate critical and transparent decision-making, we suggest these should be made explicit by identifying *features of significance* that communicate what heritage is, *aspects of value* that explain why each feature is significant and worthy of conservation and *qualifiers of value* that justify why some features should be prioritised in conservation efforts over others (Figure 2).

Definitions are exclusive by nature; due to concerns with making heritage more inclusive, the creation of formal definitions and broader conceptual frameworks to guide conservation practice is often avoided. However, the lack of an effective language to identify and communicate heritage is inhibiting practice and damaging the reputation of the discipline. This has been identified by Poulios (2010, 2014) with regard to 'living heritage' contexts and by Walter (2013) in religious heritage contexts where non-professionals are involved in decision-making processes. As values-based approaches continue to be adopted by an increasingly diverse range of heritage professionals, the deficiencies of established typologies must be addressed and guidance for the use of typologies provided in order to avoid to mismanagement of heritage. The proposed framework is purposefully simple, in order to be applicable to, and useful in, a large number of contexts; the inevitability of exceptions does not preclude the utility of a rule. It is based on a broad, dialogical (Harrison 2013; 2015) and symmetrical (Schofield 2009) understanding of heritage, which is accessed through the application of Stephenson's (2008) Cultural Values Model. It can favourably be applied to contexts where professionals retain complete authority in decision-making or where authority is shared.

It is the process of identifying, eliciting and interrogating interpretations of significance that renders statements of significance powerful decision-making tools. A crucial question is therefore how interpretations of heritage and significance are gathered and organised into actionable information. Much work remains to be done in this area, not least how the gathering and processing of information relating to significance can be made more inclusive and efficient in order to allow periodic, context specific reviews. The discussion above has, however, demonstrated that the language we use to do this is not without consequence. In the real world, where statements of significance are often written by a single person, if at all, and time and financial constraints limit consultation, frameworks capable of identifying and arresting preference are essential. Professionals should be willing to operate with a language, which, while perhaps not the most convenient to us, challenges preconceptions and is accessible to the public. Thereby, rather than perpetuating boundaries, some may be torn down. Changing the conservation discourse, the way we speak and think about heritage, is a crucial first step toward creating a theory of conservation that responds to the needs of practice, is informed by academic critical heritage literature and can re-shape practice to retain and regenerate the relevance of heritage for current and future generations.

Notes on Contributors

Harald Fredheim is a trained objects conservator, holding both MA in Principles of Conservation and MSc in Conservation for Archaeology and Museums qualifications from the Institute of Archaeology at University College London. In addition to his academic studies, which have spanned the conservation and management of objects, collections and sites, Harald has conducted placement work with the Fort Amherst Heritage Trust and Medway Council, the National Trust at Knole, the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple and Studio Västsvensk Konservering. In the past, his research has focused on the appropriate use of heritage and the concept of acceptable damage as well as how values-based conservation policies can be applied to 'living' heritage contexts. He is currently a PhD Candidate at the University of York, where he is investigating the sustainability of community-led heritage stewardship projects.

Manal's background is a mixture of architecture, urban planning and heritage and accordingly, her research interest is in the intersection of these three fields. Manal holds a BSc in Architecture (Excellent with honour). Following her undergraduate degree, she spent few years working in the urban planning field exploring the implications of social, cultural, economic and ecological variables in the design and planning of the physical environment. After gaining this experience, Manal became a research and teaching assistant at the University of Bahrain. In 2008 she joined the MSc in Sustainable Heritage course offered by the UCL Centre for Sustainable Heritage where she had the opportunity to foster a new interest in the heritage field. Manal pursued her PhD at the UCL Institute for Sustainable Heritage. Currently, she is a lecturer at the University of Bahrain.

References

Abu-Khafajah, S., and S. Rababeh. 2012. "The Silence of Meanings in Conventional Approaches to Cultural Heritage in Jordan: The Exclusion of Contexts and the Marginalisation of the Intangible." In *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. L. Stefano, P. Davis, and G. Corsane, 71-83. Woodbridge: Boydell Press. Heritage Matters Series 8.

Abungu, G. 2012. "Africa's Rich Intangible Heritage: Managing a Continent's Diverse Resources." In *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. L. Stefano, P. Davis, and G. Corsane, 57-70- Woodbridge: Boydell Press. Heritage Matters Series 8.

Appelbaum, B. 2007. *Conservation Treatment Methodology*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Ashley-Smith, J. 1999. *Risk Assessment for Object Conservation*. Oxford; Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Australia ICOMOS. 1979. "The Australia ICOMOS Guidelines for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance ('Burra Charter')." Accessed 17 March 2016. http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Burra-Charter_1979.pdf.

Australia ICOMOS. 2013. *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013*. Burwood, VIC: Australia ICOMOS.

Avrami, E., R. Mason, and M. de la Torre, eds. 2000. *Values and Heritage Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Baudrillard, J. 1981. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. St. Louis, MO: Telos Press.

Bergdahl, E. 2012. "Conversations Piece: Intangible Cultural Heritage in Sweden." In *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. L. Stefano, P. Davis, and G. Corsane, 47-56. Woodbridge: Boydell Press. Heritage Matters Series 8.

Blake, J. 2002. *Developing a New Standard-Setting Instrument for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Elements for Consideration*. Rev. ed. Paris: UNESCO.

Borrelli, N., and P. Davis. 2012. "How Culture Shapes Nature: Reflections on Ecomuseum Practices." *Nature and Culture* 7 (1): 31-47.

Bouchenaki, M. 2007. "A Major Advance towards a Holistic Approach to Heritage Conservation: The 2003 Intangible Heritage Convention." *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* 2: 106-109.

Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Brown, S. 2010. *Cultural Landscapes: A Practical Guide for Park Management*. Sydney: Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (NSW).

Burke, H., and G. S. Smith. 2010. "Vestiges of Colonialism: Manifestations of the Culture/Nature Divide in Australian Heritage Management." In *Cultural Heritage Management: A Global Perspective*, edited by P. M. Messenger and G. S. Smith, 21-37. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Byrne, D. 1995. "Buddhist Stupa and Thai Social Practice." *World Archaeology* 27 (2): 266-281.

Byrne, D., H. Brayshaw, and T. Ireland. 2003. *Social Significance: A Discussion Paper*. 2nd ed. Hurstville, NSW: NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Byrne, S., A. Clarke, R. Harrison, and R. Torrence, eds. 2011. *Unpacking the Collection: Networks of Material and Social Agency in the Museum*. New York: Springer.

Cane, S. 2009. "Why Do We Conserve? Developing Understanding of Conservation as a Cultural Construct." In *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*, edited by A. Richmond and A. Bracker, 163-176. London: Butterworh-Heinemann.

Canning, S., and D. Spennemann. 2001. "Contested Space: Social Value and the Assessment of Cultural Significance in New South Wales, Australia." In *Heritage Landscapes: Understanding Place and Communities*, edited by M. M. Cotter, W. E. Boyd and J. E. Gardiner, 457-468. Lismore, NSW: Southern Cross University Press.

Caple, C. 2009. "The Aims of Conservation." In *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*, edited by A. Richmond and A. Bracker, 25-31. London: Butterworh-Heinemann.

Carman, J. 1995. "The Importance of Things: Archaeology and the Law." In *Managing Archaeology*, edited by J. Carman, M. A. Cooper, A. Firth, and D. Wheatley, 19-32. London: Routledge.

Carman, J. 2005. "Good Citizens and Sound Economics: The Trajectory of Archaeology in Britain from 'Heritage' to 'Resource'." In *Heritage of Value, Archaeology of*

Renown: Reshaping Archaeological Assessment and Significance, edited by C. Mathers, T. Darvill, and B. J. Little, 43-58. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Carver, M. 1996. "On Archaeological Value." *Antiquity* 70 (267): 45-56.

Castellanos, C., F. Descamps, and M. I. Arauz. 2007. *Joya de Cerén, El Salvador Management Plan Executive Summary*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Chiantore, O., and A. Rava. 2012. *Conserving Contemporary Art: Issues, Methods, Materials, and Research*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Clark, K. 2001. *Informed Conservation: Understanding Historic Buildings and their Landscapes for Conservation*. London: English Heritage.

Clark, K. 2006. "From Significance to Sustainability." In *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: The Proceedings of the London Conference, 25-26 January 2006*, edited by K. Clark, 59-60. Swindon: English Heritage.

Classen, C. 1990. "Sweet Colours, Fragrant Songs: Sensory Models of the Andes and the Amazon." *American Ethnologist* 17 (4): 722-735.

Clavir, M. 2002. *Preserving What Is Valued: Museums, Conservation, and First Nations*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dakin, S. 2003. "There's more to Landscape than Meets the Eye: Towards Inclusive Landscape Assessment in Resource and Environmental Management." *The Canadian Geographer* 47 (2): 185-200.

Darvill, T. 1995. "Value Systems in Archaeology." In *Managing Archaeology*, edited by M. A. Cooper, A. Firth, J. Carman, and D. Wheatley, 40-50. London: Routledge.

de la Torre, M., ed. 2002. *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

de la Torre, M., M. and Mac Lean. 1997. "The Archaeological Heritage in the Mediterranean Region." In *The Conservation of Archaeological Sites in the Mediterranean Region: Proceedings of an International Conference Organized by the Getty Conservation Institute and the J. Paul Getty Museum, 6-12 May 1995*, edited by M. de la Torre, 5-14. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Dean, J. 2000. *Middle Temple Hall: Four Centuries of History*. London: The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple.

Demas, M. 2002. "Planning for Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites: A Values-Based Approach." In *Management Planning for Archaeological Sites*, edited by J. M. Teutonico and G. Palumbo, 27-54. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Duckor, A., J. Cutajar, L. H. Fredheim, and D. Sully. Forthcoming. "A Significant Statement: New Outlooks on Treatment Documentation." *Journal of the Institute of Conservation*.

Emerick, K. 2014. *Conserving and Managing Ancient Monuments: Heritage, Democracy, and Inclusion*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press. Heritage Matters Series 14.

English Heritage. 2008. *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*. London: English Heritage.

Feilden, B. 2003. *Conservation of Historic Buildings*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Fredheim, L. H. 2013. "Use or Abuse: A Framework for Determining the Appropriate Use of Material Heritage." MA diss., University College London.

Fredheim, L. H. 2015. "Conserving Heritage Objects in Use: Applying Digital Humanities Approaches to Significance Problems at the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple." MSc diss., University College London.

Frey, B., 1997. "The Evaluation of Cultural Heritage: Some Critical Issues." In *Economic Perspectives on Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. Hutter and I. Rizzo, 31-49. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gibson, L., and J. Pendlebury, eds. 2009. *Valuing Historic Environments*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate,

Gómez Robles, L. 2010. "A Methodological Approach toward Conservation." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 12 (2): 146-169.

Gwilt, D. 2008. "The Collection Care and Access Project: Balancing Demands on Collections." In *Conservation and Access: Contributions to the London Congress*, edited by D. Saunders, J. H. Townsend and S. Woodcock, 192-195. London: International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works.

Hales, J. 2014. "Bats in Churches: Objective Assessment of Associated Damage Mechanisms." *Archaeology International* 17: 94-109.

Harrison, R., and D. B. Rose. 2010. "Intangible Heritage." In *Understanding Heritage and Memory*, edited by T. Benton, 238-276. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Harrison, R. 2015. "Beyond 'Natural' and 'Cultural' Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of Anthropocene." *Heritage & Society* 8 (1): 24-42.

Heinich, N. 2011. "The Making of Cultural Heritage." *The Nordic Journal of Aesthetics* 22 (40-41): 119-128.

Heritage Collections Council. 2001 *Significance: A Guide to Assessing the Significance of Cultural Heritage Objects and Collections.* Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Howard, P. 2009. "Historic Landscapes and the Recent Past: Whose History?" In *Valuing Historic Environments*, edited by L. Gibson and J. Pendlebury, 51-63. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.

Howes, D. 2006. "Scent, Sound and Synaesthesia: Intersensoriality and Material Culture Theory". In *Handbook of Material Culture*, edited by C. Tilley, W. Keane, S. Küchler, M. Rowlands, and P. Spyer, 161-172. London: Sage.

ICOM. 2002. "Shanghai Charter." Accessed 17 March 2016. http://archives.icom.museum/shanghai_charter.html.

ICOMOS. 1994. "Nara Document on Authenticity." Accessed 17 March 2016. http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf.

ICOMOS. 2007. "The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites: Proposed Final Draft." Accessed 17 March 2016. http://www.enamecharter.org/downloads/ICOMOS_Interpretation_Charter_EN_10-04-07.pdf

ICOMOS New Zealand. 2010. "*ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value.*" Auckland: ICOMOS New Zealand. Accessed 17 March 2016. http://www.icomos.org.nz/docs/NZ_Charter.pdf.

Kapelouzou, I. 2012. "The Inherent Sharing of Conservation Decisions." *Studies in Conservation* 57 (3): 172-182.

Keene, S. 2005. *Fragments of the World: Uses of Museum Collections*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Khalaf, M. 2015. "Urban Conservation Planning Beyond the West: The Case of Bahrain." PhD diss., University College London.

Kreps, C. F. 2003. *Liberating Culture: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation, and Heritage Preservation*. London: Routledge.

Kreps, C. 2009. "Indigenous Curation, Museums, and Intangible Cultural Heritage." In *Intangible Heritage*, edited by L. Smith and N. Akagawa, 193-208. Abingdon: Routledge.

Lemonnier, P. 2012. *Mundane Objects: Materiality and Non-Verbal Communication*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. UCL Institute of Archaeology Critical Cultural Heritage Series 10.

Lertcharnrit, T. 2010. "Heritage Values and Meanings in Contemporary Thailand." In *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, edited by G. S. Smith, P. M. Messenger, and H. A. Soderland, 279-285. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Lipe, W. 1984. "Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources." In *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management Systems*, edited by H. Cleere, 1-11. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Lithgow, K., and D. Thackray. 2009. "The National Trust's Approach to Conservation." *Conservation Bulletin* 60: 16-19.

Lloyd, S. 2013. *The Courts & Gardens of the Middle Temple*. Stroud, Glos.: Pitkin.

Lowenthal, D. 1998. "Fabricating Heritage." *History and Memory* 10 (1): 5-24.

Maeer, G. 2014. "The Values and Benefits of Heritage: Do Economists Think about More than Money?" *Association for Preservation Technology Bulletin* 45 (2/3): 57-63.

Mason, R. 2002. "Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices." In *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. de la Torre, 5-30. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Mason, R. 2006. "Theoretical and Practical Arguments for Values-Centered Preservation." *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 3 (2): 21-48.

Michalski, S. 1990. "Time's Effects on Paintings." In *Shared Responsibility: Proceedings of a Seminar for Curators and Conservators*, edited by B. A. Ramsay-Jolicœur and I. N. M. Wainwright, 39-53. Ottowa: National Gallery of Canada.

Muñoz Viñas, S. 2005. *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Orbaşlı, A. 2000. *Tourists in Historic Towns: Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*. New York: E&FN Spon.

Orbaşlı, A. 2008. *Architectural Conservation: Principles and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Pearson, M., and S. Sullivan. 1995. *Looking after Heritage Places: The Basics of Heritage Planning for Managers, Landowners and Administrators*. Carlton, VIC: Melbourne University Press.

Poulios, I. 2010. "Moving beyond a Values-Based Approach to Heritage Conservation." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 12 (2): 170-185.

Poulios, I. 2014. *The Past in the Present: A Living Heritage Approach - Meteora, Greece*. London: Ubiquity Press.

Pye, E. 2001. *Caring for the Past: Issues in Conservation for Archaeology and Museums*. London: James & James.

Reigl, A. (1902) 1982. "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and its Origin." Translated and edited by K. Foster and D. Ghirardo. *Oppositions* 25 (autumn): 21-51.

Richmond, A., and A. Bracker, eds. 2009. *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*. London: Butterworh-Heinemann.

Rivers, S. and N. Umney. 2003. *Conservation of Furniture*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Rodwell, D. 2007. *Conservation and Sustainability in Historic Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rudolff, B. 2006. "'Intangible' and 'Tangible' Heritage: A Topology of Culture in Contexts of Faith." PhD diss., Johannes Gutenberg-University of Mainz.

Russell, R., and K. Winkworth. 2010. *Significance 2.0: A Guide to Assessing the Significance of Collections.* Collections Council of Australia, Commonwealth of Australia. Accessed 17 March 2016. http://arts.gov.au/sites/default/files/resources-publications/significance-2.0/pdfs/significance-2.0.pdf/.

Schädler-Saub, U., and A. Weyer, eds. 2010. *Theory and Practice in the Conservation of Modern and Contemporary Art: Reflections on the Roots and the Perspectives*. London: Archetype.

Schofield, J. 2009. "Being Autocentric: Towards Symmetry in Heritage Management Practices." In *Valuing Historic Environments*, edited by L. Gibson and J. Pendlebury, 93-113. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.

Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Staniforth, S. and H. Lloyd. 2012. "Use It or Lose It: The Opportunities and Challenges of Bringing Historic Places to Life." *Studies in Conservation* 57 (sup1): 286-294.

Stephenson, J. 2008. "The Cultural Values Model: An Integrated Approach to Values in Landscapes." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 84 (2): 127-139.

Strlič, M., D. Thickett, J. Taylor, and M. Cassar. 2013. "Damage Functions in Heritage Science." *Studies in Conservation* 58 (2): 80-87.

Stubbs, J. H. 2009. *Time Honored: A Global View of Architectural Conservation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sully, D. 2007. Colonising and Conservation. In *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses outside New Zealand*, 27-43. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Szmelter, I. 2010. "A New Conceptual Framework for the Preservation of the Heritage of Modern Art." In *Theory and Practice in the Conservation of Modern and Contemporary Art: Reflections on the Roots and the Perspectives*, edited by U. Schädler-Saub and A. Weyer, 33-49. London: Archetype.

Taylor, J. 2015. "Embodiment Unbound: Moving Beyond Divisions in the Understanding and Practice of Heritage Conservation." *Studies in Conservation* 60 (1): 65-77.

Teutonico, J. M., and G. Palumbo, eds. 2002. *Management Planning for Archaeological Sites*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Thompson, M. 1979. *Rubbish Theory: The Creation and Destruction of Value*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Throsby, D. 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Throsby, D. 2002. "Cultural Capital and Sustainability Concepts in the Economics of Cultural Heritage." In *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. de la Torre, 101-117. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Throsby, D. 2006. "The Value of Cultural Heritage: What Can Economics Tell Us?" In *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: The Proceedings of the London Conference, 25-26 January 2006*, edited by K. Clark, 40-43. Swindon: English Heritage.

Tjelldén, A. and K. B. Botfeldt. 2008. "Konservering af Arkæologiske Kompositte Materialer." *Meddelelser om Konservering* 2008 (1): 20-27.

Truscott, M. C. 2000. "'Intangible Values' as Heritage in Australia." *ICOMOS News* 10 (1): 4-11.

Truscott, M. C. 2004. "Contexts for Change: Paving the Way to the 1999 Burra Charter." *Historic Environment* 18 (1): 30-34.

UNESCO. 2010. *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape HUL – Preliminary Report*. Paris: World Heritage Centre.

van Zanten, W. 2004. "Constructing New Terminology for Intangible Cultural Heritage." *Museum International* 56 (1-2): 36-44.

Walter, N. 2013. "From Values to Narrative: A New Foundation for the Conservation of Historic Buildings." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 20 (6): 634-650.

Waterton, E. 2010. *Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Waterton, E., and L. Smith. 2009. "There Is no Such Thing as Heritage." In *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*, edited by E. Waterton and L. Smith, 28-47. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Waterton. E., L. Smith, and G. Campbell. 2006. "The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12 (4): 339-355.

Watson, S. 2009. "Archaeology, Visuality and the Negotiation of Heritage." In *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*, edited by E. Waterton and L. Smith, 28-47. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Whitelaw, L. 2013. *Middle Temple: A Guide. Rev. ed.* London: Middle Temple.

Worthing, D., and S. Bond. 2008. *Managing Built Heritage: The Role of Cultural Significance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Zetterstrom-Sharp, J. 2015. "Heritage as Future-making: Aspiration and Common Destiny in Sierra Leone." *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 21 (6): 609-627.