



ELICITING A HISTORIC CITY'S HERITAGE VALUES THROUGH THE ANALYSIS OF ITS DESCRIPTIONS OVERTIME

An Overview

Obtención de los valores patrimoniales de una ciudad histórica a través del análisis de sus descripciones en el tiempo

MARÍA SOLEDAD MOSCOSO-CORDERO ^{1,2}

¹Universidad del Azuay, Ecuador

²Universidad de Valladolid, España

KEYWORDS

*Heritage values elicitation
Significance mutation
Historical sites
City's descriptions
Discourse analysis
Grounded theory
Content analysis*

ABSTRACT

Heritage values are basic in conservation, nevertheless there is not a methodology to analyze their variation over time and how it has affected the conservation of heritage assets. Therefore, a methodology that allows us to determine their variation in written descriptions about a specific heritage site was needed. In this article we have addressed the concept of heritage values and stressed their importance and their variability over time, but also analyzed different methods from the field of linguistics that would better adapt to determine heritage values variation and their application in the heritage field.

PALABRAS CLAVE

*Valoración Patrimonial
Cambios en la significancia
Sitios históricos
Descripción de ciudades
Análisis de discurso
Teoría Fundamentada
Análisis de Contenido*

RESUMEN

Los valores patrimoniales son significados asociados al patrimonio, por lo que reconocerlos permite una adecuada conservación. Los valores, al ser significados, dependen de las percepciones de las personas e instituciones relacionadas con dicho patrimonio y cambian a lo largo de la historia. A partir de la literatura histórica sobre la ciudad es posible deducir los valores que determinan la conservación o transformación del patrimonio edificado. Para esto hemos decidido emprender una investigación a través de métodos cualitativos de análisis de discurso y análisis de contenido para identificar la variación de estos valores.

Recibido: 08/ 07 / 2022

Aceptado: 30/ 09 / 2022

1. Introduction

This research topic was chosen because heritage values are the main instrument in heritage conservation, but even if the variability of heritage values has been stressed in several studies, there is no methodology placed to analyze this variation over time. Therefore, there was a need to look for a method that would allow us to determine its variation in written descriptions of a specific historic site. In this literature review article, we have first addressed the concept and the importance heritage values have been given in heritage theory and its evolution but also to find a methodology in the field of linguistic that would better adapt to determine heritage values variation and the application for these methodologies in the heritage field.

2. Heritage values evolution in time

Most of the twentieth century conservation was focused on maintaining heritage fabric and was aimed at preserving historic assets according to two traditional values: aesthetic and historic, based on the contributions made by Italian theorists such as Cesare Brandi (1963). But it is necessary to ask ourselves: who decides that something is heritage? Originally it was the academics who were called to determine if something had characteristics to become "heritage", later by first years of the 21st century the conception evolved towards "value-based conservation" trying to avoid subjectivity. However, these values were still determined by an intellectual elite, under the premise that assets possess intrinsic values (Muñoz Viñas, 2004).

Nowadays, heritage is valued from a social and democratic perspective, promoting the idea that the entire population must participate in its conservation and exploitation. Therefore, heritage has evolved from a particularistic vision towards using monuments as examples of national culture and collective identity (Llull Peñalba, 2005).

In this regard, Susan Pearce, reinforces the issue of heritage construction:

Cultural heritage is cognitively constructed (...) It is a social fact, and like all social facts, it is both passive and active. Its passivity rests in its role as an arena of selection: most elements (of whatever kind) do not make it into the heritage zone. Its activeness lies in its influence: once particular elements are established as heritage, they exercise power; they have a life of their own that affects people's minds and consequently affects their choices. (Pearce, 2000, p.59)

In the last decades, emphasis has been placed on the need to include a social vision in the subject of heritage conservation, considering that those elements worthy of being conserved are such because they embody several meanings important for communities. Therefore, heritage is something in which people agree to understand as such, and their values are no longer something inherited, indisputable, or objective, but something projected on them by people. Heritage quality does not come from objects, but from subjects: it can be defined as a non-physical energy that the subject radiates on an object and that it reflects (Muñoz Viñas, 2004).

Moreover, heritage assets reflect a certain society's psychology, costumes, and ideals, and its transmission is justified by the meanings they represent (Edson, 2004). Therefore, and as suggested by Llorenç Prats, heritage is a resource from the past that is useful to interpret the present and to build the future (Prats, 2005). "Heritage is both intensely personal and intensely political. In effect, these two elements go hand in hand, as heritage is hotly contested because we each have our own views on what represents heritage, and what is worth conserving" (Alpin, 2002, p.358).

As proposed by Susan Pearce (2000), heritage produces a back-and-forth association between community and object, the object becomes the representation of the beliefs that a determinate community has about itself, this people would take good care of the object as a mean of projecting their own imaginary. In fact, there is a selection that needs to be made of what assets have the merits to become heritage, in this way a society of a particular moment decides the way it wants to be remembered. This selection and representation of objects of the past is not neutral, because it depends on a determinate point of view that embodies specific values and ideals, therefore every culture or community plays an important role in determining and constructing their own cultural heritage (Juul Jensen, 2000).

For the reasons above, we can state that heritage is built day by day, and it is not an unmovable ensemble of physical objects but of elements that embody feelings, interests, beliefs because of a never-ending process made by a group of individuals. Cultural Heritage is therefore considered a social construction, that results of social process that are specific to a certain place and time (Arévalo, 2012).

Objects, collections, buildings, and places become recognized as "heritage" through conscious decisions and unspoken values of particular people (...) and for reasons that are strongly shaped by social contexts and processes. Thus, the meaning of heritage can no longer be thought of as fixed, as the traditional notions of intrinsic value and authenticity suggest. (Avrami, Mason & de la Torre, 2000, p.6)

In short, heritage is embodied by object or manifestation that a given society has received as an inheritance from its ancestors, which is an important element for their identity, and it is intended to be passed on to future

generations. The hypothesis that heritage is not the object itself, but that it is in the minds of people who are able to recognize values in it, is getting stronger (Caraballo Perichi, 2011). Laurajane Smith proposes that the sense of heritage is not in the possession of an asset, but in the act of transmitting it, of receiving memories and knowledge from it. The use, reform and recreation of these memories and the knowledge that is born from that object serves us to understand who we are, and who we want to be. The loss of an asset is important, not because of the loss of its inherent value, but because it has lost the ability to tell stories and be a reference for future generations (Smith, 2006).

Heritage is therefore a process of active identity making and remaking, a useful cultural tool or discourse through which a community or other group or collective defines themselves. What is important, however, is that this is a process that is more about change than cultural stasis. It is a process not simply about the preservation or conservation of traditions but is also a process in which cultural and social values are rewritten and redefined for the needs of the present. (Smith, 2006, p.273)

Additionally, Smith proposes that every heritage is, in essence, nonmaterial by stating that "(...) heritage not so much as a 'thing', but as a cultural and social process, which engages with acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present" (Smith, 2006, p.2). It is very important to understand heritage as a process, therefore it is necessary to understand the current heritage policies, and the changes that have occurred in the conservation of cultural property, asking us why something is as significant that justifies that a given society safeguards it and transmits it to the next generations. Gérard Lenclud states that it is not the past that produces the present, but conversely, the present is the one that shapes the past (Lenclud, 1987). Therefore, heritage assets cannot be merely conserved, but we should consider the possibility that each new generation could modify these assets, for better or worse (Avrami *et al.*, 2000).

To adore the past is not enough; good care taking involves continual creation. Heritage is ever revitalized; our legacy is not simply original but includes our forebears' alterations and additions. We treasure that heritage in our own protective and transformative fashion, handing it down reshaped in the faith that our heirs will also become creative as well as retentive stewards. (Lowenthal, 2000, p.22)

This paper aims to address heritage as a changing concept; therefore, it is necessary to understand that heritage values are mutable. And of course, this approach could make a big difference if we are working on a value-based preservation perspective. Ioannis Poullos defines value-based preservation as the coordinated and structured operation of a heritage object or site with the purpose of protecting the significance of the place as determined through a values assessment (Poullos, 2010).

A basic element in a value-based preservation approach are the stakeholders who are the nucleus of conservation. Heritage is not such because of its inherent values, or its material aspect but because of the values to it ascribed by stakeholders. The main objective of conservation is not merely the preservation of the fabric, but the protection of the values assigned to the asset. (Poullos, 2010)

In this dynamic, slowly values have begun to be researched to highlight the extensiveness that cultural heritage can have, which goes beyond the aesthetic scope and reflects varied ways in which people give meaning to buildings, landscapes, places, or objects that are around it (Bluestone, 2000). According to Randall Mason a heritage value is understood as the ensemble of positive qualities or characteristics appreciated in sites or cultural objects by certain individuals or stakeholders. These qualities or characteristics appear from the interaction between an asset and its context, and therefore they could never be understood as intrinsic (Mason, 2002). Nevertheless, there are several authors that keep the idea of the existence of both intrinsic and extrinsic heritage values: Rodney William Carter & Richard Bramley propose that:

Intrinsic qualities are those that inherently exist in a resource and do not require modification for the value to be realised (sic). Often, intrinsic values can be assessed objectively and hence the significance level attributed to them can gain widespread agreement. (Carter & Bramley, 2002, p.178)

From this perspective, the existence of an extrinsic value depends of the negotiation that could take place between a group of people, which leads us to think that extrinsic values depend on the perception determinate group of people has about an object which therefore is not related to the object has as such, unless it is made of a precious metal. The meanings that the object can represent for a group of people, is what from our perspective turns values into something extrinsic. Isabel Villaseñor shares our perception, as she proposes that the idea that cultural heritage embodies intrinsic values has a main consequence that is the tendency to consider that the values contained in the heritage are permanent and unalterable. It is understood, for instance, that the works of a particular painter have artistic and historical values, but it is not estimated that they evolve in the same way that social groups change their way of conceiving and interpreting them (Villaseñor, 2011).

It is important to understand values as a series of meanings assigned to objects considered heritage assets by stakeholders related to them. Nevertheless, the regard over those objects can be diverse and come from different

sources that should be considered. (Delgado, 2006) From this perspective, finding the meaning of heritage is not a task reserved for professionals, but for users, visitors and those who build meanings from those objects or sites.

We need a system for taking measure of and working with the reception side of cultural heritage. Here conservators can take an active role; however, they also need to be open to the possibility that the places they conserve for one purpose may take on very different meanings over time. (Bluestone, 2000, p.67)

Obviously, there is the possibility that these meanings are contrasted, and that is where the multidisciplinary team that oversees the value assessment must be able to decide those meanings that have a preponderance over others.

Values give some things significance over others and thereby transform some objects and places into 'heritage'. The aim of conservation is not to conserve material for its own sake but, rather, to maintain (and shape) the values embodied by the heritage—with physical intervention or treatment being one of many means toward that end. To achieve that end, such that the heritage is meaningful to those whom it is intended to benefit (i.e., future generations), it is necessary to examine why and how heritage is valued, and by whom. (Avrami, Mason & de la Torre, 2000, p.7)

Conservation does not directly benefit the heritage object, nor is it the one that is harmed if it is not taken care of, but the people and social agents that confer value on it are those who would suffer the effect of its destruction (Villaseñor, 2011). In fact, the social construction of heritage can be easily evidenced in acts as simple as when people donate an object to a museum, when they take the measures and carry out the procedures to include their heritage property within the list of protected buildings in a city, or when entire neighborhoods take community initiatives for the protection of cultural property or expressions. From this perspective we agree with Lowenthal that "Heritage is never merely conserved or protected; it is modified—both enhanced and degraded—by each new generation" (Lowenthal, 2000, p.23).

Frequently, the assets produced by the popular classes are more representative than those produced by the upper social classes, because in them it is possible to read certain needs and ambitions of the groups they have built them, and also tend to be examples of creativity and aesthetic value, the need for protection of such elements has been gaining ground in the attention of experts, who have been looking for new possibilities for their assessment and to undertake actions towards the conservation of these elements that are so important in many cities, because they represent, better than the glorious architecture, its evolution, customs and traditions.

Something that is of special interest in heritage, beyond the problem of physical conservation processes and their management, is related to cultural significance and social values. The difficulty of understanding why something has a meaning, to understand for whom it should be conserved, and who must conserve it (Avrami, Mason & de la Torre, 2000). However, if this paradigm is applied, a series of difficulties arise: how to determine the breadth of the stakeholder's network that includes informants, spokespersons, and experts, and achieve adequate representation without it being so large that it becomes unmanageable? (Mason, 2002). There is no direct answer, and in fact it will depend on the asset that is being conserved.

Cultural products have had different meanings for different groups and communities, and in this way the specific meaning of each heritage site or object is determined by the set of values attributed to it. These meanings are responsible for transferring identity and memory and serve to "to construct ways of understanding and making the present meaningful" (Smith, 2006, p.75).

Finally, heritage values are not homogeneous, or permanent, or even objective, abstract values are reflected in cultural assets and manifestations that serve as a reference to the identity resources of a group of people (Caraballo Perichi, 2011). Heritage values found in cultural assets serve as a source of the meaning and as a reason for its conservation. It is necessary to keep in mind what happens as society changes, as these changing social conditions determine the conservation of assets.

In the field of cultural heritage conservation, values are critical to deciding what to conserve — what material goods will represent us and our past to future generations — as well as to determining how to conserve (...) In short, values are an important, determining factor in the current practices and prospects of the conservation field. (Avrami, Mason & de la Torre, 2000, p.1)

In sum, if our intention is to promote a through heritage conservation in a meaningful way, we must understand the ways in which values are negotiated and determined. And in addition to preserving what is relevant in the present, we should ask ourselves what will be relevant and significant for future generations (Avrami *et al.*, 2000). Bearing in mind that our goal is to understand in a manifest way why certain objects have reached our generation with the "heritage" label, it would be very pertinent to understand the variation in heritage values in history, and thus demonstrate that these changes have motivated to the disappearance, conservation, or transformation of cultural assets of the past.

2.1. Mutable Heritage Values

From a materialist perspective, historical assets are judged by the value they are supposed to have in themselves, regardless of the particularities of their creation process or the interests that motivated their selection, becoming an evaluation of the assets by their intrinsic values, leaving aside decisions about why and with what criteria these 'heritage' assets had been selected, ignoring that those assets could contain meanings attributed to them at a given historical moment (Delgado, 2006).

According to Laurajane Smith, "the traditional Western account of 'heritage' tends to emphasize the material basis of heritage, and attributes an inherent cultural value or significance to these things" (Smith, 2006, p.3).

Smith (2006) states that "although the physicality of heritage provides a sense of the immutability of value and meaning, these are never fixed, but always subject to negotiation and change" (p.75). Moreover, we agree with Avrami, Mason & de la Torre (2000), when they say that it is necessary to rescue the conservation process from the hands of technicians, since it is not a matter of conservation of physical condition, but it is necessary to promote the need for research on conservation in its relationship with economic, cultural and social forces in order to understand how the latest, in turn, shapes society at any given time.

Ciro Caravallo Perichi (2011), also pledging to this trend, thinks that it is necessary to empower people, and defines the term "value" as: "a concept that on the one hand expresses the changing needs of man, and on the other it sets the positive significance of natural and social phenomena for the existence and development of the community" (p.26). Reinforcing this idea Martha de la Torre (2000), cites Mahatma Gandhi stating that "A nation's culture resides in the hearts and in the soul of its people", which could also mean that the idea of what is heritage would inevitably change if the people's values change, and this is evidently a process that has been a continuum during the times. As we have noted in previous lines, one of the main characteristics of the values is their variability. While values are constructions of the human being, these vary related to the context in which the value assessment is being made.

A historical object (...) symbolizes many very different things and things at different historical moments and among different human groups. The fact is that in each historical phase (...) in the span of one or two generations, the symbolic load acquires different connotations, producing a sequence in time of interpretive figures, which are the ones that ultimately confer its fundamental value on the symbolic object. (Ballart, 1997, p.82)

We could talk about a variation in relation to time and place, however, as we have said before, in the same historical moment the meanings attributed to objects may vary depending on the social groups being consulted (Jaramillo Paredes, 2013). If we conceive heritage in terms of cultural capital, as Néstor García Canclini (1999) proposes, it is possible to understand it as a social process that "accumulates, renews, produces and yields that the various sectors appropriate in uneven form" (p.18).

What we recognize today as heritage is what past generations recognized as important, together with what the present generation has recognized as meaningful elements from their own set of values, in the same way future generations using their own values and criteria, will let go of some of the things that the present generation has tried to preserve, and will identify others as its heritage (De la Torre, 2000). Therefore, heritage should be understood as a process of conservation and innovation (Arévalo, 2012). We understand heritage as a negotiated version of the history promoted by institutions and politic elites, and therefore it is necessary to include a broader scope of stakeholders in that construction (Smith, 2006).

Heritage is not necessarily about the stasis of cultural values and meanings, but may equally be about cultural change (...) Heritage is about negotiation – about using the past, and collective or individual memories, to negotiate new ways of being and expressing identity. (Smith, 2006, p.4)

According to Avrami and others (2000), heritage is a very fluid phenomenon, so it is neither a stable set of goods nor does it have a fixed meaning. Thus, the value of objects and places is neutral until they are attributed a cultural value. "Value is learned about or discovered in heritage by humans, and thus depends on the particular cultural, intellectual, historical, and psychological frames of reference held by the particular individuals or groups involved" (Lipe, 1984, p.2).

Thus, the past is always interpreted, never preserved with its meanings and values unchanged, because in each moment the present will redefine what represents the current needs, aspirations, and desires "Individuals project value onto an object, place, or resource based on their own needs and desires, shaped by their current social, cultural, and economic circumstances" (Spennemann, 2006, p.7). As a result, identity is actively and continuously recreated and negotiated as institutions, communities and people reinterpret, remember, and reveal the meanings of the past from the today's perspective.

Cultural meanings are fluid and ultimately created through doing, and through the aspirations and desires of the present, but are validated and legitimized through the creation and recreation of a sense of linkage to

the past. Heritage provides a mentality and discourse in which these linkages are forged and recast. (Smith, 2006)

The contingency nature of the equity values leads us to think that its construction is outside the object itself, where social processes play a fundamental role. It is necessary to recognize the contingent nature of heritage values and to be flexible by conceiving them as “a constantly changing social construction and not as the frozen materialization of the past” (Villaseñor, 2011). Heritage values are in culture and social spheres, so they are always changing (Mason, 2002), therefore change must be understood as a contribution to the wealth of heritage, as proposed by Daniel Bluestone, understanding change is as important as to understand the original intention (Bluestone, 2000). Besides, heritage values are not objectively assigned, they are not permanent or invariable:

Values are produced out of the interaction of an artifact and its contexts; they don't emanate from the artifact itself. Values can thus only be understood with reference to social, historical, and even spatial contexts—through the lens of who is defining and articulating the value. (Mason, 2002, p.8)

For the present study, it is believed necessary to understand the origin of heritage values, because a deep consideration is needed to get a better understanding which will end into a better adapted conservation process (Villaseñor, 2011). Nevertheless, to be able to have a deep understanding of heritage values mutation process it is necessary to work with qualitative research methodologies that will be briefly explained and to assess the use these tools have had in the conservation field and their adaptability.

3. Discourse Analysis and qualitative content analysis as tools for study of mutability of heritage values

Discourse analysis “is the study of language at use in the world, not just to say things, but to do things” (Gee, 2011, ix). It is part of the qualitative knowledge, which is a set of interdisciplinary approaches that can be used in a range of social research fields. There are several ways to deal with discourse analysis, most of them related to linguistics or grammatic. There are also some approximations that are less centered in the linguistic details to give more importance to the ideas and themes considered in the discourse.

Considered among the first approach is the Critical Discourse Analysis, the Historic Discourse Analysis. Included in the second group is the Critical Content Analysis and the Founded Theory. In this section we will analyze the differences and similarities of these approaches with the aim to get a deep insight to create our own methodology adapted to heritage values mutability.

3.1. The Critical Discourse Analysis

This analysis seeks to understand the way discourse is implicated in power relations (Janks, 1997). It is possible to deduct that there are great similarities and some differences amongst the Critical Discourse Analysis categories, some empirical and other methodological, this added to the approach taken by the researchers (Meyer, 2003).

Beyond the particularities, the application of these methods together with a list of linguistic devices developed through the analysis, will depend greatly on the research questions and scope. (Philips & Jorgensen, 2002). Among the CDA approaches is the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA), that was first developed by Ruth Wodak, that aims to outline the intertextual history among phrases and arguments (Philips & Jorgensen, 2002). The DHA gets its arguments from the ethnographical research about the past and has a wide data recollection range, it analyses news, political discourses, common beliefs, and contemporary discourses (Philips & Jorgensen, 2002).

Meyer suggests that the analysis of traditional discourse is too focused on the text, while this approach is mostly centered on the process of producing the text (Meyer, 2003). Likewise, it appears as a new proposal that arises from the relationship between discourse analysis and historical linguistics (Philips & Jorgensen, 2002).

Ruth Wodak stresses the need to ask ourselves several questions while analyzing a text, in order to broaden our knowledge, such as the way people, object, phenomena, events, processes and actions are named and referred linguistically; the characteristics and qualities attributed to stakeholders, objects, phenomena, events, processes and actions; the arguments that are used in the discourse being analyzed; the perspectives from where these choices, attributions and arguments are expressed (Philips & Jorgensen, 2002).

The historical approach plays an important role in the discourse interpretation leads to a re-contextualization as an important process that links texts and discourses in an intertextual and interdiscursive manner in time (Philips & Jorgensen, 2002).

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) propose a program of eight steps to accomplish a DHA:

1. Activation and consultation of preceding theoretical knowledge.
2. Systematic collection of data and context information
3. Selection and preparation of data for specific analyses
4. Specification of the research question and formulation of assumptions
5. Qualitative pilot analysis
6. Detailed case studies

7. Formulation of critique
8. Application of the detailed analytical results

The DHA understands both oral and written language as a discursive a non-discursive social practice (Jager, 2003). It focusses on the research problem and not in merely linguistic elements. Both theory and method are eclectic since they are adaptable. Before any analytical task and any theoretical work, it is necessary to undertake field work and ethnographic processes to explore the research object. This approach requires a constant roundtrip between theory and empirical data. Multiple discursive varieties are studied to understand their relationship with the topics and arguments. It is mandatory to analyze the historical context for an adequate discourse interpretation. Categories and analysis tools are defined according to the previous process and the research problem. Great theories are the fundament and mid-range theories are useful for the analysis objectives. Finally, the results should be available for experts since they should contribute to change certain discursive and social practices. A characteristic feature of the DHA is aimed to work in a multimethod way, including different approaches enabled by the empirical character of its data (Wodak, 2003).

As seen in the previous paragraph an essential element of DHA is the absolute need to include both field work and ethnographical data to explore the research object as a previous condition that would lead to any analysis and theorization (Wodak, 2003).

This particularity shows us that this kind of discourse analysis does not adapt to our research objectives since we are trying to define the variation of heritage values in time, and in a wide timeframe we could not undertake an ethnographic study of past views.

3.2. Grounded Theory

It was first developed by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss. Its qualitative nature focuses on the search of the meaning and understanding of data in order to build an innovative theory, through a detailed inspection of data over a theoretical sampling, which means that samples are not defined from the very beginning of the research activity but are built from an inductive sampling from initial findings (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

Originally Glaser was linked to the sociological field and would begin to work with medical topics and about the difficulty medical personnel would have to face people with terminal illness. He asked for help to Barney Strauss, a sociologist who was also linked to social research. From their research "Awareness of Dying" was published in 1965 where a theory about the need of consciousness when dealing with dying patients. This theory was based in the data from the research sustained.

Strauss believed that the theoretical concepts should be "empirically saturated" which means that the theoretical concepts should be grounded in the observation and field research, therefore the name was set as Grounded Theory (Legewie & Schervier-Legewie, 2004). This theory would appear as opposed to the functional theories which are too positivist (Páramo Morales, 2015). This method was not seeking to prove theories but to build them from data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The researcher does not begin the process with a preconceived theory but builds one from a theoretical process of data. (Goulding, 2000). The methodology uses a coding system that groups similitudes found in data (Strauss & Corbin, 2002) Coding is the "analytical process through which data is fragmented, conceptualized and integrated to form a theory" (Strauss & Corbin, 2002, p.11).

The researcher using the founded theory has a retrospective and critical view. He knows that there is a certain tendency to bias when using it, but it helps to have abstract thinking, it also allows him to be flexible and open to constrictive criticism. Both the theory and the data analysis require interpretation, but at least it is an interpretation based on systematic research. (Legewie & Schervier-Legewie, 2004) This methodology changes the usual order of literature review and data collection, since the data collection is not a finished episode before the analysis, but a two-way process. (Strauss & Corbin, 2002) It has been used in a variety of research fields that of course include architecture and cultural heritage. (Legewie & Schervier-Legewie, 2004).

The grounded theory approach has several basic aspects:

1. Theoretical coding is not only a tool to class and describe phenomena but to develop theoretical concepts while it explains the phenomena (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).
2. The theoretical sampling, that implies to begin the analytic work after the first sampling, contributes to shape hypothesis that influence further material collection.
3. The comparison is made between phenomena and contexts, from where theoretical concepts emerge (Wodak, 2003).

Glaser recognizes the variability of the founded theory methodology since it must be adapted to each research question and context (Goulding, 2000). For the founded theory it is extremely important the socially constructed nature of the truth (Páramo Morales, 2015).

Theorizing, this building a theory, requires a long and complex process, a work that goes beyond conceiving or intuiting ideas or concepts, but to shape them in a logic, systematic and explanatory scheme. Thus, to arrive to all the formulated hypotheses must be checked comparing them to the data, that results into concepts, properties and dimensions that would lead to deductions. How is the resulting theory validated? It is validated by a comparison

of concepts, comparing them to the data extracted from the research and assessing the way they adapt to the theory (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

The founded theory begins by the problem formulation, from a flexible research question to face the phenomena, that could initially be very wide, but that gets adjusted during the research process and gets narrower as the concepts and their relationships are discovered. A basic advice is to promote in the researcher a strangeness ability, this is to have a distance from is preconceived ideas to find new interpretations about the analyzed texts. During the analysis, it is important to make comparisons that could stimulate the thinking about the dimensions and properties of the research to get a good perspective of it. It is also positive to explore the same episode from different data, that are gathered in diverse ways (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

The idea is not to undertake a line-by-line coding of all the documents, but a quick review of the document, and if the researcher finds something potentially interesting then a line-by-line coding is needed. Usually from this detailed analysis that categories and subcategories get related and new concepts are discovered (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

There are three kinds of coding that complement each other, these are: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Open coding is the “the analytical process by means of which the concepts are identified, and their properties and dimensions are discovered in through the data” (Strauss & Corbin, 2002, p.110).

The ultimate purpose of creating this label is to let the analyst group similar ideas under a common name. “By conceptualizing we make an abstraction. The data is broken down into incidents, ideas, events, and discrete acts that are then given a name that represents or replaces them” (Strauss & Corbin, 2002, p.114). During the analysis the researcher will understand that some concepts can be grouped into a larger abstraction, this organization of concepts into categories is useful because it allows a reduction of the data found (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

According to Strauss & Corbin (2002), There are several ways to perform an open coding task:

- Line by line coding, is a very useful procedure but takes a lot of time. It is especially useful in the first stages of the analysis because it helps to find categories in an efficient way and to develop them through an additional sampling process known as theoretical sampling.
- Paragraph by paragraph coding, is useful to determine the principal idea of each paragraph and from this process to undertake a thorough analysis.
- General document analysis based on the way the document is related to other documents previously coded and from these similarities or differences the analyst decides to make a thorough analysis of the document.

When concepts emerge from the analysis, it is important to write them down as memos. Analysis software also have these features and let the analyst work with concepts and to link them to memos to develop a theory. Since coding seeks to group similar elements according to defined properties which vary according to their dimensions. From this specific dimensions it is possible to find patterns and from them it is possible to build a theory.

Axial coding relates categories with its subcategories, to get to precise and convincing explanations about phenomena. It is useful to begin the regrouping process from the data broken during the open coding. The subcategories do not represent the phenomena but respond to the questions about them such as (how, when, where, who, why) explaining the phenomena in a detailed way (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

Categories and subcategories are not necessarily defined from the beginning, but they come from the analysis process. The procedure for an axial coding is as follows:

1. Identifying the conditions, actions/interactions and consequences linked to a phenomenon
2. Relating a category with its subcategories through sentences that relate one to another.
3. Searching for the key data that suggest the way the main categories could be related (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

Both open and axial coding are performed at the same time. Coding could become an infinite process, nevertheless, a category is considered saturated when no new information comes from coding. During axial coding process it is common the use of diagrams that help to better understand the relationship among concepts. This process must be undertaken from the beginning of the research since it helps the analyst to find relationships and to build theories (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

On the other hand, selective coding lets the analyst to integrate and tune the theory, once the open and axial coding is finished. The first step to integrate concepts in a theory it is necessary to determine the main category, which represents the main research topic; this category evolves during the research process (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

A central category must be one where the other main categories could relate, it must appear frequently in the data. The explanation that comes from relating categories is logic and consistent. The name or the phrase used to describe the central category must be abstract enough so it can help to develop a general theory. While the concept is analytically refined through the integration to other concepts, the theory becomes deeper and more explanatory. The concept may explain variations and the main subject the data is related to; when the conditions change the explanation is kept, even if the way a phenomenon is expressed may vary. Contradictory and alternate cases in terms of the main idea might be explained (Strauss, 1987).

To integrate the concepts in an adequate way, it is desirable to write the argument of the history, use diagrams, and classify the memos previously written (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

3.3. Qualitative Content Analysis.

Qualitative research is any type of research that produces findings which are not produced by any statistic procedures or other quantification methods. Qualitative analysis is a non-mathematical process of interpretation, carried out with the purpose of discovering concepts and relationships among the raw material to be organized into a theoretical explanatory scheme (Strauss & Corbin, 2002).

According to what has been expressed by Andreú (2002) it is a text interpretation technique considering texts any written, recorder, painted or filmed material where data is registered. The common denominator of all these materials is its capacity of keeping a content that could be read and interpreted to extract knowledge from a diverse aspects and phenomena of social live. This analysis is based on a systematic, objective, replicable y valid reading activity.

It is a research technique used in the field of sociology that combines data observation and production. Considering that any text or image has two communication instances: what the author pretends to communicate and what is hidden but uses the text as an instrument of communication (Andreú, 2002).

In this methodology the context is the reference frame that is useful to infer the meaning of the text, the same as it works in the discourse analysis. As said by Andreú (2002), the analysis must fit certain rules: the objectivity, the systematization and the reproductivity. It is a two-way process that lets the researcher to find categories that is useful to reduce data, and to find out which categories are overlapped or do not have much value that implies that the last can be eliminated.

According to Krippendorff (1990), the content analysis is a research technique that formulates form data reproducible and valid inferences that can be applied to its context. Laurence Bardin defines the qualitative content analysis as a set of communication analysis techniques tending to obtain indicators (quantitative or not) by systematic procedures and objectives of description of the messages content allowing the inference of knowledge related to the conditions of production and reception (social context) of these messages (Bardin, 1996). This definition has changed with the time, considering that there are approaches that prioritize the quantification of results, and other that emphasize the qualitative data as a basic procedure (Cáceres, 2003).

The main purpose of this analysis is finding inferences, that are basically the messages extracted from the data that regard different phenomena beyond those that are directly observable. According to Rodríguez Sabiote *et al.*, (2005), the qualitative content analysis process has three basic aspects: data reduction, its disposition and transformation, and obtaining results and verification of conclusions.

Nevertheless, there are several difficulties faced by researchers, this is the variety of significances the qualitative data may have, the verbal nature of qualitative data, the volume of data that needs to be analyzed, and the lack of consensus of basic aspects of the analysis since there are many approaches for its *mis-en-place* (Rodríguez Sabiote, Lorenzo Quilles & Herrera Torres, 2005).

Despite this inconvenience there are typically four stages for the qualitative content analysis:

1. Preparatory stage
2. Fieldwork Stage
3. Analytical Stage:
 - Data reduction: through categorization and coding
 - Data disposition and transformation: description and interpretation of the concurrence of codes, comparison, and contextualization of textual data, to find relevant conclusions.
 - Results obtention and conclusion
4. Informative stage, which is the moment of reporting the results in an article and share the information with the scientific community.

4. Discourse analysis in the heritage conservation field

It is necessary to consider the previous application of the above-mentioned methodologies in heritage topics. Departing from examining experiences with a “generic” approach of discourse analysis, we can discuss two research projects held in the last decade, the first one developed by Sophia Labadi, and a second experience elaborated by Leidulf Mydland and Wera Grahn. Labadi (2007) wrote an article where the discourse analysis methodology is used in heritage research topics, called “Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage”, where she uses an informatic tool called CAQDAS (Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software) to ease the analysis process, which is useful to simplify and organize basic processes of the methodology such as coding. The purpose for the use of this software was to determine the frequency of the appearance of certain heritage values in nomination files of heritage sites, looking for patterns related to their evolution. A qualitative and quantitative approach was used in this research. Leidulf Mydland & Wera Grahn (2012) developed a research work that resulted into an article called: “Identifying heritage values in local communities”

that emphasizes in the heritage values assessment through discourse analysis, working with it as an analytic tool to identify manners that local and official stakeholders interpret heritage and find meaning associated to it.

There are also some researchers that work with a Critical Discourse Analysis in the heritage field. Laurajane Smith in her book "Uses of Heritage" seeks to determine the way hegemonic forces affect the assessment of what deserves to be considered heritage and what does not. Here the researcher characterizes what is the authorized heritage discourse, that focused in the aesthetic aspects of heritage seeks to generate a common identity in the world based in the appreciation of the past, where community participation only matters while it does not affect the dominant meaning of the guardianship of the expert authority over the material element, or to the extent that experts are perceived as those who have the capacity and responsibility to identify the meanings of the heritage asset (Smith, 2006).

Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith & Gary Campbell (2006) wrote an article where the research focused in the utility the discourse analysis could have in heritage studies, aiming on the social inclusion in the Burra Charter texts. The article used the ACD approach where they stressed on the importance this analysis has for heritage and the little it has been used.

Although the idea of discourse is well established within heritage studies, it remains disappointingly ill-defined in terms of its utility as an analytical category. This oversight highlights the proposition that many of the concerns of current heritage management practices are, in large part, issues that are discursively constructed. In other words, the ways by which we create, discuss, talk about, and assess heritage issues do matter. As such, the development of rigorous and usable strategies to understand the concept of discourse and the role it plays in the social practice of managing heritage needs to be attempted (Waterton, Smith, & Campbell, 2006).

In recent years, John Pendlebury (2013) applied the ACD in his article where the heritage authorized discourse was analyzed to understand how some values are prioritized, based on the meanings attached by dominant classes, over those given by relegated ones.

On the other hand, considering the application of the Founded Theory methodology to the cultural heritage field. Among the articles that apply this methodology is "The commodification of the past, postmodern pastiche, and the search for authentic experiences at contemporary heritage attractions" written by Cristina Goulding (2000). In this article a coding and categorizing process that resulted in a theoretical formulation of three categories of the basic behavior of heritage consumers.

In 2006 Jaruwana Daengbuppha & others, written an article that aimed to demonstrate that the theoretical approach of the Founded Theory could be useful to conceptualize and model the consumer experience in heritage sites. Its findings indicate that Founded Theory is potentially useful to unveil and get a better compression of the visitors experience to a heritage site (Daengbuppha, Hemmington & Wilkes, 2006).

In 2015, Carlos Xavier Massimi Malo held a research Project that led to the formulation of a methodology for the description of the cultural landscape in the Barranca de los Oblatos site, in Guadalajara, Mexico, using Founded Theory based on the data of heritage value of the site to formulate a hypothesis that define the characteristics of its cultural landscape (Massimi Malo, 2015).

On the other hand, the Qualitative Content Analysis approach was used by several authors such as Chris Landorf (2009), that published a work where the methodology is used to examine management plans of six World Heritage Cities. In a first phase a literature review is developed where the key principles for sustainable development were identified such as a holistic planning, and the participation and empowerment of the stakeholders. Also, it was evident that physical values were prioritized over cultural and immaterial ones.

Discourse analysis in its various approaches has been proven as an effective yet not much developed methodology to work with heritage aspects, especially those related to heritage values eliciting. Therefore, it would be interesting to undertake more research projects where this methodology can prove useful, and interesting to be applied.

6. Conclusions

From this study, it is possible to understand that there is in fact an evolution in heritage values, from one centered on mostly historic and esthetic meanings to values that have a broader spectrum including meanings related to social aspects of heritage. Obviously, this shift comes after understanding that the center is not on the heritage fabric anymore but on the subject that interprets and understands this heritage object.

It is necessary to consider that initially experts were called to value and decide what is heritage and how to conserve it, and nowadays it is mostly the people who decides if an object is worthy of being conserved to the future.

On the other hand, considering the methods to find these values in historical texts, after analyzing several approaches of discourse analysis, founded theory, and qualitative content analysis, it is possible to state that they are all useful to determine heritage meanings depending on the context of study and the available texts for analysis. Several studies have been revised where the use of this methods has been proven effective in heritage

studies, nevertheless the qualitative content analysis is more versatile and less rigid to elicit heritage values from historical descriptions of the city.

7. Acknowledgements

This text is written from the data collected in a research project of the Universidad del Azuay related to the doctoral research for the Universidad de Valladolid entitled: "Análisis de las valoraciones otorgadas al patrimonio edificado de Cuenca a través de la literatura histórica escrita entre 1850 y 2014. Acomodos, transformaciones y sustituciones", supervised by Professors Javier Perez Gil and María Augusta Hermida.

References

- Alpin, G. (2002). *Heritage Identification, Conservation, and Management*. Oxford University Press.
- Andreu, J. (2002). Las técnicas de Análisis de Contenido: una revisión actualizada. *Fundación Centro de Estudios Andaluces*, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/334486>
- Arévalo, J. M. (2012). El patrimonio como representación colectiva. La intangibilidad de los bienes culturales. *Andes*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.14718/RevArq.2013.15.1.9>
- Avrami, E., Mason, R., & de la Torre, M. (2000). Values and Heritage Conservation. In *Values and Heritage Conservation*. The Getty Conservation Institute. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2159032X13Z.00000000011>
- Ballart, J. (1997). *No El patrimonio histórico y arqueológico: valor y uso*. Ariel.
- Bardin, L. (1996). *Análisis de contenido*. Akal Ediciones.
- Bluestone, D. (2000). Challenges for Heritage Conservation and the Role of Research on Values. In E. Avrami, R. Mason, & M. de la Torre (Eds.), *Values and Heritage Conservation* (pp. 65–67). Getty Conservation Institute.
- Brandi, C. (1963). *Teoria del restauro*. Ed. di storia e letteratura.
- Cáceres, P. (2003). Análisis Cualitativo De Contenido: Una Alternativa Metodológica Alcanzable. *Psicoperspectivas*, vol II, 53–82. <https://doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-Vol2-Issue1-fulltext-3>
- Caraballo Perichi, C. (2011). Patrimonio Cultural. Un enfoque diverso y comprometido. In *Unesco: Vol. Primera Ed.* UNESCO. <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:No+Title#0>
- Carter, R. W., & Bramley, R. (2002). Defining heritage values and significance for improved resource management: an application to Australian tourism. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 8(3), 175–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1352725022000018895>
- Daengbuppha, J., Hemmington, N., & Wilkes, K. (2006). Using grounded theory to model visitor experiences at heritage sites: methodological and practical issues. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 9(4), 367–388. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750610689096>
- De la Torre, M. (2000). Values and Heritage Conservation. *Values and Heritage Conservation*, 0338(June), 32–38. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2159032X13Z.00000000011>
- Delgado, J. (2006). *Zona arqueológica de Teotihuacán: problemas y conflictos en torno a su conservación e investigación*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma De México.
- Edson, G. (2004). Heritage: Pride or passion, product or service? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(4), 333–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1352725042000257366>
- García Canclini, N. (1999). Los usos sociales del patrimonio cultural. *Patrimonio Etnológico : Nuevas Perspectivas de Estudio*, 16–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do Discourse Analysis*. Routledge.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Aldine Press.
- Goulding, C. (2000). The commodification of the past, postmodern pastiche, and the search for authentic experiences at contemporary heritage attractions. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(7), 835–853. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560010331298>
- Jager, S. (2003). Discurso y conocimiento: aspectos teóricos y metodológicos de la crítica del discurso y del análisis de dispositivo. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 61–99). Gedisa.
- Janks, H. H. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool. *Discourse*, 18(3), 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180302>
- Jaramillo Paredes, D. E. (2013). *Valores Patrimoniales*. Marco Conceptual.
- Juul Jensen, U. (2000). Cultural Heritage, Liberal Education, and Human Flourishing. In E. Avrami, R. Mason, & M. de la Torre (Eds.), *Values and Heritage Conservation* (pp. 38–43). The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Krippendorff, K. (1990). *Metodología de análisis de contenido. Teoría y Práctica*. Paidós Comunicación.
- Labadi, S. (2007). Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 7(2), 147–170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605307077466>
- Landorf, C. (2009). A Framework for Sustainable Heritage Management: A Study of UK Industrial Heritage Sites. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15(10), 494–510.
- Legewie, H., & Schervier-Legewie, B. (2004). La investigación es trabajo duro, siempre está ligada a cierta dosis de sufrimiento. De ahí que por otro lado, deba ser entretenida, divertida. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 5(3). <https://n9.cl/1hqdj>
- Lenclud, G. (1987). La tradition n'est plus ce qu'elle était... Sur les notions de tradition et de société traditionnelle en ethnologie. *Terrain*, 9, 110–113.
- Lipe, W. D. (1984). Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources. In H. Cleere (Ed.), *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management Systems* (pp. 1–11). Cambridge University Press.
- Llull Peñalba, J. (2005). Evolución del concepto y de la significación social del patrimonio cultural. *Arte, Individuo y Sociedad*, 17, 175–204. <https://doi.org/ISSN: 1131-5598>

- Lowenthal, D. (2000). Stewarding the Past in a Perplexing Present. In E. Avrami, R. Mason, & M. De la Torre (Eds.), *Values and Heritage Conservation*. (pp. 18–25). The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Mason, R. (2002). Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices. In Marta de la Torre (Ed.), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 5–30). The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Massimi Malo, C. X. (2015). Aspectos teóricos y metodológicos para la identificación del paisaje cultural y la arquitectura ecotonal de la barranca de Oblatos-Huentitán, Guadalajara, México. *Apuntes. Revista de Estudios Sobre Patrimonio Cultural*, 28(1).
- Meyer, M. (2003). Entre la teoría, el método y la política: la ubicación de los enfoques relacionados con el ACD. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 35–59). Gedisa.
- Muñoz Viñas, S. (2004). *Teoría Contemporánea de la Restauración*. Editorial Síntesis.
- Mydland, L., & Grahn, W. (2012). Identifying heritage values in local communities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18(6), 564–587. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.619554>
- Páramo Morales, D. (2015). La teoría fundamentada (Grounded Theory), metodología cualitativa de investigación científica. *Pensamiento y Gestión*, 39, 119–146.
- Pearce, S. M. (2000). The Making of Cultural Heritage. In E. Avrami, R. Mason, & M. de la Torre (Eds.), *Values and Heritage Conservation* (pp. 59–64). The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Pendlebury, J. (2013). Conservation values, the authorised heritage discourse and the conservation-planning assemblage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19, 709–727. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2012.700282>
- Philips, L. J., & Jorgensen, M. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. SAGE Publications. <https://cutt.ly/XJa7DX5>
- Poulios, I. (2010). Moving Beyond a Values-Based Approach to Heritage Conservation. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 12(2), 170–185. <https://doi.org/10.1179/175355210X12792909186539>
- Prats, L. (2005). Concepto y gestión del patrimonio local. *Cuadernos de Antropología*, 21, 17–35.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis* (Issue March, pp. 87–121). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>
- Rodríguez Sabiote, C., Lorenzo Quilles, O., & Herrera Torres, L. (2005). Teoría y práctica del análisis de datos cualitativos. Proceso general y criterios de calidad. *SOCIOTAM*, 2(XV), 133–154.
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203602263>
- Spennemann, D. H. R. (2006). Gauging Community Values in Historic Preservation. *The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 3(2), 6–20.
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. University of Cambridge Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (2002). *Bases de la investigación cualitativa. Técnicas y procedimientos para desarrollar la teoría fundamentada*. Contus. Editorial Universidad de Antioquia.
- Villaseñor, I. (2011). El valor intrínseco del patrimonio cultural: ¿una noción aún vigente? *Intervención*, 2(3), 6–13.
- 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*, 12(10), 339–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600727000>
- Wodak, R. (2003). El enfoque histórico del discurso. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (pp. 101–141). Gedisa.