# TRACKS INTO THE PAST

*Alexandra Zbuchea\*, Silviu Anghel\*\**

**Keywords:** *archeological heritage, archeological site management, visitors to archaeological sites, heritage management.*
**Cuvinte-cheie:** *patrimoniu arheologic, managementul siturilor arheologice, vizitatorii siturilor arheologice, managementul patrimoniului.*

(Abstract)

The paper investigates ways to make archaeological heritage accessible to a wide public. Although archaeological sites, museums and historical monuments are amongst the most appealing cultural establishments, their visitation is occasional. Therefore, the potential of growth is significant. The diversity of sites and a wide array of valorisation strategies could support a much more intense visitation. The paper is methodologically based on a literature review of the management of archaeological sites in order to observe the solutions adopted around the world and to identify a typology of strategies in correlation with the form of archaeological sites considered. The second part of the research investigates both the reasons which facilitate and which prevent the public from visiting archaeological sites amongst Romanians and other Europeans. The final part offers some insights into strategic approaches of archaeological sites` management that could cope with the present cultural environment and help visitors to better understand the past.

## 1. Introduction

A fundamental law of radio-communication states that it does not matter how good one's broadcasting is, if there is no public. The management of archaeological and historical sites needs to take this into consideration. It requires three levels of competence. First comes the scientific knowledge relevant to the site and its historical importance. This knowledge is specialized and often fully understood only by colleagues and fellow specialists. Second is the expertise of presenting and valorising the site for the needs and benefit not of the scientific community but of the general public. This involves knowing the public, its educative needs and desires, as well as technical familiarity with traditional and emerging methods of preservation, conservation and valorisation of sites. Third, last but not least, is the ability of managers to attract funding and economic interest in the site. The present paper will discuss this equally important but often neglected side of site management.

## 2. Interest in cultural heritage – a European synopsis

Archaeological sites, historical monuments and museums are amongst the most popular cultural venues in Europe. Around half of the Europeans visit a historical/archaeological monument or site (palace, castle, church, garden etc.), while more than one out of three visit a museum or gallery a year[1]. The figures vary a lot from country to country. For instance, in Sweden, two thirds of the population visited a historical monument or a museum, while ca. 30% visited such cultural establishments at least 5 times in 2013[2]. In Greece, less than 30% of the population visited a monument in 12 months, while less than 20% visited a museum[3]. Similar variations are registered for cultural consumption, in general. Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Estonia and Finland are the countries with the highest cultural engagement[4], while Greece, Cyprus, Portugal, Hungary and Romania have the lowest registered level[5]. It seems that those who are generally interested in culture are actively involved in many types of cultural activities. There

\* Faculty of Management, National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, 30a Blvd. Expoziției, Sector 1, 012104, Bucharest, Romania, alexandra.zbuchea@facultateademanagement.ro.
\*\* EDRIS Centre, Göttingen University, Germany, silviuanghel2011@yahoo.com.

[1] EC 2013, 7.
[2] EC 2013, 11.
[3] EC 2013, 11.
[4] EC 2013, 9.
[5] EC 2013, 10.

is also a strong correlation between the level of education and the interest in historical/archaeological monuments and museums[6].

In Romania, 56% of the population do not visit museums while only less than 4% visit them monthly[7]. Considering that 70% of the Romanians did not visit a cultural heritage site outside their place of residence during the previous year and 21% of them visited less than 3 such establishments in the same period of time, the interest in such sites is rather low[8]. The main three sources of information regarding such places are friends, mass media and the internet[9].

The Cultural Participation Barometer for 2014 investigated the way Romanians perceive cultural heritage. The most mentioned types of items are: fortresses (92%), castles / palaces (90%), religious establishments and monuments (86%), archaeological sites (77%) and monuments – other than the religious ones – (62%)[10]. It would be relevant for cultural heritage managers to have in mind that Romanians consider that the value of the cultural heritage is not primarily related to its aesthetic and cultural value, but to its functionality, state of use and the way the local community relates to it[11]. The main benefits associated by Romanians to cultural heritage are tourism development, safeguarding of the identity and traditions of the local communities, and knowledge of the past[12]. In this framework, 18% of the Romanians consider that local budgeting should be directed towards cultural heritage management – an interest rated higher than modernization of schools – and which is only 12%. This interest is higher amongst young men in urban areas[13]. 30% of the Romanians declare they would donate funds for the rehabilitation of cultural heritage in the area of residence and 18% would volunteer for the benefit of such a site[14].

The main barriers to visiting historical monuments are, at European level, lack of time (37%) and lack of interest (28%). 35% of the Europeans are not interested in museums[15]. Younger respondents are less interested in historical monuments than other groups[16]. Romanians stand out among

the Europeans, stating in the widest degree that the main reason for a low cultural participation is either the poor quality of the cultural activities, or the lack of choice[17]. From a profession-oriented point of view, the highest interest level in historical monuments was reported amongst managers[18].

Heritage managers should take into account their public, both visitors and local communities, when designing their strategies. Although some regional and specific characteristics might exist, it is reasonable to generalize some of the results developed by Duran et alii[19], who identify three broad groups of persons, when considering their relationship with the cultural heritage: less sensitive (40%), indifferent (16%) and pro-culture (44%). The first group, dominated by men, recognize cultural assets but are not concerned with them. They have less previous cultural knowledge. The second group seems not to perceive the cultural loss. The cultural indifferent ones have higher incomes. The third group is opposite to the first in terms of knowledge and contact with cultural heritage[20].

There are also some regional differences. For instance, Datta et alii[21] identify some differences between the US, the EU and the Chinese citizens. The characteristics of a heritage site have the strongest impact on the attitude of tourists towards the heritage site in the case of Europeans, followed by the Americans and the Chinese[22].

Different people, based on their cultural background, perceive the same heritage site in different ways. Their experience is influenced by several factors. Some of them are related to the visitor / tourist (emotional reactions, reasons to visit, past experiences, previous knowledge and such), while others relate to the framework of the visit itself (for instance the tour guides leading the visit, conservation concerns and solutions)[23]. The more the visitors consider a heritage site related to their own culture, the more they are interested in visiting it, in understanding it and they become more emotionally involved[24]. Psychological distance is another factor that influences the perception and the experience of cultural heritage in many ways: perceived costs and willingness to visit, cognitive distance and familiarity, influences choices, emo-

---

[6]   EC 2013, 17.
[7]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 34, 59.
[8]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 116.
[9]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 117.
[10]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 108.
[11]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 108.
[12]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 110.
[13]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 121–122.
[14]   Croitoru, Becuț 2015, 126–128.
[15]   EC 2013, 21.
[16]   EC 2013, 36.

[17]   EC 2013, 22.
[18]   EC 2013, 36.
[19]   Duran et alii 2015.
[20]   Duran et alii 2015, 360.
[21]   Datta et alii 2015.
[22]   Datta et alii 2015, 24–25.
[23]   Poria et alii 2006, Massara – Severino 2013.
[24]   Poria et alii 2006.

tional evaluation, relationships with stereotypes and others[25]. Psychological distance is associated with four factors: time, space, culture and probability of visit. A higher psychological distance is related with a more abstract understanding of reality (especially for older visitors), and less attention to details[26].

Engagement with the heritage is an important aspect to be considered by heritage management. It has many dimensions, such as contextualization, attachment, emotional connection, commitment, satisfaction, motivation, previous knowledge etc.[27] It influences repurchase / revisit and loyalty. Cultural motivation, as well as emotional attachment to a heritage site influence engagement and fidelity[28]. Tourists' emotional attitude also positively influences loyalty[29]. Although visitors are initially attracted by the tangible aspects of the heritage, the immaterial aspects and cultural experience and engagement lead to loyalty (repeated visit). Intangible characteristics are related to the emotional impact of the visit, and have a significant contribution in the appreciation of culture and history. Worldwide, cultural elements seem to be more influential when compared to both the tangible and intangible aspects of heritage, but an appropriate mix of the three aspects, and also public's segmentation is useful in a successful management planning[30].

When it comes to a heritage site or visible remains of the past they can interact with, people tend to associate their significance to the present, to the current evolution in society. The value of a heritage site is also linked to the meaning(s) it holds within various groups of people and stakeholders. Sometimes different segments of the public have conflictual perceptions about a site. Therefore, the management of a heritage site should deal with these challenges and not compromise the site's significance to satisfy certain interests and opinions[31].

The context of the visit might also be relevant. For instance, not all those sightseeing a region are actual visitors of a heritage monument. The factors positively influencing a visit are not only the site features, the meaning of the heritage discovery and the characteristics of the visit, but also perceptions about the site and the conditions of experience[32].

The main drivers might be considered: personal tastes and preferences, previous knowledge about the heritage, the context of the visit, conditions of the tour, the cues associated with visitation. Fees are not so important. Amongst the characteristics of visitors, the following may have a positive influence on site-visitation: the level of education, a higher social status, a greater geographic distance to the heritage site, urban residency, interest in history and interest in specific heritage types[33].

The costs accepted by various segments of the public are associated with the way heritage is evaluated. A higher income and level of education segment of the public is willing to pay more for the conservation of heritage attributes[34]. Older people and larger families are willing to pay less for heritage preservation.

People also tend to react differently regarding the status of a certain heritage site. For instance, the designation of a site as a world heritage site leads to an increase in prestige and attractiveness. It is therefore the equivalent of branding it and, consequently, the number of visitors increases – as well as the associated revenues. Nevertheless, part of the public would associate such a status with a more crowded and more expensive site. Managers, employees and residents are also influenced, their pride in their cultural heritage increasing. In addition, some managerial tasks are facilitated. Compliance with certain restrictions and monitoring systems for the management of world heritage sites, as well as for local communities could be considered restrictive, but they lead to better protection of the world heritage sites[35]. The managers of world heritage sites also benefit of guidance in their managerial practice and of various resources associated with their status[36].

### 3. Stakeholders of the cultural heritage

Important stakeholders of cultural heritage are the residents / local communities. They built mental and emotional associations with the heritage, and link it with local identity. In some regions, they might be more active than in others in monitoring and supporting the situation of the local cultural heritage. It is noteworthy that a study of Duran *et alii*[37] shows that people who consider that the state of the heritage is better would contribute more towards its preservation and development, than

[25]  Massara, Severino 2013, 113–116.
[26]  Massara, Severino 2013.
[27]  Bryce *et alii* 2015, 573–574.
[28]  Bryce *et alii* 2015, 577.
[29]  Datta *et alii* 2015.
[30]  Datta *et alii* 2015, 28.
[31]  de la Torre 1997, 7.
[32]  Petr 2015, 252–253.
[33]  Petr 2015, 254.
[34]  Lourenco, Gomes *et alii* 2014.
[35]  Poria *et alii* 2013, Wang *et alli* 2015.
[36]  UNESCO 2013.
[37]  Duran *et alii* 2015, 361.

those considering it in a poor state. Therefore, the state of conservation and the perceived value of the heritage influence in a contradictory way public support, meaning that those most in need do not necessarily get the most support.

The involvement of local communities depends on the status of cultural heritage, as well as its characteristics. Contemporary society and communities tend to reduce and sometimes even eliminate the differences between public or private heritage[38]. Therefore, communities, tourists and heritage managers relate in a complex way to heritage sites. Within this framework, a participatory heritage construction could take place – as investigated by Frederick J. Conway[39] for the case of Sierra de San Francisco – a World Heritage Site in Mexico. A heritage site manager must also take into consideration that the local community/communities increasingly become the heritage owner/custodian[40]. Therefore, involving local representatives reduces the likelihood of various kinds of conflicts.

Different local groups evaluate differently various components of the heritage. They would have different sets of priorities when supporting or promoting different components of the local heritage. In some cases, stressing the cultural heritage component of a marginalized group might cause disengagement of some present-day communities[41].

Heritage might create social exclusion and dissonance. It could be a source of conflict among various local communities, also amongst residents and (various types of) visitors. In this context interpreting and ensuring a stimulating and positive experience for all those visiting and developing a connection with a certain heritage site should constitute a major aim for the management of the respective site. For instance, sustainable heritage tourism could be developed by finding similarities between various local communities/minorities and the mainstream population/dominant narratives[42].

The European Union, through the 2005 Faro Convention has adopted a view on cultural heritage that takes into consideration the way communities perceive and relate to heritage, rather than the definitions and taxonomies developed by scientists and cultural elites[43]. The EU also stimulates the interest in and visitation of heritage sites by set-

ting up several mechanisms, such as the European Heritage Days, the European Heritage Label, Europa Nostra Awards, as well as several financing schemes[44]. Such developments indicate that communities are important stakeholders that should be considered and involved in heritage management.

Another aspect to be considered, at least in the case of the archaeological areas, is the increased interest in community archaeology[45]. It refers to involving local communities in the archaeological research, with several positive outcomes for all those involved[46]. Nevertheless, there are also some risks associated with such processes, *e.g.* the relationships between those involved might become unbalanced, the archaeological heritage might not benefit from the best expertise and choice in what both research and preservation are concerned, the interpretations might be biased etc.. Such risks are also to be considered when archaeological sites are investigated and managed exclusively by professionally trained people, with no explicit community involvement. An open approach to archaeology, argues Mark Lake, will increase expectations of community involvement and accelerate the development of means by which more reflexive and iterative relationships can be facilitated[47]. Open archaeology also involves using crowd-sourcing for a better understanding and investigation of the heritage, ensuring new types of *in situ* interpretation.

Scientists are relevant stakeholders of cultural heritage. Their interpretation of the heritage significantly influences public perception, as well as its valorisation and thus, the management of a site. In the case of archaeological sites, archaeologists are interested in the continuous excavation and research. Although excavation is relevant to the understanding of the site and the ongoing of the research, in some cases it puts a stress on providing for the proper conservation of the uncovered artefacts and structures. In addition, public presentation and interpretation of finds does not usually keep up with the pace of the discoveries[48].

Scientists are related to universities and research centres. These institutions are in many cases partners in complex projects with heritage organizations. Most of these are research projects. Nevertheless, they also have social and educational aims related to the dissemination of the results to

---

[38] Conway 2014.
[39] Conway 2014.
[40] Aas *et alii* 2005, 33.
[41] Chhabra, Zhao 2015, 107.
[42] Chhabra, Zhao 2015, 98.
[43] Croitoru, Becuţ 2015, 101–102.

[44] EC 2014.
[45] Marshall 2002, Moser *et alii* 2002.
[46] Moser *et alii* 2002, 222–223.
[47] Lake 2012, 474.
[48] de la Torre 1997, 12.

a wider public, and taking into consideration the impact of a certain project on local communities. Luca Zan and Sara Bonini Baraldi argue for "the set of activities that takes place from the production or discovery of heritage (the equivalent of "raw material") to its possible "uses" by visitors (the "final product"), including uses made by actors within the chain (as for instance researchers)"[49]. All these organizations are therefore part of the heritage chain. Proper relationships between the members of the heritage chain are extremely important in order to ensure good operationalization and distribution of the gained knowledge throughout the chain, as well as towards the wider public.

Public administration/institutions represent another stakeholder interested in several aspects, some of them with a socio-cultural significance, others an economic one. Public administration could use heritage as a cultural, social and/or political resource. Different public institutions might be interested in a cohesion between the heritage`s significance, the image of the place, and the cultural values of the local community/communities. Various public institutions selected certain heritage sites in order to offer a definite image when developing (heritage) tourism[50]. Sustainable local development backed by public administration plans is also responsible for the conservation policy. This is related not only to the intrinsic value of the heritage, but also to place narratives[51].

The public administration or various public institutions also have the responsibility of taking the heritage conservation and promotion decisions, integrated with a wider regional development strategy. Many urban economic development pressures are related with conservation of heritage properties; sometimes these might be challenging cultural reasons[52]. Public management takes into account several aspects when designating the heritage status of an asset. Studies show that the older the heritage and the smaller the property, the greater the chances of its designation as a heritage site[53].

Special attention should be given to *in situ* presentations of archaeological remains, which are not part of an archaeological site/park[54]. In these cases, the public-value of the remains should be considered and they could be harmonically integrated in various development projects, associated either with private economic initiatives (such as shops or restaurants), or with public-space amenities (such as parks or subway stations).

Another challenging situation for public administration is the existence of several cultural and natural heritage assets in an area. Even if their management is different in terms of legal status, they should be connected in various ways in order to ensure a sustainable development of the region. Valentina Ferretti and Elena Comino[55] developed an integrated framework based on multi-criteria analysis to assess complex heritage systems in order to better support their planning. Several stakeholders were considered, especially experts and users of the heritage evaluated.

In many regions, various public institutions are also managers of the heritage. They should cooperate, integrated in a heritage chain[56], to better preserve and manage the overall heritage of the area. Therefore, there are complex relationships and interdependencies amongst all these institutions.

Local entrepreneurs and various investors in the area of heritage sites are also stakeholders. Their commercial success is tightly related with the visitation and the way the public evaluates and experiences the heritage. Relevant stakeholders for a heritage site are the cultural entrepreneurs, as well as tourism investors. Cultural heritage and tourism are increasingly more related, but tourism development is considered to generate a stress on heritage, various social problems, or difficulties associated with urban development etc. Nevertheless, heritage is an important aspect of sustainable local development especially associated with tourism[57].

Stakeholders` consensus is necessary for better management and promotion of cultural heritage sites. Heritage itself has increased value and it could be sustainably managed only in connection with the local framework – taking into account local resources as well as local needs. Stakeholders must also understand the implications in the region of the management strategies related to a certain heritage site.

A heritage/archaeological site might have multifaceted significance: historical, political, aesthetic, economic, social, educational and such. Not all stakeholders might agree on these aspects or might be sensitive only to some of them. Sometimes, valorising and planning an archaeological site might generate conflicts because the interests of

---

49    Zan, Bonini Baraldi 2013, 212.
50    Chhabra – Zhao 2015, 106.
51    While – Short 2011.
52    Yung *et alii* 2016, 313.
53    Yung *et alii* 2016, 316.
54    Fouseki, Sandes 2009.

55    Ferretti, Comino 2015.
56    Zan, Bonini Baraldi 2013.
57    Aas *et alii* 2005, 32–34; Ursache 2015, 135.

stakeholders are not identical and sometimes are not even converging. For instance, local communities have some expectations and interests, different from those of the scientists, of the public administration or of the entrepreneurs. The management of an archaeological site has to keep a balance between these aspects/interests. If some facets are less considered under the influence of certain stakeholders, other aspects and values – significant for the site itself as well as for other stakeholders – might be compromised[58]. One of the problems that have to be considered is that in many cases the dialogue between the representatives of an archaeological site and various stakeholders is not effective and meaningful[59].

## 4. Conservation and management options for archaeological sites

Heritage sites are complex organizations, serving in various ways many categories of stakeholders as well as the public and thus facing many challenges. Amongst the most common ones is maintaining a balance between public needs and site conservation. Rising the public awareness towards cultural and scientific values is another. Even finding common ground between various specialists involved in site interpretation is challenging. For instance, in the case of archaeological sites, archaeologists and historians are those competent in building explanatory theories, being aware of the scientific significance of the site. Protecting the site and the artefacts is one thing, while interpreting and presenting them to the public – making them accessible– is another responsibility. The experts in charge of them may have different views on various aspects related to heritage management according to their own specific expertise and view of the priorities related to heritage understanding and valorization. In this context, Martha de la Torre argues that

> "the role of the site manager is to ensure the implementation of the plan as developed by the larger group, including protection of the values identified by the stakeholders. The site manager assumes the responsibility of operational decisions that follow the policies set out for the site. For certain aspects of operations, the site manager calls on other individuals with specialized skills. A site manager cannot work independently, and a major part of the day-to-day implementation work is to maintain coordination with national and local authorities,

> as well as with other groups who have access to and use of the site"[60].

The national/ regional/ local framework could facilitate the management of a heritage/ archaeological site, considering various aspects – financing, preservation, protection or various forms of support. The system for the protection of the built cultural heritage is not very efficient in the case of Romania, as the report of a Presidential Commission in 2009 documented[61]. One of the causes of this situation is, according to the mentioned report, the narrow significance of cultural heritage as monument/ sites, not tightly connected to its historical, cultural and social environment in association with its limited legal protection. Investigating the state of built heritage of historical monuments, the report concentrates less on managerial issues, when compared to structural and human-related ones. The main problems related to the destruction of heritage are abandonment, arson or unchecked fire, unclear legal status, lack of education of the local communities and administration, changes in the local communities' structures, etc.[62] Even in the case of restoration/ usage, monuments could be victim of inadequate restoration/ usage, causing loss of authenticity or other types of problems[63]. Many of these problems are related to the lack of education of the monument administrators, leading to bad management. Sometimes it is connected with a limited understanding of the monument needs and a too broad acceptance of the tastes and desires of the wider public. Such problems may be widespread in Romania, as the above-mentioned report presents, but they represent risks connected to all cultural heritage sites. The management of such sites faces challenges of various sorts; many of them are connected to an improved presentation to the public, and increased accessibility, not only in a practical sense, but also in a cultural or spiritual one.

Management strategies related to the valorisation of archaeological sites and the accessibility options depend on a wide range of factors. Some factors are related to the environment: the administrative framework, the socio-political and urban situation, the needs of stakeholders and such[64]. Even fashions in conservation and presentation

---

[58]  de la Torre 1997, 8–9.
[59]  Gould – Burtenshaw 2014, p. 8

[60]  de la Torre 1997, 13.
[61]  Mohanu, Sturdza 2009.
[62]  Mohanu, Sturdza 2009, 8–11.
[63]  Mohanu, Sturdza 2009, 32–40.
[64]  Fouseki, Sandes 2009, 37.

in a specific society (trends in the contemporary society) constitute a relevant aspect, influencing managerial decisions, the way heritage is valorized and communicated, as well as public interest and preferences[65]. Other factors are related with the characteristics of the site.

Each type of site raises different issues to its managers. Worldwide renowned, fully preserved monuments are quite different from the "not-so-spectacular-for-the-wider-public" sites despite their significant scientific and cultural value (such as many of the archaeological sites). Some of the sites – such as cultural landscapes or maritime cultural heritage – integrate built, immaterial and natural heritage. They need protection in many forms to prevent not only deterioration, but also preservation of traditions (for instance fishing traditional techniques in the case of maritime cultural heritage). In such cases, public intervention, such as the involvement of local authorities, is also needed to better support managerial decisions. For instance, the public might donate money for local assets. Duran *et alii*[66] proposed discrete choice experiments in the case of maritime cultural heritage to evaluate the practical implications and the value associated with cultural heritage – both the economic and the social values. Their study indicates that there is a direct relationship between the provision of cultural goods and social wellbeing. People are willing to pay for the preservation of cultural heritage, but the figures vary in terms of both amount and destination / elements of heritage considered[67].

Dissonant heritage sites pose specific challenges[68]. The management of such sites should promote social and cultural inclusion in order to increase awareness and visitation, leading to a sustainable development. Strengthening relationships, offering common meeting grounds through interpretation makes a site representative for wider categories of public. Heritage management should mediate dialogue between various stakeholders[69]. This process is not an easy one, either from a social / political perspective, or when considering also authenticity and interpretation issues tightly related to the considered heritage.

One of the aims of a management plan for archaeological sites is to involve all the stakeholders influenced by the strategy adopted in order to ensure sustainability. The key to a good management plan is to identify the most relevant stakeholders and their needs. These groups have to be also involved in the decision-making process and planning for a heritage site[70]. Bringing together relevant stakeholders would be the first step in developing a management plan. Nevertheless, it is difficult to assess which of the stakeholders are representing the local community/communities, while the cooperation with the stakeholders could determine a series of problems and challenges[71].

The next step is the documentation on site`s history and significance, the assessment of its relevance and multifaceted value, the management assessment and the policy definition, followed by a strategy choice[72]. The management policy is vital for a suitable management of the site; it has to take into account many aspects and provide guidance for their implementation: set the statement of significance, be acceptable to the stakeholders, be economically adequate, and provide a framework for sustainable development.

Management and heritage sites, including archaeological sites, have to face many threats related to site conservation. Those more appealing to the public are facing most of the problems due to the increased human pressure and various types of expectations during the visit to such places. The range of factors negatively affecting archaeological sites is wide: the development of the surrounding communities and associated urban development, natural disasters, various conflicts including political and religious issues, lack of resources for preservation, increased visitation, amplified use of heritage sites for various events, inappropriate restoration, bad management etc.[73]

It is vital to consider the way heritage is preserved and how interventions on the uncovered archaeological remains are conducted. Four main approaches could be considered: stabilization, anastylosis[74], restoration and reconstruction[75]. A new approach is called "reversible reconstruction", ensuring the protection of the remains[76]. When developing the most appropriate approach, several factors should be considered, some of

[65]   Price 2000, Jameson 2000.
[66]   Duran *et alii* 2015.
[67]   Duran *et alii* 2015, 364.
[68]   Chhabra, Zhao 2015, 98.
[69]   Chhabra, Zhao 2015, 107.

[70]   de la Torre 1997, 17–18.
[71]   Aas *et alii* 2005, 30–31.
[72]   de la Torre 1997, 18–25.
[73]   de la Torre 1997, 6–7.
[74]   de la Torre 1997, 43–46; Thuswaldner *et alii* 2009, Vacharopoulou 2004.
[75]   Çetin *et alii* 2012; de la Torre 1997, 41–50; Alberts, Hazen 2010, 62–63.
[76]   de la Torre 1997, 53.

them related to the heritage and the costs of its management, some others related to the public. The general principles recommended are the following[77]:

> *"1. Any intervention must be consistent with the significance of the place and its management policy. Intervention for the sake of appearing "to do something" can be very dangerous and can, in fact, destroy one or all of the values of the site. This situation is perhaps especially likely when conjecture is used as the basis for restoration or reconstruction, or when restoration processes alter or destroy the historical or archaeological value of the site.*
> *2. Physical interventions are often experimental, with disastrous long-term consequences, especially if the solution demands overly elaborate maintenance and monitoring practices that require skills or tools that are not available locally or that cannot be guaranteed over the long term.*
> *3. Physical conservation solutions need to be approached with care and, indeed, with suspicion in most cases. The rule of thumb is that the best solution is the least possible intervention."*

The management of archaeological sites is influenced by contemporary ideas concerning the role of heritage sites and the way they should be preserved and administrated, as well as the contexts in which the public places them[78]. Value assessment, significance evaluation and interpretation are key aspects to be considered in deciding the type of intervention on archaeological monuments.

Interventions should consider many aspects in order to protect an archaeological site and to preserve the chances for further research and valorisation. The main criteria considered for reconstructions are accuracy of the process, avoidance of physical damage, compatibility of materials and techniques, a higher degree of visibility of interventions, allowance for future treatments, and reversibility[79]. Reconstructions and any other forms of approach should preserve the characteristics of an archaeological site.

Authenticity and integrity are key aspects in managing heritage and archaeological sites[80]. They imply to maintain a site to its original condition as much as possible. As a principle, this approach is simple to understand, but implementing it becomes extremely challenging considering both the needs of the site and its management, and those of visitors.

To better preserve and manage a heritage site, visitor studies are valuable. These studies could lead to the appropriate decisions regarding the infrastructure, facilities and services on the one hand and heritage interpretation decisions on the other hand. In the case of the archaeological sites presenting many peculiar features, and where the tangible/ intangible elements are sometimes less spectacular or accessible to the public, understanding the visitors is even more necessary. For instance, a study of the visitors at the Hadrian`s Roman Wall in the UK revealed that visitors consider that ongoing archaeological excavations are useful, that new finds should be integrated in the exhibition at the site and not removed to be displayed elsewhere[81]. Visitors also find it useful to increase the scale of reconstruction (especially for older visitors) and interpretation. The authors of the survey observed the satisfaction derived by visitors when being able to experience (or thinking they did) an artefact or site as it would have been in its original historical context[82]. It is noteworthy mentioning that visitors tend not to appreciate a children`s play area if it diminishes the museum experience[83]. Entrance price is also negatively evaluated, especially in correlation with the existence of substitute-sites in the neighbourhood[84]. This study shows that visitors to a specific archaeological site appreciate the ongoing research and its continuous presentation, and are not so eager to see the archaeological site transformed into an entertainment area. It is possible that visitors to other archaeological sites to have different attitudes towards the management strategies associated to them.

Presentation and interpretation of archaeological heritage depends both on the visitors and the stakeholders, as well as on the heritage itself, as physical evidence uncovered and its cultural significance. An interdisciplinary team should have in mind several elements when interpreting a site, setting the message and the story to be told, and designing the way it is presented to the public. Several key elements to be considered are the size and characteristics of the site and of the remains, the significance and attractiveness for the public, the value of the remains as well as that of the site itself.

---

[77]  de la Torre 1997, 24–25.
[78]  Vacharopoulou 2004, 84.
[79]  Çetin *et alii* 2012, 586.
[80]  Alberts, Hazen 2010, 59–62.
[81]  Willis 2009, 494.
[82]  Willis 2009, 496.
[83]  Willis 2009, 494–496.
[84]  Willis 2009, 497.

Since the presentation of the archaeological heritage to the public means interpretation of (partial and unclear) information, no objective presentation can be designed. Moreover, archaeological sites are complex and reflect many histories. They tell many stories and are understood in many ways. Therefore, several stories could be told, with the condition not to confuse and overwhelm visitors[85]. The setting of the presentation could be the site itself or a nearby location (a visitor centre, for instance). Many forms of presentation exist, some of them quite spectacular and interactive. Nevertheless, the focus should remain on the archaeological site itself, which should not be shadowed but rather put in light. A visitor centre, for instance, should stimulate the interest in the archaeological site; make it more interesting and accessible[86].

Preserving and valorising built heritage has been highly influenced by the philosophy of sustainable development, by the changes in the expectations both of the public and the specialists. Heritage sites have to be not only authentic, but also politically correct, energy efficient, environmentally friendly, economically viable etc.[87] Nevertheless, this new framework generates challenging problems for heritage site management: the way to preserve the integrity and authenticity of the site, to accurately interpret its cultural value, to make it suitable for modern (re)use and expectations, functionalism and such. In the case of industrial heritage sites, Mirjana Roter Blagojevic and Anica Tufegdzic[88] identified four dimensions and six aspects to be considered. The dimensions are artistic, historic, social and scientific. The aspects are form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and settings, spirit and feeling. We recommend that the management of heritage sites should also bear in mind the economic and technological dimensions.

New and emerging technologies are not only facilitating these processes and make heritage sites more accessible, but they also are becoming compulsory from a preservation perspective. For instance, archaeologists use new technologies for the non-destructive mapping of sites and their conservation, for (virtual) reconstructions useful both to scientific purposes and a better presentation of the heritage to the public[89]. These results could be used for exhibitions, shared online with all those interested, valorized through various public educational programs. They could make heritage accessible in a non-invasive way both to visitors at the archaeological site, and to all those interested via the internet. Using new technologies could be cost effective and make the heritage sites offer of more appealing. The management of archaeological sites is therefore more effective in a scientific context, as well as social and economic ones[90]. New technologies and complex mapping could also help heritage sites integrated better in larger databases and management systems designed at regional or national level[91].

Using heritage sites for the larger public's benefit involves various facilities and maintenance systems. Electricity, acoustics and other amenities have to be provided without risks for the site and with minimal costs. They would also facilitate the use of the (archaeological) sites for various cultural purposes, such as theater or concert venues. All these amenities and facilities have to be visitor-friendly, as well as sustainable[92].

Heritage sites would be more appealing for many visitors if they incorporated new technologies in order to make the experience interactive and more complex. Augmented reality is such an approach. It could be used both onsite, as well as online to stimulate the intention to visit the site. Augmented reality helps visitors to better understand the heritage and make the visit more appealing. The more useful and easy-to-use these technologies are considered, the more people would be interested to visit the site. New technologies could provide both a cognitive, as well as an emotional access to heritage, generating critical-thinking and learning; therefore, providing a participatory public space for learning and enjoyment [93]. Nevertheless, especially for those not very familiar with these technologies, facilitating conditions should be planned[94].

The presentation should also include services and various types of cultural products that would attract, explain and deepen the understanding of the archaeological heritage. Not only tangible and intangible elements of a heritage site should be included in management planning, but also

[85] de la Torre 1997, 52–53.
[86] de la Torre 1997, 54–59.
[87] Roter Blagojevic, Tufegdzic 2015.
[88] Roter Blagojevic, Tufegdzic 2015.
[89] Bruno et alii 2010, Caggiani et alii 2012, Campanaro et alii 2015, Styliadis et alii 2009, Thuswaldner et alii 2009,

Torres et alii 2014.
[90] Caggiani et alii 2012.
[91] Micle 2014.
[92] Bo et alii 2015.
[93] Papathanassiou-Zuhrt 2015.
[94] Chung et alii 2015, 595–596.

cultural components should be integrated in an appealing mix. These include man-made and natural aspects, various events and cultural services provided at the heritage site in order to have a stimulated setting and to inspire various experiences for the visitors. Cultural aspects have to be in harmony with the heritage itself. These could help visitors immerse in history and tradition, but also contribute to the protection of the cultural resources related to the heritage[95].

Educational and other public programs add value not only from the perspective of the perception of the offer of the archaeological site, but they also increase the understanding of the site. These programs should be developed considering a marketing perspective, thus meeting the needs, desires and characteristics of the public considered[96]. The variety of public programs developed at archaeological sites is wide: lectures, workshops, shows, treasure hunting, storytelling, re-enactment etc. Some of them would be limited to a few participants with specific characteristics (for instance children of certain age or persons with specific disabilities) or to a wide public. Re-enactment is such a program. Developing re-enactment programs in archaeological sites involves many aspects[97]. Some people might consider it a show, but it should be planned and implemented as a communication frame/ opportunity between the archaeological site (archaeologists, historians, and other stakeholders) and the public/visitors of the site[98]. All public programs should not be only learning opportunities, but also means of interaction between the public, the past and its present-day stakeholders. Another aspect to be considered when developing public programs associated to an archaeological site is to promote preservation ethics, respect for the past and the value of archaeology and history[99].

The management of a heritage site must also consider the economic value related to its valuation. Few studies address models assessing this aspect, and many of them are critical to the value and economic appropriateness of the offer associated with heritage sites[100]. Increased economic outcomes are associated with higher numbers of more satisfied, even more loyal visitors. Therefore knowing one's visitors is necessary. Their characteristics and motivations, the way they relate to the site

and evaluate the offer are the main aspects to be considered. Bryce et alii[101] recommend the following approach in the case of visitors motivated by heritage-related grounds: stress existential authenticity not only object-based authenticity, facilitate self-connection between visitors and heritage site in order to enhance engagement and loyalty.

The correlation between archaeology and economic development is multifaceted[102]. Sometimes they are placed in a conflictual setting, in which archaeology is an impediment to local economic development, sometimes archaeology becomes a pillar of sustainable development. In several cases, the economic valorization of the archaeological finds destroys the remains, at other times public display gives new life to the neglected ruins. In this context, the management of the archaeological sites should better understand and involve various relevant stakeholders, as well as the economic value of a certain heritage site. Archaeology is funds consuming and mastering economics is imperative for archaeologists[103]. In fact, archaeologists successful at attracting economic interest in a site are also able to improve their own scientific expertise. In most cases, the economic relevance of archaeology is related to heritage tourism, but some other aspects might be considered, among them, those related more to local stakeholders.

Marketing heritage sites within a certain region constitute a good drive for visitation, tourist deception, on the other hand, should be avoided. Promoting the heritage should take into consideration that the intention to visit is more often based on perceptions rather than on facts related to the heritage site[104].

Physical stress on archaeological sites is an issue relevant both from conservation reasons, as well as from visitors' perspective. Too much visitation may put at risk some of the more fragile structures, for instance. An archaeological site has a maximum carrying capacity that should be considered; otherwise, the risks related to its conservation become significant[105].

Crowds can make a visit annoying, and limit the experiences related to it. The first aspect that visitors have to deal with is the entrance cues. They have a significant negative impact on visitation, therefore attendance management is an important

95    Datta et alii 2015, 28.
96    Zbuchea 2014, 85–106.
97    Zbuchea 2015, 490–492.
98    Kobialka 2014, 324–330.
99    Lerner, Hoffman 2000, 232.
100   Choi 2010, 214–215.

101   Bryce et alii 2015, 578.
102   Gould, Burtenshaw 2014.
103   Gould, Burtenshaw 2014, 7.
104   Petr 2015, 255, 257.
105   de la Torre 1997, 11.

part of the management on a popular heritage site[106].

Another aspect influencing heritage related experiences is the environment provided[107]. The evaluation of the visit takes into account the ambience, the design and the layout of the space. These elements also influence the recommendation of the site to other visitors. The most influential elements are the interior design and signage[108]. Some social elements (interaction with employees, other visitors etc.) play a lesser role in these processes, but they are influencing the return of the visitors.

The managers of the archaeological sites should also consider various natural and anthropic risks[109]. Archaeological sites are frequently affected by local development plans, such as land management activities, agricultural management, real estate development, or infrastructure works. Therefore, heritage site management should closely cooperate with various local stakeholders to ensure the preservation and integrity of the site, as well as the sustainable local development.

## 5. Concluding remarks

The present survey was designed as a prolegomenon to the wide interest in site management and valorisation within the scientific community in Europe and elsewhere. These theoretical studies are only a small part of this type of activity, which often assumes a more pragmatic nature, oriented towards particular characteristics of each site. Romanian interest in site management is rather insignificant, in many cases non-existent and therefore the potential for development is much greater. At the same time expansion of contract archaeology excavations and the exposure of already exposed sites, together with the exploding level of anthropic intervention makes the responsibility of site management even a greater and more difficult task.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aas *et alii* 2005
C. Aas, A. Ladkin, J. Fletcher, Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(1) (2005), 28–38.

Alberts, Hazen 2010
H.C. Alberts, H.D. Hazen, Maintaining authenticity

and integrity at cultural world heritage sites. *Geographical Review* 100(1) (2010), 57–74.

Bo *et alii* 2015
E. Bo, M. Bergoglio, A. Astolfi, A. Pellegrino, Between the archaeological site and the contemporary stage: an example of acoustic and lighting retrofit with multifunctional purpose in the ancient theatre of Syracuse. *Energy Procedia* 78 (2015), 913–918.

Bonn *et alii* 2007
M.A. Bonn, S.M. Joseph-Mathews, M. Dai, S. Hayes, J. Cave, Heritage/ Cultural Attraction Atmospherics: Creating the Right Environment for the Heritage/ Cultural Visitor. *Journal of Travel Research* 45 (2007), 345–354.

Bruno *et alii* 2010
F. Bruno, S. Bruno, G. De Sensi, M.L. Luchi, S. Mancuso, M. Muzzupappa, From 3D reconstruction to virtual reality: A complete methodology for digital archaeological exhibition. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 11, 42–49.

Bryce *et alii* 2015
D. Bryce, R. Curran, K. O`Gorman, B. Taheri, Visitors` engagement and authenticity: Japanese heritage, *Tourism Management* 45 (2015), 571–581.

Caggiani *et alii* 2012
M.C. Caggiani, M. Crimnale, D. Gallo, M. Noviello, F. Salvemini, Online non-destructive archaeology, the archaeological ark of Egnazia (Southern Italy) study case, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39 (2012), 67–75.

Campanaro *et alii* 2015
D.M. Campanaro, G. Landeschi, N. Dell`Unto, A.-M. Leander Touati, 3D GIS for cultural heritage restoration: A 'white box' workflow, *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 2015, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1296207415001582

Çetin *et alii* 2012
F.Y. Çetin, B. İpekoğlu, D. Laroche, Reconstruction of Archaeological Sites: Principles Practice and Evaluation, *International Journal of Architectural Heritage* 6(5), (2012), 579–603.

Chhabra, Zhao 2015
D. Chhabra, S. Zhao, Present-centered dialogue with heritage representations. *Annals of Tourism Research* 55 (2015), 94–109.

Choi *et alii* 2010
A.S. Choi, B.W. Ritschi, F. Papandrea, J. Bennett, Economic valuation of cultural heritage sites: A choice modeling approach. *Tourism Management* 31 (2010), 213–220.

Chung *et alii* 2015
N. Chung, H. Han, Y. Joun, Tourists' intention to visit a destination: The role of augmented reality (AR) application for a heritage site. *Computers in Human Behavior* 50 (2015), 588–599.

---

[106] Petr 2015, 255.
[107] Bonn *et alii* 2007.
[108] Bonn *et alii* 2007, 352.
[109] Micle 2014, 270–271.

Conway 2014
F.J. Conway, Local and public heritage at a World Heritage site. *Annals of Tourism Research* 44 (2014), 143–155.

Croitoru, Becuț 2015
C. Croitoru, A. Becuț (eds.), *Barometrul de consum cultural 2014. Cultura între global și local*, Pro Universitaria, Bucharest (2015).

Datta *et alii* 2015
P. Datta, G. Bigham, Z. Zou, G. Hill, A global study of heritage site ecology, proclivity & loyalty. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 25 (2015), 19–29.

de la Torre 1997
M. de la Torre (ed.), *The Conservation of Archaeological sites in the Mediterranean Region: an international conference organized by the Getty Conservation Institute and the J. Paul Getty Museum, 6–12 May 1995*, Los Angeles, 1997.

Duran *et alii* 2015
R. Duran, B.A. Farizo, M.X. Vasquez, Conservation of maritime cultural heritage: a discrete choice experiment in a European Atlantic Region. *Marine Policy* 51 (2015), 356–365.

EC 2013
European Commision, *Special Eurobarometer 399. Cultural access and participation.Report*, Bruxelles (2013).

EC 2014
European Commision, *Mapping of Cultural Heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities*, Bruxelles (2014).

Ferretti, Comino 2015
V. Ferretti, E. Comino, An integrated framework to assess complex cultural and natural heritage systems with Multi-Attribute Value Theory, *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 16 (2015), 688–698.

Fouseki, Sandes 2009
K. Fouseki, C. Sandes, Private Preservation versus Public Presentation: The Conservation for Display of *In Situ* Fragmentary Archaeological Remains in London and Athens. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 19 (2009), 37–54.

Gould, Burtenshaw 2014
P.G. Gould, P. Burtenshaw. Archaeology and economic development. *Public Archaeology* 13(1–3) (2014), 3–9.

Jameson 2000
J.H. Jameson, Public interpretation, education and outreach: the growing predominance in the American archaeology. In: Francis P. McManamon and Alf Hatton (eds.), *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society. Perspectives on Managing and Preserving the Past*, London: Routledge (2000), 288–299.

Kobialka 2014
D. Kobialka, Archaeology and communication with

the public: archaeological open-air museums and historical re-enactment in action. *European journal of Post – Classical Archaeologies* 4 (2014), 315–332.

Lake 2012
M. Lake, Open Archaeology. *World Archaeology* 44(4) (2012), 471–478.

Lerner, Hoffman 2000
S. Lerner, T. Hoffman, Bringing archaeology to the public: Programmes in the Southwestern United States. In: Francis P. McManamon and Alf Hatton (eds.), *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society. Perspectives on Managing and Preserving the Past*, London: Routledge (2000), 231–246.

Lourenco-Gomes *et alii* 2014
L. Lourenco-Gomes, L.M. Costa Pinto, J.F. Rebelo, Visitors' preferences for preserving the attributes of a world heritage site. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 15 (2014), 64–67.

Marshall 2002
Y. Marshall, What is community archaeology?. *World Archaeology* 34(2) (2002), 211–219.

Massara, Severino 2013
F. Massara, F. Severino, Psychological distance in the heritage experience. *Annals of Tourism Research* 42, 2013, 108–129.

Micle 2014
D. Micle, Archaeological heritage between natural hazard and anthropic destruction: the negative impact of social non-involvement in the protection of archaeological sites. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 163 (2014), 269–278.

Mohanu, Sturdza 2009
D. Mohan, Ș. Sturdza (coord.), *Raportul Comisiei Prezidențiale pentru Patrimoniul Construit, Situri Istorice și Naturale*, Administrația Prezidențială, Bucharest (2009).

Moser *et alii* 2002
S. Moser, D. Glasier, J.E. Philips, L. Nasser el Nemr, M.S. Mousa, R.N. Aiesh, S. Richardson, A. Conner, M. Seymour, Transforming archaeology through practice: strategies for collaborative archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseit, Egypt. *World Archaeology* 34(2) (2002), 220–248.

Papathanassiou-Zuhrt 2015
D. Papathanassiou-Zuhrt, Cognitive Load Management of Cultural Heritage Information: An Application Multi-Mix for Recreational Learners. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 188 (2015), 57–73.

Petr 2015
Ch. Petr, How heritage site tourists may become monument visitors, *Tourism Management* 51 (2015), 247–252.

Poria *et alii* 2006
Y. Poria, A. Reichel, A. Biran, Heritage site management. Motivations and expectations. *Annals of tourism research* 33(1) (2006), 162–179.

Poria *et alii* 2013
Y. Poria, A. Reichel, R. Cohen, Tourists perceptions of World Heritage Site and its designation. *Tourism Management* 35 (2013), 272–274.

Price 2000
C.A. Price, Following fashion: the ethics of archaeological conservation. In: Francis P. McManamon and Alf Hatton (eds.), *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society. Perspectives on Managing and Preserving the Past*, London: Routledge (2000), 213–230.

Roter Blagojevic, Tufegdzic 2015
M. Roter Blagojevic, A. Tufegdzic, The new technology era requirements and sustainable approach to industrial heritage renewal. *Energy and Buildings* 7, (2015). http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037877881530178X.

Styliadis *et alii* 2009
A.D. Styliadis, I.I. Akbaylar, D.A. Papadopoulou, N.D. Hasanagas, S.A. Roussa, L.A. Sexidis, Metadata-based heritage sites modeling with e-learning functionality. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 10 (2009), 296–312.

Thuswaldner *et alii* 2009
B. Thuswaldner, S. Flory, R. Kalasek, M. Hofer, Q.-X. Huang, H. Thur, Digital Anastylosis of the Octagon in Ephesos, *Journal on Computers and Cultural Heritage* 2(1), 2009, 1–27.

Torres *et alii* 2014
J.A. Torres, D. Hernandez-Lopez, D. Gonales-Aguilera, M.A. Hidalgo, A hybrid measurement approach for archaeological site modelling and monitoring: the case study of Mas D'Is, Penaguila. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 50 (2014), 475–483.

UNESCO 2013
UNESCO, IICROM, ICOMOS, IUCN, *Managing Cultural World Heritage*, available online at *whc.unesco.org/document/125839, 2013, accessed Oct. 17, 2015*.

Ursache 2015
M. Ursache, Tourism – significant driver shaping a destinations` heritage. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 188 (2015), 130–137.

Vacharopoulou 2004
K. Vacharopoulou, Conservation and Management of Archaeological Monuments and Sites in Greece and Turkey: A Value-Based Approach to Anastylosis, *PIA Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 16 (2004), 72–87.

Wang *et alii* 2015
Z. Wang, Z. Yang, G. Wall, X. Xu, F. Han, X. Du, Q. Liu, Is it better for a tourist destination to be a World Heritage Site? Visitors' perspectives on the inscription of Kanas on the World Heritage List in China. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 23, 2015, 19–26.

While, Short 2011
A. While, M. Short, Place narratives and heritage management: the modernist legacy in Manchester. *Area* 43(1) (2011), 4–13.

Willis 2009
K.G. Willis, Assessing Visitor Preferences in the Management of Archaeological and Heritage Attractions: a Case Study of Hadrian's Roman Wall. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 11 (2009), 487–505.

Yung *et alii* 2016
E.H.K. Yung, L.W.C. Lai, Ph.L.H. Yu, Public decision making for heritage conservation: a Hong Kong empirical study. *Habitat International* 53 (2016), 312–319.

Zan, Bonini Baraldi 2013
L. Zan, S. Bonini Baraldi, The heritage chain management. General issues and a case study, China. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 14 (2013), 211–218.

Zbuchea 2014
A. Zbuchea, *Marketing muzeal pentru nonmarketeri*, Tritonic, Bucharest (2014).

Zbuchea 2015
A. Zbuchea, Museums as theme parks – a possible marketing approach?. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy* 3(3) (2015), 483–507.