Managing and enhancing the intangible heritage: the experience of "Literary Parks"

Chiara Carolina Donelli
University of Parma, Italy
chiaracarolina.donelli@unipr.it

Simone Fanelli
University of Parma, Italy
simone.fanelli@unipr.it

Isabella Mozzoni
University of Parma, Italy
isabella.mozzoni@unipr.it

ABSTRACT

In recent years, the concept of cultural heritage has changed to include artistic, archaeological, architectural and environmental heritages, including intangible forms of these. The potential of intangible heritage has yet to be fully exploited, and there are many opportunities for its enhancement and protection still to explore. The meaning of intangible heritage in social development, and its social and cultural potential is described through a case study of the Literary Park circuit in Italy. The Italian experience shows that there is potential in setting up networks in remote areas, and in the process of recognizing and enhancing the intangible heritage of a country. Heritage, particularly intangible heritage, is an alternative approach to promoting a sense of belonging and active participation in a community. It can attract financial resources and boost social development of the local cultural ecosystem. Surveys and interviews are used to assess the limits and potential as well as strengths and weaknesses of Literary Parks.

Keywords:

Cultural management

Intangible heritage

Economic performance

Literary Park

Cultural value

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Introduction

Literary heritage as an intangible cultural asset

In recent years, the concept of cultural heritage has been continuously redefined and updated from academic and legislative perspectives in order to cover new social, cultural and environmental dimensions. It has now come to include intangible assets, and has achieved formal recognition through European Union directives, charters and international resolutions.

A recent anthropological approach to heritage considers it as a social ensemble of many different, complex and interdependent manifestations (Kurin, 2007), rather than simply a combination of artefacts and human-made creations. It is now widely recognised that, given differences between cultures, value is not solely a matter of physical existence defined unequivocally on the basis of fixed criteria. Material heritage does not have the same significance for all cultures, and attention towards materiality and its physical conservation is the result of a western philosophical approach (Gruzinski, 1993). A more comprehensive approach to heritage reflects the complexity and extension of the historical heritage of various places, up to and including the intangible and landscape dimension (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009), and underlines its role in identifying values and memories (McDowell, 2016; Kuutma, 2015).

In this perspective, literature has played and continues to play a key role. The set of literary works of a country, in fact, represents its socio-cultural context and development, in various manifestations, over the centuries (Leseman, 1994). In particular, because Italy consisted of different peoples throughout much of its history, and was unified at a relatively late date, there is a great deal of variety in literature, as in other features and in other types of art, across the country.

Literature can in fact be defined as a crucial cultural heritage for a country in representing the traditions and way of life of the inhabitants. The value of Italian literature is acknowledged internationally, and it thus contributes to the communication and enhancement of Italy's intangible heritage to a wide range of potential users. Although its economic and cultural importance is clear (Herbert, 2001) the intangible nature of the asset makes the challenge of management and enhancement extremely complex (Squire, 1994). There is a need for efficient projects and schemes which enhance literary sites without unduly exploiting or plundering them.

Starting from a discussion of the semantic notion, this paper discusses the key issues in the enhancement and management of intangible heritage. The case study of Literary Parks in Italy provides indications on the opportunities and threats for management of an intangible heritage, and how this can be linked with sustainable local development.

The literature on Literary Parks is mainly composed of geography studies (Dai Prà, 2002), with some contributions focussing on tourism (Vavassori, 2000; Rao, 2006). Both approaches emphasize the potential of Literary Parks, but tend to focus on the aggregate level in analysing mainly the dynamics of supply and demand.

This paper focuses on Literary Parks as organizations and their relationships with the outside world. It examines the ability of Literary Parks to manage intangible capital, taking into account internal variables (company structure, personnel organization, forms of financing), and external variables (partners, presence in networks, coordination with other stakeholders). The aim of this paper is therefore to describe the current situation of Literary Parks in Italy with particular reference to management methods, the financing system, and effectiveness in achieving institutional goals.

Towards a formal recognition of intangible heritage

In a normative approach, the concept of cultural heritage has been enshrined in legislation. For this, it was necessary to use a univocal, subnational and objective definition of the concept of heritage (Vecco, 2010). The first important step in this process was the definition of Heritage given by ICOMOS (1964) in the Venice Charter, of which Article 1 reads: "The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event" (ICOMOS, 1964). A more comprehensive approach appears in the subsequent UNESCO Convention on the Protection of World, Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), in which the expression "cultural heritage" refers to "groups of buildings and sites" as well as monuments. The definition was enlarged to include intangible heritage in 1994, and almost a decade later the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) recognised intangible inheritance as a key factor in cultural diversity which also guarantees lasting

"BY OFFERING SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC SUCH AS ITINERARIES AND SIMILAR, LITERARY PARKS, WITH THEIR DIVERSIFIED MIX OF RESOURCES CAN ADD VALUE TO LOCAL AREAS GIVING A TANGIBLE INSTITUTION TO INTANGIBLE HERITAGE WITH A BIG REDUCTION IN THE ECONOMIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL COSTS"

development. It added the values of identity and capacity of the object to interact with memory to the parameters of artistic and historic importance (Vecco, 2010). The introduction of the term "cultural landscape" in the 2003 Convention emphasizes the importance of cultural spaces and the relationship between nature and culture (Smith & Akagawa, 2008). Article 2 of the Convention also specifies what is meant by intangible cultural heritage, emphasizing as a discriminating criterion for inclusion stakeholder awareness of the importance of heritage:

> The "intangible cultural heritage" means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity (UNESCO, 2003).

The Council of Europe Faro Convention (Council of Europe, 2005) broadens the meaning of the term "heritage" to take on a double connotation: first as inheritance handed down from the past, and second as heritage projected towards the future. In the second definition, a future-looking heritage is not an intrinsic value, but rather a value that comes from the reiteration of people's activities and places, based on the meaning and the uses that the communities attribute to it.

Between rhetoric and practice: the management of intangible heritage

The relationship between the management and culture has been widely discussed (Peacock, 1998; Throsby,

2001; Blaug, 2001; Rizzo & Throsby, 2006). The genesis of the definition of heritage, defined as an intangible asset, was important in order to identify its needs in terms of management and organization (McKercher & du Cros, 2006). The failure to perceive the specific need for adequate safeguarding and enhancement has in fact impacted negatively on management studies in the field. Previous research has mainly focused on defining the term heritage with tangible and intangible characteristics (Vecco, 2010). The few existing studies on practical implications mainly refer to the effect on tourism (Herbert, 2001) and identity (González, 2007): the specific value of an area and its real strength as a tourist destination lie in its legacy as a non-replaceable identity (ibid.), or convey the value of local tradition. Management literature identifies two ways of converting heritage into a possible tool for development of a local economy. The first is organisation of festivals, which can play an active role in the enhancement of intangible heritage (ibid.) and the second is setting up more structured institutions such as museums, which provide tangible evidence and a long-lasting structure (Alivizatou, 2016).

Both methods however have side effects. In the first case, the *festivalisation* of cities may lead to short term exploitation of local communities (Logan, 2009). On the other hand, a fixed structure may be unsuitable for the flexible and changing nature of an intangible heritage (Del Barrio et al, 2012). It is unclear which solution ensures the highest standards of physical and intellectual accessibility to the entire cultural heritage, and there is an ongoing search for management methods which can ensure the creation of value and lasting economic sustainability for all stakeholders.

By offering services to the public such as itineraries and similar, Literary Parks, with their diversified mix of resources can add value to local areas giving a tangible institution to intangible heritage with a big reduction in the economic and organizational costs, typical of more structured institutions such as museums. Literary Parks fit perfectly into this path,

precisely because they are linked to the territory, a portfolio of coordinated experiences and in full respect of the typicality and peculiarities of history and places. This is particularly true in outlying and rural areas, as well as areas not affected by mass tourism. The resources offered can thus be organized and managed not simply as an aggregate, but as an experience of local life itself and local identity.

Literary Parks: places of memory and heritage enhancement

The association between place and literature goes back to mythological times. Poetry and literature have always typically been linked to geographical sites (Herbert, 2001). The concept that best reflects Literary Parks is that of "places of memory" in which the actual features of a place enrich their image in literature, and are in turn enriched by literature. This is a process of "active" memory, and refers to the modern concept of heritage as a process of elaboration, formation and definition of identity:

> Parts of territories characterized by different combinations of natural and human elements that illustrate the evolution of local communities through literature.
> A method of interpretation of the territory that allows us to give meaning to places in a balanced combination of landscape, cultural heritage and economic activities (parchiletterari.org).

The idea underpinning Literary Parks in fact was based on combining heritage and tourism using the cultural sector as a whole as the basis for development strategy. The Literary Park is analysed in this research on the basis of the specific decisions taken in three key aspects of the management of territorial systems: the form of management, the setting of the internal organizational system and the definition of relations with other subjects in the area.

The Italian experience of Literary Parks

"Literary Parks", with the registered trademark (Parchi Letterari®) came into being in 1992 and was based on the ideas of Stanislao Nievo. In the early days, they were mainly publishing schemes and took the physical form of places and paths of memory set up by the Stanislao Nievo Foundation. The first fifteen Literary Parks were all located in southern Italy. Their aim was to combine memory and imagination with landscape and literature,

using landscape-territorial enhancement strategies through promoting "sentimental journeys".

In the first phase, Literary Parks was set up through private initiative with the collaboration of local administrations, as well as other institutions such as *Youth Entrepreneurship* and the *Italian Touring Club.* The second phase was marked by a substantial grant of 14,850 million euros, received in the years 1998 - 2001 as the "Global Grant for Literary Parks" under European Union Regional Funding, which aimed at reducing economic and social disparities, fighting depopulation and promoting rural development.

Setting up Literary Parks in the south of Italy, which is comparatively underdeveloped and poorer, in fact reflected EU Regional Funding priorities. The funding aimed at two types of activity: promotion of Literary Parks and creation of related network activities. In the first case, local authorities, public-private partnerships, associations and foundations benefited from funding. In the second case, the recipients were mostly young people who were supported in starting and developing businesses.

Literary Parks can also take the form of designated regional areas, or cultural tourism routes, and be supported by initiatives such as concerts, theatrical performances, and various local tourism businesses. Another important initiative which provided incentives to set up Literary Parks was a competition in which public and private entities were invited to present proposals for new parks. The initiative was successful and about 240 projects were presented by municipalities, associations and consortia, of which 17 were approved (1 in Molise, 5 in Campania, 2 in Basilicata, 2 in Puglia, 1 in Calabria, 5 in Sicily and 1 in Sardinia).

The "literary landscape" originally meant a place where a writer lived and drew inspiration, and Literary Parks offers the opportunity to re-read the place using his or her works (Vavassori, 2000). The potential for economic development of the project is underlined by several sources, and the concept of conservation is no longer considered to be in conflict with valorisation (Lee et al, 2005). Literary Parks can in fact revitalise traditional production activities, raise employment levels and promote environmental sustainability, and are thus a driving force for socio-economic development as well as a boost for a sense of belonging, and a potential for strengthening local identities (Bruce & Creighton, 2006; Nasser, 2003).

From an economic point of view, the potential of parks is recognized as a tool to increase the value

of an area, but also the need to define indispensable management guidelines has been noted (Barilaro et al, 2006). Key issues become for example: creation of tangible institutions such as documentation centres to complement valorisation events; activating exchanges with other parks or surrounding activities; involving a wider public; promoting culture which attracts people in numbers without becoming mass culture; and obtaining funding from diversified sources (sponsors, direct sales, admissions) to ensure long-term sustainability. However, despite the potential and the interest shown by different actors, especially associations, in running and sponsoring Literary Parks, and although cultural events have often been held, these have tended to be sporadic, and a lack of systematic planning and effective coordination has led to the closure of most of the parks over the years. Those which remain open have seen a complete overhaul of structures and programs. Empirical evidence thus reveals the need for in-depth research in order to provide management with strategic tools and guidelines.

Literary Parks saw a new lease of life in the mid-2000s when a new body, Paesaggio *Culturale Srl* (Cultural Landscape Ltd.) was set up to run them at national level. The *Dante Aligheri Company* was added in 2012. Literary Parks has evolved continuously from its early days of conflict between their utopian objectives and economic valorisation processes, which reflected the complexity of the challenge of enhancing intangible assets. In their new chapter, Literary Parks aims to leave behind its former ad hoc planning strategy. In order not to remain "parks on paper" they nowadays eschew cultural activities held exclusively inside the park, but aim rather towards building a complex of structures using an organic framework of tools. New operational and management guidelines are taking shape reflecting different geographical perspectives.

"THE POTENTIAL OF THE LITERARY HERITAGE, ECONOMIC AND OTHERWISE, HAS LONG BEEN RECOGNISED, AS IT CAN BE SEEN FROM THE PROLIFERATION OF EVENTS AND CENTRES EXISTING ACROSS ITALY: DOCUMENTATION CENTRES, THEME PARKS, PRIVATE MUSEUMS AND FESTIVALS"

Now that the European Union funding phase is over, Literary Parks in Italy is a network using a joint image. They are all under the umbrella of *Paesaggio Culturale Srl,* which governs the use of registered trademarks for an annual fee and lays down guidelines on various aspects including methods of accreditation. *Paesaggio Culturale Srl* also promotes theoretical guidelines underpinning member activities, including a holistic approach to the territory, which involves a transversal interpretation of place.

The potential of the literary heritage, economic and otherwise, has long been recognised, as it can be seen from the proliferation of events and centres existing across Italy: documentation centres, theme parks, private museums and festivals. The idea underpinning Literary Parks is not in fact particularly innovative, if it was not for the emphasis placed on planning at the network level in the area and the attention given to their endogenous development.

Methodology

The history of Literary Parks in Italy highlights the need to develop management strategies to enhance them and generate the many cultural and economic advantages they are able to produce. The potentialities of the Parks to increase the value of the territory are in fact widely recognized, but the difficulties in managing them are clear, and compromise their durability in the medium-long term.

Mapping the current situation is essential in order to identify the strengths of existing management forms which need to be continued, as well as weaknesses requiring improvement. Research findings enable us to trace, in the conclusion, broad policy guidelines for current Literary Parks managers who wish to increase efficiency and effectiveness, and for stakeholders considering investing time and / or resources in the entrepreneurial initiative of Literary Parks.

To investigate the characteristics of the parks, a three-part questionnaire was constructed. Each section focuses on one of the three key areas of the park business model:

1. Management of activities: information about the legal ownership structure of the Park, management and owners, management methods of services and personnel.
2. Economic performance: how the park acquires and uses resources.

3. Institutional effectiveness: the effectiveness of the Literary Park in achieving its institutional goals and, therefore, the ability to generate a positive relationship with the area it is located in.

Before being sent out to participants, the questionnaire was validated by the Chairman of *Paesaggio Culturale Srl*. The objective of the validation was to verify the capacity of the questions to investigate specifically the areas described above,

Name	Territory	Year	Name
Giosuè Carducci Park	Castagneto Carducci (Livorno)	1995	Nature trail, study center and museum
Gabriele D'Annunzio Park	Anversa degli Abruzzi (L'Aquila)	1997	Nature trail and documentation center
Carlo Levi Park	Aliano (Matera)	1999	Nature trail and documentation center and picture gallery
Francesco De Sanctis Park	Morra (Avellino) and Irpinia	1999	Nature trail, museum, library
Grazia Deledda Park	Galtellì (Nuoro)	2001	Nature trail and documentation center
Pierpaolo Pasolini Park	Ostia (Rome)	2005	Nature trail
Albino Pierro Park	Tursi (Matera)	2010	Nature trail and documentation center
Francesco Petrarca Park	Euganean hills (Padova)	2012	Nature trail and museum
Giuseppe Giovanni Battaglia Park	Aliminusa (Palermo)	2013	Nature trail and museum
The lands of Dante Alighieri	Ravenna and Florence	2014	Nature trail
Tommaso Landolfi Park	Pico (Frosinone)	2014	Nature trail
Eugenio Montale Park	Liguria	2015	Nature trail
Alessandro Manzoni Park	Trezzo sull'Adda (Milano)	2016	Nature trail and documentation center
Giuseppe Antonio Borghese Park	Polizzi Generosa (Palermo)	2016	Nature trail
Federico II Park	Melfi (Potenza)	2016	Nature trail and documentation center

TABLE 1. THE ITALIAN LITERARY PARKS

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

without neglecting the particular characteristics of the Literary Parks. The Chairman was also interviewed in order to enrich the data collected by the questionnaires and gain a greater understanding of the Literary Park system, among other aspects. The questionnaire was then administered by email or telephone to the Literary Park managers. For those parks owned and run by municipalities, the person in charge was identified as the Mayor or the head of the cultural office, and for those managed by non-profit associations or public-private partnerships, the questionnaire was sent to the Presidents of these associations or partnerships, as indicated by institutional websites.

Data collection lasted three months (October-December 2017). Subsequently the answers were collected, coded and analyzed in aggregate and anonymous form.

The results of an empirical study

Currently, there are fifteen Literary Parks in Italy. Table 1 shows the name of each park i.e. the writers it is named for, the location, its year of establishment, and the type of park it is.

The questionnaire was sent to parks with at least one year of activity, so the Giuseppe Giovanni Battaglia Park and the Federico II Park, set up in July and December 2016, were excluded from the sample. This was because the answers to the questions could be affected by a possible lack of experience in park management, or in any case, greater difficulty in identifying management characteristics.

Twelve out of thirteen parks responded to the questionnaire, which means a response rate of around 92%. The survey sample can therefore be considered to be well representative of the population. Only the Pier Paolo Pasolini Park did not respond to the questionnaire.

The geographical composition of the sample is as follows: four are in the north of Italy (33%), three in the centre (25%), and five in the south or in the islands of Sicily and Sardinia (42%).

It is important to note that 40% of Italian Literary Parks were established in the three-year period 2014-2016, which highlights the growing attention to such initiatives in recent times and also the fact that only a small percentage of them were part of the historic nucleus of Parks set up under European funding.

Area 1 – Management of activities

Literary Parks in Italy are differentiated and diverse, fit with different landscapes and ideas, and are based on different heritages. They are small territorial systems which include various entities linked to local entrepreneurship, with particular reference to culture and craftsmanship.

In most cases, the Literary Park is owned by the Municipality (67%), while in the remaining ones, the park is owned by a non-profit organization, association or cooperative (2 cases) or a public-private partnership (2 cases). In all cases, the owner and the managing body are the same. However, specifically in four cases, the management takes the form of an association between the owner with other public or private non-profit organizations.

Except for two Literary Parks which can be visited 24 hours a day, seven days a week, all parks have very restricted opening hours. In many cases they are open only for a few hours per day, generally in the morning, and / or only on certain days of the week (either Monday to Friday or weekends and holidays). Two can be visited only by appointment.

As far as service management is concerned, all parks except one have support tools for visitors. 42% of Literary Parks use more than one support tool, from which the most common ones are information brochures (75%) and information boards (67%). Video presentations and audio guides are rare, and digital tools such as QR codes are present in only one park.

A positive aspect is that 75% of the Literary Parks combine traditional visit activities with educational activities aimed at young people. This reveals particular attention towards cultural development of users, and the fact that services on offer are differentiated for different types of users. Particular attention is paid to the segment of schools and educational trips, identified as strategic for the parks.

Looking at facilities for disabled visitors, it is worth noting that only two parks are completely accessible to those with motor disabilities, while 83% are only partially accessible. The area of accessibility therefore requires improvement. Particularly critical is the lack of facilities for blind and partially sighted users, and dedicated pathways are offered in only one case.

It is important to evaluate additional services from the quantitative point of view, prior to the visit (ability to attract a greater number of visitors and revenues) and from the qualitative point of view, during the visit (improvement of quality of the visit). In this area, there are severe weaknesses: only five parks (42%) offer accessory services (in three cases, there is a bookshop; in another one a cafeteria, and in only one case both services are provided).

"LITERARY PARKS ARE A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF INTEGRATION BETWEEN VARIOUS CULTURAL SECTORS, FROM ARCHITECTURE TO PHOTOGRAPHY AND PUBLISHING, AND ARE THEREFORE EXTREMELY APPROPRIATE FOR COMMUNICATING AND MANAGING INTANGIBLE CULTURAL LEGACY"

Finally, in the area of personnel management, the findings of this paper show that Literary Parks largely rely on volunteers. The ratio between volunteer staff and employees is around 2 to 1: on average the parks have 2.4 employees and 5.5 volunteers. The data between the different parks is however highly diversified. There is a clear tendency for longer established parks – those set up for more than 15 years now – to have a greater number of employees (3.5 versus 1.6) and volunteers (7.2 versus 2.7) than more recent Literary Parks.

Several issues emerge from the data which need to be taken into account in making parks more accessible to tourists and locals. These range from lengthening opening hours to offering a wider set of additional services for differentiated type of users such as children, the elderly and the disabled. Some of the requirements by *Paesaggio Culturale Srl* for becoming a park are provision of an information point, a strong local network and reasonable opening hours. In practice, however, there is no point of reference, and where for example the park is run by a municipality, it may be open only during staff working hours rather than peak visiting times at weekends.

Despite these problems, various parks have put in place solutions to structural limitations and lack of personnel, such as engaging volunteers and setting up learning activities for children. These services are however supplied *ad hoc*, and are often unclear and poorly planned, and there is a great deal of room for improvement in all areas.

Area 2 – Economic performance

The second area of analysis is the financing systems of Literary Parks and the ways in which resources are used. The first finding is that only four parks (33%) have an autonomous budget, or provide a clear statement of costs and revenues, and it is complicated to analyze the economic-financial area in the remaining ones. With reference to income diversity, Literary Parks show great dependency on transfers of public funds. Only five parks impose an admission charge, on average 5

euros per ticket, which, in any case, has a very limited impact on total revenue (less than 10%). The other accessory services (bookshops, hiring our premises, laboratories, etc.) also generate low, if not almost non-existent, revenues.

Furthermore, there are sponsorships and / or fundraising activities with private individuals in only one case. The financial autonomy of the parks is thus very limited. Finance for running daily activities derives primarily from resources transferred from the Regional Authority, from the state and lastly from the municipality.

It is true that free admission and low entrance fees increase access and ensure community involvement, and it is positive that the majority of parks opt for this strategy. But it needs to be accompanied by other types of fundraising activities if high dependence on public transfers is to be avoided. Literary Parks' low ability to attract resources is a shortcoming. Our data shows that both financial and managerial autonomy need to be strengthened in order to build a wider net of private investment. More investment should be made in publicity and other initiatives to strengthen and diversify funding need to be taken.

Regarding the use of resources, the largest cost item is employees, which impacts for approximately 51% of total costs. The second largest cost is communications, which are just under 3,000 euros per year on average. Communications and publicity is a strategic area for investment in order to increase the visibility and attractiveness of Literary Parks. It is disconcerting to find that only 65% of the parks have their own updated website. Finally, there are more residual cost items linked to maintenance and other general costs, which account for 13% and 15% of total costs respectively.

Area 3 – Institutional effectiveness

The third area investigates the effectiveness of Literary Parks in achieving its institutional goals. All the parks state that their mission is to enhance the figure of the

author to whom the park is dedicated and to promote the local area. The link between park and territory is very strong: 75% of the parks explicitly mention the enhancement of the territory as a fundamental element of their mission. The effectiveness of the park in creating a network of initiatives and collaborations with the area and the community of reference has thus been investigated in this paper.

In 2017, each park had an average of around 4,500 visitors. The most effective Literary Parks in terms of visitor numbers per year are the Giosuè Carducci Park, (13,500) and the Lands of Dante Alighieri (10,000). The parks also organize on average two types of initiatives per park annually. Specifically, one park out of two organized public exhibitions. The next most frequent types of initiative are publications of books or magazines (42%), restoration (42%) and temporary exhibitions (33%). There were no cases of live shows.

With regard to the development of networks in the territory, only 50% of the Parks have established any type of partnerships with other local cultural institutions. These collaboration schemes were made especially with non-profit companies (3 cases), public bodies (2 cases), and for-profit companies (1 case). Furthermore, only four of the parks are included in a wider museum system which includes other museums and institutes in the area. However, interpreting this data, it is important to note that not all the parks answered the question (i.e. two failed to reply). Note also that where collaboration occurs, it often involves several levels and a number of other organizations.

As regards the active involvement of local citizens in park decisions and activities, the data are also somewhat disappointing. Only around 40% state that park management is participatory, and in only 50% of cases publicity campaigns are carried out and are specifically targeted at local people.

These data suggest that it would be useful to strengthen relations with the local network, strengthen initiatives and activities to increase the number of visitors, and improve relations with the local community. In this sense, tangible initiatives such as documentation centers, a museum or house to visit are useful, but of course result in a sharp increase in costs, which are already difficult to manage. Other initiatives can be effective and perhaps more cost effective. The Landolfi park, for example, offers an itinerary accompanied by an information system, interactive and virtual and also available as a leaflet, which helps visitors to interpret the historical, artistic, architectural and environmental features. There are twelve panels showing quotations

from Landolfi, a map of the route indicating key sites, and a dedicated website, using new technologies such as the QR Code.

One of the major problems can be access, and although an institutional response is often slow, or lacking, there have been attempts at finding solutions by individual parks and private initiatives. For example, the Carlo Levi park at Aliano was initially inaccessible for tourists staying on the coast. Private buses linking the coast with inland museums were then provided by the park, and as public response was positive, the municipality then activated a new bus route. The existence of a tangible component (admission ticket and services) helps park management as well as users to evaluate the value provided by the park.

This type of facility can also have a positive impact on cost reduction, taking advantage of existing networks and making fewer resources redundant. In this regard, half of the Petrarch Park staff – those involved in management – come from the shop owners' association, which is part of a local network, and 50% staff are on-site guides employed by the Euganean Hills Park.

Conclusion

Over recent decades, the concept of heritage has undergone changes which entail rethinking strategies for preservation and sustainability. The markedly dynamic nature of intangible heritage makes it not suitable for exploitation by the traditional business model. This study discusses Literary Parks as an inspiring and interesting solution in the process of enhancement of intangible heritage and history of the country.

Literary Parks are a perfect example of integration between various cultural sectors, from architecture to photography and publishing, and are therefore extremely appropriate for communicating and managing intangible cultural legacy. They are also a clear example of enhancement of intangible heritage. They do not rely on transitory experience, as a literary festival does, and neither are they embedded in a static structure, which may not fully reflect the immediate nature of the heritage.

In this study, the literature-territory heritage is analysed as a system of resources which can enhance a geographical area and boost the local economy through the development and exploitation of a local feature. A Literary Park is much more than "a literary

walk", it enables local systems to enhance the territory in its entirety.

In some cases, the parks have been able to bring together the experiences of various small municipalities in rural areas, and operate in synergy in a system. They have been able to display and enhance the existing cultural heritage of an area by way of picture galleries, sites, libraries, documentation centers and foundations. The process of creating such a system can take up to ten years. In early phases, parks were often supported in formal recognition processes and promotional activities by the umbrella organisation. Later each park acquired its own structure and an ad hoc channel for promotion.

The interpretation of the results of this study must be made in the context of Italy, which is characterized by an extensive and diffuse cultural heritage. However, the experience of Literary Parks could be extended to different sectors aiming to promote and enhance intangible cultural heritage.

The empirical analysis suggest that value created for an area derives from efficient use of planning, organization and control mechanisms as well as the potential of individual elements. In order to define strategy, the specific heritage as well as its tangible and intangible resources, need to be defined on the basis of its identity and vocation. The Literary Park can be seen as the organ governing and managing different resources and inputs from the community and place, which all together are indispensable for the conservation and enhancement of intangible heritage. It can become strategic in increasing tourist numbers and in creating value for all stakeholders involved in conservation and enhancement (citizens, businesses, non-profit organizations, etc.).

Management choices therefore need to be closely related to missions, and cannot be separated from the specific context (Sharma, 2000). Strategy can vary, but should always include the progressive involvement of multiple actors, multiple forms of financing and multiple activities that exploit it.

In fact, the strength of a development strategy lies in the close integration between the activities of the sector itself, and those of the interconnected sectors in the production chain (Winstanley, 1998). In Literary Parks, school education, professional training, specialized production and crafts, in addition to educational tourism, play a crucial role. Key elements in a strategy of territorial enhancement are the synergy of different elements of tangible and intangible capital and natural capital.

Literary Parks in Italy, which take the form of itineraries, sites, and museums dedicated to particular writers, can be regarded as possible model. Although there is clearly no "one type fits all" model, the experiences of Italian Literary Parks show that there is potential in setting up networks in remote areas, and, in the process of recognizing and enhancing the intangible heritage, a previously untapped resource can be used for the economic and social development of an area.

This research is a preliminary investigation into the state of the art of literary parks and provides an overview of intangible heritage enhancement and three economic aspects of development. Future research involving further case studies is needed to deepen our knowledge of the challenges in the three areas.

> "ALTHOUGH THERE IS CLEARLY NO 'ONE TYPE FITS ALL' MODEL, THE EXPERIENCES OF ITALIAN LITERARY PARKS SHOW THAT THERE IS POTENTIAL IN SETTING UP NETWORKS IN REMOTE AREAS, AND, IN THE PROCESS OF RECOGNIZING AND ENHANCING THE INTANGIBLE HERITAGE"

REFERENCES

ALIVIZATOU, M. (2016). *Intangible heritage and the museum: New perspectives on cultural preservation.* Routledge.

BARILARO, C.; CLAVAL, P.; PAGNINI, M. P.; SCAINI, M. (2006). The role of Literary Parks in the re-appropriation of the cultural identity of places. Proceedings of the Conference THE CULTURAL TURN IN GEOGRAPHY, 18-20th of September 2003 - Gorizia Campus.

BLAUG, M. (2001). Where are we now on cultural economics. *Journal of economic surveys, 15*(2), 123-143.

BRUCE, D.; CREIGHTON, O. (2006). Contested identities: The dissonant heritage of European town walls and walled towns. *International journal of heritage studies,* 12(3), 234-254.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE. (2005). Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society. *Rada Europy, Strasbourg.*

DAI PRÀ, E. (2002). Il parco letterario in una prospettiva geografica. *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana,* 7, 51-70.

DEL BARRIO, M. J.; DEVESA, M.; HERRERO, L. C. (2012). Evaluating intangible cultural heritage: The case of cultural festivals. *City, Culture and Society,* 3(4), 235-244.

GONZÁLEZ, M. V. (2007). Intangible heritage tourism and identity. *Tourism management,* 29(4), 807-810.

GRUZINSKI, C. F. S. (1993). *Protection of the intangible cultural heritage: survey and new prospects.* Martin's Press.

HERBERT, D. (2001). Literary places, tourism and the heritage experience. *Annals of tourism research,* 28(2), 312-333.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES (ICOMOS). (1964). International Charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites. Venice.

KURIN, R. (2007). Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage: Key factors in implementing the 2003 Convention. *International journal of intangible heritage,* 2(8), 9-20.

KUUTMA, K. (2015). From folklore to intangible heritage. *A Companion to Heritage Studies,* 41-54.

LEE, J.; ÁRNASON, A.; NIGHTINGALE, A.; SHUCKSMITH, M. (2005). Networking: social capital and identities in European rural development. *Sociologia ruralis,* 45(4), 269-283.

LESEMAN, P. (1994). Socio-cultural determinants of literacy development. *Functional literacy: Theoretical issues and educational implications,* 163-184.

LOGAN, W. (2009). Playing the devil's advocate: protecting intangible cultural heritage and the infringement of human rights. *Historic environment,* 22(3), 14-18.

MCDOWELL, S. (2016). Heritage, memory and identity. *The Ashgate research companion to heritage and identity. Hampshire,* 37-53.

MCKERCHER, B.; DU CROS, H. (2006). Culture, heritage and visiting attractions. In *Tourism Business Frontiers* (pp. 233-241). Routledge.

NASSER, N. (2003). Planning for urban heritage places: reconciling conservation, tourism, and sustainable development. *Journal of planning literature,* 17(4), 467-479.

PEACOCK, A. (1998). The economist and heritage policy: a review of the issues. *IEA Readings,* 47, 1-26.

RAO S. (2006). In viaggio tra le parole: Parchi Letterari, turismo scolastico e Mezzogiorno. Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana, 7(*11*), 1065-1081.

RIZZO, I.; THROSBY, D. (2006). Cultural heritage: economic analysis and public policy. *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture,* 1, 983-1016.

SHARMA, S. (2000). Managerial interpretations and organizational context as predictors of corporate choice of environmental strategy. *Academy of Management journal, 43*(4), 681-697.

SMITH, L.; AKAGAWA, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Intangible heritage*. Routledge.

SQUIRE, S. J. (1994). The cultural values of literary tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 103-120.

THROSBY, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge university press.

TIMOTHY, D. J.; NYAUPANE, G. P. (Eds.). (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO). (2003). Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage.

VAVASSORI, M. (2000). Parchi Letterari: fare impresa con la Cultura. Rivista del Turismo, 1(*2*), 4 -17.

VECCO, M. (2010). A definition of cultural heritage: From the tangible to the intangible. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 11(3), 321-324.

WINSTANLEY, D. (1998). *Management development. Strategy and practice*. Oxford.

To cite this article:

DONELLI, C. C.; FANELLI, S.; MOZZONI, I. (2019). Managing and enhancing the intangible heritage: the experience of "Literary Parks". *European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 9 (1), pp. 52-63.