



**TOWARDS
A NATIONAL
COLLECTION**



**Arts and
Humanities
Research Council**

INTERIM REPORT

FOUNDATION PROJECTS

LOCATING A NATIONAL COLLECTION

PI: Dr Gethin Rees, The British Library
Postdoctoral Researcher: Dr Valeria Vitale, The British Library

**The British Library | University of Exeter | The National Trust |
Historic Royal Palaces | Historic England | English Heritage |
Historic Environment Scotland | Museum of London Archaeology |
Portable Antiquities Scheme**

DECEMBER 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Aims and Objectives.....	3
Partnership Structure.....	3
Staffing Structure.....	4
Covid-19 Impacts.....	5
Revised Overall Programme.....	6
Events and Consultations.....	6
Research Approach.....	7
Early Research Results/Outputs.....	7
Next steps.....	12
Contacts.....	13
Annexes and links.....	14

Executive Summary

Locating a National Collection (LaNC) helps cultural heritage organisations to use location data — such as where objects were made and used or the places they depict and describe — to connect collections and engage audiences. Through scoping, workshops, audience research and exploratory technical work, the project will establish best practice and provide technical recommendations for a national approach to using location to discover collection items from diverse cultural heritage organisations.

Staffing and Partnership Structure

Principal Investigator: Gethin Rees (GR), British Library (BL), Lead Curator, Digital Map Collections.

Co-Investigator: Leif Isaksen (LI), University of Exeter, Director of Digital Humanities.

Co-Investigator: Alex Hunt (AH), National Trust (NT), Head of Insight.

Co-Investigator: Anthony Musson (AM), Historic Royal Palaces (HRP), Head of Research.

Postdoctoral Researcher: Valeria Vitale (VV), British Library (BL), Research Curator.

Partners: Historic England (HE), Historic Environment Scotland (HES), Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA), English Heritage (EH), Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS).

Covid-19 Impacts

The project got under way in earnest on 29 June when VV took up her role. Furlough has significantly delayed our work. The Co-Investigator from Historic Royal Palaces has been furloughed for the duration and furlough has also affected the work of the National Trust. Furthermore, Historic Royal Palaces and National Trust are undergoing restructures and there has been uncertainty regarding Co-Investigator's roles leading to adjustments to our work plan for 2021.

Research Approach

The project divides into engagement and infrastructure work packages. The engagement package focuses on the landscape of stakeholders, both cultural heritage organisations and public, examining their values, motivations and capabilities, and ensuring project recommendations meet the needs of different audiences. The infrastructure work package focuses on technical implementation and the application of previous technical work like the Pelagios methodology to forging a National Collection based on location.

Early Research Outputs

The project thus far has focused on the engagement work package whilst also organising our infrastructure workshop. The first phase of the engagement work package aimed to understand requirements, capabilities and desires in using location to connect collections within cultural heritage organisations. To this end, we have completed a series of thirteen interviews with individuals working in technical and strategic roles in cultural heritage organisations. Key findings are:

- The importance of location varies between organisations:
 - Location is fundamental to the work of organisations that manage the historic environment. They use GIS systems based on coordinates.
 - While location provides crucial context for collection items in GLAMs it is usually expressed as toponyms/place names, and treated as one type of metadata amongst many.

- All organisations have a keen interest in the potential for using location to:
 - Engage the public through concepts like local identity, proximity and memory.
 - Build innovative yet user-friendly and simple interfaces such as web-maps, GPS-based mobile apps, and narratives.
 - Create connections between collections.
- Existing infrastructure is limited with little use of structured data such as Linked Open Data for search engine optimisation (schema.org) or gazetteers/location-based authority files.
- All organisations understand their audiences and have targets in mind. Few organisations use techniques like segmentation, analytics or structured feedback, most rely on anecdotal knowledge, social media, and curators' experience.

The second phase of engagement work aims to understand who audiences are, their attitudes towards heritage and their propensity to engage with digital technologies through location. It adopts a two-stage structure consisting of a quantitative survey and qualitative interviews with the general public. A third-party research company called Research Bods has been commissioned by the National Trust to undertake the work using the National Trust's 'Our Place' online community. Together, we have completed a survey around 15 minutes in length with one thousand members of the general public. Focus-group interviews will be conducted in 2021. Our infrastructure workshop was organised as part of the [Linked Pasts conference](#), and aimed to provide a practical understanding of what is required to align LaNC partners' datasets and other cultural heritage metadata using location. Three relevant tools were selected: Alan Turing Institute/Living with Machines' DeezyMatch, Science Museum's Heritage Connector and University of Pittsburgh's World Historical Gazetteer. The creators of each tool provided a demo after which participants had 24 hours to use the tool with LaNC datasets and provide feedback at a separate session.

Next Steps

In January - February 2021 we will complete the remainder of our engagement work by gathering qualitative data through focus-group interviews conducted by Research Bods and managed by National Trust. The project will then move on to the infrastructure work package which will occupy us from February - July 2021 and follow a two-stage structure. In the first stage we will build a dataset to be used in our prototype access interface using data from partner Independent Research Organisations. The dataset will be based on themes identified as appealing in our survey work with the aim of testing practical approaches to inform recommendations for the report. We will then conduct a structured evaluation of existing web-map interfaces from cultural heritage and beyond. A two-day Engagement Workshop held between June and September 2021 will bring together representatives from across cultural heritage to discuss desiderata for linking collections through location. In August - September 2021 we will develop a prototype access interface in collaboration with the Austrian Institute of Technology, based on the thematic dataset created in the infrastructure work package. The project will end with a phase of evaluation and report writing in September - December 2021.

Abstract

Locating a National Collection helps cultural heritage organisations to use open location data —such as where objects were made and used or the places they depict and describe — to connect collections and engage audiences. Through scoping, workshops, audience research and technical exploration the project will establish best practice and provide technical recommendations for a national system that allows collection items from diverse organisations to be discovered through location. The Pelagios Network of researchers, scientists and curators has developed a methodology

that uses gazetteer referencing to link research data with considerable success, building a community of partners and stimulating research. This project builds on their methodology, scoping improvements and exploring ways to render content accessible and meaningful to different public audiences. To test and scope this ambition, participating organisations will work on a set of thematic and technological case studies to understand the requirements of stakeholders, institutional, academic and public. The objective is to understand the technical components required, the options available and to make recommendations for potential solutions, all described in the project report. The report will constitute a strategy to inform developments in the next phase of Towards a National Collection (TaNC) and across the cultural heritage sector more broadly. It will encourage cultural heritage organisations to take up a common approach to location data and provide a roadmap that enables diverse organisations to enrich their metadata and expose this in a consistent and joined-up way, ultimately spear-heading a movement beyond text-based searches in cultural heritage.

Aims and Objectives

The overarching aim of this project is to help cultural heritage organisations to use location data to connect their diverse collections and engage research and public audiences in new ways. This will be pursued through the following objectives:

- 1)** To understand how location is referenced and represented in the collections of IROs, for example where objects were made and used or the places they depict and describe.
- 2)** To scope and describe the benefits of connecting collections using location for a range of public audiences as well as for cultural heritage institutions.
- 3)** To scope and describe the technical components necessary to connect collections using location, the available options and to make recommendations for potential paths of progress.
- 4)** To survey location-based access interfaces and their potential impact on different stakeholder groups. Examples include web maps, GPS-enabled mobile apps and GIS data downloads.
- 5)** To write and disseminate a report that summarises the state of the art for using location to connect collections, and options for the required infrastructure and engagement components.
- 6)** To inform and influence strategies across the cultural heritage sector for further development, providing recommendations and outlining potential barriers.
- 7)** To develop and evaluate a prototype access interface to enhance our understanding of user requirements and potential case studies.
- 8)** To feed information on location-based discovery into TaNC Discovery Project applications and to inform the development of the programme more broadly.

Partnership Structure

LaNC includes partners from across the cultural heritage sector. Partners feed into project research by providing data and expertise. Institutions in which investigators are based also act as partners.

Partner	Roles
British Library	Data provider, consultation on specific themes for the prototype, expertise from internal steering group, interviewees.
Historic England	Data provider, consultation on specific themes for the prototype, interviewees.
Historic Environment Scotland	Data provider, planned hosting of the engagement workshop, consultation on specific themes for the prototype, interviewees.
MOLA	Data provider.
English Heritage	Provision of data and expertise problematic due to furlough.
Historic Royal Palaces	Provision of data and expertise problematic due to furlough.
National Trust	Provision of data and expertise problematic due to furlough.
Portable Antiquities Scheme	Provision of data and expertise problematic due to furlough.

Staffing Structure

Principal Investigator: Gethin Rees (GR, British Library) 0.1 FTE, 24 months

Lead Curator Digital Map Collections at the British Library. Coordinates the project, line manages the Postdoctoral Researcher and manages phases of the infrastructure work package including public scoping and the development of the prototype access interface. The PI has now also taken over managing parts of the engagement work package in the absence of the Historic Royal Palaces Co-Investigator.

Co-Investigator: Leif Isaksen (LI, University of Exeter) 0.1 FTE, 18 months

Director of Digital Humanities, University of Exeter. Manages phases of the infrastructure work package including the creation of the prototype's linked dataset.

Co-Investigator: Alex Hunt (AT, National Trust) 0.1 FTE, 12 months

Head of Insight at the National Trust. Contributes to the engagement work package providing input into scoping, workshop and evaluation phases, focusing on heritage visitors from under-represented groups.

Co-Investigator: Anthony Musson (AM, Historic Royal Palaces) 0.1 FTE, 12 months

Head of Research at Historic Royal Palaces. Planned contribution to the engagement work package, working on the scoping, workshop and evaluation phases with communities and schools, has not been possible to date due to furlough.

Postdoctoral Researcher: Valeria Vitale (VV, British Library) 1.0 FTE for 18 months

Research Curator, Geospatial Cultural Heritage. Leads research and supports delivery of both work packages, including carrying out and writing up scoping work, organising the workshops, managing prototype developers, organising evaluation work and co-writing the final project report. Manages and coordinates workflows with investigators to ensure project milestones are delivered on time.

Covid-19 Impacts

The appointment of the post-doctoral researcher was originally scheduled for December 2019. The appointment was delayed due to the date of decision on the project application followed by restrictions on capacity at the British Library's employee services due to Covid-19. Interviews took place on 1 May with the appointed postholder starting on 29 June.

The bulk of the work in the scoping phase of the engagement work package was to be managed by CIs Alex Hunt at NT and Anthony Musson at HRP. This phase should have taken four months and was due to be completed by the end of October 2020. Although AH was not furloughed due to Covid-19, several members of his team at the National Trust were, resulting in restrictions on time available to work on the project and making it difficult to plan work. AH began on the Engagement Scoping Public phase in late August (survey and interviews with the public) and is working to complete the phase by end of January 2021. Due to these circumstances, we chose to organise the infrastructure workshop early, and to deliver this alongside working on the engagement work package.

AM has been furloughed due to Covid-19 since the project began. The PI has taken on and delivered work in the Engagement Scoping IRO phase that was assigned to AM. It is hoped AM will be able to conduct surveys of teachers and pupils and carry out on-line interviews with teachers from the York Schools trust from January 2021. He is also liaising with the Historical Association, which has a constituency of around 4000 teachers and they have indicated they are willing to submit the survey to their members in January 2021.

We are unable to run our invited workshops in person. This has led to two concerns, first about the length of digital events and second about attendance. In order to overcome these concerns, we decided to organise the infrastructure workshop as part of the Linked Pasts conference, a fully remote and online event. The conference provided us with access to a community of heritage professionals and researchers. As the conference took place over two weeks, we were able to hold a succession of hour-long events, with time for participants to participate in technical tasks asynchronously in the interim.

Partners including English Heritage and the Portable Antiquities Scheme have also been affected by furlough, meaning they have not been able to provide data or expertise.

Revised Overall Programme

Work Package	Phase	Milestone	Investigator	Dates
Engagement	Scoping Cultural Heritage	Interviews conducted, report section written.	GR	July-Sept 2020
Engagement	Scoping Public	Survey and interviews conducted, report section written.	AH/AM	Sept 2020-Feb 2021
Infrastructure	Workshop	Workshop delivered.	GR	December 2020
Infrastructure	Scoping Cultural Heritage	Dataset created, report section written.	GR/LI	Feb-March 2021
Infrastructure	Scoping Public	Interface survey completed, report section written.	GR/LI	April-July 2021
Engagement	Workshop	Workshop delivered.	AH/AM/GR (availability tbc)	June-Sept 2021 (Covid dependent)
Infrastructure	Delivery	Access interface delivered.	GR	August-Sept 2021
Engagement	Evaluation	Report section written.	GR/LI	Sept 2021
	Researcher finishes			Dec 2021
	Report writing	Report completed.	GR/LI/AH/AM (availability tbc)	Oct-Feb 2022

Events and Consultations

Title	Number of attendees/ responses	Date
Interviews with cultural heritage professionals	13	July-Sept 2020
Infrastructure workshop at Linked Pasts (Demos of 3 tools, feedback sessions and roundtable)	213	7-16 Dec 2020
Research Bods survey	1000	December 2020
Research Bods interviews	20-30	January-Feb 2021
York schools trust teacher survey (Furlough dependent)	20-50	January-March 2021
York schools trust teacher interviews (Furlough dependent)	2-5	March 2021
Engagement workshop	10-15	June-Sept 2021

Research Approach

The project defines a strategy for linking the collections of UK cultural heritage organisations using location. The task divides into engagement and infrastructure work packages. Too often, technological solutions and audience experiences have been developed separately. Our approach bridges that gap by bringing both perspectives. The engagement package focuses on the landscape of stakeholders, both cultural heritage and public, examining their values, motivations and capabilities and ensuring project recommendations meet the needs of different audiences. The infrastructure work package focuses on technical implementation and the application of previous technical work, like the Pelagios methodology and the Collections Trust prototype aggregator, to forging a National Collection.

Each work package divides into scoping, workshop, and evaluation/development phases. Sections of the report are written up at the end of each phase. The scoping phase of the engagement work package gathers structured information from IROs, other cultural heritage organisations and the public in surveys and interviews. The scoping phase of the infrastructure work package gathers structured information from cultural heritage organisations alongside technical exploratory work focused on linking data provided by partners. The findings of both work packages inform workshops where experts engage in practical exercises that provide guidance on wider applicability, and a set of recommendations. Finally, a set of practical activities in an evaluation/development phase, which includes creating a prototype and gathering feedback from stakeholders, will begin to test and evaluate solutions.

The approach draws on both academic disciplinary and professional insights. Cartographic and digital humanities visualisation research will be used to communicate the complexities of location, space and place, whilst research into linked open data and data science can help to connect collections. Professional concepts of value from cultural heritage and user experience from software development can help ensure a location-based National Collection has considered diverse requirements and motivations. The overall aim is to examine technologies within the context of applications with cultural heritage organisations and audiences, in order to provide practical recommendations.

Early Research Results/Outputs

The project has worked on two phases of the engagement work package to date. The first, Engagement IRO Scoping consists of a series of interviews with professionals in cultural heritage organisations that have now been completed. The second, Engagement Public Scoping, remains underway and involves the gathering and analysis of quantitative data from a survey, followed by qualitative investigation of potential users. The project has also completed our infrastructure workshop as part of the Linked Pasts conference.

Engagement Scoping Cultural Heritage phase (Interviews with professionals)

Interviews conducted with thirteen professionals in the cultural heritage sector aimed to scope requirements, capabilities, and desires in using location to connect collections. Our sampling criteria were type of organisation and role in the organisation. In terms of type of organisation, we included institutions of different sizes, as well as at different stages of their digital development. In terms of role, we selected professionals with expertise in the following areas:

- Technical. Expertise in the acquisition, maintenance, sharing and delivery of cultural-heritage data including location information.

- Strategic. Expertise in managing and designing the public delivery of cultural heritage content to the public on the web or elsewhere.

Technical Interviews - Key Findings

Use of Location

Organisations divide into three types based on the importance of location to their work:

- Location is fundamental to the work of certain organisations, typically those managing the historic environment. They have strong expertise in GIS, with institutional systems founded on location. Data is often held as coordinates, yet there is considerable heterogeneity, and a lack of standardisation.
- Whilst metadata contains substantial location information, this does not occupy a key role in other institutions, typically regional or national GLAM organisations at more advanced stages in their digital development. Location data is represented as toponyms, and suffers from a lack of standardisation and patchy coverage.
- Location information is held mostly in non-digital format in some smaller local organisations.

The digital representation of the locations that a collection item is related to (i.e. provenance, findspot, or location of production) is not standardised across collections. Gazetteers don't seem to be used for place names. Subjects with GIS expertise saw coordinates as the most promising common denominator between heterogeneous data. Yet coordinates were also problematised due to their reductive nature, and inability to account for the complexities of place. An efficient data management strategy was observed in historic environment institutions, where hierarchical relationships in structured data allow cascade updates e.g. town, parish, county.

Access to Data

TaNC's Discovery Projects will seek to dissolve barriers to facilitate digital search across collections. The digital infrastructure required to do this using location is in its infancy. Few or no institutions have publicly available APIs, and the only SPARQL endpoint that was discussed was the BL's British Bibliography Online. We found little evidence of organisations making structured data available for crawling such as schema.org or Dublin Core. This is common practice for Search Engine Optimisation (SEO), yet schema.org is only becoming available at the BL. Downloads in CSV and/or GIS formats are commonplace at institutions where location is fundamental to their operation such as from HES's Canmore or HE.

Strategic Interviews

Current web presence

TaNC's Discovery Projects can build on the substantial cultural heritage web presence where location plays a key role. A core purpose of such websites is to offer practical information (i.e. opening times and a calendar of events). A second purpose, more common among larger organisations, is to search the catalogue. However, fragmentation of resources and heterogeneous standards make it nearly impossible to perform searches across collections. According to one interviewee (HE), current access interfaces rely on the motivations and expertise of researchers to *"search in 12, 13 different places"* to obtain desired content. Many organisations encourage user-generated content. HE was initially reluctant to showcase user content, but they found that users prefer pages that contain such content. The Ure Museum (UM) enables users to create their own "galleries", while the Hastings Museum (HM) wants to archive community content created in lockdown, and make it available to enrich collections. Location provides a critical hook to encourage

engagement with this content. Historic environment organisations use maps as both means of communicating directions and tools for discovery, for example to search “what is near me” on the HE cultural heritage map.

Audience

Large organisations gathered users’ data either automatically (BL) or via surveys (HE). Local organisations or those at an earlier stage in their digital journey relied on the experience of curators, social media activities, interaction with volunteers and interest groups for information on audiences. Retired citizens were mentioned as a strong audience by the HM and the HE, as well as students doing research for their school assignments (UM, HE, HM). National institutions like HES, HE and BL recognise they have a consolidated user group, and feel it is mostly composed of sector specialists who know exactly what to look for and how to find it. Organisations were unanimous in their wish to broaden their user base, prioritising general public over specialist researchers, reaching out to minorities who do not feel represented by the collections. Actual profiles of potential audiences are thin on the ground. Exceptions include HE and NT, where audience segmentation based on user studies had taken place. The existence of [open audience segmentation](#) could be of assistance to these groups. Organisations discussed a range of drivers that engage audiences with locations and/or places. The first was a sense of local identity that could help the public to relate to specific items and their stories. The second was ‘proximity’, seen as a gateway to the discovery and exploration of the past of a location. Third, memory is also strongly connected to location, and an interest in the areas where one has lived often motivates a search for historical information. Last, providing opportunities to co-interpret, co-curate and co-create content offers users a personal stake in collections. However, interviewees made few references to how drivers might apply to particular audiences. Two exceptions were older citizens who were associated with the memory driver (HM) and BAME communities who became more engaged with the collections of Royal Geographical Society through co-interpretation. It emerged in all interviews that connecting resources offered added value, both within a single collection and with external ones. These hypothetical connections were seen as a means to contextualise and discover information, providing a richer experience to users. Some organisations (HE, HM) specifically mentioned how connections with related items would facilitate engagement and exploration for general audiences, fostering serendipitous discovery and ‘traveling’ from link to link.

Access Interface Opportunities

User-friendliness and simplicity were perceived as priorities in the pursuit of broadening audiences. However, there was a wealth of different ideas regarding how this might be expressed in practical terms. All organisations mentioned a single place/access point to search across their own or aggregated collections using location and other terms, to reproduce a Google-like experience (i.e. one single search to get all the relevant results). One feature commonly described (BL, HM, UM) was the ability to plot query results on a dynamic web map. Two subjects (HM, UM) described a zoom functionality to filter the results by location, moving from general to more specific. Several interviewees expressed a desire to filter results on a map according to criteria, such as type of resource (BL), type of object (UM, HM), or a combination of both (BL). Both subjects at HES named “time” as a useful filtering category: “Just a simple feature that says what something is and how old it is. [...]. Like, looking at the record of an abandoned farmstead and knowing this was used at the time of Mary Queen of Scots.” Layers were mentioned on several occasions, more in conceptual than technological terms. They were seen as a means to separate and filter rich information, but also to express the idea of “stratified data”, i.e. as a way to offer tailored user experiences, according to levels of expertise or search goals. One subject (HM) used layers to describe user-generated content: “I would like users to be able to add new layers and create their histories.” Imagining a map-based

interface, most interviewees envisioned points on the map as active links that would show a preview of the resource. Several subjects described a two-way interaction with the digital map: being able to look for a particular location and discover all the related items, or to look at an item, and discover the related locations. According to one HE subject, institutions shouldn't "try to put everything on one page" but to link to other material, "creat[ing] a wikipedia effect that makes you feel that you can explore further."

Engagement Scoping Public phase (Public Survey)

LaNC's engagement scoping public phase aims to understand how discovery projects can engage public audiences with a national collection based on location. It has two goals:

- Understand audiences, their attitudes towards heritage and their propensity to engage with digital technologies.
- Understand access interfaces to inform the design of LaNC's prototype.

The phase is divided into two parts: a quantitative survey and qualitative interviews. A third-party research company called Research Bods has been commissioned by the NT to collaborate in the work using the NT's 'Our Place' online audience community research platform, applying their specialist skills to support design of meaningful research with different segments of the population. First, in collaboration with AH, we have completed a survey around 15 minutes in length with a nationally representative sample of one thousand members of the general public. Please find a draft of the survey included in the appendix. As the survey was completed in mid-December, the report does not include detailed findings. The survey aims to gather insights from across the UK adult population into:

- Attitudes towards and engagement with cultural heritage and other interests.
- Ability with location-based and other digital technologies.
- Values and their relations to place and geography.
- Appeal of access interfaces that present heritage information based on location.

The survey enables us to cluster respondents into several possible audience profiles and understand how interests and technological confidence can shape engagement with project outputs. Sampling is key, and survey respondents include enthusiasts but also less engaged audiences from across the country. This information is valuable in its own right as it informs decisions on theme and content as well as guiding the complexity of access interfaces. The results will inform the design of second-round interviews with focus groups that have not been conducted yet but are included here as they are relevant to the work described above. These extended video sessions will explore audience attitudes and behaviours in depth. Here we will explore attitudes amongst two groups: those with an existing interest in history/heritage and less engaged audiences. We are considering whether to work with regionally-focused groups; these offer clear benefits to TaNC but extrapolating findings to a national level could be problematic. The aim of the interviews is to develop a deeper understanding of:

- Drivers and barriers to engagement, including, but not limited to cultural heritage/history.
- Reasons why different groups use or don't use access interfaces for cultural heritage.
- Features of websites that they enjoy and find easy to use.

A key component of the qualitative phase will be the use of visual stimulus or prototypes produced in collaboration between AH and Research Bods. These bring possibilities to life through combinations of interface features alongside themes that connect location and cultural heritage.

Example insights include if a reference to local heritage makes an event more interesting or which themes and items elicit a sense of national identity. We intend to gather feedback on whether features should be included in the LaNC prototype, with the ultimate aim of informing the development of future Discovery projects' themes and interfaces.

Infrastructure Workshop

The objective of the infrastructure workshop was to provide a practical understanding of approaches to aligning LaNC partners' datasets using location. Held between 7 and 16 December, it formed part of the Linked Pasts 2020 virtual symposium, co-organised by the British Library and the University of London. As the infrastructure workshop finished on 16 December the write up does not include detailed findings. The project is interested in the potential of several tools that can be used to align and enrich location information in cultural heritage metadata. We felt that the best way to understand their value was to make the tools available to a community of experts and gather feedback. Three tools were selected: Alan Turing Institute/Living with Machines' DeezyMatch, Science Museum's Heritage Connector and University of Pittsburgh's World Historical Gazetteer. The workshop aimed to:

- Gain feedback to improve tools, their documentation and to gather potential use cases.
- Develop an approach to link location data in our partners' datasets.
- Start the process of creating LaNC's linked open dataset (LOD) that will form the basis of the prototype.

The workshop adopted an innovative structure. The creators of each tool gave a demo after which attendees were invited to apply that tool to datasets provided by LaNC or to their own, over a twenty-four hour period. Participants then reconvened to feedback on use cases, documentation, and issues. Participants did not need to write code to participate as GUI tools were included and spreadsheet datasets can be prepared using Open Refine or Excel.

The event finished with a roundtable including contributions from Mariona Coll Ardanuy (Alan Turing Institute), Kalyan Dutia (Science Museum), Karl Grossner (University of Pittsburgh), Patricia Murrieta-Flores (Lancaster University), Bruno Martins (Universidade de Lisboa), Katherine McDonough (Alan Turing Institute) and chaired by GR. The workshop deliberately sought out strategic collaborations with: Our data partners including Historic Environment Scotland, Historic England and the British Library to provide thematic datasets focused on the Anglo-Scottish and Anglo-Welsh borders.

- Members of projects funded by UKRI's Strategic Priority Fund (Heritage Connector, Living with Machines).

In terms of outputs, the workshop has produced:

- Structured feedback on the use of individual tools from participants.
- Improvements to our project team's and participants' understanding of the workflow required to align location data.
- Datasets participants created and available at <https://github.com/LinkedPasts/LaNC-workshop>

Next steps

Completion of Engagement Scoping work: January-February 2021

The primary outstanding piece of work is to gather qualitative data in focus-group interviews, conducted by Research Bods and managed by NT, with subsets of respondents to the survey. See detailed description above. HRP also hopes to obtain data from York Schools Trust in this period.

Infrastructure work package Scoping phase: February-July 2021

Next, the scoping phase of the technical work package will run from January-May 2021, the early period running concurrently with the end of the Engagement Scoping phase. The package will have two audience foci, IRO or cultural heritage organisations and public. The first phase will link data from partner IROs based on themes identified through our survey work. The aim is to build a dataset for the prototype and to test approaches in practice to inform recommendations for the report. We will also scope public infrastructure or access interfaces to understand technical barriers to implementing recommendations from our public survey and interview work. This consists of a structured evaluation of existing web-map interfaces from cultural heritage and beyond, their benefits and potential. This survey and practical work will produce a road map, providing technical details of how collections can be linked using location, as well as where current UK infrastructure falls short, and offer recommendations for a common strategy.

Engagement Workshop: June-September 2021 (Covid dependent)

A two-day Engagement Workshop held between June and September 2021 will bring together representatives from across cultural heritage to discuss cultural heritage organisations' and the public's desiderata for linking collections through location. The first day will encompass thematic case studies in linking data and their presentation. The second day will be based on the Europeana Impact playbook examining strategic perspectives, design thinking, and networks for community engagement.

Prototype Development: August-September 2021

We will develop a prototype access interface in collaboration with the Austrian Institute of Technology, based on the thematic dataset created in the infrastructure work package. The prototype will likely repurpose Peripleo, an access interface created by Rainer Simon for Pelagios data. The interface and code will be open.

Evaluation: September 2021

The intention was for AH and AM to test the prototype with audiences including schools and heritage visitors. However, COVID-19 impacts mean that evaluation work will have to be reassessed nearer the time.

Report writing: October 2021-February 2022

Our project researcher, Valeria Vitale, will finish in December 2021. The final months of the project will be spent completing the report and articles based on sections of the work for publication in cultural heritage journals.

Contacts

gethin.rees@bl.uk

valeria.vitale@bl.uk

Annexes and links

Engagement Scoping Cultural Heritage: interview questions for cultural heritage professionals

Group One: Technical interviews

Introduction

1. Could you please state your name and institution?
2. What is your role in the institution?

Part One: Describing geo-spatial data [Key information: how is the geographical information expressed, and in what format]

3. Does your institution hold location/place data?
4. Within which systems/databases does this type of data reside in your institution?
5. What types of collection items have location/place data associated with them?
6. How is location/place representative of the collection item? Eg “place of publication”, “about”, “depicts”, “findspot”, “associated place”.
7. How is location/place represented? For example geospatial standards (coordinates or place names), authority files (Gazetteers), or other?
8. How is location/place data expressed? Do you use a free text field, or is this formalised?
9. What is the variation in toponymy? Are place names consistent in the place references?

Part Two: About Data Creation [Key information: how easy is it to edit relevant data? Can we use gazetteers to align the data?]

10. Where does place/location feature in Cataloguing/Data creation workflow?
11. Are there opportunities for intervention or flexibility in the workflow? For example, upgrading records, adding further identifiers, creating annotations.
12. Is place/location embedded within metadata hierarchies?
13. Who creates metadata? What is their geospatial literacy and are there opportunities there for training?
14. Do you think it would be useful to connect the items in the collection to items held in different collections?

Part Three: Access to the Data [key information: what is the best way to get the data?]

15. How can your organisation make data accessible to both the public and other institutions? For example through an API (programmatic), export (dump), Linked Data (crawling), OAI-PMH (harvesting) or other.
16. Does your organisation use LOD for SEO eg Schema.org?
17. Does your organisation contribute to authority files/registries?
18. What licensing/IP issues exist around metadata? Is the licensing status of the catalogue information clearly stated, either within individual records or in a general policy covering the site as a whole?

Part Four: Overall Technical Conversation

19. In your opinion, how important is location/place to the organisation?
20. What are the challenges that you foresee with aligning your data to other institutions data or authority files?
21. How is location/place currently used by your institution? For example, do you have digital maps, or other widgets on your website?
22. If you had unlimited time and resources, what kind of place-related features would you like to offer to your users/visitors? For example GPS mobile, widgets, GIS downloads, QR code.

Group Two: Strategic interviews

Introduction

1. Could you please state your name and institution?
2. What is your role in the institution?

Part One: Discussing Web Resources [key information: does the institution have resources online and are they searchable?]

3. What is the main purpose of your digital presence? Do you aim to promote on-site visits or facilitate access to your digital collections?
4. Could you provide a brief overview of your institution's web presence?
5. What role does place/location play in your online content? For example, is it possible to visualise/search/filter by place?

Part Two: Access [key information: current use of geographical information]

6. Is there a searchable online catalogue of some, or all, of the institution's collections?
7. What kind of content did your institution make available online, and what is the rationale behind that choice?
8. How do your online services contribute to your institution's identity and overall vision?
9. What access interfaces (such as maps, graphs, widgets, APIs) do not currently feature on your website, but you would be interested in exploring in the future?

Part Three: Audiences [key information: audiences the institution would like to reach. Special focus on underrepresented audiences]

10. Do you have a target audience? Do you differentiate your content and your access interfaces to meet the needs of different groups (for example expert and non-expert audiences, adult and young audiences)?
11. Do you have a sense of how different groups and communities use your institution's data, and, in particular, data related to location? [possible follow up question focusing on underrepresented groups]
12. Is there a potential group of users you are trying to reach? Do you think that LaNC could help you broaden your audience?
13. In your opinion, what are the audience's motivations to visit the institution's website?
14. Do you receive user's feedback on your online services and/or have your online services been informed by a preliminary user study?

Part Four: Connections and Emerging Themes [key information: could the institution be a data partner?]

15. How is location used to build and support your institution's narrative? And how is it used to add value to the various collections?
16. Do you think that connections with related documents held in other institutions would add value to your own collections?
17. With what collection or collection types would you like to establish links?
18. Can you identify a theme in your collection that could connect meaningfully different resources?
19. If you had unlimited time and resources, what kind of place-related features would you like to offer to your users/visitors? For example GPS mobile, widgets, GIS downloads, QR code.

Engagement Scoping Public survey questions by Research Bods

N=1,000 nat on age, gender, location All to have some interest in history/heritage

Screening & Profiling Questions

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE

S1. Are you...?

1. Male
2. Female
3. Other (please specify)
4. Prefer not to say

ASK ALL, NUMERIC

S2. Please enter your age

ENTER AGE

S2_RECODE

1. Less than 18
2. 18-34
3. 35-54
4. 55 - 64
5. 65+

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE

S3. Which region do you live in?

1. Channel Islands
2. East of England
3. East Midlands
4. Isle of Man
5. London
6. North East
7. North West
8. Northern Ireland
9. Scotland
10. South East
11. South West
12. Wales
13. West Midlands
14. Yorkshire and the Humber
15. None of the above TERMINATE

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER INTEREST, ASK FOR HISTORY/HERITAGE AND 9 OTHER INTERESTS ALLOCATED ON A LEAST FILL BASIS

S5. How interested would you say you are in each of the following...

Interests (Randomise)

1. History/heritage
2. Sports
3. News/Current affairs
4. Food/cooking
5. Music
6. Arts and culture
7. Fashion and design
8. DIY
9. Antiques, collecting and collectables
10. Making arts and crafts
11. Science and technology
12. Cinema
13. Outdoors pursuits
14. Family history and genealogy
15. Photography
16. Cookery and baking
17. Wildlife and nature
18. Gardening
19. Books and literature
20. Travel
21. Walking
22. Gaming / online games

Scale

1. Not at all interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Quite interested
4. Very interested

IF CODE 1 (Not at all interested) FOR History/heritage THEN TERMINATE

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

S6. Roughly how often do you use the following online tools?

1. Search engines
2. Online map services (e.g. Google Maps, map functions on websites)
3. Online video services (e.g. YouTube)
4. Price comparison sites
5. Wikipedia

Scale

1. Once a day or more often
2. 2-3 times a week
3. Once a week
4. Once a fortnight
5. Monthly
6. Less often
7. Never
- 8.

IF CODE 7 FOR 'Online map services (e.g. Google Maps, map functions on websites, or Wikipedia)' THEN CODE AS 'Non-Online Map User'

Current Technology Use & Behaviours

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER PLATFORM

A1. How frequently do you use each of the following online platforms?

1. Facebook
2. Twitter
3. Instagram
4. LinkedIn
5. YouTube
6. Wikipedia
7. TripAdvisor

Scale

1. Multiple times a day
2. Daily
3. Every 2-3 days
4. Weekly
5. Less often
6. I don't use this platform

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE FOR EACH PLATFORM

A2. What do you use each of these platforms for?

Ask for each platform that respondent uses weekly or more often (Code 1-4 at A1)

1. Facebook
2. Twitter
3. Instagram
4. LinkedIn
5. YouTube
6. Wikipedia
7. TripAdvisor

Options

1. Following brands/organisations I'm interested in
2. Following individuals who are specialists/experts in things I'm interested in
3. Connecting with others who have shared/similar interests to me
4. Searching for information about things I am interested in
5. Posting comments on content that I'm interested in
6. None of the above [EXCLUSIVE]

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE FOR EACH STATEMENT

A3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about technology?

Statements, Randomise

1. I feel confident in searching for and finding what I want online
2. When I'm looking for information about something the internet is the first place I go
3. A lot of my hobbies involve spending time online
4. I prefer to use offline methods of information than online where possible
5. I feel confident in using lots of different apps on my mobile phone

Scale

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

Using location services

Ask Section B (B1-B11) to all except for Non-Online Map Users at S6

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT

B1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about using maps/location services?

Statements, randomise

1. I prefer using physical maps over digital maps
2. I use maps as part of one or more of my hobbies
3. I have an interest in Ordnance Survey maps
4. I have an interest in historical maps (e.g. antiquarian maps, medieval maps)
5. I have an interest in maps from fiction (e.g. Middle Earth from Lord of the Rings, Narnia from Chronicles of Narnia)
6. I enjoy using satellite maps (e.g. Google Earth, Zoom Earth)

Scale

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

B2a. Which of the following types of online map interfaces for searching and finding places are you aware of?

1. Map services such as Google Maps, Apple Maps, Waze, etc.
2. Map functions on property/accommodation sites (e.g. Rightmove, Air BnB, etc.)
3. Map functions on things to do sites (e.g. TripAdvisor)
4. Map functions on news sites/articles (e.g. maps with infection levels in an article about Covid, election maps)
5. Map functions on heritage/history websites (e.g. Historic England map of listed buildings, History Pin)
6. Map functions on weather/meteorology websites (e.g. Met Office, BBC Weather)
7. Satellite imagery (e.g. Google Earth)
8. None of the above [Exclusive]

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

B2b. And which of these types of online map interfaces have you used before?

SHOW THOSE SELECTED AT B2a

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER OPTION

B3. To what extent do you enjoy using the online map interfaces that you have used before?

Options

SHOW THOSE SELECTED AT B2b

Scale

1. Don't enjoy at all
2. Don't enjoy
3. Neutral
4. Quite enjoy
5. Really enjoy
6. Don't know/can't remember

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

B4. Which of the following do you use online map interfaces for?

Randomise

1. To plan journeys
2. To search for properties to rent or buy
3. To search for local businesses
4. To search for local places of interest
5. To search for places of interest not local to me
6. To plan my holidays and see what's close to where I will be staying
7. To search for historical places of interest
8. To search for places I have heard about (e.g. in the news, in films/TV, that I've read about)
9. To browse (i.e. just to have a look without a clear purpose)
10. To understand where places are
11. To read/leave reviews/comments on places
12. Other (please specify)

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

B5. What features do you like to have available when using online map interfaces?

Randomise

1. Different view options (e.g. satellite view, street view)
2. Practical information about places (e.g. opening hours, pictures, reviews)
3. Historical information about places (e.g. description of its history, historical pictures of it)
4. Links to external sites with information about places
5. Suggested similar places nearby
6. The ability to save places so you can come back to them later
7. The ability to share places with others through social media
8. The ability to read/leave reviews
9. The ability to measure distances between places
10. The ability to download for offline use
11. Other (please specify) [Fixed]

12. None of the above [Fixed, Exclusive]

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT

B6. We're keen to understand how people use online map interfaces.

Thinking about when you use an online map interface, how often would you say you typically do the following?

1. Use the search function to search for a specific place
2. Use the search function to search for a type of place
3. Browse the map to find places i.e. moving around on the map to find places rather than using the search function
4. Click on links that take you to external sites (i.e. outside of the map) for more information

Scale

1. Always
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. Rarely
5. Never

ASK IF DON'T SELECT CODE 5 AT B2a (i.e. NOT A USER OF ONLINE HERITAGE INTERFACES), MULTI CODE

B7. You mention that you haven't used online map interfaces to explore cultural heritage places before. Why is that?

1. I wasn't aware of them
2. I'm just not that interested in history/heritage
3. I prefer to find out about history/heritage from other places online
4. I prefer to find out about history/heritage through non-online ways (e.g. books, magazines, etc).
5. I don't think I've got the tech skills to make the most of them
6. I prefer finding out about history/heritage in different ways than by locations/places (e.g. by people, by time period, etc.)
7. I don't have the time to spend on something like that
8. I wouldn't know where to start with something like that
9. Other (please specify)

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE

B8. Imagine that an online map/location interface had been created that allowed you to search for a place/location and then explore information online about that place from various historical or heritage organisations (e.g. the British Library, the National Trust, English Heritage, etc.).

How interested would you be in using something like this?

1. Not at all interested
2. Not very interested
3. Slightly interested
4. Quite interested
5. Very interested

ASK ALL, OPEN END

B9. You said you would be [PIPE IN ANSWER FROM B8] in something like that.

Why do you say that?

OPEN END

ASK IF CODES 1 OR 2 AT B8, SINGLE CODE

B10. You said that you wouldn't be that interested in an online map/location interface for searching for information about historical or heritage places.

What if there was something similar but rather than for historical or heritage places, for something of interest to you. For example it might be to search for places of sporting significance, or locations that have been used in films or TV shows if you were interested in that.

How interested would you be in using something like that?

1. Not at all interested
2. Not very interested
3. Slightly interested
4. Quite interested
5. Very interested

ASK IF CODES 4 OR 5 AT B10, OPEN END

B11. You say that you would be interested in something like that.

What kinds of subjects/topics would you be interested in an online map interface for searching for information on?

OPEN END

Current Heritage Attitudes & Behaviours

In this final section we'd just like to ask you a bit more about your interest in history and heritage as well as the place where you live and places you might visit.

ASK ALL, OPEN END

C1. Which elements of history and heritage would you say you are most interested in?

We'd be interested to hear the periods, individuals, topics or geographic areas that you're interested in.

OPEN END

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

C2a. Which of the following types of place are you most interested in?

Randomise

1. Places of natural beauty
2. Places of sporting or cultural significance (e.g. stadiums, theatres, gig venues)
3. Places of religious significance
4. Museums/Galleries
5. Historic buildings (e.g. Castles, historic houses, etc.)
6. Archaeological/ancient sites, ruins or monuments
7. Places where big moments in history have happened
8. Places important to local history
9. None of the above [Fixed, Exclusive]

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER IDEA

C2b. We're now going to show you three different ideas for services that would allow you to explore the history and heritage of the area where you currently live...

Please let us know how appealing you find each of these ideas.

IDEAS, EACH RESPONDENT TO ANSWER FOR THREE IDEAS ASSIGNED ON A LEAST FILL BASIS

1. A site that provides a brief overview of the top 10 most significant historic stories of people, buildings, objects and events linked to your postcode
2. A selectable layer on a mapping app or service (e.g. Google / Apple / Bing maps) which helps you discover and explore historic buildings, objects and documents linked to the history of your local area
3. A gallery of historic photographs, paintings, film footage and audio recordings of people, views or buildings related to the area where you live, searchable by postcode and explorable through a map
4. Information on the archaeology of your area, including recent discoveries and reconstructions of historic or ancient things hidden beneath the ground where you live, explorable by map or postcode
5. A site that generates short self-guided history tours of your local area based on different themes, people or periods of history
6. A site where local people can upload and share old photographs, documents and memories to make your own online local community museum
7. A site which allows you to search historic censuses of the people living in your local area with information about old industries, shops, trades and businesses that they worked in
8. A site or selectable layer on a mapping service (e.g. Google / Apple / Bing maps) which provides information about places, people or buildings in your local area that have been featured in TV programmes, movies, documentaries, songs or works of literature
9. A site which collates a wide range of historical resources to allow you to explore the history of your local area in depth through a map (e.g. bringing together information on different historical documents and objects cared for in different museums and archives)

Scale

1. Good idea which I / my family would use
2. Good idea which I / my family might use
3. Good idea but I / my family wouldn't use it
4. I have no preference either way
5. I'm not keen on the idea

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE

C3. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

Statements, Randomise

1. I regularly visit places relating to history/heritage
2. I'm interested in the history of my local area
3. I'm actively involved in groups/societies relating to history/heritage
4. I use the internet to discover new things about history/heritage
5. I enjoyed studying History at school
6. I enjoy dramatised accounts of history (e.g. TV shows, historical novels)
7. I'm more interested in history/heritage if it is local to me or places I used to live
8. I enjoy watching TV programmes which focus specifically on history or archaeology
9. I enjoy programmes that feature history in a light touch way (e.g. Antiques Roadshow, The Repair Shop, travel programmes, Countryfile etc)

Scale

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT

C4. Here are some statements that refer to the place and local area that you now consider to be your home (e.g. County, city, suburb, town or village). Please say how much you agree or disagree with each statement when thinking about this place:

Statements

1. I identify strongly with this place
2. I feel well connected to the local community of this place

Scale

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neutral
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

ASK ALL, MULTI CODE

C5. How do you tend to find out about information relating to your local area?

1. Local newspapers (either physical or online)
2. Local websites
3. Leaflets/magazines put out by local organisations
4. Following people/organisations on social media
5. Belonging to groups on social media
6. Word of mouth
7. Other (please specify)
8. I don't tend to find out information about my local area [Exclusive]

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT

C6. And now we're going to ask you about **visiting other parts of the UK**. In thinking about travelling to different places, please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

Statements

1. I'm always curious to find out more about the places I visit
2. I enjoy a visit more if I can find out information about the history of the place

Scale

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neutral
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

End Demographics

We just have a few final questions. [Ask All, Single code](#)

D1. Please indicate to which occupational group the chief income earner in your household belongs, or which group fits best.

1. Semi or unskilled manual worker (e.g. Manual workers, all apprentices to be skilled trades, Caretaker, Park keeper, non-HGV driver, shop assistant)
2. Skilled manual worker (e.g. Skilled Bricklayer, Carpenter, Plumber, Painter, Bus/ Ambulance Driver, HGV driver, AA patrolman, pub/bar worker, etc)
3. Supervisory or clerical/ junior managerial/ professional/ administrative (e.g. Office worker, Student Doctor, Foreman with 25+ employees, salesperson, etc)
4. Intermediate managerial/ professional/ administrative (e.g. Newly qualified (under 3 years) doctor, Solicitor, Board director small organisation, middle manager in large organisation, principal officer in civil service/local government)
5. Higher managerial/ professional/ administrative (e.g. Established doctor, Solicitor, Board Director in a large organisation (200+ employees, top level civil servant/public service employee))
6. Student
7. Casual worker – not in permanent employment
8. Housewife/ Homemaker
9. Retired and living on state pension
10. Unemployed or not working due to long-term sickness
11. Full-time carer of other household member
12. Prefer not to say

D1_Recode

A: Code 5

B: Code 4

C1: Code 3 or Code 6

C2: Code 2

D: Code 1

E: Code 7, 8, 9, 10 or 11

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE

D2a. Do you have any children aged 17 or under living with you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Prefer not to say

ASK ALL, SINGLE CODE

D2b. Of the children aged 17 or under living with you, which of the following age groups do they fall into?

1. 0-5
2. 6-12
3. 13-17

Lifestage_Recode

1. Young Independent (S2 is 18-39 and D2a is Code 2)
2. Young Family (Oldest child at D2b is Codes 1 or 2)
3. Teen Family (Oldest child at D2b is Code 3)
4. Mature Independent (S2 is 40-59 and D2a is Code 2)
5. Senior (S2 is 60+ and D2a is Code 2)

Ask All, Single code

D3a. The next question is for the collection of sensitive personal information which covers your ethnicity.

We are requesting this information as it helps us to ensure that our questionnaire is representative of the UK population and to conduct research more effectively.

Providing sensitive personal information is always voluntary, if you wish not to provide this information please select the prefer not to say option below, otherwise, if you are happy to provide this information please provide your explicit consent below.

1. I am happy to provide this information
2. I prefer not to provide this information

Ask if code 1 selected at D3a, Single code

D3b. What ethnic group best describes you?

3. White British
4. White Irish
5. White Gypsy/Traveller
6. White Other

7. Black African
8. Black Caribbean
9. Black other
10. Bangladeshi
11. Chinese
12. Indian
13. Pakistani
14. Asian other
15. Mixed White/Asian
16. Mixed White/Black African
17. Mixed White/Black Caribbean
18. Mixed other
19. Any other
20. Prefer not to say

D3_Recode

White British: Code 1

White Other: Codes 2-4

BAME: Codes 5-12, 17

Black: Codes 5-7

Asian: Codes 8-12

Minority Ethnic: Code 17

Ask All, Single code per statement [SCRIPTER: Include GQ20 block and algorithm from NT template for segmentation]

GQ. Finally, below are a number of statements. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of these.

Statements

1. The arts and culture are essential to my life
2. I like doing things that make me feel connected to nature and the natural world
3. I feel more comfortable in the city than the countryside
4. It's not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don't do the same
5. Visiting historic houses is not for people like me
6. I find history boring
7. If something needs doing in my local community, I'm willing to get stuck in and sort it out
8. I can't afford to go out or travel as much as I'd like to
9. I'm not a political person
10. I couldn't live without the internet on my mobile phone
11. I get a good deal of pleasure from my garden
12. The effects of climate change are too far in the future to really worry me
13. My family is more important than my career
14. There's little I can do to change my life
15. I like to keep up with the latest fashions
16. Our coast is a national treasure
17. It's important to encourage our children to value historic buildings and heritage
18. Protecting historic buildings gets in the way of progress
19. I am interested in other cultures
20. Money is the best measure of success

Scale

1. Strongly disagree
- 2.
- 3.
4. Neutral
- 5.
- 6.
7. Strongly agree