

A Systematic Literature Review on Categories of Non-Use Values of Archaeologically Protected Buildings in Heritage Contexts

W D S Weerakkodi^{1*}

¹*Government Valuation Department, Kandy*

Abstract

Conventional heritage valuation methods primarily emphasize economic and use-based aspects, often neglecting the intangible or non-use values of heritage assets. This gap highlights the need for a comprehensive understanding of non-use value categories associated with archaeologically protected buildings. Therefore, this study presents a systematic literature review aimed at identifying the non-use value categories associated with archaeologically protected buildings within heritage contexts. The review was conducted by analyzing peer-reviewed academic articles published between 2001 and 2024. Key non-use value categories identified include Existence Value, Option Value, Bequest Value, Symbolic/ Cultural Value, Spiritual/Religious Value, Social Value, and Environmental/ Landscape Value. Data were extracted and analyzed using thematic analysis, and a tabulation method was applied to identify recurring patterns and classifications. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of intangible heritage values, which are often overlooked in conventional valuation methods that emphasize economic and use-based perspectives.

© 2025 The Authors. Published by Department of Estate Management and Valuation, University of Sri Jayewardenepura

Keywords: Archaeologically Protected Buildings, Heritage Value, Non-Use Value, Property values.

Introduction

Existing scholarly literature provides substantial evidence on the various categories of non-use values associated with archaeologically protected buildings. (Bullen & Love, 2010) emphasize the growing recognition of conserving heritage buildings, highlighting that such efforts generate significant economic, cultural, and social benefits. Furthermore, the literature identifies the Total Economic Value (TEV) framework, which categorizes heritage value into two main components: use value and non-use value (The Allen Consulting Group, 2005), (SGS Economics and Planning Pvt Ltd, 2018). Use value represents tangible, market-based benefits such as tourism income, rental returns, and adaptive reuse potential. In contrast, non-use value refers to the intangible satisfaction derived from the mere existence and preservation of heritage assets and the assurance that future generations can continue to experience them. Non-use values, including existence, bequest, and option values, are not reflected in market transactions but express the deeper social, cultural, and emotional significance of heritage. (Ruijgrok, 2006) defines the economic value of cultural heritage as “the amount of welfare that heritage generates for society,” explaining that this welfare encompasses both material and immaterial aspects. Despite these insights, there remains no standardized method or framework for valuing archaeologically protected buildings, indicating a significant research gap. (Throsby, 2001) further elaborates that total heritage (architectural) value comprises both economic and cultural

*Corresponding Author- dilsakuw@gmail.com

dimensions, with cultural value encompassing aesthetic, symbolic, spiritual, social, historical, and authenticity aspects. The findings from this systematic literature review reveal multiple non-use value categories within broader value classifications, such as Total Economic Value, Sociocultural Value, and Industrial Heritage Value.

Objective/s of the Study

To identify the categories of non-use values associated with archaeological protected buildings in Heritage Contexts through a systematic literature review.

Literature Review

According to (The Allen Consulting Group, 2005), understanding value in a heritage sense is significant because value is the main reason for conserving the heritage. Furthermore, they explain there are no societies that make an effort to conserve what they ignore as valuable. Specifically, (The Allen Consulting Group, 2005) identifies any action that individuals gain satisfaction from, considered as value, and this content answers economic meaning, although these unpriced values can't be revealed. (Throsby, 2001) States that the total heritage (architectural) value consists of both economic and cultural value. And also, cultural value, in his concept, consists of aesthetic, symbolic, spiritual, social, historical, and authenticity value, and it is multidimensional. (Ruijgrok, 2006) define "The economic value of cultural heritage as the amount of welfare that heritage generates for society." It explains that the welfare formed by cultural heritage is more than the financial benefits that certain historical objects or areas can produce. (Avdikos & Dragouni, 2021) mainly focuses on Museums and heritage sites, it recognizes heritage values as a combination of economic and non-economic (Cultural, Social and Environmental values) aspects. Furthermore, this study explained that non-economic values, such as social and cultural values like identity or cultural participation, can be measured using proxies. These include quantitative methods such as willingness to pay, hedonic pricing, subjective well-being, balance theory, and optimal simulation theory. (Chen, et al., 2024) identified eight value types as a dimension under the industrial heritage value evaluation system such as historical value, Artistic value, social value, cultural value, scientific value, technological value, economic value, and functional value. (Łaszkiewicz, et al., 2022) identifies four dimensions linked to spatial order for evaluating architectural heritage, such as architectural value, aesthetic value, functional value and social value. The article (Mendes, 2016) focuses on contributing to the discussion around the value of archaeological heritage from an economist's perspective. This study mentions the different types of archaeological cultural values, which are economic, historical, spiritual, political, educational, aesthetic, artistic, scientific, and social. (Huang, et al., 2024) mainly focuses on historical buildings in universities, and assessment of value primarily revolves around three facets, such as historic value, artistic value, and scientific value. (Ruijgrok, 2006) determined three values of cultural heritage, such as the recreational value, the bequest value and the housing comfort value. According to the results of (Zin, et al., 2019), indicated that there are four groups of heritage property value determinants such as transaction characteristics, structural characteristics, spatial characteristics, and historical characteristics. Furthermore, this study concluded that heritage property values are differentiated by historical characteristics, especially in their design or architectural styles and the status of the heritage property.

Methods

A systematic search was carried out to review existing scholarly literature on the values associated with archaeologically protected buildings, particularly within heritage contexts. The search was conducted using academic databases accessed through Google Scholar. Keywords used in the search included: 'heritage value', 'value assessment of archaeologically protected buildings', 'use and non-use value of

heritage buildings', and 'determinants of heritage property value'. The search was limited to peer-reviewed articles published between 2001 and 2024 that were relevant to the assessment of heritage values. Existing scholarly literature was selected based on its relevance to the research topic, methodological suitability, and its contribution to the understanding of non-use values in the context of heritage conservation. Data were extracted from the selected articles regarding the identification and classification of non-use values associated with archaeologically protected buildings. The extracted data were then thematic analysis, and a tabulation method was used to identify recurring patterns, value categories.

Results and Discussion

The data collected through the qualitative literature review can be presented in a tabulation method in Table 1, to identify that the scholars mostly highlighted the values associated with archaeologically protected buildings.

Table 2
Value Categories

Value Categories Identified	Reference	Reference Country/Region
Total Economic Value: - Use Value (Direct: income/revenue, economic activity; Indirect: community image, aesthetic) - Non-Use Value (Option, Existence, Bequest)	(The Allen Consulting Group, 2005)	Australia
- Sociocultural Values: Historical, Cultural/Symbolic, Social, Spiritual/Religious, Aesthetic - Economic Value: Use & Non-Use (Existence, Option, Bequest)	(Avdikos & Dragouni, 2021)	Europe
- Basic Value: Historical, Artistic, Scientific - Core Value: Socio-cultural, Environmental Landscape - Subsidiary Value: Use Value	(Dengyue, Jun, & Ke, 2023)	China
- Industrial Heritage Value: Historical, Artistic, Social, Cultural, Technological, Economic, Environmental, Functional	(Chen, et al., 2024)	China - Fuzhou City
- Sociocultural: Social (Community link, Pride), Symbolic (Nostalgia, Reminiscence), Wellness, Historical, Spiritual; Economic: Use Value	(Rajapakse, 2018)	Sri Lanka - Galle Fort
- Sociocultural: Historic, Aesthetic, Scientific, Spiritual, Symbolic, Social - Economic Value: Use (Direct/Indirect), Non-Use (Existence, Option, Bequest)	(SGS Economics and Planning Pvt Ltd, 2018)	Australia
- Economic: Use, Non-Use - Cultural: Aesthetic, Spiritual, Social, Historical, Symbolic, Authenticity, Scientific	(George, Phoebe, Panagiotis-Stavros, & Angelos, 2024)	Europe
- Industrial Heritage: Historical, Cultural, Artistic, Scientific/Technological, Social & Economic, Location, Environmental	(Zhang, Xiang, Tao, & Yao, 2021)	China

Historical, Evidential, Architectural Aesthetic, Symbolic/Emotive, Social, Personal/Community Value	(North Norfolk District Council, 2018)	United Kingdom
---	--	----------------

Source: Compiled by Author, (2025)

Referring to Table 1, most of the studies (The Allen Consulting Group, 2005), (Avdikos & Dragouni, 2021), (SGS Economics and Planning Pvt Ltd, 2018), (George, et al., 2024), three primary non-use values emerge consistently, which are Existence Value, Option Value, and Bequest Value. Some studies, such as (Rajapakse, 2018), (Avdikos & Dragouni, 2021), (George, et al., 2024), classify non-economic intangible values under sociocultural categories such as Symbolic value, Spiritual value and Social value. Studies like (Dengyue, et al., 2023), (Zhang, et al., 2021) extend heritage value frameworks to include environmental landscape value and emotive/personal meanings. Non-use values, which include existence, bequest, and option values, represent intangible benefits gained from heritage buildings, such as emotional satisfaction, cultural continuity, and potential future use. Unlike use values, which reflect measurable economic benefits such as tourism or rent, non-use values emphasize heritage significance beyond market transactions, capturing identity and collective memory.

Conclusion

This systematic literature review has evaluated classifications of non-use values associated with archaeologically protected buildings. Key categories include Existence Value, Option Value, Bequest Value, Symbolic/Cultural Value, Spiritual/Religious Value, Social Value, and Environmental/Landscape Value. The review was guided by a theoretical framework and employed a tabulation method to identify recurring patterns and categorize these values across the selected literature.

This study highlights non-use values of heritage buildings, often overlooked in traditional, use-focused valuation practices. By synthesizing findings from nine peer-reviewed journal articles, the review highlights the significance of intangible and non-economic value dimensions that are crucial to heritage conservation. However, the scope of this review is limited by the number of sources analyzed. Future researchers are encouraged to expand upon this work by including a broader and more diverse set of academic publications to enhance the generalizability and depth of insights into non-use value assessment.

Acknowledgement

The author gratefully acknowledges the support provided by the Centre for Real Estate Studies, Department of Estate Management and Valuation, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka.

References

Avdikos, V., & Dragouni, M. (2021, July). Assessing values of cultural heritage and museums. In *Culture, Creativity and Economy* (pp. 83-94). Routledge. Retrieved March 10, 2025

Bullen, A. P., & Love, E. P. (2010). The rhetoric of adaptive reuse or reality of demolition. *Cities*, 27, 215-24.

Chen, X., Jiang, L., Cheng, B., Zhang, Y., Shi, X. L., Zheng, Y. D., & Fu, Y. (2024). Evaluating Urban Industrial Heritage Value using Industrial Heritage Matrix Analytic Hierarchy Process Models. *International Review for Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development*, 12.

Dengyue, L., Jun, W., & Ke, S. (2023). Research on the Investigation and Value Evaluation of Historic Building Resources in Xi'an City. *Buildings*.

George, E. H., Phoebe, C. K., Panagiotis-Stavros, C. A., & Angelos, P. (2024). Evaluating the tangible and intangible parameters of cultural heritage: an economic meta-analysis in a global context. *Discover Sustainability*.

Huang, B., Liu, L., Lyu, S., & Li, Z. (2024). Evaluation of the Protection of Historical Buildings in Universities Based on RCM-AHP-FCE. *Building*.

Łaszkiewicz, E., Nowakowska, A., & Adamus, J. (2022). How Valuable is Architectural Heritage? Evaluating a Monument's Perceived Value With the Use of Spatial Order Concept. *Sage Journal*.

Mendes, I. (2016). Assessing the Values of Archaeological Heritage. *Lisbon School of Economics & Management*.

North Norfolk District Council. (2018, August 30). *Heritage Value*. Retrieved March 30, 2025, from <https://designguide.north-norfolk.gov.uk/sections/heritage-assets/heritage-value/>

Rajapakse, A. (2018). Exploring the Living Heritage of Galle Fort: Residents' Views on Heritage Values and Cultural Significance. *Journal of Heritage Management*, 95-111.

Ruijgrok, E. (2006). The three economic values of cultural heritage: a case study in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*(7), 206–213.

SGS Economics and Planning Pvt Ltd. (2018). *The Value of Heritage: Summary Report*. Canberra.

The Allen Consulting Group. (2005). *Valuing the Priceless: The Value of Historic Heritage in Australia*. Melbourne : The Allen Consulting Group.

Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Melbourne: Cambridge University.

Uditha, J., & Bandusena, P. (2017). A study on impact of residential property value based on designated heritage property with special reference to the city of Kandy-Sri Lanka. *Bhumi The Planning Research Journal*, V.

UNESCO World Heritage Center. (2003). Section II: Periodic Report on the State of Conservation of the Sacred City of Kandy, Sri Lanka. *State of Conservation of The World Heritage Properties in The Asia-Pacific Region*, pp. 110-112.

Zhang, P., Xiang, M., Tao, Z., & Yao, Y. (2021). Study on Comprehensive Value of Industrial Heritage in Yuejin Road Historic District Based on GIS Technology. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 440-454.

Zin, N. M., Ismail, S., Mohamad, J., Maimun, N. H., & Azmi, F. A. (2019). Critical Determinants of Heritage Property Value: A Conceptual Framework . *Journal of the Malaysian Institute of Planners* , 17(1), 219-231.