Heritage and heritage education: an issue for educational debate?

La patrimonialización y la educación patrimonial ¿un asunto para el debate educativo?

Patricia Castañeda Paz
Alquería Cavelier Foundation. Bogotá. Colombia
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0024-0694.
patryze@yahoo.es.

Lissette Jiménez Sánchez
Universidad de Matanzas. Cuba
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3912-7901.
lissettejimenez.1963@gmail.com.

Abstract

Objective: Explain the relationships between heritage processes and heritage education as a matter for educational debate

Methods. The research is assumed from a mixed approach with qualitative predominance. The system of methods included the theoretical use of the historical-logical, the analytical-synthetic and the inductive-deductive. The empirical methods used were document analysis, and the common synthesis matrix as a technique.

Results. The study reveals the insufficient approach to the relationships between the processes of heritagization and heritage education from a theoretical perspective, as well as the need to value the latter as one of the ways for the sociocultural sustainability of heritage from the formation of an awareness and an educational practice. wealth in educators and wealth managers, focused on the use of social technologies and educational innovation.

Conclusions. The relationships between the processes of heritagization and heritage education demonstrate the need to value the latter as one of the ways for the sociocultural sustainability of heritage from the formation of an awareness and a heritage educational practice in educators and heritage managers, focused on the use of social technologies and educational innovation.

Keywords: heritage; heritagization; heritage education; innovation

Resumen

Objetivo: Explicar las relaciones entre los procesos de patrimonialización y educación patrimonial como asunto para el debate educativo

Métodos. La investigación se asume desde un enfoque mixto con predominio cualitativo. El sistema de métodos incluyó la utilización desde lo teórico del histórico-lógico, el analítico- sintético y el inductivo-deductivo. Los métodos empíricos utilizados fueron el análisis de documentos, y como técnica la matriz de síntesis común.

Resultados. El estudio revela el insuficiente abordaje de las relaciones entre los procesos de patrimonialización y educación patrimonial desde lo teórico, así como la necesidad de valorizar esta última como una de las vías para la sostenibilidad sociocultural del patrimonio desde la conformación de una conciencia y una práctica educativa patrimonial en los educadores y gestores patrimoniales, centrada en la utilización de las tecnologías sociales y la innovación educativa.

Conclusiones. Las relaciones entre los procesos de patrimonialización y educación patrimonial demuestran la necesidad de valorizar esta última como una de las vías para la sostenibilidad sociocultural del patrimonio desde la conformación de una conciencia y una práctica educativa patrimonial en los educadores y gestores patrimoniales, centrada en la utilización de las tecnologías sociales y la innovación educativa.

Palabras clave: patrimonio; patrimonialización; educación patrimonial; innovación

Introduction

Heritagization as a process and result is a recent term. Authors such as Bustos (2004), Arrieta, Hernández and Andreu (2016), Corbera (2016), Silva y Fernández (2017), Zusman and Pérez (2018) Pinassi (2018), Porcal (2019), Mendoza (2018), Pérez (2020), Gallegos and Lina (2021) and Suden (2022), have contributed to its conceptualization understood as a complex social, cultural, economic and political process, which shapes identities, manages heritage assets, and is expressed at different scales from the local to the global. and emphasizes the role of the subject in this process.

For their part, Almagro (2020) and Castejón (2021) agree that heritage and education constitute an emerging binomial in the cultural policy sector, due to their contribution to the appropriation of inherent values among citizens to patrimonial assets.

Heritage education as a field of interaction between education and heritage, aims to strengthen the links between people and their cultural heritage to ensure access to culture and cultural identity of citizens.

It is highlighted by Muñoz (2014), Fontal (2017), Rodríguez (2017), Jiménez (2023), Jiménez, Peñate, & Jiménez (2023) and Jiménez, Peñate, Soto, Hernández and Santos (2022), who emphasize its necessity from everyday educational practices, schooled and unschooled, although not always from a theoretical construction that deepens the importance of these practices as a way and resource for the sustainability of heritage processes.

Understanding the interrelationships between heritagization and heritage education, in principle, incorporates the multiple connections that articulate them as social processes. However, in heritagization as a process, the theoretical approach to these relationships is insufficient, as is the need to value the latter as one of the ways for the sociocultural sustainability of heritage from the formation of a heritage awareness and educational practice. in educators and wealth managers, focused on the use of social technologies and educational innovation.

Correspondingly, this research aims to: Explain the relationships between the processes of heritagization and heritage education as a key issue in the educational debate, considering the need to value the latter as one of the ways for the sociocultural sustainability of heritage.

Materials and methods

The research is assumed from a mixed approach with predominance in its design of the documentary-type qualitative approach with descriptive scope, since it focuses on revealing the relationships between the processes of heritagization and heritage education. The system of methods included the theoretical use of the historical-logical, the analytical-synthetic and the inductive-deductive. These methods allowed us to reveal the logic in the development of essential determinations around heritage, the approaches to heritagization as a process and the complexities that are inherent

to it, as well as its dynamic and innovative character.Likewise, heritage education was delved into, in schooled and unschooled contexts and its place in heritagization.

The theoretical approaches derived from the application of these methods and the use of document analysis as an empirical method, and the common synthesis matrix as an investigative technique allowed us to reach conceptual consensus on the relationship between the processes of heritagization and heritage education, systematize and guarantee the necessary objectivity in the analysis of the information collected and the contributions of the consulted authors recognized in the sciences of education and heritage. Likewise, the resulting information was contrasted with the experience of the authors of this research.

Results and discussion

Heritagization is a voluntary process of incorporating socially constructed values in a specific space-time, which identifies and analyzes the actions of its main actors and their territorial symbolic implications. Authors such as Bustos (2004), Arrieta et al. (2016), Corbera (2016), Silva y Fernández (2017), Zusman and Pérez (2018), Pinassi (2018), Porcal (2019), Mendoza (2018), Pérez (2020) , Gallegos and Lina (2021) and Suden (2022), agree in its essence as a complex and dynamic process that involves the social construction of territorial values, the configuration of national identity, and the management of cultural and natural assets in a territory. given.

The results of the use of the common synthesis matrix identify the following as coincident elements in relation to heritagization between these authors:

• Its condition is a relational and anti-essentialist process, where actors with symbolic authority define which elements acquire the status of heritage, based on current interests.

• It participates in the economic and symbolic reintegration of cities into neoliberal capitalism but is not reduced to an instrumental nature.

• It functions as a device for configuring the idea of nation, promoting a founding myth that hides space-time discontinuities.

• It can occur through institutional processes promoted by States, or at a global level by organizations such as UNESCO.

• It involves the construction of a "heritage consciousness" of a representational and communicational nature.

• It leads to the fusion of various cultural and natural assets present in a territory, through the heritage characterization of the territory and the territorial characterization of the heritage.

Without highlighting opposing ideas, for this article it is interesting, as part of the systematization carried out, to highlight some of the aspects emphasized by the authors that incorporate certain aspects that enrich a conception of heritagization as a process:

Bustos (2004). It refers to its historical character, the ecological and sociocultural values it implies in relation to the culture of a territory and refers to the term " heritage awareness".

Arrieta et al. (2016). The agents that participate in heritage development stand out: the public administration, cultural heritage specialists and professionals, economic agents, associations, groups or local scholars and citizens in general.

Corbera (2016). It is of interest that it highlights the relationship between history and heritage. The selective historical heritage discourse expresses a historical explanation that highlights what is essential, enriches it and shows the authenticity of the heritage.

Silva and Fernández (2017). They allude to the dynamic between heritagization and no-heritagization as processes of exaltation and loss of values.

Zusman and Pérez (2018). They introduce their multiple process conditions.

Pinassi (2018). It refers to the conflicts linked to heritage and uses the term "heritage lived space", which emphasizes the experience and affectivity of the subjects, the importance, first, of the past, but also focused on the future.

Porcal (2019). It describes how a valuable landscape goes from being "potentially heritageizable" to a "recognized heritage landscape", which consolidates its status as a process.

Mendoza (2018). It refers to network heritagization, not in technological terms, but to the interaction of multiple actors who connect or disconnect, in a constant reconfiguration.

Suden (2022). Introduces the definition of heritage cultural landscape

These references ratify the dynamic and complex condition of heritagization as a process and result, immersed in social, political, economic and cultural contradictions, where heritage assets are identified and declared and even lose this condition. This is accompanied by permanent learning to achieve heritage awareness and the involvement in its sustainability of the social actors of the communities that hold that legacy.

The education inserted in heritage as a process has its origin in the 1972 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. It privileges the interaction with heritage assets and is a timely tool in the dissemination of heritage and the identity values that support it to strengthen cultural identity and actions consistent with its continuity. For this reason, education, in its broad sense, constitutes one of the ways to raise heritage awareness and is among the priorities associated with this process, as it defends its sustainability.

Authors such as Almagro (2020) and Castejón (2021) agree that heritage and education constitute an emerging binomial in the cultural policy sector, due to their contribution to the appropriation among citizens of the values inherent to heritage assets. Important contributions are offered by Muñoz (2014) and Fontal (2003, 2008, 2017) who defend intentional educational actions that promote knowledge, values and identity, as well as them sustain.

For his part, González (2014) specifies the education heritage relationship in three dimensions: Education about heritage (emphasizing dissemination), Education for

heritage (highlighting its sustainability over time, respect, and care), and Education from heritage (linking learning with living experiences of cultural heritage, family, local, national, and global).

In these authors and others consulted in the systematization carried out in her doctoral thesis by Jiménez (2023), the main contributions stand out due to the diversity of actors involved, the spaces and heritage assets, as well as the proposals for formal and informal educational scenarios. Heritage education is recognized to strengthen the heritage awareness of the main actors in their interaction with heritage, its history, values and identity, focused on raising their commitment as social transformers.

Based on this precedent, Jiménez (2023, p. 19) defines heritage education as:

The educational and social praxis that allows the development of pedagogical and educational actions with interdisciplinary approaches, which forms values in new generations. As a scientific discipline, its objective is to articulate the teaching-learning processes, heritage and institutions; as an instrument of cultural literacy and driving force in the defense of local cultures. It is a continuous process of educational work focused on cultural heritage, carried out by experts on the subject to educate the public. It allows you to make a sociocultural assessment of the environment, strengthen your relationship with history, art, ways of life, increase your social commitment and conserve heritage.

What has been explained so far considers heritagization as a process and result, where heritage assets are identified and declared. This is accompanied by permanent learning to achieve heritage awareness and the involvement in its conservation and sustainability of the social actors of the communities that are depositaries of that legacy. Therefore, in its broad sense, education is inherent to heritage development, focused on a better understanding, conservation and management of cultural and natural heritage.

In this sense, it is confirmed that heritagization as a process not only refers to the identification of heritage assets and the declaration of their values, but also includes the need for educational actions for the involvement of social actors in their conservation. Heritage processes require programs, campaigns and educational actions to raise awareness at all levels of society, from the earliest ages to administrators, managers and political decision-makers.

Heritage and education, dynamic and holistic processes, come together due to their highly innovative essence over time. Updated analysis perspectives and the main advances in the study of both, provide approaches and conceptions that favor their interrelationships and mutual influences from social technologies and active methodologies with an innovative vision.

There are various contemporary technologies where the social is the protagonist: intellectual, cultural, political, wisdom and social. Jiménez et al. (2022) highlight the importance of the latter in wealth management in the last two decades. They are technologies based on society, whose purpose is to achieve innovations in this area. In the case of this paper, social technologies express participatory methods, negotiation techniques, conflict management, social learning, cooperation and innovation.

Innovation is inherent to progress. Innovating is essentially transforming. At the educational level, the seventies of the last century incorporated innovation as a challenge for educational models in the search for answers to the demands of society expressed in the training needs of students. Currently, the leading role of technologies seems to be that innovation weights the use of know-how and not academic postulates of a pedagogical nature, which is an unfinished criterion of the matter. Technological advances and innovation entail new challenges for educational processes, particularly the ways and means in which teaching and learning are carried out. In this scenario, educational innovation becomes a key piece, involving not only content and methodologies, but a restructuring and deculturalization of educational systems.

Educational innovation is a complex and unfinished process, since the school itself and the main actors in the educational process make up a living and changing system. Educational innovation because of scientific research is essential as a social process with multiple impacts: in the formation of the human capacity to transform, create and recreate the world, the production of material and symbolic modifications in connection with tradition and in general the training of innovative subjects with a critical sense. Thus, the development of innovative educational practices applies depending on specific educational contexts; the diverse actors involved in it, the general or reduced field of knowledge in question and the specific cultural patterns that support it

In heritage education, innovation incrementally contributes to favor decision-making and citizen participation in the educational community, self-management of knowledge, and cultural literacy. It is about incorporating:

- Anthropological aspects, the cultural heritage of communities, their social representations, common interests, and problems, from an interdisciplinary approach and a sociocultural vision beyond the development of material means and technological attractions, contributing to improving curricular designs and school programs.

- Ubiquitous learning, where not only access to learning and information through Information and Communication Technologies is valued but also the "in situ" use of cultural and natural heritage to facilitate the development of knowledge, skills, values, and social interaction of individuals.

- Heritage becomes a source of knowledge and for enhancing procedural contents through the application of an inquiry and research methodology that generates meaningful, functional, and comprehensive learning through problem-solving related to students' concerns through direct contact with heritage assets in a face-to-face or virtual manner (reconstructions and recreations of virtual or augmented reality), but contextualized temporally, spatially, functionally, and socially.

The use of social technologies and active methodologies with an innovative vision in heritage education requires taking into account:

- The context. It contributes to the contextual resolution of problems, from a transformative practical vision and a meaningful learning that is situated in real contexts or as close to them as possible.

- Teamwork. Cooperation, shared responsibility, and individuality in the group are key aspects.

- Functionality of learning. The proposed learning provides the construction of knowledge with meaning and the need to put into operation higher-order thinking skills.

- Discovery learning. It allows for an active role, a protagonism of those who build their own learning process.

The application of social technologies and active methodologies with an innovative incremental vision in heritage education favors transformations in the roles of the actors; introducing changes in their levels of involvement. The sustainability of heritage processes determines the inclusion of a view towards heritage education supported by social technologies and active methodologies with an innovative incremental vision.

Conclusions

The sustainability of heritage processes determines the inclusion of a view towards heritage education supported by social technologies and active methodologies with an innovative vision. These processes: heritage, heritage education, and innovation have in common the social actors who participate in them and contribute to making these actors active and transformative subjects in the social fabric of the 21st century.

References

Almagro, J. (2020). School and museum: a link to optimize the educational value of cultural heritage. Journal of American History, Heritage, Archeology and Anthropology, (3), (176-184). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.

Arrieta Urtizberea, I., Hernández León, E. & Andreu Tomàs, A. (2016). Patrimonio local en un mundo global: procesos de patrimonialización cultural en contextos locales de Andalucía y el País Vasco. *Arquivos, 8*(14). https://periodicos.ufpel.edu.br/index.php/Memoria/article/view/7545.

Bustos Cara, R. (2004). Appraisal of territorial value. Tourism, productive system and local development. *Aportes y transferencias,2*, 11-24. http://nulan.mdp.edu.ar/id/eprint/287/1/Apo2004a8v2pp11-24.pdf.

Castejón Ibáñez, M. (2021). Arte, museos y maestros: una perspectiva desde la formación del profesorado de educación primaria. *ARTSEDUCA Revista electrónica de educación en las Artes, 29*(29), 127-140. https://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/handle/10234/193801.

Corbera Millán, M. (2016). El paisaje, su patrimonialización y el beneficio económico. *Investigaciones Geográficas,* (65), 9–24. https://doi.org/10.14198/INGEO2016.65.01.

Fontal Merillas, O. (2003). La educación patrimonial: teoría y práctica para el aula, el museo e Internet. Ediciones TREA. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322991859_La_educacion_patrimonial_teoria_y_practica_para_el_aula_el_museo_e_Internet.

Fontal Merillas, O. (2008). La importancia de la dimensión humana en la didáctica del patrimonio. En *La comunicación global del patrimonio cultural* (pp.79-110).Ediciones TREA. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322991960_La_importancia_de_la_dimension_humana_en_la_didactica_del_patrimonio.

Fontal Merillas, O., Ibáñez-Etxeberria, A., Martínez Rodríguez, M. & Rivero Gracia, P. (2017). El patrimonio como contenido en la etapa de Primaria: del currículum a la formación de maestros. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado, 20*(2), 79-95. https://www.academia.edu/36820616/Heritage_as_Content_in_Primary_Education_From_the_Curriculum_to_Teacher_Education.

Gallegos Tejeda, P., & Lina Manjarrez, P. (2021). Modelo de patrimonialización del paisaje agroecológico urbano en América Latina. *PatryTer, 4*(8), 194–214. https://doi.org/10.26512/patryter.v4i8.31299.

González, O. (2014). Education for identity, an approach from the basic secondary school curriculum. *Electronic magazine Pedagogy and Society, Cuba,* (41).

Jiménez Pérez, G. A., Peñate Villasante, A. G., Soto Portillo, D., Hernández de León, M., & Santos Pérez, O. (2022). Valores del patrimonio inmueble del centro histórico urbano de Matanzas como contenido para la educación patrimonial. *Revista de Arquitectura e Ingeniería, 16*(2). https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=193971847005.

Jiménez Pérez, G. A. (2023). La educación patrimonial desde un enfoque de ciencia, tecnología y sociedad en espacios urbanos. *CIMEXUS, XVIII*(1), 27-45. https://cimexus.umich.mx/index.php/cimexus/article/view/473/441.

Jiménez Pérez, G. A. & Peñate Villasante, A. (2023) La educación patrimonial en espacios públicos mediante la labor del gestor sociocultural. *Transformación, 19*(3), 357-370. https://transformation.reduc.edu.cu/index.php/transformacion/article/view/138.

Jiménez Pérez, G., Peñate Villasante, A., & Jiménez Sánchez, L. (2023). Experiencias de interpretación y educación patrimonial en la formación del gestor sociocultural.*Opuntia Brava, 15*(3), 111-120. https://opuntiabrava.ult.edu.cu/index.php/opuntiabrava/article/view/1869.

Mendoza Mejía, J (2018). Reflections on the heritage processes of intangible cultural heritage. *PatryTer, 1*(2), 72-83. https://doi.org/10.26512/patryter.v1i2.7177.

Muñoz Guzmán, C. (2014). *El paisaje cultural cafetero: una encrucijada entre la sostenibilidad y un futuro amenazado.*[Tesis de maestría]. Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira. https://repositorio.utp.edu.co/server/api/core/bitstreams/82bf8cee-5551-4c11-ba7a-1d393df30dad/content.

Pinassi, C. A. (2018). Conflictos en torno al patrimonio cultural de Ingeniero White (Bahía Blanca, Argentina). Cuadernos De antropología Social, (48). https://doi.org/10.34096/cas.i48.4100.

Pérez Winter, C. (2020). Heritage processes in the re-actualization of nation: National Commission of Museums, Monuments and Historic Assets in Argentina. *Revista de Geografía Norte Grande*, 75, 61-81. https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/168479.

Porcal-Gonzalo, M. C. (2019). Búsqueda de especificidades en el carácter de los paisajes del viñedo e identificación de sus procesos de patrimonialización. La Rioja Alavesa como laboratorio. Cuadernos Geográficos, 58(2), 215–239. https://doi.org/10.30827/cuadgeo.v58i2.7390.

Rodríguez-Herrera, D. (2017). *Hacer espacios en patrimonialización. Prácticas cotidianas en la formación del Paisaje Cultural Cafetero de Colombia-Patrimonio Mundial*. [Tesis de doctorado]. Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371982909_Hacer_espacios_en_patrimonializacion_Practicas_cotidianas_en_la_formacion_del_Paisaje_Cultural_Cafetero_de_Colombia-Patrimonio_Mundial.

Silva Pérez, R. & Fernández Salinas, V. (2017). El nou paradigma del patrimoni i la seva consideració amb els paisatges: Conceptes, mètodes i prospectives.

Documents   d'Anàlisi   Geogràfica,   63(1),   129–151.
https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/dag.344.

Suden, C.A. (2022).Paisaje cultural patrimonializado: conceptos y aportes sobre la
base de áreas observadas en el área metropolitana de Mendoza, Argentina.
Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural, 20(2), 435-452.
https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2022.20.031.

Zusman, P. & Pérez Winter, C. (2018). Las áreas rurales y el patrimonio histórico-
cultural.En Castro, H. y Arzeno, M. (Eds.). *Lo rural en redefinición.
Aproximaciones y estrategias desde la Geografía*,(231-252). Byblos.