

Participatory methods and intangible cultural heritage in the neighbourhoods

Metodologías participativas y patrimonio cultural inmaterial en los barrios

Nuria Nebot-Gómez de Salazar

Universidad de Málaga

nurianebot@uma.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6187-0972>

Eva Morales-Soler

Universidad de Málaga

evamorsol@uma.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4182-9443>

Carlos Rosa-Jiménez

Universidad de Málaga

cjrosa@uma.es

<https://orcid.org/000-0001-6356-8734>

Abstract

The protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) is essential as a tool for social cohesion in local communities, instilling in them a feeling of identity and continuity, and promoting respect for diversity and human creativity. However, the safeguarding of this type of heritage is something very recent and there is still a lack of consensus about the common criteria and methodologies for its protection. Hence the importance of designing and implementing participatory methodologies that specifically create spaces for participation around the management of the ICH in neighbourhoods. This article shows results obtained from a real experience carried out in the neighbourhood of La Fontanalla (Málaga, Spain). A series of innovative and flexible methodological actions are proposed, based on the involvement of neighbours and local entities in the design of the participatory process. The results carried out confirm the suitability of this methodology to create spaces for participation. The conclusions include some peculiarities of community management of the ICH, mechanisms used, difficulties that have been found and their impact on participatory governance in the Malaga neighbourhood.

Keywords

Intangible cultural heritage, community participation, local communities, collective memory, neighbourhoods, trades, crafts.

Suggested citation: Nebot-Gómez de Salazar, N., Morales-Soler, E., & Rosa Jiménez, C. (2020). Participatory methods and intangible cultural heritage in the neighbourhoods. *Universitas*, 33, pp. 83-102.

Resumen

La protección del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial (PCI) resulta fundamental como herramienta de cohesión social en las comunidades locales, al infundir en ellas un sentimiento de identidad y continuidad, y promover el respeto a la diversidad y creatividad humana. Sin embargo, la salvaguardia de este tipo de patrimonio es algo muy reciente y existe todavía una falta de consenso acerca de criterios comunes y metodologías para su protección. De ahí la importancia de diseñar y poner en práctica metodologías participativas que permitan crear espacios de participación en torno a la gestión del PCI en los barrios. Este artículo muestra los resultados de una experiencia real llevada a cabo en el barrio de la Fontanalla en Málaga (España). Se propone una serie de acciones metodológicas innovadoras y abiertas, basada en la participación e implicación de vecinos/as y entidades locales en el propio diseño del proceso participativo a desarrollar. Los resultados confirman la idoneidad de dicha metodología para crear espacios de participación. Las conclusiones reconocen algunas particularidades de la gestión comunitaria del PCI, mecanismos utilizados, dificultades encontradas y su impacto en la gobernabilidad participativa del barrio malagueño.

Palabras clave

Patrimonio cultural inmaterial, participación comunitaria, comunidades locales, memoria colectiva, barrios, oficios, artesanía.

Introduction and state of the art

Intangible Cultural Heritage and the need to research protection methodologies

Intangible cultural heritage, hereinafter ICH, is clearly defined in the text prepared by the Convention for its safeguarding held in Paris —although its entry into force does not take place until 2006— referring to “the uses, representations, expressions, knowledge, and techniques that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as an integral part of their cultural heritage”(UNESCO, 2003, p. 2). This document shows the importance of intangible heritage as a tool that instills in communities a feeling of identity and continuity, promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. Recent research (Carofilis & García, 2015) attributes a qualita-

tive and specific role to cultural heritage in the formation of communities that can guide transformations of the physical environment and economies towards spaces of identity.

The protection of this type of heritage is something very recent that still requires research, consensus, and governance by administrations and institutions. Among the main tasks established by the Convention, the identification of the ICH through the elaboration of inventories stands out. However, it does not specify how they should be done, the methodologies to be implemented, or clear and concrete criteria for discrimination (UNESCO Catalonia, 2011), leaving it open to interpretation and adaptation by the states.

As expressed by Escalona-Hernández et al. (2017) the methodologies used for the preparation of inventories are oriented to tangible cultural heritage, and intangible heritage is addressed in a more limited way. Other investigations (Dumas, 2016) agree that work for the conservation of intangible heritage has not been prioritized in the appropriate manner. Some recent publications on previously carried out experiences are of special interest, especially in relation to the management of intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO Catalonia, 2011; Van der Hammen-Malo et al., 2015), in which, from real cases, one can learn about some of the difficulties encountered in the processes. These experiences confirm the lack of consensual methodologies and the need to investigate common criteria to approach the study and management of ICH.

The administrations themselves are beginning to become aware of the importance of protecting this heritage, and of agreeing on policies and intervention criteria. In Spain, in the absence of common criteria and intervention methodologies in the different autonomous communities, a National Plan for Intangible Heritage (National Plan for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2011) was established as a common frame of reference. In it, intangible heritage is characterized as a remembered heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, recreated, and linked to emotions and sensory records. Likewise, some areas of intangible heritage are defined that, without differing from those established in the Paris Convention, are more precisely adjusted to the Spanish reality: 1) productive activities, 2) beliefs and rituals, 3) oral tradition, 4) representations, 5) musical sphere, 6) food and cooking, and 7) forms of socialization (Carrión-Gutiez, 2015).

Currently, the catalogs or records of this intangible heritage in Spain are very limited. It should be highlighted the work of the *Atlas on the Intangi-*

ble Heritage of Andalusia, of the Andalusian Institute of Historical Heritage (Carrera, 2009). Since then, important work has been carried out in the identification, cataloging, and dissemination of the intangible heritage of the Andalusian region. However, there is still a field of study that has not been explored: the identification and safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage linked to neighborhoods and local communities.

What is proposed from this research is to use intangible heritage as a tool to promote participation processes and an active community life in the neighborhoods. The ultimate goal is not the development of a catalog itself, but the creation of spaces for participation around intangible heritage that encourage cohesive, diverse, and creative communities.

Involvement of local communities in safeguarding ICH

A reading of the text prepared by the Convention reveals the important role of local communities in safeguarding the ICH. It is the local communities that endorse and nurture the traditions, and guarantee their permanence and continuity over time (Frieri, 2014). The recommendations of the Convention (Unesco, 2003) stress the need to involve communities, groups, and social agents in the definition, location and inventory of their intangible cultural heritage. Other subsequent investigations affect the necessary participation, negotiation, and consensus with the bearers of this heritage (Mariano et al., 2014).

The role of administrations is very important in the face of the need to safeguard intangible heritage, starting with its identification, registration, and cataloging, as well as its dissemination and promotion. However, the heritagization processes are complex and, on many occasions, there are conflicts between the institutional conceptions and local dynamics (Lacarrieu & Laborde, 2018; Sánchez-Carretero & Jiménez-Esquinas, 2016). Some research shows the need and appropriateness of integrating the opinions of experts and scientists with local knowledge as a means to address this complexity (Craps & Brugnach, 2015). If some of the measures to be adopted by local administrations are to be prioritized, it insists on the need to involve communities and groups in safeguarding intangible heritage as agents that maintain, transmit, and can manage the intangible heritage of their neighborhoods in an active way.

This article proposes a series of methodological actions to involve communities, groups, and social agents throughout a participatory process. The

main objective of this process is to define, locate, and value their cultural heritage. From the deep conviction of the need to involve local communities in the management of their cultural heritage, their involvement has even been considered in the preparatory phases of design and planning of actions to be carried out, together with the support of technicians and academics.

This set of methodological actions, whose more general bases are shown below, will be tested in different Malaga neighborhoods in order to draw some conclusions about its validity as a form of action that can be extrapolated to different areas. Specifically, the contribution of the research is to contribute to the knowledge and comparison of methodological experiences in the management of intangible heritage. This article evaluates of the results obtained in the participatory process carried out in the Fontanalla neighborhood in Malaga (Spain).

The Fontanalla neighborhood as a case study

The *Arrabal de Fontanalla* in Malaga (Spain) is an old neighborhood outside the walls of the ancient Arab city (Machuca Santa-Cruz, 1987). It was an industrial area whose main activity was the artisanal activity of ceramics, which justifies the outcrop of a multitude of medieval archaeological furnaces in the different excavations carried out. These remains are a sample of the artisan neighborhood that was and that, at present, is being promoted through the work of some glass craft workshops, ceramics, and other trades (PTVMalaga, 2019).

Along with these ancient and current outcrops of crafts and trades, one can find a multitude of elements with heritage, tangible and intangible value: mural paintings on the facades of some of their homes, traditional residential house-patio typologies, narrow and irregular streets, typical of the old urban fabric of the Muslim city, etc. (Racero-Calvo, 2014). From the social and urban point of view, we find ourselves in a highly complex neighborhood, with a high unemployment rate among its inhabitants and a high percentage of immigrants (Sánchez Gómez et al., 2013). Problems of lack of coexistence have been identified within a local community, made up of an autochthonous neighbors, with a strong sense of roots, compared to other groups that more recently live in the neighborhood, and that suffer from it. In addition, its urban structure, characterized by its variegated hamlet, narrow and irregular streets, a high number of empty lots, and the strong impact of dividing walls in the urban space, accentuates the existing problems of social segregation.

Faced with this situation of uprooting of a part of the local community, represented by a high number of immigrants, there is a very active sector in the community life of the neighborhood and its cultural heritage. In this context of imbalance and division, the objective of the participatory process is to involve the greatest number of agents and people that allow greater cohesion of the community, reinforce the sense of identity and belonging to the neighborhood, and in the best of cases, promote the respect of the inhabitants towards their physical environment. In this way, the designed methodology would have a direct and very positive impact on the participatory governance of the neighborhood. The objective of this article is to design and implement a series of methodological actions that allow the creation of spaces for participation around the management of intangible heritage in neighborhoods and their local communities. In this way, the ICH becomes the means or tool capable of activating participatory processes.

Methodology

The methodology requires a multidisciplinary team of specialists with experience in participatory management in the field of urban planning and social education. On the other hand, the study and management of intangible heritage require very specific training, even more so if the lack of previously mentioned existing methodological references is considered.

Likewise, the scope or scale of action is defined: neighborhoods as areas of opportunity to access citizen groups, learn about their needs and problems, and meet their demands. In order to involve the local community, both in the design of the participatory process itself and in the planning of the actions to be carried out around the intangible heritage of La Fontanalla, three phases are established:

Phase 1. Construction of a map of intervening agents, protagonists of the process and working group

- a. At a preparatory level, the key informants have been contacted, these are the representatives of the Association of Neighbors and Merchants of the Arrabal Fontanalla, representative of the Glass and

Crystal Museum of Malaga, representatives of the artisan collective as well as some people from the neighborhood.

- b. With the support of key informants, a map of the intervening agents or sociogram of the neighborhood has been drawn up, which has made it possible to identify those people or sectors of the population that live and intervene in the study context. The priority intervening agents are the neighbors, but, in addition, people linked to the neighborhood who are part of the technical, political, and business sectors have been included.
- c. From here, the ideal way to communicate and disseminate the proposed participatory activities has been established, as well as the format, time, and place where they have been carried out.

Phase 2. Preparation by the specialists of an initial open and generic technical proposal of possible actions around intangible heritage as a basis for work and discussion with the local community

It is essential to develop an initial proposal of methodological actions that is generic enough to be implemented in different contexts and idiosyncrasies. This initial proposal includes a series of actions that are described below (the choice of actions to be developed has been decided by the local community based on this proposal). The following list includes all the actions that have been proposed to the group of participating neighbors at the beginning of the participatory process. Of all of them, action a) has been executed and completed and action b) has started.

- a. The collective walk. This action refers to collective walks with citizens, with the express invitation to privileged informants who promote knowledge of the history, reality, and ways of life of the neighborhood. This practice should make it easier for the people who participate to contribute to the construction of the story about life in the neighborhood.
- b. The memory of the neighborhood. With this action, the collection of old photos that collect the memory of the neighborhood open to the neighborhood is proposed. This compilation can be carried out in a

specific workshop with this objective, as well as from a virtual space that invites citizens to upload their own photos. These images can be accompanied by ‘short stories’ that allow us to compose ‘life stories’ and ‘elements of heritage value’ of the neighborhood.

- c. Discussion Workshop. A workshop with a discussion group is proposed for the qualitative characterization of the identified elements. With the images and stories collected, a workshop open to the public will be held, which will allow organizing and constructing a ‘lived history and the heritage elements of the neighborhood’ in a collaborative way. It is about characterizing the elements collected in a qualitative way, ordered from a timeline.
- d. Public exhibition. The exhibition action proposes a graphic construction of a timeline where the collected and selected material is ordered according to the type of element it is, the population sector that identifies with it, and the temporal or sequential origin in which it is located. With this sequence of images, an open and public exhibition can be held to open the debate to the entire neighborhood and/or city.
- e. The final workshop. By way of conclusions, a final meeting or gathering is proposed, with the aim of opening the debate and finishing prioritizing the heritage, tangible and intangible elements that can be collectively identified throughout the workshops.

Phase 3. Preparation by local agents and neighbors of a program of actions to be carried out based on the initial technical proposal of methodological actions

Based on the initial technical proposal of actions, and after a series of participatory meetings, open to the entire local community, the program of methodological actions to be carried out, dates, places, and people and institutions involved in each of them has been agreed. Given the difficulty of involving certain sectors of the population in attending participatory workshops, it has been considered necessary to carry out activities with different formats and spaces for participation.

Results

Based on the first results, an assessment can be made of the used mechanisms, their impact on the governance of the local community, as well as assessing the capacity of intangible heritage and its safeguarding as an activator of participatory processes.

Phase 1: Map of local agents, working group and planning of actions

The Fontanalla sociogram has been a simple task to carry out because it is a community where there is already an association of neighbors and merchants made up of people who live or work in the neighborhood, representatives of local institutions, even small businesses in the surroundings.

This association is very active and facilitates the relationship of the inhabitants with some of the main institutions of the neighborhood such as the Museum of Glass and Crystal of Malaga, the educational center IES Vicente Espinel, the workshop of *Artesanía del Vidrio Viarca*, the artisan collective, or the small shops in the neighborhood. All of them are part of that local community whose involvement in the process has been fundamental. The formation of this map of intervening agents may be expanded throughout the process, as the successive phases of the process unfold. Once the sociogram was constructed, a working group has been formed with the some agents of the neighborhood and technicians/academics: president of the Association of Neighbors and Merchants Arrabal Fontanalla, director of the Museum of Glass and Crystal of Malaga, a craftsman with a workshop in the neighborhood, various people from the neighborhood, specialists and researchers in the management of participatory processes from the University of Malaga. The formation of this transversal group has allowed the non-hierarchical confluence of scientific, local, and artisan knowledge and practices. This being a fundamental issue in this type of process (Roldán & Arelovich, 2020).

One of the first tasks to be carried out has been to make the objectives of the participatory process known to local agents within said working group. It is very important to explain the concept of Intangible Cultural Heritage; what it is, what it is for, and its importance as a tool for identity and social cohesion. One can even consider holding a small training workshop on ICH,

although one should try not to be too theoretical, and bring the concept of intangible heritage in a practical way and adapted to the group to which it is taught. In the case of the project in Fontanalla, a specific workshop on intangible heritage has not been held, but the concept has been worked on and explained in different preparatory meetings. It should be noted that a good part of the local community — linked to the Arts and Crafts field — was already familiar with this concept. It can also be useful to produce graphic and written materials that explain the concept of intangible heritage in a simple and direct way. In addition, this material can be used to disseminate it to other members of the community, as has been done in the Fontanalla neighborhood (figure 1).

Figure 1
Dissemination material used in participatory process



Source: Elaborated by Marta Córnaux and Francisco J. Chamizo.

Phases 2 and 3: initial technical proposal of methodological actions and definition and planning of action program by the local community

In order for the initial proposal of the methodological actions of the technical team to be adopted as its own by the community, it is essential to clearly explain the objectives of the participatory process and the proposed actions. Based on the technical proposal, the local community —represented by the working group— has decided to carry out actions a), b), c) and d), although, at the time, only the first has been carried out. Only from the consensus and adaptation of these actions to the conditions and reality of the neighborhood (define what actions will finally be carried out, when they will be held, where, who will attend or present each activity, etc.), the local community can adopt the process and program of actions as their own.

It should be said that the agents involved in the Fontanalla process have shown great interest and availability in the development of the different activities from the beginning. The involvement of some people from the neighborhood stands out, all of them with a strong sense of roots in the neighborhood. Each one of those attending the preparatory meetings has shown interest in some of the issues presented to them. The knowledge of these personal interests, concerns, and singularities of the neighborhood is what should finish shaping the methodology and process to be followed, transforming, and specifying the initial technical proposal of actions to be developed.

In the case of La Fontanalla, the guided collective walk has been developed and the methodological action of memory of the neighborhood or collection of photographs has begun. In the preparatory meetings of the working group, the possibility of elaborating an audiovisual artifact that documents the customs and singularities of the neighborhood, that allows its dissemination and the strengthening of cultural identity through the resources of audiovisual ethnography and social communication was proposed (Bruzón-Delgado, 2017). This article shows the results of action 1 already completed.

Phase 3: execution of scheduled activity: Guided Collective Walk

It is important that the intervening agents are the ones who plan, to suit each of the programmed activities, accompanied and advised by specialists.

In the case of the guided walk through the Fontanalla, they have been the ones who have defined the places to visit, the people who presented each place, the stories, and content to tell, and so on. From an initial planning, there have been exchanges of experiences and memories in a spontaneous way that are of great value to build collective memory. The activity, in turn, has consisted of different phases: preparatory meetings for the guided tour, its occurrence, and a day to assess the experience and compile the resulting materials.

In the preparatory meetings, the participants have designed and decided the elements of interest that they wanted to show, including, within these elements, some of the traditions, crafts such as glass and ceramics, personal stories and legends of the neighborhood, such as the of the “*Monster of High Street*”, memories and tribute to special people for different reasons, new forms of socialization within the neighborhood, and special places for their ability to generate memories of collective experiences in them. Likewise, other points of interest have been included in the visit, such as the IES Vicente Espinel institute that, although it can be linked, a priori, to tangible architectural heritage, represent places that generate attachment and arouse many shared memories linked to them. However, it could be said that one of the greatest difficulties encountered in the process is related precisely to the concept of intangible heritage: what can be considered a heritage element and its distinction between tangible and intangible. It is very necessary to establish clear criteria from the beginning.

These preparatory meetings have been of great interest due to the discussions and debates that have taken place in them about the unique aspects and values of the neighborhood. It is important to document and record all this information from notes, photographs, even videos. Failure to do so, as in any of the meetings held, will lose very valuable information that must be constructed throughout the process. It is advisable to prepare an open document or list of singular elements that generate “attachment” in a collective way. At a later stage, it will be possible to assess which of these can be considered elements of intangible heritage according to the general requirements of the Paris Convention. The initial development of the project has made it possible to construct this list of unique elements, although it has not been concluded which ones will form part of a catalog of the neighborhood’s intangible heritage. The collective definition of these elements will be determined throughout the different activities programmed within the participatory process.

Another aspect to highlight is the choice of guides and tellers for the visit. This group of cicerones has been formed with people from the neighborhood and with other people and scholars who know it in depth: historians, an archaeologist, and artisans. Their in-depth knowledge of the place has been essential to define and design the milestones of the guided collective walk. It is necessary, not only to define those milestones or stops, but to make a general plan of the visit: contents to be shown, time dedicated to each place, and so on.

Likewise, it is advisable to prepare graphic material that describes the route, the stages, and the order in which they will be carried out. In this way, the residents who have not been able to attend the full day, have been able to do it, at least, to some of its parts by knowing their location and estimation over time. Ultimately, it is about facilitating participation in the experience of the largest possible number of people.

One of the most interesting aspects of the experience was focused on the spontaneous personal contributions of the neighbors. Again, the need to record all testimonies through videos, audios or any other available resource is indicated.

The activity ended with the invitation to a snack prepared by the organizers (mostly neighbors), being this a ludic moment in which there was an exchange and coming together between those attending the activity. These spaces for participation are very important to strengthen interpersonal relationships within the community. After the event, a meeting was held with the intervening agents to assess the experience, share the resulting materials, and begin to collectively plan the next activity.

The results of the visit are considered very positive considering attendance, reaching an approximate number of 120 attendees. The high participation translates into a high impact of the experience, which has made it possible to publicize the neighborhood and its singularities beyond its geographical limits. It should be said that local media were interested in the neighborhood and provided exposure to the initiative (PTVMálaga, 2019). In terms of qualitative analysis, an assessment is made from different points of view. The attendees were, to a large extent, residents of the neighborhood, but also some students, university professors, technicians from the local administration, even people from other neighborhoods attended. This diversity implies an interest in the neighborhood and its heritage on the part of Málaga's citizens (and not only of the local community).

It is appropriate to indicate that the participation in the activity of some of the most disadvantaged groups and recent inhabitants of the neighborhood is low in comparison with the group of people who have lived in it for many years. Some attendees have been accounted for very punctually. With the aim of promoting social cohesion in the local community, the need to incorporate new social agents into the participatory process is proposed, such as NGO organizations based in the neighborhood, and that are actively and directly related to these groups. The incorporation of these social agents in the different and future planned activities aims to improve the participatory governance of the neighborhood, increase the number of interpersonal relationships, as well as encourage the care and respect of the physical environment by these groups. From this point of view, a critical evaluation of the methodology used is made. It is essential to deepen and understand, in an exhaustive way, the reality and social problems of the neighborhood, putting local social agents in contact with the most disadvantaged groups from the beginning. Currently, we are actively working on the incorporation of these agents into the process.

On the other hand, and in order to facilitate and encourage the participation of the largest and most diverse number of agents, it is important to develop a strategy for disseminating activities. In the case of the Fontanalla, the work of dissemination through social networks, the “word of mouth” of the neighbors, the holding of neighborhood meetings where the different activities have been reported is highly valued. Likewise, it is considered that the involvement of certain agents, such as some representatives of the local administration, has been very positive, facilitating the dissemination of the event in local media.

In the activity: evaluation session, the lack of consensus and common criteria to discriminate between tangible and intangible heritage arises again in the discussions, which denotes the priority of establishing clear criteria. On the other hand, criticism is made of the lack of planning in terms of the time dedicated to each stage, which caused the delay of the different stops and the impossibility of attending the last ones on the part of some attendees. In the same way, it would have been desirable to carry out a survey to assess the experience of the participants, including in it, possible improvements and suggestions that can be incorporated into similar future experiences. The incorporation of a participant evaluation survey is recommended in the following planned activities.

However, and despite the consideration of possible improvements in the successive phases of the participatory process, the first results confirm the importance of participation and the development of participatory actions for the safeguarding of intangible heritage, and specifically, to achieve cohesion, diversity, and creativity in local communities. The different meetings — preparatory meetings, a guided tour, a snack organized by residents, and a discussion meeting — have generated rich debates that have highlighted and valued some of the singularities of the neighborhood. Stories and information were shared through spontaneous contributions. The most ludic events have allowed the exchange of memories and experiences that favor interpersonal relationships in the community, and a sense of belonging to the neighborhood. All these actions have led to new creative proposals such as the future organization of an outdoor exhibition in the neighborhood with all the materials and information collected so far.

Conclusions

Evaluation of the methodology designed for the creation of spaces for participation around ICH management

The methodological development has been carried out, mainly, through the creation of a local working group accompanied by technicians, and the holding of workshops and collective reflections on the intangible heritage and singularities of the neighborhood. A series of open methodological actions were proposed and subsequently, the local community defined what actions to carry out and planned the participatory process. After evaluating the first phases, a very positive evaluation was made of the methodology and used mechanisms, as they allowed the creation of spaces for participation among residents of the local community and with other agents outside the neighborhood. The first steps in the process have made it possible to make the neighborhood and its intangible heritage known beyond the local community. The execution of the first phases points out, however, the need to incorporate new social agents related to the most disadvantaged groups of the neighborhood, and with a lower rate of participation in the process.

A positive evaluation was made of the methodological process in terms of its flexibility and empowerment of the neighbors. This empowerment has resulted in high involvement in the different activities that were carried out. One of the difficulties encountered is related to the management of intangible heritage, precisely: the lack of consensus and common criteria when it comes to discriminating which elements can be considered as such. From all this, it is clear the importance of creating, from the beginning, a multi-disciplinary group with knowledge, both in the management of participatory processes and in the specific management of ICH. It is essential to establish clear criteria both in the identification phase, as well as in the registration and cataloging phase of this type of heritage. Likewise, it emphasizes the need to document the entire development of the process, not only the, a priori, most important conferences or milestones, but also the preparatory meetings and other encounters where many experiences and knowledge of the locals are exchanged.

Intangible Cultural Heritage as a generator element of participatory processes

The intangible cultural heritage of a place allows that place to be singled out, to make it different and special, and to generate ties or bonds of identity among its inhabitants, towards the place and among themselves. The search for values and singularities, in general, is a very enriching process for all people, especially if it is done in community, allowing to establish bonds of identity and cohesion.

The different preparatory meetings and conferences held are spaces for the exchange of information between participants, and at the same time, for co-existence and discussion, which, without a doubt, has made it possible to strengthen relations between neighbors with different ages, professional fields, social ranks, and concerns, but all of this with strong roots in the neighborhood.

Likewise, some of the singularities of the neighborhood have been made known among neighbors and other attendees, with special importance given to the artisan activity of glass and ceramics. The exhibition of the Glass Museum has been unveiled and the techniques of the trade have been shown in one of the craft workshops, thus bringing the entire community closer to one of the main artistic manifestations of Fontanalla. On the other hand, the

experience has strengthened the neighborhood's relationship with some of the institutions involved in the process, such as the University of Malaga, the Glass and Crystal Museum, the IES Vicente Espinel center, or the Malaga City Council.

The case of La Fontanalla joins, thus, other previous participatory experiences carried out that aim to make known and value the singularities and values of its cultural heritage. Lerner (2005) reminds us that it is necessary to know in order to value, to value in order to respect, and to respect in order to love when referring to the importance of promoting a sense of identity towards the place we inhabit. In this sense, intangible heritage becomes a motive or activating tool for participatory processes that seek to strengthen the relationship with the place and between people.

Research support and financial support

Entity: University of Malaga-Malaga City Council.

Country: Spain

City: Malaga

Subsidized project: (1) Chair Emerging Technologies for Citizenship / (2) Malaga Net Project: bases for the sustainable rehabilitation of Malaga's historical heritage.

Project code: (1) 8.07 / 5.83.5026 / (2) 8.06 / 3.14.4955

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the residents of Fontanalla who have participated in the planned activities, to the institutions and entities involved: the association of residents and merchants of Arrabal Fontanalla, the Museum of Glass, and Crystal of Malaga, the Viarca Glass Wrokshop, and the IES educational center Vicente Espinel. We also thank the research technicians Marta Córnaux Martín and Francisco J. Chamizo Nieto for their collaboration, who have contributed to the dynamization of the process.

Bibliography

- Bruzón-Delgado, L. (2017). Audiovisual etnográfico y tradición: una contribución a la identidad y el desarrollo del municipio. La experiencia de San Juan Atitán (Guatemala). *Universitas*, XV(27), 45-65. <http://bit.ly/3cZUw2S>
- Carofilis, N., & García, G. (2015). El patrimonio como recurso: el cambio de paradigmas en la conservación urbana desde una perspectiva internacional. *Estoa. Revista de La Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo de la Universidad de Cuenca*, 4(6) <https://doi.org/10.18537/est.v004.n006.12>
- Carrera, G. (2009). Iniciativas para la salvaguardia del Patrimonio Inmaterial en el contexto de la Convención UNESCO, 2003: una propuesta desde Andalucía. *Revista Patrimonio Cultural de España*. <http://bit.ly/2TPsIXq>
- Carrión-Gutierrez, A. (2015). *Plan Nacional para la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial*. <https://doi.org/10.4438/030-16-425-3>
- Craps, M., & Brugnach, M. (2015). *A relational approach to deal with ambiguity in multi-actor governance for sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.2495/RAV150201>
- Dumas, N. Q. (2016). El futuro del pasado. *Estoa. Revista de La Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo de la Universidad de Cuenca*, 4(6). <https://doi.org/10.18537/est.v004.n006.04>
- Escalona-Hernández, C., Calvario-Morales, Á.F., García-Mora, M.T., Marín-Bolaños, B.A., Sonda de la Rosa, R., & Valle-Cantón, O. (2017). Metodología para la identificación del patrimonio cultural inmaterial en la península de Yucatán. En Margarita de Abril Navarro Favela (Coord.), *Estudios multidisciplinarios hacia el turismo sustentable en la Península de Yucatán* (pp. 175-215). <http://bit.ly/2TTt4N0>
- Frieri, S. (2014). *Manual de herramientas participativas para la identificación, documentación y gestión de las manifestaciones del patrimonio cultural inmaterial*. Bogotá. <http://bit.ly/38T5B2G>
- Lacarrière, M., & Laborde, S. (2018). Diálogos con la colonialidad: los límites del patrimonio en contextos de subalternidad. *Persona y Sociedad*, 32(1), 11-38. <http://bit.ly/2vjx5R8>
- Machuca Santa-Cruz, L. (1987). *Málaga, ciudad abierta origen, cambio y permanencia de una estructura urbana*. Colegio de Arquitectos. <http://bit.ly/2QflBph>
- Mariano, M., Endere, M.L., & Mariano, C.I. (2014). Herramientas metodológicas para la gestión del patrimonio intangible. El caso del municipio de Ola-

- varría, Buenos Aires, Argentina. *ICANH, Revista Colombiana de Antropología*, 50(2), 243-269. <https://doi.org/10.22380/2539472X53>
- Plan Nacional para la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial (2011). <http://bit.ly/2Qf78cE> Accessed 15/03/2020
- PTVMálaga (2019). Tu barrio: Arrabal de Fontanalla. España: PTV Málaga. <https://bit.ly/30R1SC5>
- Racero-Calvo, J. (2014). *Nuevos espacios culturales en la oferta turística de la ciudad de Málaga: El Museo del Vidrio y Cristal y su entorno*. <https://bit.ly/33O33nn>
- Roldán, D., & Arelovich, L. (2020). Territorios en disputa. Los pescadores, la ribera, el urbanismo y el acuario del Paraná (Rosario, Argentina). *Universitas*, 32, 77-98. <https://doi.org/10.17163/uni.n32.2020.04>
- Sánchez-Carretero, C., & Jiménez-Esquinas, G. (2016). Relaciones entre actores patrimoniales: gobernanza patrimonial, modelos neoliberales y procesos participativos. *Revista PH*, 190. <https://doi.org/10.33349/2016.0.3827>
- Sánchez-Gómez, J., Nebot Gómez de Salazar, N., & García-Bujalance, N. (2013). Ensayos de reciclaje urbano como experiencia docente realizados por estudiantes de Arquitectura. Aprendiendo del barrio artesanal de La Fontanalla. En Aula Greencities (Ed.), *Greencities y Sostenibilidad: Inteligencia Urbana aplicada a la Sostenibilidad Urbana* (p. 15). Málaga. <http://bit.ly/2U62Qpk>
- UNESCO (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris, France. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2IKh4qH>
- UNESCO Cataluña (2011). *Metodología para el inventario del patrimonio cultural inmaterial en las REservas de la Biosfera*. Barcelona. <http://bit.ly/2vnjyrX>
- Van der Hammen-Malo, M.C., Frieri Gilchrist, S., Sánchez-Silva, L.F., & Peña Bautista, A. (2015). *Opciones y Acciones para la salvaguardia del PCI: una compilación de experiencias* (Bogotá: Mi). Bogotá. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/38RQLcP> Accessed 15/03/2020

Submission date: 2020/03/19; Acceptance date: 2020/08/10;

Publication date: 2020/09/01

