

Cultural Welfare: Social Impact and Employment on Territories

By Roberta Caragnano*

The authoress examines the issue of cultural welfare with respect to its social and health impact, and as a tool for individual and societal well-being. The essay also considers empirical evidence in which a decrease in inflammatory markers is found after cultural experiences, so much so as to confirm the therapeutic value of art and culture. It is in this orientation that cultural welfare, recognised by the World Health Organization, is placed. The author analyses both the scientific methodologies of culture-specific impact assessment and the resulting social return on investment, as well as the social impact of culture on the surroundings and on employment. Culture, in fact, stimulates processes of innovation and change both in organisations and on local development governance processes. The essay analyses, therefore, the relationship between tourism and culture on the one hand, and on the relational role between cultural assets and tourist fruition on the other, with the related employment impact (such as development of ancient crafts, generation turnover, territorial marketing) resulting from the enhancement of heritage. There is also a focus on the phenomenon of smart working and projects for the enhancement of villages.

Keywords: *cultural welfare; social and health impact; smart working; employment*

Introduction

The topic of cultural welfare has been the subject of attention and study in scientific literature over the years, especially after the publication of a number of epidemiological studies that have demonstrated unequivocally how intelligent enjoyment of leisure time is associated with the extension of life expectancy and a reduction in certain illnesses and degenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's or cancer.

Grossi¹, while highlighting issues related to the privileged relationship between cultural participation and health status, conversely notes that in Italy, culture is generally considered to be "entertainment." This is just the aspect that needs to be reversed. It is on this aspect that a reversal is needed.

*Professor of Law of Social Policies and Labour - LUMSA University, Rome, Italy; General Secretary of "Gli Stati Generali del Patrimonio Italiano"/"The General States of the Italian Heritage".

Email: caragnano.roberta@gmail.com

¹ Grossi (2013).

Social and Health Impact of Cultural Welfare

The interpretative keys of culture are diverse and move not only in the more strictly cultural sphere, understood as the protection and enhancement of intangible, historical and artistic material heritage, but also as a tool for individual and societal welfare taken note of the great value and multidisciplinary approach of culture.

It follows, therefore, that cultural activity must also take on a precise value from the point of view of "well-being," becoming a tool that can prevent cognitive decline, mitigate stressful conditions and contribute to general well-being².

The close relationship between culture and well-being (understood as mental and physical well-being) also enjoys several empirical evidences. Among the most recent is the 2018 study from the U.S. University of Berkeley, which found a decrease in inflammatory markers after experiencing cultural encounters, as well as the scientifically proven fact that listening to music during chemotherapy helps reduce nausea.

In this vein, there are several countries that believe strongly in the therapeutic value of art and culture; in Canada, for example, museum visits are prescribed by the attending physician and reimbursed by the state similar to prescribed medications.

It is this orientation that cultural welfare is recognised by the World Health Organization and defined by the Treccani encyclopedia as «a new integrated model of promoting well-being and health of individuals and communities, through practices based on visual, performing and heritage arts».

In 2015, WHO launched the Cultural contexts of health and well-being project in order to contribute to the implementation of the European Region strategy (represented by the 53 countries in the area and not just those in the European Union) outlined in Health 2020. A European policy framework and strategy for the 21st century³ (WHO, 2013) aimed at guiding national health policies according to the Health in All Policies approach (WHO, 2013). A work that later fed into WHO's research asked what evidence there is on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A sweeping review (from 2019)⁴ highlighted the contribution of the arts to improving well-being and quality of life.

A welfare model, then, that can be delineated into multiple types of activities, from health promotion, inclusion, active aging, and the introduction of projects as complementary therapies to traditional therapeutic pathways and their use as supportive of the caring relationship or as mitigants for some degenerative conditions.

We are in the context of a scenario that is the result of a process that has matured over the past twenty years, aiming to «appropriately and effectively incorporate the processes of cultural production and dissemination within a

²Cicerchia & Bologna (2017); Lampis (2017); Grossi (2017); Bodo & Sacco (2017); Fisher (2017); Fujiwara, Lawton & Mourato et al. (2017); Sacco (2017).

³https://www.dors.it/documentazione/testo/201409/2013_Health2020-Long_ENG.pdf

⁴<https://www.who.int/europe/publications/i/item/9789289054553>. The Italian version, what is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review (Full report), was translated by CCW-Cultural Welfare in partnership with DoRS Piedmont Region Regional Documentation Center for Health Promotion, authorised by WHO.

welfare system to make them an integral part of the social welfare and health services that guarantee citizens the context to develop their potential, a central element for well-being (Life Skills - WHO), forms of care and accompaniment necessary to overcome the critical issues related to aging, pathologies, disabilities, and social integration with which is associated the duty of social protection»⁵.

Findings/Results

Impact Indicators

Scientific impact assessment methodologies specific to culture began to develop in a more structured way in the 2000s with Scott and Selwood's ⁶ studies in an area that traditionally presented difficulties.

Measuring impact, and before that the set of indicators, is not a simple matter because it is not enough to monitor data and calculate only the number of visitors; rather, it is necessary to identify indicators that can document the multi-dimensionality of the impacts generated by culture ⁷.

The impact is twofold: On the one hand, the direct or indirect tangible one measured through the effect that the cultural institution can generate at the level of the local economy, jobs, wages for the categories of employees in the sector, and supply chain costs. On the other hand, there is the impact of an intangible nature that is generated when an individual or a community is in contact with art and heritage as much in terms of cultural learning as in terms of well-being ⁸.

Impact Methodologies

There are three main impact methodologies. The first is Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA), which takes the form of a technique that identifies and analyses impacts in monetary terms and determines whether the benefits of investments outweigh the costs. It is often used in the public and private sectors to have "economically" assessable data unencumbered by other factors in order to evaluate investment decisions more than to measure impacts.

The second methodology is Multiplier Analysis (MA) and is used to demonstrate the added value of an impact on the economy more generally. These impacts include measurable direct (employment) and indirect (service providers) effects; this technique captures the 'trickle down' or cascade effect, that is, the effect an institution has or can have on the economy. In practice, however, this technique does not allow for the evaluation of social and cultural benefits.

Then there is Contingent Valuation (CV) which is characterised as a methodology that uses a 'revealed preference' model. Specifically, it takes the form

⁵Seia (2020).

⁶Scott (2002); Scott (2006); Selwood, (2010).

⁷Armbrrecht, (2014); Hooper-Greenhill (2004).

⁸Holden (2004); Scott (2006).

of a survey in which users are asked to express a specific preference about a service or product. Users are thus asked to indicate value through (a) their willingness to pay (WTP - Willingness to Pay) for a service that is actually free, or (b) their willingness to accept (WTA Willingness to Accept) the loss of a service in the form of compensation. The aforementioned methodology often proves to be suitable for some surveys in the cultural sphere, considering that it is a method for attributing a value to activities that do not have a conventional, market value and for also taking into consideration the point of view of those who do not directly use a good or a product (but to which they nonetheless attribute a value).

Finally, there is the social return on investment (SROI) methodology, which builds on a technique used in the purely economic sphere and combines elements of Multiplier Analysis and Contingent Valuation to indicate both impact and value, and includes a range of financial, economic and social indicators. SROI has been applied widely in the private and nonprofit and Third Sector sectors.

Social Return on Investment (SROI): Strengths and Weaknesses

As a result of its characteristics, SROI offers greater flexibility in that it provides a set of indicators that are constructed ad hoc, and it can be used to monitor the progress of a museum's impact, for example, over time. In fact, there are several experiments in this very area.

Going into the substance of impact assessment, from a practical point of view it evaluates the social, economic and environmental impact of the work done by an organisation through direct engagement with key stakeholders or interested parties.

The evaluation process goes through certain principles and steps: a) the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation; b) the definition of certain proxies, choosing the most relevant parameters and those that best express the social value created and that are measurable; c) a parameter is identified that allows a profile of "realism" to be maintained; d) there is a commitment to transparency and rigor in the evaluation of data; e) aspects that can be traced back to material proxies, and basically of a monetary nature, are considered; f) finally, the verification of results is carried out⁹.

The combination of qualitative, quantitative and financial data for the purpose of assessing the impact on both an organisation and the well-being generated¹⁰ allows for a clearer and fairly realistic picture. The scientific approach, in fact, is that of the "Theory of change," which aims to explore how social change is achieved and how change can be demonstrated and illustrated in to show that value has been created¹¹.

⁹Arvidson, Lyon, McKay & Moro (2010); Whelan (2015); Nicholls (2012); SROI Network (2015); Millar & Hall (2012).

¹⁰Paddon et al., (2014); Nicholls (2012); Whelan (2015).

¹¹Arvidson, Lyon, McKay & Moro, (2010);

Hence the centrality of stakeholder involvement, which is substantiated through such methodologies as focus groups, interviews, World Cafés, and data collection questionnaires¹².

This modality also allows a transparency of the process: the definition of the social value that is created and the impact map or chain of cause and effect from inputs to outputs, are commonly defined between the organisation and the stakeholders.¹³ On the other hand, the initial financial statement, which covers the time frame of one year to evince financial data related to the entity that is proposed to make the assessment of its social performance, can be applied to a more extended time frame. In this way, the impact of a range of factors can be assessed. Such factors may have intervened in the achievement of a given result, such as the contribution of other parties or events to the achievement of the result, and thus not attributable to the direct contribution of the organisation or entity.

It is precisely the SROI methodology, at that moment, and because of the empirical evidence, that appears to be the most effective as it is able to provide quantitative evidence to intangible factors such as social and cultural impacts. However, the use of SROI is not widespread except for those entities that have in their mission objectives of a social nature or that in some way have a pronounced social return of the activities put in place, such as the museums mentioned earlier¹⁴.

However, one aspect that part of the doctrine highlights as critical concerns certain aspects of method that aim to return an economic-monetary measure of social impact¹⁵. The other element that is most critically evaluated is the use of discretionary indicators for evaluation. It still remains, as Arvidson¹⁶ points out, that there are advantages in such a methodology. One among them is the flexibility and pragmatism considering that SROI can be applied in many sectors and in many initiatives, even single ones, as long as the type of impact to be measured is defined in a correct and interspersed way, without claiming to estimate the totality of social impacts generated. Transparent reporting of results and the clarity with which the areas of impact and the categories of stakeholders involved are defined comes into play in an important way in this case.

¹²Wilson & Whelan (2014); Whelan (2015); World Cafe (2015).

¹³Nicholls (2012); Rotheroe & Richards (2007).

¹⁴In England there are significant examples of such application in the case of the museums of East Anglia (MEAL), Liverpool and Manchester. With respect to them it is noted that this happens because there are often areas of activity that are purely social in nature and not related to the "core" activities of a museum and in the case of MEAL for example there is also a social enterprise that in accordance with the social mission works primarily on creating a local community and facilitating people to enter the world of work. Other cases to mention include that of the Tyne and Wear Museums (TWAM) in the Northeast of the United Kingdom, which in 2006 analysed the social impacts generated by an exhibition 'Cinema India: The Art of Bollywood.' In Italy, we mention in 2017 the project of the Florentine association MUS.E, which oversaw the enhancement of the heritage of the Florentine Civic Museums (including the Palazzo Vecchio Museum, the Museum of the Twentieth Century, the Santa Maria Novella complex, the Brancacci Chapel, the Forte di Belvedere and the Murate).

¹⁵Pathak & Dattani (2014); Arvidson, Lyon, McKay & Moro (2010).

¹⁶Arvidson, Lyon, McKay & Moro (2013).

Discussion

Social Impact of Culture on the Territory and Employment

Culture stimulates processes of innovation and change both in organisations and in the social fabric, thus impacting local development governance processes.

Beginning with the studies of Landry and Matarasso in the second half of the 1990s¹⁷, the topic of assessing the social and territorial impacts of culture has been the subject of attention and, at the same time, of complex framing because of both the variables involved, which differ from one context to another, the approaches used, and the impacts resulting from them.

While on the one hand there are experiences that demonstrate the positive impact of culture on the rebirth and social regeneration of places, the empowerment of territories and suburbs, with annexed important birth of "new employment" (including and especially for women) in some areas, on the other hand and at the same time a diversified picture emerges such that it is difficult to identify common criteria for assessing impacts, typical of economic-legal impact analysis¹⁸.

The impact of cultural innovation initiatives on the regeneration of places and spaces and the employment addendum it produces are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Culture and cultural enterprises that bud as a result of actions and investments in the territory, as already highlighted, are considered important not only from a social point of view but also from an employment point of view since they contribute to a direct growth in employment and social capital innovation, to an equal or greater extent than other productive sectors.¹⁹ Conversely, they generate an indirect effect on other sectors of the economy such as tourism or communications. The cascading effect on the territory that produces wealth and innovation is determined²⁰.

Boschma²¹ in his paper on the economies of proximity highlights how the creation of co-working spaces and Fab Labs, as new workplaces, have also produced a game-changing effect on the productive fabric in the relationship of exchange between businesses, institutions, and local communities and, therefore, also on policies²².

Therefore, it is evident that a process is being grafted and has also seen the transformation of local authorities in the management of services and their shift from a role of government to one of governance in which the typical aspect of this transformation does not only concern the network of public/private entities involved and the coordinating role played by the public body, but pertains to the involvement of the entire local community. In this regard, the modes of public consultation and crowdsourcing in the definition of the policies to be put in place

¹⁷Matarasso (1997).

¹⁸Ratti (2015).

¹⁹NESTA (2013); Tricarico (2018).

²⁰Sacco, Ferilli & Blessi (2014).

²¹Boschma (2005).

²²Tricarico & Geissler (2017).

help to recompose the stretch marks that have marked the relations between civil society and institutions in recent years.

In this way, local authorities, through the development of new governance models based on collaboration between public and private entities, including with the involvement of intermediate bodies and local stakeholders, can trigger virtuous welfare mechanisms.

It follows that in this path of welfare territorialisation, it is necessary for each local context to be able to build «a sufficiently solid and recognisable system of social protection. In the absence of minimum standards and certain shared rules. Each territory responds, in fact, to the multiple challenges of local welfare with different approaches, investment logic and priorities. Everywhere, however, and in each case, there is a need for the development of skills and capacities to design and plan social policies by the entities and actors there that contribute at different levels and different roles»²³.

On this basis and in order to respond to the changing needs of the labour market, and as a result of the economic crisis that imposes a paradigm shift in the vision of the role of the public entity and a necessary rethinking of development models, business networks²⁴ together with co-operatives and consortiums (not forgetting the role of bilateral bodies as outlined in Legislative Decree No. 276/2003, which, however, assume a greater role in guaranteeing forms of assistance of a health and social security nature) have become increasingly widespread, especially among small and medium-sized companies.

In this regard, one part of the doctrine has observed that «the traditional industrial paradigm, which suggested the pursuit of concentration and economies of scale, grants equal dignity to the model of networks, flexibility, integration of districts, alliances, and consortia. Within the network, coordination takes place that is not always based only on hierarchical rules and not based solely on price mechanisms. That is, we are often outside the Williamsonian market-hierarchy dichotomy: we are within vertical (bidirectional), horizontal, (peer) and lateral (decentralised) relationships»²⁵.

Cultural Assets for Tourist use

The concept of cultural heritage, according to the dominant doctrine, is based on the dual relationship between tourism and culture on the one hand and the relational role between cultural heritage and tourist enjoyment on the other²⁶.

In this scenario are two interesting themes that we intend to explore here in depth: the role of villages and the European Cultural Routes²⁷.

²³Costa (2009).

²⁴For more on the network contract read Bianca (2010) and Scognamiglio (2009). On the spread of business networks in Italy read Colombo, Mangolini & Foresti (2014).

²⁵Bernardi, Treu & Tridico (2011).

²⁶Dallari & Mariotti (2011); Trono (2012)

²⁷The Cultural Routes program, of which there are 38 to date (available at the following link <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cultural-routes/by-theme>), was initiated by the Council of Europe in 1987 with the Declaration of Santiago de Compostela. The Routes represent an invitation to travel

The Cultural Routes and Paths

Cultural Routes can be qualified as complex cultural assets²⁸ that can combine recreational and tourism aspects with the concept of cultural heritage.

As a forerunner, Michel Thomas Penette in 1997 stated that «Cultural Routes are founded on a process of cultural cooperation that responds to three functions. The first is a function of protecting Europe's cultural values that considers the tensions between local, regional, national and European identities. The second is a dynamic observatory function, enabling the exchange of information and experiences. The third is an experimental function that allows the emphasis at the same time to be brought to bear on new programs of cooperation between different and complementary areas of research, new forms of bringing together young Europeans, the enhancement of lesser-known heritages, the establishment of networks that bring together expertise ranging from project conception to implementation and working across the board, seeking interdisciplinarity»²⁹.

It follows that the Cultural Route is understood as a cultural, tourism cooperation and educational heritage project having the objective of developing and promoting an itinerary, or a series of them, on the basis of a historical route but also a cultural concept and transnational scope with special relevance and significance for understanding and respecting European community values.

In a joint manner with the Routes in 2016 in Italy, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities (MiBACT), to cite one example, launched the project "National Year of the Italian Cammini" in collaboration with the Regions. The goal was to implement the network of Cammini, pedestrian hiking routes or otherwise usable with other forms of sustainable soft mobility, and to promote their targeted implementation and management.

In fact, the Ministerial Directive³⁰ defines the Caminos as «cultural itineraries of particular European and/or national importance, which can be travelled on foot or by other forms of sustainable soft mobility, and which represent a mode of enjoyment of the widespread natural and cultural heritage, as well as an opportunity to enhance the natural, cultural and territorial attractions involved. Consistent with the vision of the Council of Europe, the paths cross one or more regions, may be part of European routes, are organised around themes of historical, cultural, artistic, religious or social interest».

The Cammini represent opportunities for the rediscovery and enhancement of the villages and inland areas of our regions, see, for example, the National Strategy for Inland Areas (SNAI) within the framework of European policies, and which is inextricably linked not only to the theme of preventive conservation and planning of our territories (which in recent years have also been the protagonists of seismic events that have changed the landscape and highlighted the need to intervene with actions to adapt and secure the cultural heritage, in a general concept of protection

and discover Europe's rich and varied cultural heritage and aim to create a network of people and places linked together through a common history and heritage.

²⁸Sorcinelli (2012); Berti (2012)

²⁹Penette (1997).

³⁰ See Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism, Directive 2016 - Year of the Paths of Italy.

and preservation of heritage), but also to a path that is intertwined with a cultural governance³¹ in which, for example, regional Museum Hubs and other local forms of association are structured according to a different approach and in a perspective of «subjective and transversal integration that allows the development of local and supra-local synergies»³².

Likewise, the enhancement of heritage becomes an "activator" of tourism which, in addition to being a driver for employment, is also one of the main levers to reverse the trend of depopulation and contribute to local development³³.

The Villages: Heritage Enhancement, Smart working and Tourism

Italy safeguards the most important historical-artistic heritage in the world³⁴; a very vast public, private and ecclesiastical wealth distributed throughout the country. A heritage that includes many boroughs, for which there are many initiatives in support of both MiBACT, such as and to name a few *Borghi più belli d'Italia* (257 boroughs in 2016), *Borghi in Festival* (MiBACT Notice of 2021), and FAI with the Campaign, *Luoghi del Cuore*; but also the Italian Touring Club's initiative for the enjoyment of 69 *Places Open for You and Italia Nostra's Borghi 2020 Plan*, which, in line with the National Strategy for Inner Areas, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and ANCI's Counter-Exodus Agenda on small municipalities, has launched a cultural project for Europe that puts heritage at the centre.

The renaissance of the boroughs stands as a path of cultural heritage enhancement.³⁵ It has also laid the groundwork for a new welfare model: Think, for example, of the enormous renaissance there has been of the boroughs with smart working as a result of the pandemic, noting that many workers during the lockdown, as a result of the physical or total closure of the offices of the norms on social distancing have moved from the urban centres to the suburbs, particularly to the boroughs and also to the realities of the south of the country, in what has been called the South Working³⁶. However, as will be made clear later in this section, there are still open issues such as those concerning connections in the boroughs and bridging the digital gap.

The Italian village scenario, including for such small and medium-sized municipalities, returns a picture of a reality of more than 6,670 "small villages" having a population of less than 10,000 and an entrepreneurial density of 10.4 businesses per 100 residents versus a country average of 8.5. Not only that, but in small municipalities there is also a higher concentration of young people entering the labour market, amounting to 17.3 percent compared to the national value of 16.9 percent. However, among the critical issues is still the delay on the deployment of ultra-wideband as shown by the data of the Report, *the augmented reality of*

³¹Golinelli (2008).

³²Vitale (2018).

³³De Matteis & Governa (2009); Trigilia (2005).

³⁴Drogo Inglese & Caragnano (2022).

³⁵Barbati (2004); Casini (2011).

³⁶De Masi (2020); Garofalo, Tiraboschi, Filii & Seghezzi (2020).

*small municipalities*³⁷, for which as of 2018 the utilities served were 17.4 percent as opposed to a national average of 66.9 percent.

In addition, there also remains a rate of abandoned or underutilised houses, which over the years has prompted several municipalities to remedy by launching special projects such as the initiatives of houses sold symbolically for 1 euro.³⁸ Additionally, several regions have also taken action with the provision, in such cases as in Emilia Romagna, Tuscany and Abruzzo, of making regional incentives for those who move to municipalities with a certain population density.

Obviously, the obstacles to overcome are also transportation networks and means of connection to prevent isolation, combined with the need for efficient "technological connections" with enhanced networks. While in fact the quality of life in the villages grows due to their proximity to nature and the presence of sustainable rhythms of life, this must be made possible by placing the responsibility on the institutions (State, Regional Local governments) to adapt infrastructures, including digital, and strengthen fundamental services such as health and mobility. In this sense, it is strategic to focus on innovation and local participation in order to implement smart strategies and approaches also for the creation of smart villages, within the European Network for Rural Development (ENRD)³⁹, as occurs in other European countries, without impeding the performance of work activities both of workers and companies, who can settle in these territories.

This is even more topical today also in light of the new prospects of smart working⁴⁰ - where at the moment they are only for emergency due to the pandemic. But they are stimulating the national legislature to intervene in the more punctual definition of the discipline which is seeing the proliferation of initiatives breathe new life into Borghi, candidates as ideal places, along with seaside resorts, to host workers performing this mode of work performance.

In this regard, it should be noted that the Milan Polytechnic is collaborating with the Touring Club to launch pilot projects such as the one in the Trebbia Valley, where agreements to sign reciprocity contracts with the nearby city of Milan would be conceivable for small towns in the process of abandonment; all on the French model of Brest⁴¹.

³⁷Legambiente, rapporto UNCEM, La realtà aumentata dei piccoli comuni, maggio 2019, a cura di CAIRE.

³⁸In detail, these are properties are donated to municipalities by private individuals who wish to dispose of them, and the municipalities themselves, through a public procedure, sell them by opening an auction for the symbolic sum of one euro. In practice, local institutions do not include a restriction on transfer of residence in the notices, providing, among the various for the purchase of the home, the requirement to provide for the renovation of the properties within a certain time frame (usually one year).

³⁹De Angeli (2018); European Network for Rural Development (2020); Slee (2020).

⁴⁰Official data show that since the beginning of the health emergency in Italy, smart workers have increased from less than 600,000 to between 6 and 8 million. See Martone (2020).

⁴¹France in 2015 launched an experimental program to promote inter-municipal cooperation through so-called "city-country reciprocity contracts" (contrats de réciprocité ville-campagne) aiming to reduce gap between urban and rural areas by passing through the promotion of partnerships for areas of common interest. This policy includes the model of Brest and West-Central Brittany where innovative projects are being implemented in the areas of economic development, social inclusion, health, culture and services, environment and energy transition. For more details read European

It is a fact, moreover, that villages are potentially interesting realities for the growth of tourism businesses or activities that have among their aims the protection and enhancement of the cultural and real estate heritage in which Italy is rich.

The initiatives put in place, however, are different both by MiBACT, by municipalities and regions and by FAI. The latter has launched a project with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Boston and involves the village of Vaccarizzo di Montalto Uffugo (in the province of Cosenza). The goal is to make the village a prototype for social regeneration through an international initiative involving 35 countries around the world, 300 teams and as many ideas for social transformation.

The hamlet, as explained by Roberta Caruso (entrepreneur founder in Montalto Uffugo of the coliving "Home for Creativity," involved by BRIT⁴²), 'preserves traditions and ancient crafts. Bachiculture and silk processing, wood carving, and typical agri-food products, declined in a contemporary key, constitute resources on which to design a new social and economic model, capable of repopulating homes and revitalizing activities'.

Starting again from villages, therefore, also means starting again from ancient crafts in order to create, first and foremost, youth employment but, at the same time, encourage generational turnover in the area of skills transfer, the development of niche productions and the interchange of skills between ancient crafts operating in common sectors.⁴³

Conclusion

The cultural sector and its impact on the territory necessarily passes through the regeneration of municipal areas, rural and inland areas, and hamlets as well as projects that focus on Metropolitan Cities and, therefore, peripheral urban areas that need policies to accompany and support social cohesion. Policies can bring together both cultural and welfare aspects and innovation such as diffuse innovation projects⁴⁴.

The Apulia Region within the framework of MEASURE 2.1 PNRR "Attractiveness Borghi" has launched a pilot project for the regeneration of the Borgo "Rione Fossi" to promote an integrated system of investments on the cultural, natural and residential heritage, in order to implement a new development

Network for Rural Development, Borghi intelligenti nuova linfa per i servizi rurali, *Rivista Rurale dell'UE*, n. 26, 2018.

⁴²BRIT is the archicoach for Business Regeneration Ideation and Training, whose official page is www.mundobrit.com and is a reality that was created with the aim of identifying ideas and strategies from the world develop an economy based on the enhancement of private historic heritage.

⁴³On this point, we note Apulia Regional Law No. 26 of June 19, 2018, Discipline of apprenticeship and norms regarding Bottega scuola, which provides for the promotion and support by the region of projects for the enhancement and recovery of artistic, traditional and clothing crafts.

⁴⁴Tricarico & Zandonai (2018); Fareri (2009).

matrix, with the activation of new functional economies aimed at repopulation and the (inter)active involvement of economic operators, contemporary artists, new professions, and tourists.

«Project interventions include the integral rehabilitation of the natural and cultural heritage, and public residential units; integrated incentives for creative enterprises; contemporary musealisation of the "Ruderi Park" and the vast underground network of hypogea; the creation of a permanent system of artistic and creative residences; and the enhancement of ancient crafts»⁴⁵.

In the broader scenario that the European Union calls city makers⁴⁶ and places under Urban Innovative Actions, collaborative spaces for social innovation, community hubs, community enterprises, and social enterprises in which the concept of community and citizenship is reinforced have emerged⁴⁷.

It follows that an important factor, which emerges from the studies and analysis of the different contexts, concerns the management of the heritage of major attractors and cultural assets and overall public assets that could and should be used in favour of projects that merge the cultural dimension with that of social and employment impact.

In recent years, and not only as a result of the pandemic, we are witnessing a decline in public heritage that in many cases is not only not "recovered" and protected but not even enhanced, often even being in a state of abandonment.

And where modes of enhancement are deployed, in many cases they run up against the great weakness arising from the combination of inefficient management models and consequent balances in the public resources used.

It is here that the public-private management model needs to be revised, in light of government-wide asset transfer mechanisms capable of effectively impacting territories. Supporting elements are the capacity of institutions (both national and local) to amplify the spill-over effects of the initiatives implemented in order to help create value in the urban supply chain, from the promotion of entrepreneurship and local community representation in the strategic planning of urban development to the valorisation tout court of the asset and the environment⁴⁸.

It is clear that action should also be taken on the issue of a paradigm shift of public managers of culture in the direction of activating, perhaps even borrowing from foreign experiences such as the United Kingdom for example, sustainable models of public-private management that goes beyond mere ticketing, intercepting needs for the enhancement of the asset in the context of territorial peculiarities, partemdemo anhe of cultural and creative enterprises, all on the basis of a participatory model⁴⁹.

At the same time, there is a notable need for territories and communities to engage in dialogue with financial instruments (both European and private programming also linked to collective funding) to enable the promotion of targeted

⁴⁵See Press Regione Puglia, *MISURA 2.1 PNRR "Attrattività Borghi". La Regione Puglia candida Accadia con il Rione Fossi nell'Area interna dei Monti Dauni*, 18 marzo 2022.

⁴⁶European Union EU (2016).

⁴⁷Avanzi, *Dynamoscopio*, Kilowatt & Cooperativa Sumisura (2016); Tricarico (2014); Tricarico (2016).

⁴⁸Inguaggiato (2011).

⁴⁹Caliandro, Sacco (2011); Micelli (2016).

investments that also aim at global and local environmental sustainability, in a general scenario of innovative exchange schemes between public and private assets and multi-stakeholder governance in the co-production of services.

References

- Armbrecht, J. (2014). 'Developing a scale for measuring the perceived value of cultural institutions' in *Cultural Trends* 23(4):252 – 272.
- Arvidson, M., Lyon, F., McKay, S. & D. Moro (2010). Briefing Paper 49: The ambitions and challenges of SROI. Birmingham: Third Sector Research Sector. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2014.912041>
- Arvidson, M., Lyon, F., McKay, S. & D. Moro (2013). 'Valuing the social? The nature and controversies of measuring social return on investment (SROI)' in *Voluntary Sector Review* 4(1):3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204080513X661554>
- Avanzi, Dynamoscopio, Kilowatt & Cooperativa Sumisura (2016). *Community Hub: I luoghi puri impazziscono*. Disponibile a: <http://www.communityhub.it/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Community-Hub.compressed.pdf>. https://www.dynamoscopio.it/portfolio_page/community-hub
- Barbati, C. (2004). *La valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale* (art. 6). <https://aedon.mulinino.it/archivio/2004/1/art6.htm>
- Bernardi, A., Treu, T. & P. Tridico (2011). *Lavoro ed impresa cooperativa in Italia. Diversità, ruolo economico, relazioni industriali, sfide future*. Passigli Edizioni.
- Berti, E. (2012). *Itinerari culturali del Consiglio d'Europa tra ricerca di identità e progetto di paesaggio*. Firenze University Press: Firenze.
- Bianca, M. (2010). *Il regime patrimoniale della rete*, relazione al convegno "Le reti di imprese", Università di Macerata, 2010.
- Bodo, C. & P.L. Sacco (2017). 'Nota introduttiva/Introductory note' in *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* 2017(2): 153-164.
- Boschma, R. (2005). 'Proximity and innovation: a critical assessment' in *Regional Studies*, 39(1):61-74.
- Caliandro, C. & Sacco, P.L. (2011). *Italia reloaded: ripartire con la cultura*. Il Mulino: Bologna.
- Casini, L. (2001). 'La valorizzazione dei beni culturali', in *Riv. trim. dir. pubbl.* 3:651-707.
- Cicerchia, A. & E. Bologna (2017). 'Health, Wellbeing and Cultural Participation: Between Narratives and Indicators', *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* 2017(2):313-322.
- Colombo, E., Mangolini, L. & G. Foresti (2014) (eds). *Quarto Osservatorio Intesa San Paolo sulle reti d'impresa, pubblicato nel marzo 2014*. Intesa San Paolo, marzo.
- Costa, G. (2009). *Prove di welfare locale. La costruzione di livelli essenziali di assistenza in provincia di Cremona*. Franco Angeli, Milano
- Dallari, F. & A. Mariotti (2011). Sistemi locali, reti e competitività internazionale: dai beni agli itinerari culturali, Paper presented at the Aisre, Atti della XXXII Conferenza Scientifica Annuale di Scienze Regionali, Torino.
- De Angeli, S. (2018). 'Lo smart working ripopola i borghi' in *Osservatorio Cultura e lavoro*, 18 settembre 2020.
- De Masi D.. (2020). *Smart working. La rivoluzione intelligente*. Venezia: Marsilio.

- De Matteis G. & F. Governa (2009). *Territorialità, sviluppo locale, sostenibilità: il modello slot*, Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Drogo Inglese, I. & R. Caragnano (2022). 'Work and employment for the heritage: system analysis of an economic asset for an innovative welfare model', in *Athens Journal of Law* 8(1):9-30.
- European Network for Rural Development, (2020). 'Smart Villages in Finland: ideas for designing support in the future CAP Strategic Plans' in *European network of Rural Development*.
https://ec.europa.eu/enrd/sites/default/files/enrd_publications/smart-villages-briefs-finland_future_cap_strategic_plans.pdf
- European Union EU (2016). Urban Agenda for the EU, Pact of Amsterdam. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy_themes/urban-development_agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf.
- Fareri, P. (2009). *Rallentare: Il disegno delle politiche urbane*. FrancoAngeli, Milano.
- Fisher, R. (2017). 'Arts and Health in the UK: No longer in the margins of public policy?' in *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* 2017/2:189-202
- Fujiwara, D., Lawton R.N. & S. Mourato (2017). 'The health and wellbeing benefits of public libraries' in *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* 2/2017:203-212.
- Garofalo, D., Tiraboschi, M., Filii, V. & F. Seghezzi (2020). *Welfare e lavoro nella emergenza epidemiologica*, ADAPT
- Golinelli, C.M. (2008). *La valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale. Verso la definizione di un modello di governance*, Milano, Giuffrè.
- Grossi, E. (2013). 'Teoria della complessità applicata all'interazione tra cultura e salute' in Grossi, E. & A. Ravagnan (eds) *Cultura e salute. La partecipazione culturale come strumento per un nuovo welfare*. Springer Verlag: Milano.
- Grossi, E. (2017). 'Cultural participation and health: Some medical and scientific evidences' in *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* /2017(2):175-188.
- Holden, J. (2004). *Capturing cultural value. How culture has become a tool of government policy*. London: Demos.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2004). 'Measuring learning outcomes in museums, archives and libraries: "The Learning Impact Research Project (LIRP)"' in *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10:151-174.
- Inguaggiato, V. (2011). 'Gängeviertel, un caso aperto di riuso temporaneo per produzione culturale, Amburgo' in *Territorio*, 56:40-42.
Labour Studies e-Book series n. 90
- Lampis, A. (2017). 'Towards an expanded concept of welfare definition. Cultural welfare projects of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano', *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* 1/2017(1):131-136.
- Legambiente, UNCEM report, the augmented reality of small municipalities, May 2019, prepared by CAIRE.
- Martone, M. (2020). *Il lavoro da remoto. Per una riforma dello smart working oltre l'emergenza*, in "QADL", 2020, n. 18.
- Matarasso, F. (1997). *Use or ornament? The social Impact of participation in the Arts*. Comedia.
- Micelli, S. (2016) *Fare è Innovare. Il nuovo lavoro artigiano*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Millar, R. & K. Hall (2012). "Social return on investment (SROI) and performance measurement" in *Public Management Review* 15:923-941.
- NESTA (2013). 'A manifesto for the creative economy' at <http://www.nesta.org.uk> sites

- default files a-manifesto-for-the-creative-eco- nomy-april13.pdf
- Nicholls, J. (2012). *A guide to social return on investment*, Liverpool: SROI Network.
- Paddon, H.L., Thomson, L.J., Menon, U., Lanceley, A.E. & H.J. Chatterjee (2014). 'Mixed methods evaluation of well-being benefits derived from a heritage-in-health intervention with hospital patients' in *Arts Health: An International Journal for Research, Policy and Practice*, 6:24–58.
- Pathak, P. & P. Dattani (2014). 'Social return on investment: Three technical challenges' in *Social Enterprise Journal* 10:91– 104.
- Penette, M.T. (1997). *Les itinéraires culturels*. Actes Sud.
- Ratti, M. (2015). "Outcome Indicators for the Cultural Sector" in *Economia della Cultura* 1:23-45.
- Rotheroe, N. & A. Richards (2007). 'Social return on investment and social enterprise: Transparent accountability for sustainable development' in *Social Enterprise Journal* 3:31–46.
- Sacco, P.L. (2017). 'Health and Cultural welfare: A new policy perspective?' in *Economia della Cultura, Rivista trimestrale dell'Associazione per l'Economia della Cultura* 2: 165-174
- Sacco, P., Ferilli, G. & G.T. Blessi (2014). 'Understanding culture-led local development: A critique of alternative theoretical explanations' in *Urban Studies Journal Limited* 51(13):2806-2821.
- Seia, C. (2020). 'Verso un Welfare Culturale' IBSA Foundation, 24 june.
- Scognamiglio, C. (2009). 'Il contratto di rete: il problema della causa' in *Contratti* (10): 961-965.
- Scott, C. (2002). 'Measuring social value' in R. Sandell (ed.) *Museums, society, in- equality* (41 – 55). London: Routledge.
- Scott, C. (2006). 'Museums: Impact and value' in *Cultural Trends* 15:45-75.
- Selwood, S. (2010). *Making a difference: The cultural impact of museums*. London: Sara Selwood Associates.
- Slee, B. (2020). Smart Villages and the European Green Deal: making the connections, European Network for Rural Development in <https://enrd.ec.europa.eu>.
- Sorcinelli, P. (2012). *Turismo e Storia, AlmaTourism*, 0, 0: 20H25, 2009;
- SROI network. (2015). *What is SROI?* Retrieved from <http://www.thesroi-network.org/what-is-sroi>.
- Tricarico, L. (2014). 'Imprese di Comunità nelle Politiche di Rigenerazione Urbana: Definire ed Inquadrare il Contesto Italiano' in *Euricse Working Papers*, 68-14.
- Tricarico, L. (2016). 'Imprese di comunità come fattore territoriale: riflessioni a partire dal contesto italiano' in *CRIOS*, 11:35-50
- Tricarico, L. (2018). 'Impresa culturale, impatto sociale e territorio: nuovi approcci e strategie di sviluppo' in Caroli, G.M. (ed.). *Evidenze sull'innovazione sociale e sostenibilità in Italia: IV Rapporto CERIS sull'Innovazione Sociale*. Franco Angeli: Milano. Pp. 107-127.
- Tricarico, L. & B. Geissler (2017). 'The food territory: cultural identity as local facilitator in the gastronomy sector, the case of Lyon' in *City, Territory and Architecture* 4 (16). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40410-017-0072-2>
- Tricarico, L. & F. Zandonai (2018). *Local Italy. I domini del "settore comunità" in Italia*. Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli: Milano.
- Triglia, C. (2005). *Sviluppo locale: un progetto per l'Italia in Roma-Bari*. Editori Laterza.
- Trono, A. (2012). 'Percorsi religiosi e turismo culturale' in A. Trono (ed.) *Via Francigena. Cammini di Fede e Turismo Culturale*. Galatina: Mario Congedo editore.

- Viganó, F. & G. Lombardo (2018). *Misurare l'impatto sociale generato dai musei. L'applicazione della metodologia del Ritorno Sociale sull'investimento (SROI)*, in Alessandro Luigini e Chiara Panciroli, Alessandro Luigini e Chiara Panciroli (eds.) *Ambienti digitali per l'educazione all'arte e al patrimonio*. Franco Angeli s.r.l., Milano, Italy.
- Vitale, C. (2018). 'La valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale nelle Aree Interne. Considerazioni preliminari' *Aedon*, Fascicolo 3, settembre-dicembre 2018.
- Whelan, G. (2015). 'Understanding the social value and well-being benefits created by museums: A case for social return on investment methodology' in *Arts & Health* 7(3):216-230.
- Wilson, K. & G. Whelan (2014). *An evaluation of House of Memories dementia training programme, Midlands Model September 2014*. Liverpool: Institute of Cultural Capital and National Museums Liverpool.
- World Cafe (2015), *Key concepts. An overview*, Retrieved from <http://www.the-worldcafe.com/overview.html>.