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The purpose of this thesis is to identify key trends in presentations which contribute decisively to a greater understanding of the Romano-British to Late Medieval period. An in-depth review of theories and critiques introduced the academic debate on the relationship between the past and the present. The fundamental premise of a public interest in the past was established, as was the justification of the need to pursue research which explains that interest. A presentational template of the Jorvik Viking Centre was then constructed, on which to consider other forms of presentation, and to appraise its role as a pioneer and exemplar in this field.

The suitability of conducting questionnaires in order to obtain the most accurate and consistent form of visitor responses to selected presentations was verified. The technique was explained, with enclosed sample copies of the questionnaires. The results were then displayed, in the form of data relating to permanent presentations and resultant visitor trends, followed by more specific case studies of enactments and educational facilities. After ascertaining the managerial responses, and the significance of the Jorvik Viking Centre as a role model for their presentations, a focused assessment of the 1993 commemoration of the 1950th anniversary of the Roman Invasion of Britain was made. This case-study incorporated elements from the previously considered themes, and was discussed in some depth as a comparative, in order to give a perspective upon the overall theme. A broad overview of the results and their implications was then made, and placed in the context of relevant contemporary visitor surveys. Finally, proposals for further initiatives were made.

It has been established that the concept of the past as a resource is valid, as is the necessity of identifying the public with which a presentational dialogue is sought. An objective assessment of innovative and experimental presentations is also seen to be of merit. In this case-study, it is shown that it is the innovative presentations which tend to be popularly approved, and which also contribute to a sense of community and museum/visitor cooperation. The existing development plans are accepted, and there is an expectation of being able to participate in presentational activities. Such trends are also noticeable in result trends relating to enactments and educational presentations. The Jorvik Viking Centre is shown to have only a generally minimal influence. Despite overall presentational flaws in the Roman anniversary commemoration, it sets an example of individual achievement. Apart from advocating further research into presentations, case-studies with future potential are also considered, as is the concept of utilising the Annales system to this end.
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CHAPTER ONE. PERSPECTIVES ON THE PRESENT STUDY.

Introduction.

An essential element in this study is the analysis of the consequences for the presentation of the past of the contemporary debate concerning the interaction between the past and present, with particular focus on English presentations engaging with the Romano-British to the late medieval periods, and with the intention of incorporating a wealth of related themes.

To do this, it is necessary to show firstly why the contemporary debate on the significance of the past in the present is itself significant, together with the reasons for the high profile nature of the debate. In accepting the argument that whatever the relationship with the past, there is a need to make the past more accessible so as to achieve that relationship, the generally accepted view that it is the museum which can best facilitate this access also has to be considered; and so should the techniques and experimentations which are employed in demonstrating and reconstructing existing presentations and enactments in the fulfilment of this role.

This review will ultimately serve to explain and justify original research into the effectiveness of the presentations and their implications. In order to understand the debate about the present's relationship with the past, as manifested by museological presentation, it is necessary to understand
contemporary archaeological perceptions of the past, and their associated proposals concerning the relationship.

This process will begin in the form of a literature review. The subject is introduced by way of a major consideration of the significance of the past's accessibility in contemporary society, the archaeologist's role, and contemporary or current theories on Post-Positivism/Processualism and New Archaeology (Bintliff 1988; 1991a; 1991b).

A critical response to resynthesised New Archaeology and defence of Post-Processualism is then considered (Shanks, 1996: 1995; 1992; Hodder, 1984; 1992). Ideas relating to independent contributions are also reviewed (Parker-Pearson, 1998; Sherratt, 1998; Kristiansen, 1988), in the context of which, Post-Processualist definitions of the past and theories about its presentation are stated (Shanks & Tilley, 1987).

Overviews of the contemporary state of these theories are then contributed (Trigger, 1998; Renfrew & Bahn, 1992; Shanks & Hodder, 1996). Less theoretical and more pragmatic perspectives of the past are then aired (Hodder, 1992; Pearce, 1990). Literature of the uncritical uses of social theory is also drawn in by referring to critical French and English primary thinkers (Coudart, 1999; Bintliff, 1991b; Lash, 1990), and finally, an avoidance of theory is also noted (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992). A shared New Archaeological/Post-Processual concern for the safety of past remains and a link with the present (Hodder, 1984; Bintliff, 1988) is finally
highlighted, with reference to the prophetic call for socially relevant research in archaeology (Fritz & Plog, 1970).

The next section is introduced by the presentation of the concept of the past as a resource (Pearce, 1990). This serves as a basis for presentation and communication theories, in comparison with other perspectives (Whitley, 1998; Tilley, 1998; Fowler, 1992), along with criticism of the prevailing literary penchant for description rather than analysis (Merriman, 1992). Critical perspectives (Fowler, 1992; Kavanagh, 1990) which indicate the necessity for museological change in general, are discussed. More specific proposals for change (Shanks & Tilley, 1987; Tilley, 1988) are then set out, in the light of criticism (Kristiansen, 1988) and endorsement (Walsh, 1992).

The trend of theoretical concerns about the archaeological relationship with the public is shown to be significant and persistent (Hodder, 1984; Prince & Schadla-Hall, 1987; Cleere, 1988; Parker-Pearson, 1998). The difficulties posed by perennial institutional trends, by contrast, are also noted (Walsh, 1990; Lumley, 1993; Fowler, 1987; 1992; Pearce, 1990). Efforts to actually identify the public (Pearce, 1990), arising out of texts emphasising the importance of the public (Fowler, 1981; Cleere, 1988) are then presented. This is set in a context of institutionalised, financially based criteria and realities (Fowler, 1987; 1992; Kavanagh, 1990; Carmen, 1995; Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999). The issues of public
perspectives about the past and its presentations (Pearce, 1990), and the concerns about a dialogue (Bintliff, 1988; Boylan, 1992) are then noted.

This appraisal functions as a backdrop to the final section, and its consideration of the proposed and actual ways and means of dialogue and presentation. Starting with the generalised (political) proposals for deconstruction and reconstruction (Shanks & Tilley, 1987; Tilley, 1998), discussions of their actual implementation (Pearce, 1990; Cleere, 1988) are placed in the context of a re-established differentiation of museums from heritage institutions (Kavanagh, 1990; Wickham-Jones, 1988). Related appraisals of the role of the personnel involved are then compared (Sorensen, 1990; Pearce, 1990; Owen, 1996; Merriman, 1991).

Walsh (1990; 1992) and Fowler (1987; 1992) are then shown to differ from Pearce, Shanks and Tilley, in their stronger forms of critique and proposal, as regards heritage concepts and presentation techniques, the latter of which are summarised (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992) so as to provide an insight into general archaeological attitudes towards them. A selection of alternative perceptions and theories (Hodder, 1992; Shanks, 1990) are also cited by way of criticism and contrast. Reference is also made to independent perspectives (Shelton; 1991; Carmen, 1995). The significant contrast between material and techniques which are irredeemably dated (Fowler, 1981), perennial (Pearce, 1990) and evolving (Carlson, 1997)
is also made, in conjunction with an evergreen enquiry about visitor expectations (Fowler, 1981), and references to their transience and problem creation (Jones, 1998), thus showing the necessity for further enquiries in this direction.

Finally, to emphasise the necessity for further analysis of all these themes, a proposal for an enforced Marxist presentation (Walsh, 1990) extending out of generalised calls for political content in displays (Shanks & Tilley, 1987; Tilley, 1998) is highlighted. It is then contrasted with antipathetic critiques of Marxist and National Socialist based archaeological theories (Bintliff, 1991b, McGann, 1989), as well as with more generalised criticisms of explicitly political theorisation and presentation (Kristiansen, 1988; Bintliff, 1988; Carmen, 1995).

Consideration is then made of what are termed politically extreme and neutralised examples of presentation (Tierney, 1997). This review concludes with an assessment of how original research on this subject will be conducted, and to what end, citing the contemporary analysis of prehistoric presentations (Owen, 1996) as an example.
The Significance of the Past's Accessibility in the Present.

In reviewing the contemporary perspectives of the meaning of the past, Bintliff (1988) identifies a fundamental issue as the potential of the meaning of the past to society, and calls for an investigation of the use and relevance of the past, "both in terms of already existing purposes the past serves, and in terms of untapped potential" (Bintliff, 1988: 4). This is in the context of a post-1979 atmosphere in which an archaeological sense of public service combined with a governmental inclination to redefine archaeology as heritage management, put pressure on public archaeology to be "accountable and productive" (Bintliff, 1988: 3) to taxpayers, and more directly to those private entrepreneurs who increasingly become primary sponsors.

Governmental understanding of heritage is in terms of a collection of antique objects or edifices, as opposed to a comprehension of the societies responsible for their production. What is termed the 'National Physical Past', was increasingly recognised by the state services as being under threat. This induced a governmental recognition of archaeological data as a component of "management and central ideological strategies" (Bintliff, 1988: 3). The very importance of the heritage excluded archaeologists from its management though, just as an object-centred past required guardians rather than interpreters and "exploitation along commercial lines not educational holistic experiences"
In the view of Bintliff (1988) however, "the archaeologist is an historian and a social anthropologist of past cultures; objects as data define the special operational sphere of archaeologists within those broader disciplines, but they are our particular means to the same ends" (Bintliff, 1988: 3). In considering the call for an investigation into the meaning of the past, therefore, the need for a clear idea of this "many-facetted function" is required, so as to facilitate an "intellectual process of evaluation and criticism", as "no imposed management strategy or commercial hard-sell can hope to do justice to our heritage" (Bintliff, 1988: 4).

In seeking to achieve a better comprehension of archaeological data, new methodologies have developed. Post-War Positivism, utilising statistical and computing methodologies for an improved world, had been incorporated in New Archaeology, but became subject to increasing if divided criticism. An outright rejection of generalisations about an unknowable past which was unattainable, was also the basis for a call by thinkers such as Trigger to revert to traditionally detailed descriptions of unique enactments (Bintliff, 1988: 12).

Alternately, the concept of cross-cultural comparison was retained by thinkers such as Hodder, but only so as to identify similar patterns in material culture, or in utilising Collingwood's theory of empathy, so as to acquire an "insider" insight into individual perspectives by means of behavioural 23
evidence (Bintliff, 1988: 12). Those scholars who claim to be politicised, particularly the Marxists, have rejected Positivism as being disguised propaganda for the continuation of the Capitalist society by the fabrication of past models. They prefer to search for proof of the enactment of their own theories in the past. Some New Archaeologists themselves, meanwhile, had become less generalised in their theorising. What are termed subjective attitudes had been challenged by the concept of New Archaeology in the 1960s and 1970s.

The New Archaeology is classified as a "unified, objective and scientific methodology" (Bintliff, 1988: 6). The antipathetic illustration of biased, subjective background influences on academic thought was correlated with a tolerant acknowledgement of a contemporary inclination to conduct research which was of contemporary significance. Commentators such as Hodder are then identified as seeking to "use these studies to demolish New Archaeology's pretensions to recover an agreed reality in the past, claiming that in the future our activity will be recognised to be self-projection onto an essentially unknowable past" (Bintliff, 1988: 6).

Hodder's perspective (1984) serves as a contrast to the New Archaeology, insofar as such Post-Positivism or Post-Processualism is expected to develop an indigenous methodology rather than emulate the sciences, and refocus on the role of individuals as opposed to model communities, to permit greater scope for such issues as freewill, or the significance of
individual initiatives, which was a concern of the humanistic archaeologists who preceded the New Archaeologists.

New Archaeology was also criticised for its perceived basic cause and effect sequences (in imitation of the sciences) being presented as a meaningful analysis, and that its intention to understand the human past, the mental landscapes of past cultures (as opposed to individuals) should be reconstructed by means of symbols. Appraisal of Hodder brought accusations of what is termed anarchic subjectivity, which amounts to an admission that the past is unknowable, and that professional efforts to demystify it actually become a platform for contemporary personal or politicised ideologies: "there is no validation possible for our personal visions of the past, each is as good as any other, and originates in our own viewpoints of the present" (Bintliff, 1988: 6).

Any contradiction would appear to be actively encouraged and approved.

Bintliff (1988) criticizes Hodder's approach by identifying the accomplishment of a transfer of post-positivist methodologies from other disciplines into archaeology. He also takes him to task for failing to present a strong methodology for the concept of the role of the individual, other than by the pre-1945 approach of empathy (as practised by Collingwood). That approach actually homogenises rather than individualises past societies. He concludes that what this particular argument advocates is an acceptance of the significance of
ancient individualism, but also an inability to analytically comprehend corresponding individual thought processes, other than as empathic speculation which is at best plausible, but lacks any means of validation.

As for creating mental landscapes (which gives priority to the community rather than the individual), the use of symbolic analysis does not function as a consistent system, and by making use of a sociological based methodology, is actually typical of New Archaeology, and still reliant on outsider interpretation. The need for an archaeological awareness of the enactments is commended, as is the need to identify mental landscapes within material culture and historical records. Yet it still has to be acknowledged that for prehistoric societies, only 'outsider' interpretations are applicable, unlike more accessible historic societies which can often make 'insider' interpretations possible.

The 'insider meaning' approach is also criticised for its assumption that past societies and individuals always deliberately operated according to a cultural programme. This is not the case in contemporary society, in which allowance is made for varying interpretations of standard norms which are recognized via education, not instinct. External influences on societies, namely climate, agricultural conditions or population flow, must also be taken into account, being more consistent than symbols. In any case, the proposed methodology is one based in traditional social anthropology.
Finally, in considering the advocacy of anarchic subjectivity, a contradiction in the rejection of scientific methodology but utilisation of consistent "attempts to make sense of the past as a real and recoverable set of processes" is observed (Bintliff, 1988: 19).

Having expressed a need to clarify the contemporary meaning of the past in contemporary society, and how our models of the past interact with modern life, so as to be both relevant and valid, Bintliff (1988) summarises Post-Positivist/Processual Archaeology as a new 'Old Archaeology' which is "in reality a more sophisticated version of the old 'New Archaeology'" (Bintliff, 1988: 19), and that it is also realistic for an outside imposition of analytical meaning to "take precedence over speculative but imaginative reconstructions of meanings attributable to past historical actors" (Bintliff, 1988: 19).

Bintliff (1988) then proposed that contemporary developments in corresponding disciplines can create a new scientific synthesis, in which the weaknesses of New Archaeology can be turned into strengths, not least in making the past of relevance to ourselves, but not falsified by (sub)conscious contemporary perspectives. What would be created is a "complex body of unitary theory for analysing and understanding human society and human development in a future holistic Science of Man" (Bintliff, 1988: 31).

Bintliff (1988) concludes by introducing the Annales French historiography (as practised by Braudel), in which "the
The texture of the past is created by the constant interaction between historical forces operating on different timescales" (Bintliff, 1988: 32), and in which the historian distinguishes between short-term events, mentalities, conjunctures, and long-term perspectives, citing examples from contemporary archaeology as evidence for their successful application in that discipline.

It is emphasised that the core of the discipline must remain positivistic and scientific, emphasising that all is structure, and commends the enrichment of archaeology by the addition of Post-Positivist, humanistic perspectives, because it is again emphasised that all the past is 'history': "to understand any moment in the past is to see it as a unique fusion of the general and particular" (Bintliff, 1988: 33). Although Bintliff endorses the Annales for his own research, he is critical of Post-Processualism by contrast, in that it has "imported, uncritically, the whole spectrum of Post-Modernism, as if it were a unitary programme" (Bintliff, 1991b: 276).

Perceived contradictions of Hodder are pointed out as being incomprehensible vacillations "between a practical programme for reconstructing the intentions between past behaviour (Contextual Archaeology) and a view that we only project modern preconceptions into an essentially unknowable past" (Bintliff, 1991b: 276). Disillusion with archaeologists who accept the idea that there is no real historical past, rather than challenge the relativism (as manifested in the heritage
industry) is also expressed, as is a complaint that
professional archaeologists should strive against the
(politically extremist) fabrication of the past (Bintliff,
1991b).

Where Post-Modernism is of value, is in its interest in
human motivations (akin to research interest in Processual
archaeology), "and a commitment to make archaeology more
emotionally and morally challenging" (Bintliff, 1991b: 278),
which is also akin to the recent theme of Reflexive
Archaeology, which is itself a component of the current form
of New Archaeology. Post-Modernism as a whole though,
as promoted by Post-Processualists, is denounced for
"its determination to topple science, reason, truth,
objectivity, a 'real past' and professional responsibility,
from their privileged status in the hearts and minds of
serious researchers" (Bintliff, 1991b: 278).

Shanks (1996) notes the criticism of a Post-Modern application
to archaeology, and what he regards as Bintliff's belief in a
"scientific discipline which develops knowledge of the past and
which involves eliminating the present as far as is possible"
(Shanks, 1996: 172). The criticism is regarded as "the idea of
a dispossessed Humanities (dispossessed by the success of
Science) ...; an imaginary world of the interpreter's creation
which will flatter low and popular (democratic?) tastes"
(Shanks, 1996: 172-73). A response is "to put people in their
place, archaeologists in the present and in respective
theoretical camps, the past quite separate, and upon which archaeologists should focus" (Shanks, 1996: 173).

Shanks (1995) however, does not see the past as being separate from the present, and in commenting on what he regards as the (familiar) tension "between the past (as it may have been) and its continuing existence in the present" (Shanks, 1995: 170), asks "can we ever know what really happened, what past do we play in realising the past, in making the past what it is (now)?" (Shanks, 1995: 170). Apart from finding a grammatical link between the past and present in that "we write and speak of the past and of ourselves at the same time" (Shanks, 1995: 170), a pragmatic link is discerned in the need to tell the story of the (archaeological) past because of its destruction in the process of discovery.

A more substantial link is perceived as arising out of a mystery which is consequent on the separation of a past which is regarded as being objective and of its own time, from the contemporary present which only views it in an erratic, arbitrary way; "the mystery is of how to make the link one which can lead to objective knowledge of what happened then, when the link depends as much on subjective and fragile whim, not some necessity given in the nature of things" (Shanks, 1995: 170).

Although we wish the past to be unsullied and uncontaminated, the (political, present, etc.,) biases of the present mark it. The resolution of the mystery is in "the acceptance of 30
the inextricable unity of the past and its retelling" (Shanks, 1995: 170). This means that the "meaning of archaeological things does not reside in the past so much as between past and present" (Shanks, 1995: 170). It is ultimately declared that the primacy of interpretation is what is argued for, instead of "a past out there and back then; for a dynamic unity of past and present in the crafting of culture and history; for accepting the loss and decay of the past; and therefore the obligation of restitution, our redeeming act of reconstruction" (Shanks, 1995: 173).

Hodder (1984), as if anticipating Bintliff's complaint (1988) about the consequences of relativism, acknowledges that "the notion that the past is an active product of the present, ..., raises problems and dilemmas of its own...if archaeologists cannot be seen as providing neutral information for the public, what social responsibilities are involved?" (Hodder, 1984: 28). He proceeds to ask what is the past that people want, if archaeologists should uphold or subvert contemporary perceptions with their version of the past, and if it is for exclusive interests, or for the benefit of all (1984).

Unlike Clarke (1973), who in Parker-Pearson's view (1988: 684) was "not particularly concerned with Archaeology's wider audience", Hodder (1984) also raises the issue of the public interest in the past, observing that "the past that interests (archaeologists) may not be of such interest to others"
(Hodder, 1984: 29). He suggests that the archaeological community could be motivated by "the vision of the past as an arena for the playing out of different social values and interests" (Hodder, 1984: 31).

This is subsequently echoed in the definition of the past renamed heritage, as "an important arena for working out the opposed claims of our social responsibilities and our decentred consumer existence" (Hodder, 1992: 280), and new, vital role in Post-Modernism (Hodder, 1992: 276). It explains popular fascination in the past in the current heritage boom (Hodder, 1992: 275). A retrospective of archaeological theories relating to the past, has been published in a number of articles in a special section of 'Antiquity', which were edited by Malone and Stoddart under the title 'Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence. Twenty-Five Years After.' (Malone & Stoddart, 1988, 72: 676-702). This is a review of an influential article 'Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence', twenty-five years after its publication in an earlier edition of the same journal (Clarke, 1973, 47: 6-18). This has served as an opportunity to consider the long-term effects of formative Post-Processualism.

Parker-Pearson (1998: 681), for instance, notes that although archaeology in lacking a theory of its own, has appropriated those utilised by other disciplines, this action has not been reciprocated. Clarke's own social models (1973), now seen to be erroneous, serve as a warning of the dangers of giving greater priority to theory than to detailed knowledge of, and skilful
attention to, archaeological material (Parker-Pearson, 1988). Sherratt (1988) however, draws attention to Clarke's thorough utilisation of the latter (1973), exonerating him from responsibility and practice, "both in interpreting the past and in addressing archaeology's role as a cultural practice in the present" (Sherratt, 1988: 700).

Like Bintliff, Parker-Pearson (1988: 682) also comments on the issue of subjective anarchy, by noting that the Processualist archaeologists and New Archaeology positivists criticise the Post-Processualists for their promotion of a disabling relativism. Reference is made to Renfrew's accusation of Shank's and Tilley's 'anything goes' approach and their denial that this is the case, "but how are we to evaluate Post-Processual creations of 'Past-U-Like', images of the past constructed not on any particular evidence but so as to critique politically unsound practices in the present?" (Parker-Pearson, 1988: 682).

This echoes a criticism by Kristiansen (1988) of their perspective, when he asks how far "should interpretations of the past as rooted in the social practices of the present be taken? Are we not being overrun by another modernist fantasy, another ideology - rather than a better understanding of the past as something different from the present?" (Kristiansen, 1988: 475). This unprecedentedly open ideology (in the opinion of Kristiansen) is provocative, but perhaps not unwelcome in that it encourages thoughts about the past, and about
presentational interpretations of the past.

Shanks and Tilley (1987) themselves place emphasis on its representation not being realistically objective, and that there is "no genuine past to be brought into harmony with archaeological thought and neutrally re-presented to the public. Archaeology does not provide a mirror to the past nor does it provide an abstract system which expresses the 'reality' of the past" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 95). The past itself is identified as not being "a three-dimensional jigsaw puzzle buried beneath the archaeologist, or a palimpsest" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 95), or, following Fowler, "a tangle of factual details to be decoded, presented to and appreciated by those with an educated sense of the past" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 95). Instead, they accept Benjamin's definition of the past as being "the precise dialectical problem that the present is called upon to resolve" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 95).

Trigger (1998) draws attention to the humanistic archaeological interpretation of the past, in commenting on Clarke's opposition (1973) to culture-historical archaeology. Bintliff is followed in the reference that is made to the influence of Collingwood, but it is Von Ranke's 'Show it as it Really was' historiography which is seen as the basis for a perspective on facts being "the basis and ever-expanding core of archaeology and interpretations, which were regarded as provisional personal opinions" (Trigger, 1998: 696).

This, in turn, fostered flights of fancy masquerading as
opinion, which turned archaeology as Clarke protests (1973), into what has become "an irresponsible art form" (Trigger, 1998: 696). Renfrew and Bahn (1992), who note the strengths and weaknesses of New Archaeology for instance, but state that "even the critics ... implicitly recognise its influence when they agree that it is indeed the goal of archaeology to explain what happened in the past as well as to describe it" (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992: 39). Specific elements of Post-Processual archaeology such as neo-Marxism, Post-Positivism and Hermeneutism are identified.

A recent suggestion by Shanks and Hodder (1992) that 'Interpretive Archaeology' is a more positive label than 'Post-Processual', is acknowledged, and its diversity is also commended as being one of its strengths (Shanks & Hodder, 1992: 43). Their assessment of archaeology as a whole in the 1990s, is as emphasizing "the value and importance of the past for the contemporary world, and they lead to the realisation that the cultural heritage is an important part of the human environment ... . The task of interpretation is now seen as very much more complex than it once seemed" (Shanks & Hodder, 1992: 44).

The continuation of Post-Processualism is also acknowledged, as are its claims that "there is no single, correct way to undertake archaeological inference, and that the goal of objectivity is unattainable" (Shanks & Hodder, 1992: 42), and critical counter claims of relativism and anarchic,
'factionalised' subjectivity. There is agreement with Shanks and Tilley, though, in their view that "our own interpretation and presentation of the past, as in any museum display, ..., involve choices which depend less on an objective assessment of the data than on the feelings and opinions of the researchers and of the clients who they aim to please" (Shanks & Hodder, 1992: 42).

One further classification of the past, is to it being "renamed a 'resource' (as in Cultural Resource Management), which needed protection (Hodder, 1992: 275), in the 1970s and 1980s. The purpose is to seek an immediate explanation in the heritage boom since the 1970s, by suggesting a link to "the rise in the importance of Green issues" (Hodder, 1992: 275). Pearce (1990: 170) also refers to the past as a resource, but states that it is a valuable resource. In highlighting its positive symbolic qualities, she sees it as possessing great potential, not least in making archaeology itself more accessible and intelligible.

Before proceeding further, it should be noted if not automatically endorsed, that some field archaeologists, as is observed, "are relatively untouched by theoretical debates" (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992: 42). An aversion to an application of theory may also exist, as demonstrated by the (reported) average French archaeological views of "the battle between (British) processualists and post-processualist (as) a respectable kind of exoticism" (Coudart, 1999: 166).
Social thinkers can themselves be averse to social theories, particularly if they are seen to be uncritical. If Bourdieu himself is described by Lash (1990: 238) as the most influential sociologist of culture, he not only proceeds to refer to Bourdieu's scepticism of the very existence of Post-Modern culture and "ill disguised contempt for its commentators" (Lash, 1990: 238), but endorses it with his own reference to Baudrillard's "uncritical and even irresponsible celebration of postmodernism" (Lash, 1990: 2).

There is another reason for refocussing the perception of the past and its accessibility from the theoretical to the practical. Clarke did not apparently consider it necessary to refer to the public in his 1973 text, despite an earlier warning that "unless archaeologists find ways to make their research increasingly relevant to the modern world, the modern world will find itself increasingly capable of getting along without archaeologists" (Fritz & Plog, 1970: 412).

It is therefore also noticeable in the more recent views of Hodder (1992) and Bintliff (1988), that they share a concern about the well-being of the past, and a (concerned) awareness of the involvement of the public. Scrutiny of this issue would be similarly rewarded by a consideration of the practical nature of this involvement. It may also ultimately verify or refute the stance taken by Shanks and Tilley (1987), not least in the pragmatic linkage between past and present.

To facilitate the transition to a more tangible if
generalised perception in terms of its actual presentation, Pearce's image (1990) of the past as a resource will serve as the means by which this can be achieved. It will also be a suitable introduction to an analysis and explanation of the practical manifestations of the past, and the concerns of presentation and communication relating to them.

It has proved impossible to truly define the past. It is intangible, and only possesses the identity as past when it no longer exists in the present, and is therefore unavailable for direct consideration and analysis. What are available, though, are its manifestations, in the physical forms ranging from displays to reconstructions, and from portrayals to re-enactments. Commentators do not doubt that it is in this sense that the past as a resource does exist in the present, actually flourishing to the extent that its present significance guarantees it a role in the future. It is this complex of issues that the next section explores.
The Past as Resource: Critical Pressures in Relation to Issues of Presentation and Communication.

In describing the past as a resource, Pearce (1990: 170) outlines its positive symbolic value. Reference, as has already been noted, is made to a consequent responsibility on archaeologists to make their practical activities "as accessible and intelligible as possible" (Pearce, 1990). To add further emphasis, she cites Lipe's 1984 analysis of the inherent value in sites of past activity, as consisting of aesthetic and artistic values, associative and symbolic values, historic and informational values, and consequent economic and utilitarian values. This gives "a useful summary of the wide range of human responses to ancient sites" (Pearce, 1990: 171-72).

In an introduction to Tilley's "program of action (which means) to move archaeology away from its traditional ideological posture toward one that is both more self-aware, and that can help transform society in many ways" (Whitley, 1998: 302), it is also stated that "museums are ... one of our primary means for communicating our interpretations to the public" (Whitley, 1998: 302). Fowler (1992) rounds off this perception of the past by stating that the passage of time provides many occasions to have what is described as a good time. Unlike the other two authors though, not so much significance appears to be attached: "whether the past is being used as an excuse for a party, or whether the occasion
is the medium for a genuine celebration of pastness remembered, usually at a fixed moment in time, is sometimes a moot point, but ... not a particularly important one" (Fowler, 1992: 44).

In all three of the main available sectors (open-air sites, museums/centres, enactments), accessibility to the past appears to be constituted, as is access to the means by which access is achieved. This apparently establishes a link, and thereby a dialogue involving the public, as well as a greater degree of professional influence, if Bintliff's comment (1988) about the political exclusion of archaeologists is recalled. This observation, though, also serves as a reminder of the negative motivations for access and dialogue.

It is said that "because the past is inescapably intertwined with the present, there can be a strong tendency to delve into the details of its many and often bizarre manifestations. However, description is no substitution for analysis, and it is time we moved on to an explanatory mode" (Merriman, 1992: 818). Fowler (1992) argues that the role of the museums as users of the past, bringing curios into the public arena, is actually a defensive justification of their role in a society in which "the word 'museum' has generally become, outside museological circles, to be a term of denigration" (Fowler, 1992: 115).

This revolves around the failure as perceived in some quarters, of museums to create a link with the public, by neglecting to adequately or consciously interpret the difference between the past and the present (Fowler, 1992). A claim is even made 40
that the museum world has tended to make itself "sociologically irrelevant" (Fowler, 1992: 116). This is reminiscent of an earlier declaration (in Lowenthal & Binney, 1981), that the majority of the population "frankly do not give a damn about archaeology" (Fowler, 1981: 57). It is of more immediate concern to note that Fowler is not alone in criticising what is regarded as museological isolationism. Kavanagh (1990: 117) for instance, reclassifies professional assumptions of museums as being "by definition 'good things', accessible to all and an instrument for the public good" as being actual if not universal "palpable falsehoods, delivered with a smug, purposeful ignorance of real social and cultural trends" (Kavanagh, 1990: 117).

Although Tilley (in Whitley, 1998) states that the museum "remains the major institutional connection between archaeology as a discipline and profession and the wider society" (Tilley, 1998: 322), he similarly criticizes it for its isolation from the public, its very institutionalisation distancing "and disenfranchising people from their past" (Tilley, 1998), so that the past remains aloof, controlled, mediated, and all that is permitted is a passive response and acquiescence" (Tilley, 1998: 323).

Despite the belief that "a disregard for the interests of the public is already being undermined" (Kavanagh, 1990: 117), little would seem to have changed, considering the use of the word 'remains', in the context of observations which were
made a decade before, that the museum suppresses contradiction, "fixing the past as a reflection of the appearance of the present ... suppresses difference and heterogeneity ... temporality and agency. In the museum the past becomes the death mask of the present" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 97).

Kristiansen (1988) however, criticised what is described as the pre-conceived, repetitive critiques of those authors who see everything as commodified or mystified, separated from the past and the present, as being "boring and counter-productive" (Kristiansen, 1988: 475). Walsh (1992) supports their theme of ossification and corresponding alienation, in observing that museums and "the various forms of heritage derivatives, have in fact contributed to a form of "institutionalised rationalisation of the past" which has been "served from the daily experiences of people and mediated as a neutered essence" (Walsh, 1992: 176). This is regarded as being an extension of the distancing effects of Post-Enlightenment modernization on people from their pasts (Walsh, 1992).

It is observed though, that Walsh actually seems to criticize and patronise the public 'punters' (Shanks, 1992: 30).

Criticism can also be a two way process, for as Hodder (1984) warns, "in Britain at least, the call for accountability requires academic archaeologists to consider more carefully their relationship with the public" (Hodder, 1984: 28).

Parker-Pearson (1998) makes a more generalised criticism of archaeologists, as stating that they "could benefit from a
certain humility which sacrifices not our expertise and knowledge but our pomposity and self-importance as high priests of the past, communicating truths from on high to the wider public" (Parker-Pearson, 1998: 684). In Cleere's critical reference (1988) to Fowler's generalised division (1981) of the public as an interested minority and apathetic majority as "a brusque dismissal of some forty million of our citizens" (Cleere, 1988: 37), it is implied that this attitude, for all its realism and courage, lacks factual validation.

Yet it is significant that it was in conducting a Hull Museum visitor survey, that Prince and Schadla-Hall (1987) should find that "the overall pattern which can be projected from the work in Hull not only seems to confirm Hodder's view that archaeology is failing to play an active role in society, but also emphasizes a lack of wider public appeal; archaeologists may indeed be better at communicating with each other rather than with those whom they increasingly claim they seek to serve" (Prince & Schadla-Hall, 1987: 70). A selection of statistical efforts to discern the public's perception is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three.

If the archaeological/museological establishment regarded itself as being under threat in the 1980s, it would have been natural to blame the heritage industry, which seemed to be, as Walsh (1992: 177) claims, a Post-Modern development in a Post-Modern world. It must be considered, albeit with hindsight, that the heritage 'threat' was largely chimerical.
That it was more certainly transient, even dated, is the view of Fowler as early as 1992, despite his criticism of what was actually "a demeaning service industry, shallow, tawdry images of pastness, ... a downmarket denial of proper access to its legitimate pasts to society whose very curiosity triggered the opportunity in the first place" (Fowler, 1992: 154).

In the recession of the early/mid 1990s, however, "heritage was quite suddenly no longer an easy passport to profitable commercial enterprise, nor will it be again in the immediate future" (Fowler, 1992: 156). A review by Fowler in 1987 of a governmental report on historic buildings had already concluded that "precisely because of the dynamism inherent in the heritage, already it is a fading snapshot, of some historical interest, of what a group of people thought about what it saw as the English Heritage in 1986" (Fowler, 1987: 415).

Pearce (1990) also warns that contrary to received wisdom, in terms of a 'Jorvik' style combination of genuine archaeology and entrepreneurial thrust, "the market can possibly sustain a dozen or so Jorviks distributed across the country but not more" (Pearce, 1990: 36). The waning fortunes of such political and economic trends in this period of the late 1980s to early 1990s, certainly influenced archaeological commentators.

Where heritage might be of general significance, it is as Lumley (1993) claims, citing Bourdieu, "a field in which competing groups and interests seek to establish or
undermine orthodoxies" (Lumley, 1993: 66), thus deconstructing the past, and more directly, induced museum curators to show "a much greater interest in how visitors perceive displays" (Lumley, 1993: 67), and acquire a better idea of what the public really is, not as "the discerning few and the ignorant many, and is seen as complex and differentiated, requiring subtle and carefully calibrated strategies in order to have its attention engaged" (Lumley, 1993: 67).

A more specific subdivision is made by Pearce (1990), who recognises that, setting aside professional archaeologists and curators, the general public consists of a majority adult group of those who do not have a general interest in the past, or whose interest is perceived to be antipathetic, a minority who are classified as taking an informed interest in the past, and the children, whose interests are as yet flexible; and "cross-cutting these distinctions are the cultural differences which result from the fact that Britain is now a multicultural society" (Pearce, 1990: 133).

In addressing the role of heritage in the question of national identity, Lumley (1993) even concludes that heritage actually creates "a less narrow and insular conception of the "a less narrow and insular conception of the national past" and "loosen(s) the grip of myth" (Lumley, 1993: 68). In arguing that "if archaeology is to proceed at all, other than as an introverted specialism for the recondite few, the retention and indeed the development of the public interest is vital"
(Fowler, 1981: 64), Fowler places emphasis on the public paying "the piper and its right to influence the tune has to be accepted" (Fowler, 1981: 64).

Cleere (1988) commends the courage and realism of what he regards as a minority view, aligning himself with it in his own assertion that "it is the public that is paying, both through its taxes and its entrance fees, for the preservation of ... monuments, and in return the state organisations must surely have a duty to make them more accessible to the public, both physically and intellectually" (Cleere, 1988: 41). He also anticipates Pearce (1990) though, by warning that "given the materialistic and monetarist policies of the present Government ... the major effort will be expended on a very small number of 'honeypot' sites, because of solely financial criteria" (Cleere, 1988: 41).

Evidence for this view is discerned by Fowler (1987) in the governmental Environment Select Committee's "enthrallment (in 1986) by the commercial success of the Jorvik Viking Centre" and excitement "by the revenue-earning potential of Stonehenge" (Fowler, 1987: 412). These are presented as the examples of a commercial approach which regards conservation and the heritage movement as money making enterprises, thereby reducing the amount of, and eventually (liquidating) governmental financial support" (Fowler, 1987: 412). An assertion by the Committee that "we believe that the heritage is capable of paying its own way" (Fowler, 1987: 412) is quoted as proof.
Although this author follows Pearce (1990) and Cleere (1988) in warning that "for every Jorvik there are several dozen other equally worthy heritage-based operations struggling to make ends meet on tourist income" (Fowler, 1987: 412), a "hard-nosed entrepreneurial" argument that they are badly managed or producing the wrong product in the wrong place at the wrong time is regarded as still leading to the confinement of heritage to tourist traps; "goodbye many museums, outdoor projects trying to promote culture and research as well as to entertain, and most of field archaeology" (Fowler, 1987: 412).

The consequent situation may not have been quite so extreme, but Kavanagh (1990) regards the enforced reappraisal by museums of their levels of presentation and service as "evidence of the changing nature of museum funding. As both national and local government slowly begin to withdraw from absolute financial support of museums, other forms of funding have had to be sought" (Kavanagh, 1990: 117). This scenario may also occur by default.

Elsewhere, Fowler (1992), having, as has been noted, observed that an economic downturn can adversely affect heritage in general. It is then shown that the public sector as a whole can be affected by financial realities, with knock-on effects; "at a time of local authority cuts, for example, it is always the museum services, ... which are in the front line" (Fowler, 1992: 156).
Nor does a change of government and ideology automatically mean an insulation from monetary influences, whether baleful or benevolent. It is significantly in a post-1979 British General Election paper that Carmen, Carnegie and Wolnizer (1999) express their concern with the archaeological utilisation of accounting practices for the evaluation of their material as actually "supplying ammunition to those wanting to reduce the value of such material to arbitrarily-determined financial terms" (Carmen, Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999: 143).

These authors also note that although "the assessment of 'significance' remains the main technique used for the evaluation of archaeological material across the globe ... a concern with the idea of 'sustainability' (essentially an economic approach in origin) is evident in the UK" (Carmen, Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999: 146). The aim would appear to be a form of community service in which a framework is provided, within which archaeological remains find their place and are provided with appropriate functions that will simultaneously allow their continual survival and benefit the community, thus overcoming the problem of competing value systems (Carmen, Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999: 146).

A preference is expressed however, for an alternative valuation system of the heritage being "a store of symbolic and cultural capital" (Carmen, Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999: 146), beyond any form of accounting. Although these authors themselves argue that "these different approaches to archaeological value are
mutually exclusive" (Carmen, Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999: 146), and that if the heritage is a resource with "use values of various kinds, then these can be compared and evaluated" (Carmen, Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1999: 146). This evenhandedness may not be shared elsewhere though, for as Pearce (1990: 133) states, "both museums and archaeology depend wholly upon public support, mediated in a variety of ways, for their operation" (Pearce, 1990: 133).

This generalised consideration may well approach its conclusion with the related statement that "the way in which the past is viewed by the general public, and how those areas should or could be changed, is one of the most difficult areas to confront archaeologists" (Pearce, 1990: 133). She refers again to the issue of what the public apparently wants, saying that "archaeologists may have to accept that the public wish to experience the cultural heritage is not really about understanding the past at all, but rather about feeling better in the present" (Pearce, 1990: 174).

This 'commoditization' of heritage (in line with popular demand) and the proposed probability of the development of at least some archaeological sites as exemplifying "the link between heritization and contemporary capitalism in a particularly vivid form" (Pearce, 1990: 174) are portrayed as "thorny problems to which no simple solutions exist" (Pearce, 1990: 174). This does not rule out the possibility of there being any solution, however complicated.
Pearce (1990) proceeds to suggest that such "difficulties at actual sites can perhaps be negotiated by helpful approaches to management and display" (Pearce, 1990: 175), just as Bintliff (1988), in introducing the presented papers from the 'Extracting Meaning from the Past' Conference at Bradford University in 1987, concludes that "archaeologists should aim to reach out and interest more and more of the general public in their heritage (the objects and the knowledge), not by over-trivialising the past, nor by overt party lines" (Bintliff, 1988: 2). This must all be set within the context of the reality of what Boylan (1992) summarises as the impact of politics on museums at both local and national levels, the relationship between museums and ordinary people, the nature and future of the museum's professions, and the "changing financial climate for museums, especially the drive for profit" (Boylan, 1992: 1).

To answer the resultant question as to how all this is to be achieved, it would now be appropriate to consider more specific solutions and calls for experimentation, which the commentators and critics themselves propose. Having noted the arguments thus far, it might also be better to perceive the heritage industry as a catalyst for presentational change rather than as a problem, particularly in the light of the current political policies of both right and left which stress the virtue of the play of monetarist market forces.
Proposals for Dialogue and Presentation.

There have been, and continue to be proposals for what needs to be done about museums, arising out of the apparent consensus since the 1980s that change was necessary. When Tilley (1998: 324) advises the deconstruction and restructuring of the museum to enable people to create their own pasts, he is maintaining what is now a tradition which extends back to 1987 at least, and its calls for "specific acts of construction" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 98).

More specific proposals may also be compared. What Shanks and Tilley describe as techniques in their reconstructions include the introduction of political content into conventional displays to reveal their misuse, the decontextualisation of past artifacts and mingling with those of the present to challenge commodification, the enlivening of their related narratives so as to reduce the potency of their self-evident meanings, the avoidance of permanent displays in order to illustrate changing perceptions of the artefactual past, and the encouragement of the community use of those same artifacts outside the museum (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 98-99).

In some cases, they would appear to have been already put into practice, as in the use of irony and humour in the labelling of an exhibition in the Scunthorpe Museum, which Pearce (1990: 164) refers to. There is significance in the related remark that "these are radical ideas, most of which await trial by practice" (Pearce, 1990: 168), although they are also
given an immediate value in that they capture some of the fundamental problems in exhibiting the past.

Tilley (1998) continues to find a political role for museums in that they should make people aware that they do not make their own history, but have the ability to change it by their actions in the present, adding that "the museum display should not promote acquiescence but shock people into reflection on their past and current situation" (Tilley, 1998: 274). An inclusion within museum displays of a variety of interpretations is also advocated, so as to encourage criticism, creativity and make the museum "a cultural experience to be shaped and modified at will" (Tilley, 1998: 274). Iconoclastic narratives and the community use of artefacts are also again proposed.

Proposals are not only made, but their realisation is discussed. Cleere (1988) for instance, makes positive reference to the development of the 'interpretation centre' as exemplified at Fishbourne Roman Palace (Cleere, 1988: 41). The recruitment of staff, the redesign of guidebooks and provision of a variety of publications to appeal to different tastes, and installation of explanatory notice boards and signs are also noted (Cleere, 1988: 41).

Academic opposition is registered however, as manifested in the belief that proposals for improved presentation and visitor numbers would mean accusations of 'Disneyfication' and the ruination of an exclusive atmosphere; "the Jorvik Viking Centre, whilst now generally accepted, is seen as the
thin edge of the wedge" (Cleere, 1988: 41). Whether this is actually the case requires verification.

Pearce (1990), also noting the creation of independent museums like Jorvik and Fishbourne, places them in the vanguard of developments in exhibition and preservation, also acknowledging the financial significance by adding that these factors, combined with influential patronage and a special image, make it "possible for them to maintain themselves and the research functions associated with them, by entrance fees and grant raising" (Pearce, 1990: 35).

It is also worth noting the approaches to the presentation of open-air sites (apart from their already stated inherent value), "because these overlap with the interpretative approaches used within the museum walls" (Pearce, 1990: 170). Pearce (1990) acknowledges that there are difficult choices, as in which sites to present, and which would be realistically contingent on combined political and archaeological pressures, and in which interpretative strategy to implement in each case.

Pearce (1990) states that there is potential in sites with "on-site trails backed up by well-conceived information panels and by reconstructions and simulations" (Pearce, 1990: 180) in an admittedly limited and impressionistic presentation (to an archaeologist) which yet satisfies the visiting public's interest in them. Visitor-based interactive and self-discovery elements may be added to the list, insofar as museum displays are concerned, such as audio-visuals, reconstructions,
and activities which include trails, quizzes and computer games. All of this should be linguistically accessible and possible for people to relate to, on the basis of family or domicile.

What is also significant is that, by using visitor survey results as evidence, Pearce (1990) is able to suggest what most visitors do not want; "standard textbook approaches, too much information, too many broad generalities or concepts, and presentations which are static, and offer no opportunity for visitor involvement" (Pearce, 1990: 195). There is also a solidly evaluated visitor trend which validates the great importance of "the value of seeing 'the actual object', the 'real thing', and if the human interest inherent in the material can be drawn out, it is always exciting. There is much which is positive here, and much which offers food for thought" (Pearce, 1990: 195).

Pearce's view (1990) is endorsed by the statement that "the implications of all these (theoretical and actual) efforts to involve a wider audience are considerable" (Pearce, 1990: 196), although this 'new realism' is dependent on commitment, time and money, and may well be at the expense of other programmes. Kavanagh (1990) also draws a contrast between museums and heritage entertainments, in that whereas the former are continually evolving institutions with various responsibilities, the latter is only concerned with maintaining itself and its profits, once established. Yet in the real
world in which the two are compared, "evidence would suggest that astutely publicized and well-organised museums can attract large audiences and generate income" (Kavanagh, 1990: 168).

The additional statement that "when appropriate attitudes and methods are brought to bear, museums can meet and match the challenge from the heritage industry, without eroding responsibilities towards scholarship and collection care" (Kavanagh, 1990: 168) implies an ability by museums to effectively counter the heritage industry without being compromised. This however, assumes that museums did, as strongly advised, "establish an astute awareness of how they are different from heritage exhibitions and the heritage industry in general" (Kavanagh, 1990: 168).

Wickham-Jones (1988) takes a stronger stance than Kavanagh on the issue of challenging the heritage on its own territory in that archaeologists themselves, reluctant or not, remain essential "suppliers of information for interpretation" (Wickham-Jones, 1988: 185). As the issue raised by the heritage industry if not its failed commercial operations will not go away either, "archaeologists must confront the industry and the direction in which it is moving if they are to maintain control over their own profession" (Wickham-Jones, 1988: 186).

This stance also raises the point that if the role of the museum is to be considered, so must the role of the museum curator. It is in considering that role for both curators and heritage personnel, that Sorensen (1990) speculates...
that they "are all in some ways representative of a new secular priesthood" (Sorensen, 1990: 66). This view is somewhat reminiscent of Parker-Pearson's critical remarks (1998) on an exclusivist tendency in archaeology (Parker-Pearson, 1998: 684).

Pearce (1990) by contrast, offers advice on how the curatorial responsibilities should be fulfilled, not least in being willing "to shed some professional pride which alienates others" (Pearce, 1990: 194). Owen (in Kavanagh, 1996) places a more specific emphasis on the powerful role of the (influenced) author of museum narratives, citing this as an example of the theory by Shanks and Tilley that what "museum display histories really do is further reinforce or legitimize the dominant social and political norms of the present" (Owen, 1996: 203). Merriman (1991) proposes community liaison officers "who can build up close relations with communities" (Merriman, 1991: 134).

Although Walsh (1995) and Fowler (1992) are similar to Pearce (1990), Shanks and Tilley (1987) in commenting on the existing state of presentations and making their own suggestions, they differ somewhat by making more pronounced critiques of what has actually been enacted, rather than just criticise proposals, though Shanks and Tilley (1987) for example, critically review Jorvik, commenting on specific features (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 86-90).

If Fowler (1992) for instance, regards (selected) heritage
themed parks as making history merely providing "a convenience packaging to image a leisure product" (Fowler, 1992: 133), Walsh (1990) is more explicit in his description of an apparently contrived heritage landscape, to wit, the 'Catherine Cookson Country' in Tyneside as where imaginary characters live in a landscape that no longer exists as something created out of nothing" (Walsh, 1990: 285).

Fowler (1987) also interprets the governmental view that the encouragement of tourist orientated enactments as meaning "pulling crowds to olde-tyme-happenings, tourney, joust and pseudo-gunfire in the lawn-precious precincts of ruinous castles" (Fowler, 1987: 413). Walsh (1990), echoing Pearce in asserting that most people do not visit heritage attractions in order to learn about the past, darkly observes that "if they do learn anything I am sure that what they learn and how they ultimately perceive the past should worry most of us involved in archaeology" (Walsh, 1990: 282).

What seems even worse is that "heritage centres are problematic in terms of the techniques that they use to present and interpret the past ... they can be quite easily be perceived as a Post-Modern nightmare that becomes more real each year as more heritage centres open" (Walsh, 1990: 282). In considering such criticisms however, it should be borne in mind that Fowler is well aware of the datedness of the governmental proposals, as already noted (Fowler, 1992: 114). Care is also taken to give credit to Living History for instance, which if
properly done, can be "educationally stimulating" (Fowler, 1992: 114).

Walsh's proto-example of the Raunds Heritage Park (Walsh, 1990: 282) also remains speculative, because of the decision taken by Northamptonshire County Council not to invest in the project until the economic situation had improved (1). His perception of Post-Modernism inadvertently making heritage a threat to the past, "where any possible perspective of time is obliterated through pastiche and bricolage" (Walsh, 1990: 282) is sharply contrasted by Bintliff's belief (despite his theoretical criticisms earlier) that Post-Modernism is a valuable antidote to the "creeping mindlessness of the heritage industry" (Bintliff, 1991b: 275).

Hodder (1992) meanwhile, argues that the material past is actually the "site of struggle between two aspects of Post-Modernism ... continuity and discontinuity, ... contextualised and decontextualised" (Hodder, 1992: 280). The varying criticisms of heritage by these authors, implies a lack of consensus as to the identity of the threat as such.

Walsh (1990) himself does put forward positive proposals about finding "a greater role for the 'expert'" in the form of guided tours for instance, and openly political interpretations (Walsh, 1990: 291), like Shanks and Tilley (1987). He differs from them however, in taking issue with the proposed decontextualisation of displays. The result is considered to be a confusing Post-Modern bricolage (Walsh, 1990).
In reviewing these opinions however, Shanks (1990) defends the Catherine Cookson tourist trail on the grounds that it is what she writes about which many people can relate to, and which can interpret everyday life. This is an example for him of the popular attraction of heritage (Shanks, 1990: 208). In a call for more experimentation and creativity, Shanks asks "why not try out different writings, different presentations?" (Shanks, 1990: 209). The (archaeological) is also directly asked to "learn of bricolage, montage and pastiche and turn them to our purpose" (Shanks, 1990: 209). The means if not the ends would not seem to be at fault.

Walsh (1992) does concede that "the heritage experience may act as a 'taster' for many people who may subsequently develop an interest in the (local) history and archaeology, ... and thus require the facilities offered by the local museum" (Walsh, 1992: 183). This is a revision of his earlier doubts about visitor learning ability, but also a qualified one, given his assertion that it is the heritage consultants and marketeers who "do not communicate with the public" (Walsh, 1992: 182). This may be compared with Shelton's belief (1991) that "museums of mass culture create an ever more acute alienation which isolates them from the public they seek to address" (Shelton, 1991: 99).

Walsh's own preference (1995) is for the ecomuseum, which would operate as part of the community and integrate any discipline which is of use in comprehending people and places,
in addition to techniques such as interactive video (Walsh, 1995: 134-37). This is an example of what Renfrew and Bahn (1992) describe as "techniques at the cutting edge of modern technology" in the presentation of the past (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992: 531). Carmen (1995) does criticise its potential for encouraging passivity in the viewer though, identifying it as a typical fault in Post-Modern heritage and the control of the material by such a structure (Carmen, 1995: 95).

This example may also serve as a warning of the potential transience of such interpretative tools, or supersession by more advanced, or popular forms. The continuing development of the Internet for instance, means in Carlson's view (1997), that "barriers to communication between scholars and members of the public have been falling" (Carlson, 1997: 1049).

Fowler (1981) also warns that the archaeological material itself can become dated, in that it "no longer represents the main thrust of archaeological research" (Fowler, 1981: 63). Jones (1998), in reporting on a South Korean conference on (prehistoric) heritage presentation, correspondingly notes that "many presentations are difficult to adapt to changes in either archaeological interpretation and/or visitors' expectations (Jones, 1998: 413).

Some display techniques are perennial however. Pearce (1990) notes that "it has been recognised since the early 1950s that visitors respond well to galleries which have differing light levels and contrasting colours, in conjunction with
impressive graphics like large blown up photographs" (Pearce, 1990: 163). Fowler (1981) also points out, that although visitor expectations may not be what archaeology is about or capable of producing, museums and site displays could doubtless be improved "if we know exactly what they wanted" (Fowler, 1981: 63).

One further proposal by Walsh (1990) which shall be considered, will also illustrate the necessity for further research on the issues which have been raised in this chapter. It is in the belief that what is also required is the development of an essentially political framework or series of frameworks that must be applied to the interpretation and presentation of the past; each framework will implicitly accept the need for discussion about what the practitioners (archaeologists, historians, etc.,) consider to be valid or considered 'truths' or themes" (Walsh, 1990: 290).

The concept of deconstruction or of reconstruction is, as has been observed throughout this study, a common theme, and certainly merits experimentation and examination. The proposed inclusion of a Marxist framework is of concern however. What is termed "a valid or considered 'truth' or theme" is the "class struggle throughout history" (Walsh, 1990: 290), and mechanisms for displaying "the class-based nature of British history" which must be developed (Walsh, 1990: 290).

It is not the Marxist arguments themselves which are being
questioned here. Having extended Tilley's calls for the inclusion of political content so as to shock people out of acquiescence, Walsh himself (1990), though equally dogmatic in stating that "political content must be a prerequisite for a presentations of the past" (Walsh, 1990: 290), does consider it healthy and natural to make allowance for the deconstruction of any such framework.

What is being queried is the logic of presenting frameworks which are not only dated, but politically bankrupt. Bintliff (1991b) for instance, perceives the irony of a Marxist based paper at a 1990 conference "on behalf of an ideological movement whose former adherents have been deserting it in millions over the last couple of years" (Bintliff, 1991b: 277). If (practical circumstances and critical accessibility notwithstanding), one political ideology can continue to be publicly promoted in an evergreen fashion, it must be assumed that National Socialist pseudo-archaeological theories and models, as outlined by McGann (1988) must also be put into overt presentational form everywhere, including racial, religious and politically based (e.g. Marxist) communities.

The prospect of the resultant alienation of the multicultural community with which contact is sought, in addition to real or potential institutional and financial sponsors, must be considered. The tarnishing of unrelated programmes and proposals by a fabricated wrong impression must also be taken into account. What one author terms a "fantasy"
Kristiansen, 1988: 475) could have nightmarish consequences for museological presentations.

In commenting on Walsh's concern (1995) for community building, Carmen (1995) also observes that it should be recalled that "while some people are chosen to be included, others have to be excluded" (Carmen, 1995: 98). It has to be asked if this should be for the benefit of a discriminating ideology.

These concerns should not become an excuse for censorship, or the manipulation of the past by covert (as opposed to Bintliff's overt) party lines. Yet apart from the potential for misunderstanding, there may also be localised reasons for such a universal formula not being universally applied, however well-intentioned.

Tierney for instance (1997), in reviewing Brett, agrees with the argument that the mixture of the Navan Centre's concerns to do with Irish myths, science, and architecture "are pulled together through modes of representation arising out of the sublime. These ultimately provide naive apologetics for a virulent form of so-called ethnic superiority, once more bound up in the more extreme forms of Ulster Unionism" (Tierney, 1997: 172).

The Ceide Fields Centre in the Irish Republic is subsequently cited as an example at the other extreme of this presentational spectrum. Although it deals with the use of prehistory projected into the present "to offer an ideal image of some people's idea of what society should be like, it is
perceived as "a frustratingly neutral kind of location" (Tierney, 1997: 173). This would mean a frustratingly neutral kind of presentation.

Ultimately, taking into consideration Pearce's (evaluation based) strictures (1990) on what visitors do and do not want, in addition to Walsh's own more subjective doubts (1990) about their inability to learn, more evaluation is required. Even if some forms of presentation are perennial, the same should not be assumed for recorded visitor preferences. Nor might a technique which is suitable for one theme, be equally so for another.

An analysis of prehistoric presentations by Owen (1996) has served as one means by which the implementation of theories has been scrutinised. A consistent concluding theme is in the call for publicised evaluation and experimentation; "we must not be afraid to take risks and try out novel ideas of interpretation" (Owen, 1996: 213). It is a good idea to focus on experimentations and interpretations which are concerned with one historical period. This is in order to construct an integral research structure which may be compared with other such structures, which are concerned with similar interpretations of such themes. This is although the themes themselves are historically dissimilar.

To assess such novel ideas and their effects, in addition to the issues which have been raised in this chapter, a visitor survey based methodology, which focuses on presentations...
concerned with themes ranging from the Romano-British to late medieval periods, will be presented in Chapter Three, in the context of other surveys which have arisen out of the calls for dialogue and evaluation.

Also, given the persistent references to the Jorvik Viking Centre in York which have been made in this review, and which therefore imply both an academic and public significance, it is proposed that a presentational template for Jorvik is constructed out of a synthesis of academic and public material in Chapter Two. In doing so, the overall contemporary significance and influence of Jorvik in theory and practice will be more clearly discerned.

The results, themes and issues arising from those two chapters will be considered in the subsequent chapters. This will be an extension of the research which has been conducted in this field, and which may assist in the continuing development of a framework for further studies and presentation concepts.
CHAPTER ONE FOOTNOTE.

(1) From a letter from Alan Hannan, County Archaeologist, Northamptonshire County Council, dated 9th February 1994.
CHAPTER TWO. A PRESENTATIONAL TEMPLATE: THE JORVIK VIKING CENTRE AND ITS INFLUENCE.

Introduction.

In constructing Chapter One, a trend was discerned, by which the Jorvik Viking Centre in York appeared to be not only of great academic and public significance, but also of influence. Clearly, this invited further scrutiny. It was therefore decided that a synthesis of academic and public material should be analysed. This would firstly attempt to determine the nature and relevance of the significance, and then the influence of this one centre.

Having sought to evaluate the Centre itself in these terms, it should then be possible to make a fairly balanced assessment of the direct consequences of its existence, and implications at large. The results could then serve as a theoretical template on which to create an appraisal of the other static presentations which come under review in Chapter Four.

The understanding of Jorvik will be approached through a consideration of specific rationalisations and criticisms by its representatives and critics in an academic context. The translation of two contemporary overviews of the Vikings into popular textual and televisual form will serve as an introduction to popularised views of Jorvik and its influence upon imitators. How this influence is perceived will also be noted.
Critiques of Jorvik.

To recapitulate on general impressions, two authors were noted as being positive about Jorvik. Pearce (1990: 35) located it in the vanguard of museological presentation, and Cleere (1988: 40) commended it as an honourable exception in a general trend of not communicating archaeological material to the public in an accessible way. Fowler (1987: 412) also observed its commercial attraction, from a governmental perspective.

All three authors were agreed however, in Jorvik being a harbinger of a limited rather than a universal trend. Pearce (1990: 36) predicted no more than a dozen imitators, Fowler (1987) predicted a dozen failures, and Cleere (1988) warned of there being a limited number of Jorvik style centres, not because of archaeological opposition to 'archaeological Disneyland's' emanating from the generally accepted Jorvik, but because of a governmental preference for "honeypot sites" (Cleere, 1988: 41). This is a view which is shared by Fowler (1987).

Before considering more specific criticisms by Shanks and Tilley (1987) however, it is necessary to consider a statement by Bintliff (1988), of the successful achievement of a genuine mixture of spectacle and educational achievement at Jorvik. This in turn, could be appreciated by a general public "with its increasingly technical background and social awareness" (Bintliff, 1988: 1). This appreciation has to be developed out of an attraction to the Centre,
which derives from a stimulation in public interest in excavation results, as practised by Addyman and Gaynor, promoters of Jorvik, according to one view (Prince & Schadla-Hall, 1987: 69).

Attention is also drawn to the development of imitator 'time-capsule' experiences (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992: 518). In a more detailed description of the Centre itself, agreement is made with Prince and Schadla-Hall's view, on the basis of resultant financial support for new excavations in York and success in attracting eight million visitors. An important role for Jorvik is also defined in its "presenting a particular excavation and period to the public" and "explaining the sequence of archaeological discovery and interpretation in an imaginative new way" (Renfrew & Bahn, 1992: 536).

Hodder (1992) poses the question as to why centres such as Jorvik do so well, which arises out of a search for an explanation as to "the way in which people seem fascinated by the past in the current heritage boom" (Hodder, 1992: 275). The answer is apparently to be found, partly in the past's role in image-addictive Post-Modernism, in which 'traditional' museum displays of artefacts in long typological sequences, "have been replaced by a visit to an instant frozen in time in Viking York with all the sounds and smells relived - a commodified, contrived depthlessness" (Hodder, 1992: 276).

It is also found in the materiality of the collectable past (in the form of artefacts), which can be "packaged and
'sold' as a commodity, both figuratively and literally" (Hodder, 1992: 277). Replica sales at Jorvik are cited as an example, just as the rapidity of its time car ride, "precisely calculated to maximise profit" is cited as an example of the past selling well (Hodder, 1992). This is the motivation of councils and commercial businesses being interested in museums which promote tourism and create "wealth and jobs" (Hodder, 1992: 277).

Hodder (1992) does perceive a certain merit in Jorvik, in its claiming of a historical integrity, via the time car journey through the 'intervening centuries' back to Viking York (Hodder, 1992: 280). Centres such as Jorvik which can give "people a local sense of place" (Hodder, 1992: 280) could actually counter socio-economic efforts to commercialise and de-legitimise the past for all, thereby alienating people from it (Hodder, 1992). Pearce (1990) is also positive about Jorvik, insofar as its management's interest in how visitors perceive the subject matter, publicises popular misconceptions about the past (Pearce, 1990: 194). This indicates what material is required in an improvement of displays providing such information.

It is also noted that the Centre's literature "suggests that Jorvik succeeds because it makes learning fun, and, ... without endangering academic integrity, it presents the complicated story of an excavation and its interpretation in a way that people can grasp, using innovative and highly
Imaginative interpretative techniques" (Pearce, 1990: 164). These techniques, displaying supposedly 'hard' or 'positive' facts in relatively uncontroversial exhibitions, make such presentations "intelligible and interesting to the visitors" (Pearce, 1990: 156) because of what is actually a popular approach to presentation in the museological mainstream.

What is clear is that criticisms aside, "Jorvik is a success, and from it lessons must be learned" (Pearce, 1990: 164). Fowler (1987) approvingly notes that what the Government seems to have learned from the success of Jorvik, is that archaeological finds have a huge appeal to visitors, and that English Heritage in consequence, should have more funds for special projects, "which in turn will increase revenue and the public appeal of archaeology" (Fowler, 1987: 44).

Another lesson learned by Fowler (1992), is in how a centre like Jorvik can attract an otherwise disinterested public, "not through the relatively easy appeal of recent pasts but through superb marketing and presentation of a popularly little-known past arranged ... in a convenient, instant and easily assimilable form" (Fowler, 1992: 116).

Its research-based academic integrity is also commended, and the influence in museums elsewhere of Jorvik style, visually-led, vocabulary-simple, exciting presentations which make things discernible and stories accessible is also noted (Fowler, 1992: 117). Silver (1988) however, also observes that Jorvik could be seen by orthodox museums to be
"an insidious threat to their continued funding" (Silver, 1988: 190), especially as the Centre's management had plans to open similar establishments in Oxford, Canterbury and Edinburgh, all of them cities with a "well-established tourist infrastructure" (Silver, 1988: 191).

What must also be discerned however, is the qualified nature of the presentational influence of Jorvik. It is also noted that in a market led economy, "some would-be copycats have gone for 'the experience' alone, forgetting or not realising that behind Jorvik ... is academic substance" (Fowler, 1992: 117). Nor is educational influence all pervasive either. Fowler (1992) refers to the Isle of Man Tourist Board utilising stereotypical if spurious Viking 'horned helmet' symbols in its London Underground poster advertising campaign in an apparent preference for the fictitious but familiar image (Fowler, 1992: 159). Other presentations, although concerned with the Viking theme as such, may prefer (traditional) forms of display. The Anglo-Saxon and Viking Life Gallery at the Yorkshire Museum in York for instance, is described by Pearce (1990) as being "a good example of a classic dynamic display" (Pearce, 1990: 159).

A recurrent perception at Jorvik is that "there is a startling contrast between the innovative reconstructions and the classic, not to say archaic, museum displays in the (overcrowded) Skipper Gallery" (Fowler, 1992: 164).
The subsequent speculation is that "most interest here will concentrate on the hologram of the Coppergate Helmet" (Fowler, 1992: 164). Walsh (1990) however, having criticised what he regards as the subjective, inauthentic visitor impressions which are created by decontextualised smells "from the Viking period" (Walsh, 1990: 287), deplores the hologram as being not only "the Post-Modern condition at its most dire (but) fascinating to most people ... because it is a hologram" (Walsh, 1990: 287), but even difficult to see for small children. Yet he does give credit for Jorvik's direct influence on the creation of the Archaeological Resource Centre and indirect encouragement of public visits to museums elsewhere, as an example of the value of heritage centres (Walsh, 1992: 173).

Lumley (1993) by comparison, makes the more generalised statement that the "new generation of museums in which Jorvik is included (Lumley, 1993: 67), have as a key ingredient, the desire "to 'show' history by making the past into an experience" (Lumley, 1993: 67). In response (Lumley, 1993), Jordonava's critique (1989) is not only quoted but approved. It is argued that what is created is an artificial simulation and experiencing of the past (Jordanova, 1989: 66-67). In considering more technical critiques of the Centre aside from the issue of the hologram), Silver (1988), despite some reservations about claims of authenticity being undermined by "the lack of anything to draw attention to
the nature of the work which has been put in" (Silver, 1988: 189), and the confusingly modern nature of the smells in an overall artificial simulation which is presented in only ten to fifteen minutes, states that "the displays do manage to convey a surprising amount of informative detail and to offer an enjoyable show" (Silver, 1989: 190).

Chabot (1988) however, challenging the philosophical perspectives by Jorvik's creators of visitors as being limited in their comprehension of the Viking past (Chabot, 1988: 67), proceeds to argue from a feminist perspective, that the presentation as a whole, though technologically innovative, is academically traditional in its assumption of "an unintelligent and passive" public (Chabot, 1988: 73).

Suggestions (following Shanks and Tilley, 1987) are then made as to how visitors can be more actively involved in the construction(s) of the exhibited past, which will acknowledge "the importance of gender analysis in the public presentation of pasts" (Chabot, 1988: 74).

Shanks and Tilley (1987) are also more critical, as in their description of the presentation of objects "which are made to carry meanings which would have mystified their makers: empirical detail, representational accuracy, (and) inanimate display for educational purposes" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 86). After the presentation of "the result of the labour of the archaeologist-hero" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 89), the passive visitor is then moved on into the Object Gallery and
Museum Shop, which are interpreted as being "the commodified object of archaeological labour and the reality of commodity purpose" (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 88). Walsh (1992) places this presentation "in the context of twelve years of Thatcherism, with its emphasis on doers rather than thinkers" (Walsh, 1992: 115).

The text of the process of discovering and interpreting the site, then reconstructing it, would be at least, if not "an exercise in self-gratification and political statement on behalf of the York Archaeological Trust in particular, and archaeology in general (Shanks & Tilley, 1987: 87-89), certainly seems to testify to the powerful role of the author of museum narratives (Owen, 1996: 203). That this narrative is also challenging, is noted by Wickham-Jones (1988), who observes that the onset of such presentations will have important implications for those concerned with interpretation.

The Jorvik technique, when compared with the minimalist presentation of an open-air site, raises the question as to "which (one) stimulates 'better' understanding?" (Wickham-Jones, 1988: 198).

Another issue which requires evaluation is asked by Merriman (1988), who in considering the academic argument that commodified centres like Jorvik dupe and indoctrinate visitors, notes that "we have not seen how these representations of the past are actually consumed by the public" (Merriman, 1988: 147). Addyman and Gaynor (1984), the promoters of
the Centre, are themselves critical of what they regard as an archaeological failure to display excavated sites, particularly in the 1970s. What are preferred are (stone) Roman structures and medieval buildings of higher social status, to the detriment of other periods and excavated timber structures (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 7).

This trend, and a significant public interest in archaeological excavations in general (and the Coppergate dig in particular), and what is perceived as the public's lack of understanding of archaeology and the Viking Age (Addyman, 1989: 259), forms the theoretical background to the creation of the Centre. The two principal problems were the question as to the fate of the substantial, well-preserved remains, and the communication of the information gleaned to the public. The options of recording and destroying the remains or re-establishing them in the Yorkshire Museum were ruled out, partly because of the unique nature of this discovery (in England), and partly because of the unsuitability of the Museum due to lack of room.

Another option was considered by Addyman and Gaynor (1984), of preserving and presenting the remains in situ; "the impact which this would create in the public mind was felt to be a supremely compelling argument in favour of this option" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 9). Communication with the public would also be achieved by the York Archaeological Trust. This entity defined itself as an educational charity, "with as its prime charitable objective the education of the public.
in archaeology" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 9-11), and its Centre as the purveyor of that archaeological information (Addyman, 1989: 261).

The commercial connotations of that self-description, are supported by the nature of its sponsorship, which was in large part, a loan. This made it all the more necessary for a centre which was potentially well-sited in a renowned tourist city, and which could fit into the overall presentation of its history as an attractive component, to achieve visitor figure numbers of 500,000 per year, with "an imaginative display and systematic marketing" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 10), the latter controlled by Heritage Projects Limited. Though essential to the Centre, the marketing could not observe the educational theme.

The actual sequence was designed to begin with an orientation area, in which visitor perceptions would be "confirmed" or "corrected" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 11). This would be followed by the short regression sequence of the time ride, to enable the visitor to understand the difference in time between Twentieth century Coppergate, and its Tenth century precursor. The latter entity is then presented in the form of a three-dimensional reconstruction of an alley with its inhabitants and traders. Great reliance is placed on the "sensory input modes" of sight, sound and smell (Addyman, 1989: 259), if not touch and taste. This is followed by an overview of the excavation and interpretation of
the site in the late 1970s, before the visitors can proceed on foot into a "conventional museum gallery" and shop (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 12).

The "somewhat rigid layout" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 12) is partly rationalised by the reason that large visitor numbers in a confined underground environment strengthen fire and safety considerations. The Centre's narrative being perceived (by the Trust) as being complicated, is also a consideration. It is therefore presented in such a way as to be made interesting and educationally comprehensible by all visitors, irrespective of background.

If the Time Ride is restrictive, at least the Orientation Area and Museum Gallery permit scope for a more leisurely scrutiny. There is also "a database that can be re-interrogated, checked and re-evaluated academically" (Addyman, 1989: 261). In addition, an academic specialist is available for consultation, if required by inquisitive visitors (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 18). Presentational challenges and problems are acknowledged, but Walsh's criticism (1990) of the Coppergate Helmet Hologram notwithstanding for instance (Walsh, 1990: 287), the lighting scheme of the Objects Gallery as a whole has been designed to emphasise the cases. The colour sequence has "a richness which helps to promote the importance of the essentially very small artefacts" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 151).

The shop is also justified as an extension of a marketing
system which was created to meet public demand for "a range of interpretative material, together with souvenirs of their visit" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 15). As in the narrative, there is also variety in the souvenir range, to cater for all interests. Despite Fowler's labelling (1992) of the overall presentation mechanism as being "overtly Disney-inspired" (Fowler, 1992: 116), Addyman & Gaynor (1984) stress that to make the time-cars effective, the display concept actually "called for a quite different type of vehicle than those encountered in Disneyland and other leisure centres" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 16).

The claim by Shanks and Tilley (1987) of the politicised nature of the 'archaeologist as hero' narrative though, does seem to be backed by Addyman's claim (1989) that despite sample survey results, "the Jorvik Viking Centre is probably (an) effective propaganda machine for the Vikings and for archaeology" (Addyman, 1989: 262). Asserting a consciousness of the necessity to maintain academic integrity while simultaneously "educating the public in archaeology in an entertaining and enjoyable manner" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 18), Jorvik's management classifies itself in maintaining that it has created a "substantial and meaningful experience for far more people than normally enter the portals of a conventional museum" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 18).

Its commercial success had also put it in a position to repay its loan and utilise profits for rescue archaeology ventures.
Its developers could therefore believe that "the same subtle techniques of effective and accurate communication can be used to put across almost any archaeological message and to help to alter the nation's perception of almost any aspect of its past" (Addyman, 1989: 262). Direct and indirect real or planned examples of pseudo-Jorvik ventures, such as a proposal for an Eboracum Roman Centre (devised by the York Archaeological Trust), the development of the Canterbury Pilgrims Way (under the aegis of Heritage Projects Limited) and the plans for the Raunds Archaeological Park (Chapter One: 58) are cited as evidence.

Addyman (1989) does seem to acknowledge the argument by Pearce Pearce (1990) and Fowler (1987) that the Jorvik influence is finite. It is stated that "whether the developing sequels to Jorvik will be able to maintain archaeological integrity in the face of commercial pressure, the circumstances of the development, or the tenuous nature of the archaeological evidence, must be a cause for concern" (Addyman, 1989: 263). Any limitations cannot be ascribed to the Jorvik style however, "since there is little doubt that Jorvik methods of communication can implant whatever messages are formulated" (Addyman, 1989: 263). What matters is that "the messages should be worthy and responsible ones" (Addyman, 1989: 263).

What Owen (1996) would call an awareness of the power of the Jorvik message, is in it being the result of "a careful, thoughtful, balanced, and, it is hoped, non-tendentious
approach" (Addyman, 1989: 263). By 1991, this approach had netted nearly seven million sititors for the Centre itself, and over £20 million per year for York as a whole. Centres such as Jorvik were also community builders, in that they provided cultural foci in the midst of cultural zones; "it is no accident that the Coppergate shopping area, with the Jorvik Viking Centre at its core, was one of the most successful commercial ventures in the north during the last decade" (Addyman, 1991: 80).

This is not the only differentiation between presentation and purpose. When Fowler (1992) referred to Disney inspiration, it was in the context of the method (unlike other critics), rather than the objective of good, popular education (in his opinion). The Jorvik fostered Archaeological Resource Centre (ARC) nearby, is cited as an example of this distinction, in its use of the alternative format of hands-on experiments "to achieve an educational objective" (Fowler, 1992: 116).

Jones (1995) also draws a distinction in that "unlike the Jorvik Viking Centre which is a magnificent spectacle, the ARC (of which he is Director) actively encourages the visitor to participate" (Jones, 1995: 157). It has also been "hugely successful at communicating with a mass audience about the Vikings in York and archaeology in general" (Jones, 1995: 156).

In commercial, presentational and educational terms, the Jorvik Viking Centre would appear to have reached its objectives, at least from some academic perspectives. In doing so,
it has also raised issues, not to say controversies. The correction or confirmation of popular impressions of the Viking Age is one such issue. Before considering the public perspective of Jorvik, it would be appropriate to briefly consider the two main contemporary academic trends in perspectives of the Vikings, in the period before the opening of the Centre, so as to understand its translation for the benefit of the public.

Controversy is associated with this difference in academic perceptions, and its relevance in this study is in its direct influence on Jorvik and at large. A historically based perspective, utilising hindsight, could therefore develop a clearer picture of Jorvik as an influenced entity which is in turn directly responsible for the development of other centres. Addyman (1989) for instance, acknowledges that in trying to convey an accurate impression of what the archaeological evidence seems to say, "the interpretation reflects the archaeological methods employed during the excavation and the experience, background, and predilections of the York archaeologists of the 1970s and 1980s as much as any objective truth" (Addyman, 1989: 263).
Academic and Popular Perceptions of the Vikings.

An analysis of academic and popular perceptions of the Vikings in the early 1980s would also entail what Bintliff (1988) describes as the modern filter effect on interpretations of the past (Bintliff, 1988: 8), determining its significance in the topical formulation of Jorvik's image of the Vikings. Smyth (1995), in reviewing "a relentless catalogue of treachery and cruelty" by the Vikings (Smyth, 1995: 77) for instance, criticises what he regards as Victorian naivety about the 'noble savage', in a combination with revisionist and Post-Christian interpretations of heathen integrity which have "done much to sanitize our view of pagan barbarism" (Smyth, 1995: 77).

This view is translated in Smyth's non-academic history text as being a mixture of Nineteenth century (Wagnerian) romanticising of Norse heroes and "a radical view which gained ground in the 1960s (which) held that the Vikings were a rather misunderstood group of long-haired tourists" (Smyth, 1984: 107). Examples of their opportunistic cunning and terrorising are cited as proofs of the invalidity of such views (Smyth, 1984).

Wood (1980) also draws attention to a change in perception of the Vikings, from seeing them as destroyers to emphasising their role as "a creative catalyst in European civilisation" (Wood, 1980: 100). It is added though, that this latter theory is "now proving difficult to sustain when seen against the evidence ... as a whole" (Wood, 1980: 100). In a
contemporary text which has also since been reissued as a BBC Classics publication however, Magnusson (1980) argues that a more balanced perspective is forming. This is achieved "mainly through modern archaeology, but with the help of other scientific and literary disciplines as well, which presents the Vikings in a less lurid and more objective light ... less emphasis on the raiding, more on the trading; less on the terror, more on the technology of those determined and dynamic people ... and the positive impact they had on the countries they affected" (Magnusson, 1980: 7). The Vikings are also classified as "entrepreneurs" (Magnusson, 1980: 159), although an example of 1960s revisionism appears to be provided in the rationalisation of the first Viking raid as "an ordinary quayside brawl that got out of hand" (Magnusson, 1980: 124).

In a 'Radio Times' preview of the corresponding BBC television series, Sawyer (its consultant) was even more dismissive of such atrocity claims, insisting that the Vikings only broke the rules of battle like anyone else, when the opportunity arose; "people always will, when it is to their advantage, just like in secondary picketing" (Rogers, 1980: 72). These arguments are not so different in content from Cunliffe's comment (in a text accompanying his 1973 BBC series 'The Making of the English') that "far from being vicious savages ..., the Vikings were an organised people with complex law, ability to write, and evidently appreciative of a vigorous art style"
(Cunliffe, 1973: 44). Foote and Wilson (1970) also explicitly state their intention to focus on Scandinavian societies of the Central Middle Ages, so as to understand how "they maintained their commerce with the outside world, both peaceful and warlike" (Foote and Wilson, 1970: xvi).

The difference is that these revisionist views were being more strongly asserted and better publicised by 1980. This was not only because of the contemporary ten part BBC television series 'Vikings!', which was broadcast in that year, but also because of the acclaimed parallel major exhibition of the Vikings at the British Museum, one major exhibit (in the forecourt) being the reconstructed Viking Ship, Odin's Raven, which had itself featured prominently in the Manx Millennium anniversary celebrations of 1979.

In the literature of the exhibition, the guidebook presents a basic narrative of the Vikings, based on "about five hundred items ... from over forty institutions" (Anonymous, 1980: 1) and a reconstruction of the Hedeby House, focussed on the practicalities of nautical and domestic life, political and economic development. In a more detailed publication, Graham-Campbell and Kidd criticise both the idealistic and negativistic perspectives of the Vikings (Graham-Campbell & Kidd, 1980: 15), regarding Scandinavians (by definition) instead for instance, becoming "part of a vigorous mixed group involved in aggressive trading" (Graham-Campbell & Kidd, 1980: 52).
What aided the publicity was that sponsorship for the exhibition, in conjunction with Scandinavian Airways and the Nordic Council, was provided by Times Newspapers Limited. This guaranteed free publicity in the form of fourteen articles, fourteen items of correspondence and one educational wallchart promotion, in addition to nine other Viking related references, five of which concerned the Coppergate excavation (James et al, 1981a: 44). The excavation was also mentioned (complete with photograph) in the detailed guide (Graham-Campbell & Kidd, 1980: 31, 79, 180).

Wilson (1980) also emphasises the importance of significantly changed perspectives of the Vikings; "major interpretations have produced ideas that the exhibition demonstrates in digestible form" (Wilson, 1980: 39). The apparent contradictions of Scandinavian artists and adventurers could be "confidently expressed and explained by this exhibition" (Wilson, 1980: 40). There was nothing incongruous about such brutal people in a brutal age; "they were interested in gathering wealth for themselves by any means that would not leave them too liable to retribution or revenge. The line between raiding and trading was not too finely drawn" (Wilson, 1980: 40).

This exhibition was one of several which in recent years "have pursued the theme of the domestic Viking with accounts of Scandinavian towns and trade, craft, industry and art" (Hills, 1986: 179). Hills (1986) has also observed that
(exaggerated) accounts aside, "excavation of various Scandinavian towns have focussed attention on the domestic side of Viking life, and their achievements as craftsmen and artists, while their travels are now being described in terms of adventure rather than as piracy" (Hills, 1986: 179).

Attention is drawn (in a Channel Four text) to the understandable preference by modern Scandinavians for stressing "the more constructive sides of their ancestors' lives" (Hills, 1986: 178). This is a preference which is apparently shared by British scholars who have strong Scandinavian familial connections.

Apart from Magnusson (1980), one such Scandinavian authority is Randsborg (1982), whose own positive image is based on "recent archaeological finds and ... more broadly based studies" (Randsborg, 1982: 11). International inter-disciplinary cooperation has enabled archaeologists to study new themes such as settlement archaeology and reconsider existing material, aided by increasing utilisation of reconstructions which are themselves "an expression of this new interest and understanding" (Randsborg, 1982: 14).

An important supportive factor is the public interest in the past, as manifested by the popularity of related publications and media projects. In Scandinavia, an important reason "must, it seems, be a search for 'roots' and preferably roots capable of instilling pride and fostering imagination. In many ways, the Viking Age can do just this" (Randsborg, 1982: 14).
A interest in Viking 'roots' need not be indigenous either. Magnusson (1980) draws attention to the declaration of the Wood Quay site in Dublin by the High Court in 1978, as a National Monument because of its significance as a Viking site. It was an important sign that "the Vikings had been retrospectively naturalised and were now accepted as an integral part of the Irish heritage" (Magnusson, 1980: 152-53), by the public at least.

Nor was this public interest a passing fad, as evidenced by 'The Scandinavian Impact' series in 'History Today' in October and November 1986, and in newspaper articles such as 'Tracking down those mighty Viking warriors to Repton' (Nurse, 'Daily Telegraph', 27 February 1989: 12), or 'Danes find hall of the Viking Kings' (Follet, 'Times', 14 February 1992: 15). This public interest also had commercial possibilities, and not just in media or publishing terms.

As early as 1979, in one incident at Trondheim during the voyage of Odin's Raven from Norway to the Isle of Man, "a large and enthusiastic crowd swarmed around the ship to purchase posters and the products of a pop group calling themselves The Vikings" (Binns, 1980: 171). It is also noted that "Viking ships are familiar images which sell everything from beer to matches" (Wilson, 1980: 39).

Like the other revisionists, Randsborg (1982) emphasises that Vikings were neither better nor worse than their enemies, and mainly concerned with profit. This was achieved by the
acquisition of easily convertible assets, lands, and political dominance, yielding taxes and trade, excitement and fame; "behind this lay their capacity for taking advantage of new solutions" (Randsborg, 1982: 197). It is concluded that this dynamic and adaptable internationalist society, commercially prosperous if socially unstable, enabled the Vikings to utilise possibilities as they arose in very innovative ways; "their energy and enterprise made them quick to exploit every advantage" (Randsborg, 1982: 225).

Emphasis is also placed on the collapse of established Migration period trade routes as a reason for the Viking raids, "which expressed the violent forces unleashed when the big incomes ..., suddenly failed" (Randsborg, 1989: 222). This is interpreted as "economic recession, social unrest and war" in a popularised Channel Four text (Randsborg, 1984: 93).

It was also noted that "the archaeologist's view of the Viking Age was largely dependent on that of the historians" (Randsborg, 1982: 11). It would now seem that the reverse is true, and that in presentational terms, the inter-disciplinary positive model of the Vikings is the predominant one.

Smyth (1984), having presented Viking atrocities as being calculating if not cunning, rules them out as acceptable pre-conditions for long-term domestic settlement; "such households needed peace to survive; very soon the aims of ordinary Norse men and women began to coincide more and more with those of the conquered English population" (Smyth,
Evidence for Viking responsibility for the revival of urban settlements and commerce is also found, particularly in York (Randsborg, 1984: 114). Hall (1986) though, the excavator of Coppergate, draws attention to the existence of a pre-Viking trading centre in York (Hall, 1986: 30). This suggests a developing interest in Migration period urban settlements and re-use of Roman buildings which contributes to the overall archaeological database of Post-Classical and Pre-Medieval urban settlement patterns.

The best balanced model of the Vikings seems to be by Eldjarn (1982), who not only places emphasis on setting the activities of the Vikings in the context of their period, but strictly classifies a 'Viking' as being a pirate and only a pirate; "we must not forget that the soldier is often a very different person in combat than in everyday life at home ... many a man, after a blood-stained career as a Viking, settled down as a peaceful farmer ... perhaps an artistically gifted worker, ... a first-rate poet ..., lawmaker and peacemaker in his native district" (Eldjarn, 1982: 288).

Eldjarn (1982) saw popular interest in the Vikings to be on the increase, as evidenced by a proliferation of related books for all interests. This general interest was being largely managed by the archaeologists by now. Despite the scientific tendency in archaeology, as indicated in the British Museum exhibition, "the romantic view of the Viking still retains some of its
former hold on the popular imagination. It perhaps appears most clearly from the fact that commercialism has found it profitable enough to enlist it. There are Viking Airlines, Viking Hotels, and Viking God-knows-what in unlikely as well as likely places, to say nothing of motion pictures, the mass media, comic strips, and the souvenir industry. All of these things thrive because the Viking Myth - however altered or modified - lives on" (Eldjarn, 1982: 273).

More specifically for the purposes of this study, the commercial factor in York is powerful. Hall states that "images of Viking Age York, or Jorvik (to give it its Old Norse name), are many and varied. Consult the city's telephone directory as a guide to modern associations of the name and you'll encounter Jorvik Cleaning Services, Jorvik Furnishing, Jorvik Home Improvements, Yorvik Real Dairy Ice Cream and Yorvik Shipping" (Hall, 1994: 13). The commercial factor in the case of the Jorvik Centre was the really potent factor, because of the contemporary conditions.

The majority of texts which have been assessed in this section, are indicative of the filter effect of the 1980s. The use of the word 'Roots' by Randsborg (1982) is reminiscent of a widespread burgeoning interest in genealogy because of the popular 1970s book of that title by Alex Haley and spin-off television series, and the reference by Saywer (in Rogers, 1980) to the (now outlawed) 'Secondary Picketing' is reminiscent to industrial unrest in that same period.
The persistent and popularised academic model of Vikings as being dynamic, trans-continental merchant adventurers and unashamedly aggressive, opportunistic traders who actually thrived in an era of social upheaval and weak government differs however, in being not only a reflection of the prevailing free-market zeitgeist of the 1980s, but a promotion of it on the basis of historical precedent and example. Even in the former Soviet Union, archaeology was being utilised to support a theory of opportunistic Viking involvement in existing Slavic trade patterns, rather than previous (ethnic based) conflicting models of a Viking introduction of trade into Russia or the (Soviet backed) primacy of 'glamourous' (albeit Capitalist) Slavic trading states which attracted marginal outsiders (Magnusson, 1980: 109-111).

If the Jorvik project could adopt and endorse this model, it still had to be careful about how the public reacted to its presentation, if it was to achieve its commercial objective. Descriptive terminology which was acceptable among academics, even if informal, could still have a counter-productive effect. A BBC documentary on Viking York in 1981 had already been criticised in the 'Sunday Times' for its descriptions of York as a "bustling, thriving city, or an electric transformer, stirring up men's lives, ... especially when, in the same sentence, the city was doubling as a racial melting-pot" (Davies, 1981: 39).

It has also been argued that such televisual photo-realism
and verbal impressionism should be reversed for a more positive and plausible effect (Davies, 1981). The best method of analysing the Jorvik text and its derivative models, is to study the varied publications by Heritage Projects Limited, which are an extension of the policy of verifying popular views of the Vikings, at all educational levels.
Jorvik Publications.

Indications that this model of the Vikings is the one which was adopted and promoted by the Jorvik management are to be found both in the Centre and in its literature. The introductory illustration panels in the Orientation Gallery were replicated in the original introductory visitor guidebook of 1984, presenting the Vikings as busy traders at home and in the Middle East (by implication). In the Forward (written by Magnusson), Viking York itself is described as one of the greatest commercial cities in England.

The violent circumstances in which the Norse Kingdom of York was founded is only hinted at, and the 'horned helmet' symbol (of the barbaric image of the Vikings) is firmly refuted on the final page. This combined assertion of the commercial model and rejection of the barbarous one is also promoted in the 1989 edition. This approach has remained constant in official texts, although these publications are aimed at different audiences.

An introduction to a popularised historical background of Jorvik text, 'Viking Age York' (Hill, 1984), describes it as a "local and international trading centre" (Hall, 1984a: 13). In his archaeologically based 'The Viking Dig', it is stated that the Viking take-over of York "saw a revitalisation of the (long-abandoned) Coppergate area (Hall, 1984b: 48), and that there is archaeological evidence for regeneration and urban renewal with associated innovations. The evidence would also seem to suggest that "the overall picture was one of
prosperity - no matter whether a Viking or an Anglo-Saxon was king, it was business as usual at York's commercial heart. Even (frequent political changes) apparently did not affect the city's booming economy, and the expulsion of the last Viking king, Erik Bloodaxe, ... also seems not to have caused any noticeable commercial disruption" (Hill, 1984b: 66).

It is somewhat incongruously in the educational information pack that one 'innovation' in the Viking revival of York is acknowledged, in the form of a comment on the reported 'blood-eagle' human sacrifice rite (Hall, undated: A.2), along with archaeological evidence for a massacre. This is although the alternative theory of the associated remains being pagan burials is also tentatively forwarded elsewhere (Hall, 1984b: 47). In the information pack, Fell (undated) however, draws attention to the contemporary Christian bias against Vikings in a discussion of the written sources (Fell, undated: A.3).

Fell's text 'Jorvikinga Saga' (1984), which is the printed script of the Tenth century soundtrack is interesting however, in that it shows that if the model of a commercial past was being presented, it was not in the form of a sanitised preoccupation with self-absorbed trivia, might claim be claimed (Walsh, 1990: 286). Interwoven with the references to buying and selling, medicine and shipping for instance, is the theme of the dramatic confrontation between the poet, Sigil Skallagrimson and his enemy, Erik Bloodaxe, and the
former's permitted escape because of the improvised eulogy ('Head-Ransom') of the latter.

It is acknowledged that the primary source for these events, *Egil's Saga*, is not strictly historic fact, but as it is "the only source which purports to know of anything that took place in Viking Jorvik, ... this is the source of the basis of the scenes (overheard by the visitor) ... . Not everyone is talking about it, but it is, if not match of the day, at any rate the news of the moment" (Fell, 1984: 5). This is why the scene has been set in the Autumn of 948, when these events apparently occurred.

Apart from the (possibly) melodramatic element, this theme serves as a foundation for the presentation of Jorvik family relationships and tensions (1984, Act II, Scene 1: 11-14), and for an exposition on Norse maritime and trading practices in the quayside discussion sequence (1984, Act V, Scene 1: 19-20). Nor does the script omit references to Viking piracy, but in a detached rather than a judgemental context, as shown in these two extracts;

Arinbjorn: I'll need to go on another Viking raid next Spring.
Gyoa: You can bring me back a white headdress embroidered with gold.
Eymundr: ... No, they were on the west Viking circuit.
    They went raiding through Northumbria, and they
    founded a place called Scarborough.

Toki: I want to go.

Karl: Many splendid men sailed west on Odin's Raven, Toki.
    They sailed to the Hebrides - plenty of good harbours
    there - and then they made south for Man. Robin had his
    own ship.

Eymundr: They sailed a long way for fame. I sailed with
    Rognvaldr, son! He was a good man to follow and we
    came a long way for gold.

Karl: I was with Sigtruggr. I remember the weather was very wet
    and foggy. And he wasn't generous with the food.

Eymundr: Don't praise the day till it's over my friend.

Another interesting form of experimentation in the presentation
are the subliminal anachronisms in the script, as in the
reference to the Odin's Raven voyage of 1979, or to a
contemporary Yorkshire brewery;

Ulfr: I've come a long way with a great thirst. Where's the
    best beer in York?

Skotr: There's a man from Theakston who knows about brewing.
    It's an English ale and an old one.

Ulfr: Old and peculiar?
(Act IV, Scene 1: 17).
It would seem then, that a judicious use of a myth is made, which is itself regarded (on the basis of corroborative information) from the independent academic perspective of Smyth as being "well informed on Tenth century Northumbrian affairs" (Smyth, 1979: 169). It might also even be regarded as an updated form of the traditional role of the saga as a provision of entertainment (Eldjarn, 1982: 264).

The question arises however, as to how such a presentation can be decoded by the average visitor, as previously advocated (Chapter One: 53-54) when the language used is a contrived form of Anglo-Norse dialect. The very stress on authenticity, as in a stated distinction between Yorkshire Norse and Norwegian Norse (Fell, 1984, Act IV, Scene 1: 16), is one which might make the overall presentation all the more incomprehensible to the visitor who is not an Old Norse linguist, unless the script and its translation is purchased.

There is no such profit element in the (undated) press information handout, but the promoted theme remains the same. Apart from introducing the concept of the urban Viking, the Centre apparently exchanges "the Twentieth century bustle of shopping crowds in Coppergate, ... , for an equally bustling market in Tenth century Coppergate" (Press & Public Relations Department, undated: 1). The theme was also emphasised in independent publications, as in the positive reference in the popular History journal, 'History Today' (Addyman, 1984, 'Jorvik. Rebirth of a City', 34, 5: 43-45), to Viking rule.
having transformed York "into a new, vibrant and above all, immensely rich, international emporium and regional centre" (Addyman, 1984a: 43).

There is also the corresponding image of Jorvik harbour in the 'Illustrated London News' (Magnusson, 1984, 'A Journey Through Time', 272, 7029, 4: 50), as "the Crewe junction of North Sea trade, with coasters coming in from all over Northern Europe with their merchandise" (Magnusson, 1984: 50). More recently, the mercantile theme continues to be promoted on the Jorvik Internet website ('http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/never.html'). A potential first time visitor is informed that on arrival, "Viking inhabitants of the York of 1000 years ago will be eager to tell you the best place to buy wooden bowls or bone skates" (Wishart & Grant, 1999: 1), before seeing "the bustling market of Coppergate with its mass of traders all shouting for your custom" (Wishart & Grant, 1999: 2).

The positive public receptiveness to this theme can be independently corroborated. It is noted for instance, that among other themes, "more or less anything to do with the Vikings, are examples of subjects which already 'mean something', and so provide pegs upon which new stories can be hung" (Morris, 1999: 15). Jorvik has also merited an official acknowledgement, in the Government publication, 'Britain 1992. An Official Handbook', as being "among the newest museums" (Central Office of Information, 1992: 401), although its claim that the whole town has been reconstructed is mistaken.
Apart from stories, the archaeological evidence in York has shown Wood (1981) that "the impression is of a Viking centre ... with a settled sense of urban life" (Wood, 1981: 161).

A context also existed for enactments, in that "the point about Viking ship festivals, none very old, is not at all continuity, but its opposite, an attempt to cross a gap which is very well known to exist, and is really regretted by some" (Binns, 1980: 102).

Hills (1986) improves on the concept of the urban Viking by stating that the apogee of the house-trained Viking can be seen at Jorvik (Hills, 1986: 178). This is somewhat contradictory, considering a subsequently expressed doubt on the authenticity of the smells, given archaeological evidence for an extremely unhygienic town (Hills, 1986). The overall presentation is approved however, and placed in the context of Viking exhibitions in the British Museum and elsewhere, which in recent years, "have pursued the theme of the domestic Viking with accounts of Scandinavian towns and trade, craft, industry and art (Hills, 1986: 179).

Not all commentators are as generous. Hills (1986) considers the one major fault to be the unawareness of many visitors that the soundtrack is genuine Old Norse. Hewison (1987) though, refers to "dummies speaking Twentieth-century Icelandic" (Hewison, 1987: 84). To him, this is all part of the "archaeological equipment of the funfair ghost ride: a twelve-minute electric trolley tour round the recreation of a
Tenth century village (complete with) imagined Viking odours" (Hewison, 1987: 84). It is therefore worrying that when such museums "become one of Britain's new growth industries, they are not signs of vitality but symbols of national decline" (Hewison, 1987: 84).

Elsewhere, the actual number of significant finds is dismissed as being easily "displayed on the top of a single table" (Hewison, 1988: 6). Such a claim is actually used to strengthen the contention that the public success of Jorvik is typical of the usual heritage centre, in that the provision of a pleasurable experience for the visitor has replaced the scholarly role of preserving and interpreting a substantial number of objects (Hewison, 1988).

It should be noted that Hewison's assessment of Jorvik is at odds, not only with Fell's assertion that the soundtrack is Old Norse, but a management claim (quoted in the 'Sunday Times') that "a proverbial treasure chest of 15,000 artefacts" had been discovered at Coppergate (Huxley, 1984, 'When a dig hits paydirt', 'Sunday Times', 7 October: 13), or the listing of 230,000 pieces of pottery and five tons of animal bones in 34,000 layers (Hall, 1984: 14).

A more constructive criticism is made by Schadla-Hall (1984). He comments on the lengthy queues (putting visitors in a receptive frame of mind for the time-ride), the overwhelming effect on the senses in a limited time period, the over-sanitized excavation area which might be better positioned...
at the start, and the old-fashioned Artefact Hall, 
(intentionally?) resembling a "medium to high-class jeweller's shop" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 62).

The shop itself, is (unsurprisingly) described though, as an "extremely well laid out commercial operation" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 63), and the overall museum display commended as "a tremendous triumph of inventiveness and technical skill" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 63). There is also speculation however, as to the spontaneity of the public popularity and responsiveness to the Centre being actually based (in part) on "a really impressive media hype" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 63).

The surprising conclusion is then made that electric cars and daring if somewhat overdone reconstructions aside, Jorvik has "added nothing to the problem of displaying artefacts. There is very little that is new in terms of display technique that we haven't seen before" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 64).

An interesting aspect of the Jorvik promotion is in its management's tolerance of such criticisms (Addyman, 1989: 263). Addyman (1989) acknowledges the risk of trivialised archaeology and prepackaged, glossy but passivity inducing displays and corresponding lack of financial support for unglamorous museum activities. Yet "in an age of increasing skill and sophistication in communication, some new form of presentation is called for to which people can easily and readily respond" (Addyman, 1989: 263).

The expensive display of a Viking sock is criticised for
instance, in references in two 'True Stories' articles in the satirical magazine 'Private Eye' (Logan, 1982, 16 July, 537: 12, Logan, 1984, 13 January, 576: 14). It is also accepted in the Centre's Tenth anniversary publication, 'Jorvik 10' (Moore, 1994, 'Welcome to the Queue', 12 April: 17), along with general criticisms from the visitors (Anonymous, 1994: 3).

In publicising the Centre, its promoters are also careful to qualify the authenticity of the promotion, as in referring to "the illusion of a living Viking Age street" (Addyman, 1984a: 46). Magnusson (1984) states that the time ride provides the pioneering perspective of "both the reality and the marvellous illusion of the past ... here reality and illusion merge into perfect presentation" (Magnusson, 1984: 50). In an article for a historically minded audience, it is also noted that the York Archaeological Trust's opinion is that "the general impression (Jorvik) gives of life in Viking-age York is reasonably close to the truth" (Addyman, 1984a: 45).

Not so easy to promote in terms of plausibility is the 'Time Tunnel'. The press handout refers to the 'Time Tunnel' by which visitors are carried back through the centuries by means of Twentieth century technology; "the passage of time from the present day back to the Viking era is evoked by a procession of figures representing citizens from each age of York ... . Leaving the Tenth century, Jorvik's 'time travellers' proceed through a realistic reconstruction of the Coppergate dig" (Press & Public Department, undated: 1).
In the Jorvik website description, "you climb aboard your magic timecar ... moving backwards on a journey through time, you will start to move closer and closer to the world of the Vikings in York ... past the ghostly generations of figures from deeper and deeper into the past" (Wishart & Grant, 1999: 1). Magnusson (1984) and Addyman (1984) also seek to create the illusion of time travel, the former describing the arrival of the timecar in the reconstruction and later departure as follows; "time has stopped now. It is late afternoon on October 28, in the year 948. History is frozen. All these people have come to life ... in a frozen instant of activity ... and now, an abrupt switch through the time warp again" (Magnusson, 1984: 50).

The design of the Time Tunnel is justified by Addyman (and Gaynor) on the grounds that it is meant "to stress the very long period of time that has elapsed since the Viking age - a simple enough concept; but one which the average person finds extremely difficult to grasp, and which it is difficult to convey meaningfully" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 11). Schadla-Hall (1984) appears to agree with this though, in that although he appreciates the reason for the "rather unrealistic monochrome mannequins representing ... figures from ... the Nineteenth to the Thirteenth century" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 62), "the people I spoke to afterwards did not always appreciate the idea, and it really was a little like a rather smooth ghost-train ride" (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 62). He subsequently expressed doubts as to its lasting
effect, regarding its popularity as being welcome relief after
the lengthy queueing outside the Centre (Schadla-Hall,
1984: 63-64).

Reactions in the media can also be illuminating. If for
instance, Jorvik is described as being "perhaps the most
accessible archaeological experience available" (Caulkin,
1994: 8), it may also be observed that "the modern techniques
used at the Jorvik Centre ... arouse suspicion, usually from
those who have not seen them" (Balmer, 1990: 65). The question
is whether Jorvik's publicly stated role of it being a powerful
means of introducing the concept of the Vikings as urban
colonists (to readers of the 'Illustrated London News') and
"demonstrating the power of archaeology - rescue archaeology at
that - to recover and preserve for us whole swathes of the
nation's lost history" (Addyman, 1984a: 50) is sufficiently
appreciated by the media.

One report is quite complementary, regarding the visit as
more like a fun-fair ride than an endurance test" but also
commending it for being highly educational (Ferriman, 1989:
45). Montgomery-Massingbird (1989), also using funfair
language (Like Hewison, Schadla-Hall and Ferriman), notes that
visitors "are transported back in a sort of ghost train to the
Viking age" (Montgomery-Massingbird, 1989: 10). He also
praises such institutions for their provision of fairly
harmless entertainment for the family; "at their best these
heritage centres can provide an educational and entertaining
day out" (Montgomery-Massingbird, 1989: 10).

The management of Jorvik is also prepared to use fairground terminology, as in the broadcast observation by Julia Delaney of Heritage Projects Limited, in the Channel Four programme on 11 October 1989, 'Signals: Theme Park Britons', that "it was Heritage Projects at Jorvik who first cracked the marketing formula, putting 500 people an hour on a twelve minute historical ghost train" (Holmes, 1989).

There is however, a mixed reaction to the process of orientation. The "few simple details" about the violent and peaceful activities of the Vikings are noted (Ferriman, 1989: 45). A description of the time ride is concluded "through the real archaeological remains of the city, which have been made much more comprehensible by your visit" (Ferriman, 1989: 45). Keys (1988), clearly a supporter of the positive view of the Vikings, because of his reference to Viking raids being "only ten per cent of the period of Scandinavian influence and power in Britain" (Keys, 1988: 22), simply describes visitors being able to eavesdrop on Old Norse conversations and "see the lifesize models of the town's former citizens going about their daily business" (Keys, 1988: 22).

Andrew (1990) is more hostile to the Time Journey, though he does acknowledge that this is what "pulls in the visitors in their hundreds of thousands" (Andrew, 1990: 37). Apart from querying the plausibility of positioning the orientation sign to it, opposite a sign to the toilets, the Time Journey is 106
familiarly described as "very much like a fairground ghost train" (Andrew, 1990: 37). It is also criticised for its confusing of the senses and unreal stasis.

Despite the convincing simulation of Viking town life by means of the buildings and artefacts, Jorvik "claims to reproduce the actual experience of being in a Viking city, and this it signally fails to do. In fact it presents a rather false version of the past" (Andrew, 1990: 37). As for the figures, "creatures of a twilet underworld" (Andrew, 1990: 37), their problem is that "they are plainly other, a different species, and the Time Journey's striving after immediacy only renders them the more remote and unreal. This is as serious a mistake as it opposite, which would make the people of all ages just like us" (Andrew, 1990: 37).

One way to avoid stasis is to update the displays, especially when updated technology is available to interpret updated material. The reconstructed visages of Jorvik is one such example, and an interesting means of ensuring that the figures were no longer "dingy, grotto-dwelling grotesques" (Andrew, 1990: 37). In April 1991, "the most important development at the Centre since it opened in 1984" was announced by the management (Anonymous, 1991: 9).

It took the form of a reconstructed head which was contrived by computer and laser based interpretations of an excavated Viking era skull in York. 'Eymund the Fisherman' would then replace the existing figure in the ship tableau, as the
start of a plan to ensure that "all the figures will have the faces of people from York's Viking past" (Davenport, 1991: 3). Addyman was to subsequently comment that "we can look forward to a street peopled with Viking-age citizens" (Hawkes, 1991: 91). Despite criticism of of this proposal (Davies, 1991: 22), by 1994, a further seven reconstructed 'Vikings' were reported as being installed, out of a target number of thirty-one (Pithers, 1994: 25).

The Assistant Director was reported as claiming that "there was no better way for people to relate to individuals, even from the past, than by seeing their faces" (Pithers, 1994: 25). The figures were also given names "to popularise if not exactly authenticate" them (Pithers, 1994: 25). This was a form of community construction which has its roots in the 'Jorvikinga Saga' and in such projects as a 'Name the Boy' (Toki) competition in Yorkshire schools in 1984 (Magnusson, 1984: 50).

By 1999, the Jorvik website could contain a file which was titled 'Visited Jorvik Viking Centre before - loved it then, what's new now?', in which the process of character and clothing reconstruction was described complete with photographs, along with opportunities to strike coins or play a Viking board game in authentic settings. There were even "friendly Vikings ... on hand" (York Archaeological Trust, 1999, 'http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/new.html': 1).

One such friendly Viking would "tell you stories of his
eventful life in Jorvik and help you to understand exactly where his house fits in with the rest of the mighty metropolis" (York Archaeological Trust, 1999, [http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/new.html](http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/new.html): 1). The opening of a 'Virtual Viking Shop' on the Internet was also promised (York Archaeological Trust, 1999, [http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/makepost.html](http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/makepost.html): 2).

Despite the changes and updating of the displays though, it is advisable to recall Moore's comments, which were as relevant in 1999, as when they were made in 1993. The York Archaeological Trust is praised for having "succeeded in making lay people interested in archaeology (although a certain amount of academic sniffiness has been directed at this populist approach). What is less certain is whether the Trust's efforts reveal the past or fabricate it. ... even the most literal reconstructions require invention and compromises with accuracy; if nothing else, the modern leisurewear of the customers will always destroy the illusion" (Moore, 1993: 13).

It is then stated that "given too, that knowledge of Viking and medieval life is incomplete, it is misleading to present such rounded simulacra, implying that every detail is based on fact. Despite the best efforts of archaeologists, the past is still a mystery that no number of resurrected cake recipes can or should dispel" (Moore, 1993: 13). The Jorvik innovations in the 1990s may therefore continue to be regarded as being the pioneering examples of terrestrial and
cyberspace innovations and experimentations in presentation.
This is based on a realistic managerial awareness of the enterprise and its resources. Alternately, it may be dismissed as an overrated, money minded, trendy manipulation of superficial, homogenous commodification.
The Perceived Influence of Jorvik.

In writing the Foreward to 'The Viking Dig' (Hall, 1984), HRH the Prince of Wales expressed the hope that "the story of Coppergate may ..., provide an inspiration for others to take similar opportunities, not only in York but in other historic cities in Britain" (Hall, 1984: 5). Given its financial background and financial obligations, an obvious motivation existed for the Jorvik management to be somehow involved in influencing if not overseeing those opportunities, even if this might appear to create competition.

Delaney claims that "Heritage Projects are advising about thirty clients on their proposed heritage attractions, not only in this country, but abroad as well. Many people approach us, wanting a Jorvik Viking Centre in their town or city. Most of these cities and towns have a reason for being there. So there is usually, if you look hard enough, a good story to tell. And that's really the business that we're in. What we do is to interest people in the subject so much that they go out of the door, dying to take something home with them, to remember their experience" (Holmes, 1989).

The claim of influence was updated in the same way that the displays were in 1994, when in commenting on the reconstructed heads installation, the Assistant Director of the York Archaeological Trust stated that "it is an astonishing application, and we are now being asked by other centre at home and abroad to help them create similar images"
The Jorvik influence was by no means automatically all pervasive though, even in York itself. The highlight of a newspaper report of another discovered Viking site in York in 1988, was of its imminent destruction (Keys, 1988: 5). Although the substantial Roman remains there also formed the potential for the creation of an identikit underground centre at Micklegate, albeit with a Roman theme (Shillam, 1994: 12), the funds for even a thorough excavation were unavailable. Nor could a similar opportunity be exploited for such a development purpose shortly afterwards (Shillam, 1994: 12).

Addyman (1991) has acknowledged that incidents such as this can only have a negative effect on cooperative relations between archaeologists and developers (Addyman, 1991: 79). Yet apart from the benefits to the Jorvik management itself, York was apparently benefiting to the tune of over £20 million per year (Addyman, 1991: 80). Ironically enough, the Micklegate controversy had arisen because the City Council was benefiting "from a new economic upsurge and (was) actively encouraging development of the ancient city" (Keys, 1989: 4). In another ironic development which is indicative of the potential risks in archaeology being over closely linked with commerce, the Roman Centre plan remained a plan despite the survival of possibly extant Roman remains, because "development in York has virtually ground to a
halt" (Shillam, 1994: 12).

Despite the undoubted commercial success of Jorvik itself, something else was and is evidently required to give archaeology a greater public significance in its own right, than a change in planning laws to prevent such Micklegate scenarios from occurring again. This need was especially acute in 1989, as the contemporaneous controversies of the Rose Theatre and Huggin Hill sites in London had also placed archaeology in a heightened, and from a developer's point of view perhaps, troublesome media image.

The Archaeological Resource Centre (ARC) was to be that means of promoting archaeology, Walsh's, Fowler's and Jone's references to it being a successor to Jorvik having already been noted (Chapter Three, 73; 81). Addyman (1991) agrees, by describing ARC as a sequel (Addyman, 1991: 80). In its official literature, the ARC management, while acknowledging associations with Jorvik, states in its 1992 guide for instance, that "the ARC adds to the Jorvik experience by allowing visitors to participate in archaeology through a pioneering combination of exhibits they are positively encouraged to touch" (York Archaeological Trust, 1992: 33).

The ARC Internet website adds that its staff are "there to help and explain the wonderful world of archaeology in as much detail as you want" (York Archaeological Trust, 1999, 'http://www.jorvik-viking-centre.co.uk/arc.html': 2).

Furthermore, in an introductory guidebook for teachers,
it is acknowledged that the ARC was set up "partly in response
to visitors who wanted to know more" (Binns, 1990: 1). It is
also made clear that if pupils are brought to both centres,
'it does not matter which you visit first' (Binns, 1990: 1).

Jones summarises the proposed ARC policy as follows; "the brief
was to design interactive exhibits that were accessible and
interesting to visitors of all ages and backgrounds. ...
The aim was to design an academically sound yet exciting place
for anyone interested in archaeology and what archaeologists
do" (Jones, 1995: 157). Visitors are "encouraged to participate
in a wide variety of absorbing activities in which they handle
archaeological finds, experiment with replicas to investigate
early technology, and discover how computers are used by
today's archaeologists" (Jones, 1995: 157).

In a further technical development which is subtly linked with
Jorvik, visitors could also study 'The World of the Vikings'
on an interactive video disc and CD-ROM (York Archaeological
Trust, 1999: 2). This production had been available since 1993,
as a result of a collaboration with the National Museum of
Denmark, and contained both museum display and educational
versions for users (Fuentes, 1993: 112). In promoting ARC in
the media, Jones carefully stressed that "it was academically
sound but not a museum where the collection is in the focus:
neither is it a press-the-button-and-run fun palace" (Elson,
1993: 31). He has also explained the unity of the staff despite
their different roles and responsibilities as "a community
working together on different levels. We want to demystify (archaeology)" (Williams, 1996: 14). On the subject of contact with the community, a temporary 'Winter Lights' festival in December 1996 had been planned to coincide not only with Advent, but the Jewish Chanukah and Hindu Diwali festivals (Williams, 1996).

The ARC is also contrasted from Jorvik by Jones (in Williams, 1996) in that "the Viking centre made archaeology accessible to an extent never accomplished previously. But it was a statement, a set display. The tactile, hands-on bit was missing. That's what the ABC was set up to provide" (Williams, 1996: 14). In response, a reporter who had wondered if the hands-on activities were actually child-labour exploitation, became convinced that it was "altruistic energy-to-work conversion as never seen before. As the visitors beavered away they became part of the display" (Elson, 1993: 31).

Given these themes of community involvement and innovative (video) display, an elaboration of Walsh's appraisal (1992) of the ARC also displays his (qualified) endorsement of it (Walsh, 1992: 173-74). He does express concerns however, with such ground breaking advances as what is disparagingly referred to as 'scout camp' archaeology. This is an understanding of the past as promoted through recreations of activities such as cooking or flint-knapping; "such presentations are in fact quite superficial as they deny any consideration of the contexts within which an activity would have taken place."
They are artificial, as the activities normally tend to be 'doable'. There are no real difficulties, let alone impossibilities. All the necessary materials are available, and someone is present to help you if you get stuck. This is probably not representative of the 'real' world" (Walsh, 1992: 174).

The ARC may be the main flagship for the York Archaeological Trust's educational enterprises (Jones, 1995: 157), but offshoot enterprises have been encouraged in other English towns. It is recalled that the Trust, preoccupied with Rescue Archaeology, encouraged its development team to form Heritage Projects Limited, which was to collaborate with the University of Oxford and the Canterbury Archaeological Trust to establish centres in those cities (Addyman, 1994: 11).

That there were differences in outlook was evident, the Trust's aim being "to educate the public in archaeology. All its resources go into either research or the communication of that research, described by (the) Project Co-Ordinator as 'the very essence of collective memory'" (Caulkin, 1994: 8). Heritage Projects by contrast, aimed to "combine Disney display with Jorvik integrity" (Reisz, 1988: 34), in projects which would apparently bring alive entire environments which are described by their Creative Director as "pop-up books on a human scale" (Davenport, 1987: 11).

Apart from "brain-picking visitors" to Jorvik or ideas being "lifted wholesale" by non-affiliated centres elsewhere
(Addyman, 1994: 11), Heritage Projects have been directly involved in consultative activities, as in the £10000 study of the future development of the Cosmeston Medieval Village near Cardiff (Selkirk, 1991: 61). There was also the reported involvement of its Creative Director in the design of the Celtica Interpretive Centre in Machynlleth, Montgomeryshire (Croall, 1996: 21), and its Set Designer in the construction of The Tales of Robin Hood (Anonymous, 1991, 10). There was even the forwarding of a proposed visitor centre plan for Stonehenge to English Heritage (Balmer, 1990: 65).

The popularity of Jorvik was in itself recognised as being significant by Walsh (1992), not least in encouraging people to visit the Jewry Wall Museum in Leicester, "because a visit to Jorvik had instilled a wider interest in the past of their own place. ... There is no doubt that this effect has been repeated all over the country" (Walsh, 1992: 173). Yet if the effect was repetitious, the mechanics underlying it were not.

Superficial comparisons with Jorvik as a tourist attraction have been made, as in the description of "the crude ghost train thrills of skulls and skeletons along the route of (the) suspended time capsule through the magical forest" (Fowler, 1992: 117). It is also implied, as in the title of an article concerning the Tower Hill Pageant being 'London's Answer to Jorvik?' (Fuentes, 1988: 448), or in a description of the ARC being "the father of so many offspring" in an article on the Lincoln Archaeological Centre (Selkirk, 1991: 16).
owler's description (1992) however, is by way of demonstrating that a Nottingham style of presentation (which has been shown to be distinguished from the Jorvik style) "involves ... an element of glitz" (Fowler, 1992: 117). Nor, in a description of the development of the Lincoln Archaeology Centre did a member of staff refer to the ARC, ascribing its main design influence instead to the conviction that "since schools were likely to become major users, the Centre should explain archaeological processes in a way which would interest and inform schoolchildren. This is embodied in the subtitle of the Centre: 'How we study Lincoln's past'" (Bennett, 1990: 41).

A commentator on the Tower Hill Pageant in London also differentiated between it and Jorvik in that in Jorvik, "one rides through a single scene, a piece of recreated townscape; here, one passes by a series of historical vignettes. One gains a feeling of change, but loses the feeling of involvement" (Orton, 1991: 351). The Pageant has also been commended on its own merits, in that "it seeks to convey not just what archaeologists know, but how they reason" (Rhodes, 1992: 23).

It also differentiates from the 'urban Viking' theme at Jorvik in its portrayal of the Vikings as unwelcome sailors (Gosling, 1991: 10), or as aggressive attackers of the distinctly separate English population of London (Gosling, 1991: 12). Such a view, reflected in the paradoxical media image of
rampageous pseudo-Santa Claus worshippers attacking Saxon London (Keys, 1996: 1), suggests that traditional stereotypes are as strong (at least in publicity value) as ever.

The Tales of Robin Hood is also different, because of its theme, which makes it "a fascinating exercise in using a powerful and enduring story to explore the power of myths and legend, and as a way of studying medieval life and local history. It cleverly keeps the romance of the tales alive while never presenting fiction as fact" (Haigh, 1998: 14).

A similarity does exist in the presentation of the theme, with the statement by a spokesperson for The Canterbury Tales, that it "gives the flavour of Chaucer's tales, without encroaching on their academic integrity" (Billen, 1988: 7).

There is also a negative similarity with Jorvik. A reported disadvantage of the adventure ride approach is that you miss the opportunity offered at a more conventional exhibition or museum to linger over exhibits or to go back to them" (Haigh, 1988: 14). The absence of someone to explain the details which are seen all too briefly, and the conflicting noises on the soundtrack, have also incurred criticism (Haigh, 1998: 14).

Turning to a consideration of Viking themed displays abroad, the (English language) guidebook of the Wikinger Museum Haithabu in Schleswig, Germany, does not refer to Jorvik. Its stated theme of the "material world of the Vikings" (Schietzel, 1988: 1), and presentation of the urbanisation...
of a Scandinavian trading settlement on structural and functional criteria (Schietzel, 1988: 33), indicates which image of the Vikings is preferred, despite the admission of several destructive raids (Schietzel, 1988: 42).

In any case, the real foundation and inspiration for the presentation, was based on the site and harbour of Haithabu itself with its extensive finds, rather than in an example set by Jorvik. If there is a resemblance with any Viking themed centre, it is in the preserved and presented longboat fragment displays which are comparable with those on show at the Viking Ship Museum in Roskilde, Denmark.

In the Republic of Ireland, the Dublin Viking Centre was quite different however, in that it was a visit to Jorvik by the Managing Director of Irish Life Assurance PLC which gave him the idea to fund a similar enterprise in Dublin (1). Kingston's stated difference though, is in the combination of "a reconstruction of the buildings and the waterfront excavated at Wood Quay with live characters of the type you would have met if you had visited Dublin a thousand years ago. We have created the only living museum of the Viking Age. Nowhere else can you talk to Vikings and ask them questions in their natural habitat" (Wallace, 1988: 1).

The theme promoted also contrasted with that in London, in that the hope was expressed that visitors would leave "with a sense of respect for those first Dubliners ... far from being marauding savages (which is the modern image of the
Vikings), they actually laid the commercial and civic foundations of what remains our capital city" (Wallace, 1988: 1). This may be compared with Wallace's belief in the greater significance of discovering how Ireland's cities were developed than in finding the founders; "the Irish media want to see Vikings, whereas in fact what we have are settlements that are a unique fusion of Scandinavian, English, and native Irish ideas and influences" (Hammond, 1990: 12).

It was also hoped that "the re-creation ... shows that archaeology is a relevant part of all our lives, and not the dry preserve of some ivory-tower elite" (Wallace, 1988: 12). Yet despite Wallace's assertion that "the word 'Viking' means money in the bank" (Hammond, 1990: 12), and the hope that the apparent success of the "potent money spinner" in Dublin would serve as an impetus for Viking excavations and even centres in cities elsewhere, as appeared to be the case in Limerick (Hammond, 1990: 12), the story of Viking archaeology in that country continued to be as troubled as in the era of the Wood Quay controversy.

The authorities concerned however, do appear to be capable of learning from their mistakes, as in the demolition and pseudo-reconstruction elsewhere of part of a unique Viking city wall at Wood Quay (Swain, 1987: 8), which led to accusations against Dublin Corporation of "cultural vandalism" (Walshe, 1987: 3), two years before a discovery of another wall portion under Dublin Castle initiated a carefully organised preservation...
and presentation programme (Murdoch, 1989: 5).

The Viking Adventure has itself closed twice in the 1990s due to financial difficulties, but its Internet website promised a reopening in 1998. The presentation would be updated in that a "Norse guide" would take "visitors on a fascinating journey through a Dublin of long ago"

('http://www.temple-bar.ie/archaeology/viking.html', 1997: 1), in which they could "chat to the local people" in this "live interactive experience of life" in Viking Dublin

('http://www.temple-bar.ie/archaeology/viking.html', 1997: 1), a highlight of which would be a "Viking feast"


Economic circumstances notwithstanding, Wallace's reaffirmation of the economic value of the Viking image in 1992 (2) may still be valid. The positive (indigenous) nature of that image would also still seem to be accepted as valid, a guidebook for the Irish National Heritage Park in Ferrycarrig, Wexford, for instance, acknowledging the initial piratical Viking activity in Ireland but detailing commercial and urbanising activities (Culleton, 1987: 40-41).

This does not mean that the negative side of the Viking settlement of Ireland is being publicly denied, as in the publicising of archaeological proof for a massacre of Irish women and children, in a guidebook to the Dunmore Caves in Kilkenny (Adams, 1978: 20). The Viking theme remains an acceptable one however, simply because of its time period, 122
which make it less controversial than more recent themes in Irish history (3).

Turning now to the question of whether post-Jorvik or sub-Jorvik developments can become formative influences in turn, the subtle influence of both the ARC and the Lincoln Archaeology Centre in the new hands-on archaeological gallery in the Tolson Memorial Museum in Huddersfield, has certainly been recognised (Hall, 1994: 19). Elsewhere, a fusion of "traditional exhibition techniques" and the "interpretive advances made by the Moesgaard Viking Houses in Arrhus, Denmark, the Jorvik Viking Centre ... and the Viking Adventure in Dublin" was reportedly made in a reconstruction in a temporary exhibition at the Perth Museum and Art Gallery (Hall, 1995: 21).

Jorvik could also obtain indirect publicity, as in the references to the inclusion of the Coppergate helmet (and its provenance) in the 'Making of England' exhibition in the British Museum of 1991. This exhibition was more expansive in intent than its 1980 predecessor, but emphasised instead, a strictly English "period of great political and cultural development ... a watershed between barbarism and civilisation" in the view of its Co-Organiser (Bailey, 1991: 28).

The traditional negative view of the Vikings is also shown in the guidebook, which refers to "the threat of permanent ... occupation" and "the intensity of Viking raids" (Loverance, 1991: 9). Recalling the modern filter effect theory,
it may be noted that November 1991 was notable for the negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty, which provoked a hostile response by English opponents of greater European integration.

The point of the exhibition was, as its sub-heading shows, to present 'Anglo-Saxon Art and Culture' in a reflection of socio-political changes "which were to transform Anglo-Saxon England into a unified kingdom" (Loverance, 1991: 1). There would seem to be no aversion to the concept of integration and unified development by itself, although it was by and for the English, not aggressive foreigners. This is a theme which has also been promoted in the Tower Hill Pageant, and which was reflected in contemporary media reports of the exhibition, as in the claim that "even the Danes did not halt Alfred's age of enlightenment" (Williams, 1991: 9).

Even if the positive theme of the Vikings was not universally accepted in Viking-themed presentations, Addyman's statement that "the introduction of Jorvik's methods of presentation - and latterly also those pioneered at the ARC ... into museums of all kinds throughout the world" (Addyman, 1994: 11), appears to be plausible if not proven. Commercial motivation is unhesitatingly cited at least, in that "after Jorvik, ... museums can never afford to be the same again" (Addyman, 1994: 11).

Yet despite this confident assertion and corresponding concern that "so many of our best archaeologists are not doing archaeology - they are doing visitor centres,
or environmental projects" (Selkirk, 1991: 61), there are indications that this is certainly not entirely the case. As early as 1985, the refurbished Anglo-Saxon and Viking Life galleries at the Yorkshire Museum, are conspicuously commended for enabling the visitor "to enjoy the arts and crafts of ordinary urban Vikings" in a presentation "with not a time-car in sight" (Thomas, 1984: 23).

Funded by profits from the 1980 exhibition at the British Museum, its designers were keen to write the text for the graphic panels in the galleries, in a style "which was interesting and enjoyable enough for the public to absorb" (Hartley, 1984: 21). Given the favourable reaction of (observed) visitors to the graphics as well as the object displays, this makes an interesting contrast with the criticised "oppressively scholarly" content of 'The Making of England' catalogue (Geddes-Brown, 1992: 16). This was probably because in York, apart from selecting which relevant and interesting facts from the database to present to the public, "numerous archaeologists were approached for opinions on the latest trends of thought on the subject" (Hartley, 1984: 21).

Although Addyman's recovery of "the hard (archaeological) evidence" which underlines the text is given credit in a review (Thomas, 1984: 24), Jorvik itself is not referred to in the Yorkshire Museum guidebook. What is mentioned is the 'Head-Ransom' incident and the discoveries in Coppergate (Hartley, 1985: 23-24). A form of balanced Viking image similarly
exists in the acknowledgement of Viking skills (Hartley, 1985: 24-25) and summary of Viking rule of York as "a period of almost a hundred years of political upheaval and violence" (Hartley, 1985: 22). The focus of the collection though, is stated in the Frontispiece as being on "everyday life" (Hartley, 1985: Frontispiece).

One further point about the Yorkshire Museum which should be noted, in consideration of general calls for better uses of collections and audio-visual experimentations, is that it was observed by the management that visitors were reportedly more interested in the objects and graphics than in an audio-visual commentary on the art of Northumbria. This was contrary to expectations, because "the decision to use such a wealth of information was based on the fact that the story of Northumbria and the Viking Kingdom of York could not be got across to the public just by using the collections alone, especially as most visitors would not be familiar with the history or everyday life of the period" (Hartley, 1984: 21).

The stress on veracity in Jorvik itself (Addyman, 1989: 261), has actually been criticised as an "assumption that authenticity is some kind of guarantee that the visitor will have some kind of 'true' experience" (Davies, 1990: 17). Yet Davies himself made the assumption that "museums are under threat from heritage centres which use up scarce resources and draw visitors away" (Davies, 1990: 17), just as Hewison, echoing Cleere's comment (1988) about the thin edge of the
wedge, warns that The Oxford Story "represents the very darkest edge of a wide spectrum" (Farrell, 1991: 3).

Hewison has been criticised in a review of 'The Heritage Industry' on the subject of accuracy, in being asked if everybody should visit Jorvik to undertake a critical analysis of the past; "such centres provide a more easily digestible and less academic presentation of the past. ... Are not Hewison's objections to heritage centres as elitist as the elitist concept of history he is attacking?" (Boyle, 1988: 199).

On economic grounds alone though, the threat of such centres might be perceived as being more chimerical than real. Apart from the failure to establish a Roman centre in York itself, it was noticed as early as 1989 that The Oxford Story and The Canterbury Tales were experiencing difficulties; "neither has yet shown Jorvik's pulling power" (Bond, 1985: 14). Shillam (1994) has gone so far as to take the pessimistic view, that if another Jorvik was discovered, "would it ever see the light of day? The sad answer is that it probably would not" (Shillam, 1994: 12).

This pessimism is corroborated by Gaynor's admission in 1989, that "the success of Jorvik was possibly a one-off" (Davies, 1989: 17), given that Oxford and Canterbury were conceded as not attracting the anticipated visitor numbers. Yet Gaynor's warning that museums "had to enter the market place to survive" in the absence of increased state funding (Davies, 1989: 17), does not seem to be as enduring a warning as Aldous's
statement against 'Commoditisation' and the notion that 'the public' (placed between the few thousand members of local archaeology societies and the eight million visitors to Jorvik to date) "were always and only consumers" (Aldous, 1998: 34). Instead, they engage with archaeology in "a sustainable and non-consuming way" (Aldous, 1998: 34).

The engagement as such in Hastings was actually antipathetic, when a group of residents reacted in a hostile way to a council backed proposal to establish a Jorvik style centre in that town (McGhie, 1992: 4). The beneficial effects of Jorvik on York itself have also been queried; "a historic city becomes a set of stimulations and simulations in a highly controlled pedestrian environment" (Moore, 1993: 13). Even worse, centres like Jorvik have helped induce a transition of cities like York into "honeypots (which) start to vanish under the swarms of tourists" (Barrett, 1992: 19).

Addyman has himself been quoted as acknowledging that "Jorvik may well have been the catalyst setting up a chain of events that have been damaging to the city" (Bond, 1989: 14). What with the Government encouraging tourism however, the advocated answer to such a scenario was good management (Bond, 1989). Yet if the local authority itself is anti-tourism centre's development can be made difficult.

The Director of Heritage Projects has claimed that this was the case in Oxford, where (unlike the retailers of Coppergate) queues were not condoned (Bond, 1989). Nor might the
location of a centre make much difference to its surroundings. On the contrary, the difficulties at Oxford and Canterbury have been partly ascribed to their being off the main tourist trail (Bond, 1989). The influence of a centre on its location and vice versa, would seem to be based on indigenous circumstances. Independent constructive criticism is also proferred, as in the statement that while Jorvik for instance, provides the spectacle for pleasurable stimulus, "an historical evolved framework and encouragement to search beyond would add the extra valuable dimension" (Carr, 1991: 5). Finally, it should be noted that the Jorvik development and influence, is but one component in a greater sequence of development, for all its (publicised) pre-eminence.

New archaeological displays in the Stoke-on-Trent City Museum and Art Gallery for instance, are described as possessing an approach "that is traditional in comparison to the typical post-Jorvik experience. They centre on curatorial and user flexibility combined with an awareness of the need for accessibility, liveliness and the needs of the National Curriculum" (Hull, 1994: 23).

One final consideration to be made, is in how Jorvik and its counterparts are perceived as making the time-rides plausible. Andrew (1990) has already been quoted as stating that this is not the case, adding that another major objection is that "they present the visitor with a completely passive experience. The whole thing is prepackaged, predigested, with no
scope for making your own explorations, asking questions, drawing your own conclusions" (Andrew, 1990: 37). It is conceded that the existence of the Artefacts Gallery in Jorvik does qualify this charge (Andrew, 1999), as do the walk around areas in The Canterbury Tales and the Tower Hill Pageant.

Yet the (subliminal) possibility that such time-rides "must be seen as a (chargeable) encouragement to go through again" (Rhodes, 1992: 27) has to be considered. In the case of The Canterbury Tales, the siting of the medieval city market and its wares beside the modern souvenir shop (Chapter Two, 137: Figure 1.1) and the soundtrack's drawing of the visitors' attention to this fact should also be seen in this same light.

The problem however, exists in the Tower Hill Pageant, of there being visitors who do want to visit the Waterfront Finds Museum, but who do "not wish to take the joy-ride, fun though it is, every time they want to look at something on display. The Museum's two functions, of popular education and serious research, are being straddled a little uneasily at the moment but a balance is sure to be found with time" (Rhodes, 1992: 27).

Walsh (1990) seems to have found a balance, although he claims that in a Post-Modern society, "the concept of time is becoming redundant" (Walsh, 1990: 288). Yet he says of Jorvik that "it is important to realize that Jorvik is based on an actual archaeological site, the representation is in situ, 130
and it does attempt to reveal how an interpretation can be inferred from the archaeological evidence. Jorvik may actually contribute to the development of a sense of place" (Walsh, 1992: 173). He also draws attention to the incongruity of an introductory video in the Viking Adventure (Walsh, 1990: 287). Media reactions to the time-rides are also mixed.

The Canterbury Tales is somewhat different from the rest in that the visitor walks around the presentation, but it is summarised as "truncating (the) sixty mile pilgrimage into a two hundred and fifty yard turn around the inside of a renovated Fourteenth century church" (Billen, 1988: 7). In the process, the visitor apparently passes through three inns linked by a highway, over one bridge, and into the Shrine of Thomas Becket and adjacent street market, over a two days and one night time period in which five animated tales are also enacted. Disbelief as well as time also has to be frozen.

The Oxford Tales has an even harder task in terms of plausibility, in that the visitor is taken for a ride on "mobile scholar's desks - the equivalent of the funfair ghost train in slow motion - a 'voyage' to boldly go through 800 years of Oxford history in just twenty-four minutes" (Farrell, 1991: 3). This "whirlwind trip through time" has been criticised for being incapable of doing justice "to the paradoxes, horrors, regressions and progressions that actually took place" (Farrell, 1991: 3), despite its special effects. Another critic has claimed that "there is something a
little absurd about trying to compress 800 years of history into a twenty-five minute ride" (Reisz, 1988: 34).

The Tower Hill Pageant is different, even though it has its time ride, with resultant inevitable reference to its "ghost train feel" and its brevity (fifteen minutes) being both a strength and weakness in that it prevents boredom but but also lingering (Gill, 1991: 3). Yet there is also an interesting means by which the visitor can be introduced to the idea of time travelling; "the time machine concept starts when you enter the glass-walled lift to descend through layers of London pavement while a digital clock rolls back the years to the First century AD. A similar clock in each car then rolls the dates forward again as you ... look at the Saxons, the Vikings, the Normans ... " (Gill, 1991: 3).

In the semi-traditional setting of the Perth Museum and Art Gallery by contrast, the approach towards time is that of developing a permanent gallery entitled 'Time of Our Lives', in which the history of the district is presented in a group of themes such as Farming or the Common Good. These themes have chronological structures, "but not to the exclusion of exciting juxtapositions of objects" (Hall, 1995: 21).

There is even an orientation area which "provides a world context for the themes and a time-chart of local regional and world events (compressing) our perception of time since the last Ice Age into a single week" (Hall, 1995: 21). It may therefore be considered that where the Jorvik Viking
Centre has had a strong influence, it has not been in inducing similar establishments to imitate its presentational techniques, but in encouraging them to consider new forms of interpretation of the subject matter as much as its presentation. The Vikings flourished in a relatively short time period, but are still catalytic.
Some Conclusions about the Jorvik Experience.

To conclude, it is advisable to be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of these commentators as much as their subjects on the subject of time. One article on The Tales of Robin Hood (Nadelson, 1991: 16), provoked one reader to complain about the writer's "complete disregard of historical fact" (Warburton, 1991: 22) in discussing the mixture of time periods with which the original legends have become entangled.

The interesting point is also made in this letter that "to misuse historical data ... perpetuates the fiction ... Nadelson is discussing, until we can no longer decipher the truth. Artistic licence is indeed allowed, but reason dictates that we should permit our one stalwart piece of English folklore to exist within the bounds of truth and historical fact" (Warburton, 1991: 22).

That it is made by a reader, also suggests that it is time to pay greater attention to the views of the public on these centres and their themes, particularly those people who have actually visited them, and who have contributed to the original database. It must be ascertained if more can be learned from such presentations than "interior designer tips" (Bealby-Wright, 1994: 24), as one reviewer of the Kingmaker exhibition in Warwick Castle has claimed.

In Chapter Four, the opportunity to consider that original material will be taken. This will not only validate the
increasingly strong argument that the Jorvik success as such is based on strong prefabricated links with the local community over a long term period, and which also has a well-publicised archaeological database on which an instantly recognisable theme can be promoted (and attract) investment.

To summarise, it has to be determined if a presentation construction which is supposed to facilitate a community construction, is dependent on such an enterprise already having strong links with a community which is well aware of the (value of) the long standing archaeological activities on which the construction can be founded.

One other consideration is if the presentation of a theme in contemporary terms or a topical habitus is as applicable elsewhere as at Jorvik, or if a centre which appears to be a trend setter, is doing no more than manipulating popular trends with which a theme can be popularised. The reconstructed heads project for instance, seems to have shown an awareness of public interest in such a subject. This is borne out by the broadcasting of no less than two BBC two series on such reconstructions ("Meet The Ancestors") in 1997 and 1999, complete with tie-in publication, and a similar programme in the Channel Four 'Secrets of the Dead' series, which was titled 'Blood Red Roses', and broadcast on 29th June 1999.

The ultimate question is if it is the theme which is more important (from the visitor's point of view), or the Centre presenting it.
CHAPTER TWO FOOTNOTES.

(1) Personal communication by Dr. Patrick Wallace, Director of the National Museum of Ireland, on 30 September 1992.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid.
Figure 1.1: Trader's stall in the walk around representation of the market in The Canterbury Tales, displaying clothes, trinkets and writing materials.
Copyright, Heritage Projects Limited.
CHAPTER THREE. THE NATURE AND METHODOLOGY OF SURVEY WORK.

Introduction.

This chapter will review the establishment of visitor surveys as a relevant mode of research in museums and related institutions. It will then discuss the methodology adopted in the visitor survey undertaken as a part of this research.
The Establishment of the Concept of Visitor Surveys.

The conducting of visitor surveys to observe visitor reactions to experimentations or continuations in display structures, enactments, etc., and thereby ascertain visitor trends in order to consider what could be learned from them, now takes place within an established, respected system, which suits the purposes of this study. This has not always been the case. Hudson (1975) notes that there had been a curatorial antipathy to the concept of visitor surveys before the 1960s, on the grounds that the results would be inadequate, and possibly even distorted (Hudson, 1975: 100-01).

The development of relevant scientific procedures however, facilitated their general adoption by museums, which were "recommended to follow normal commercial procedures" (Hudson, 1975: 102). The use of the word 'commercial' is an interesting harbinger of subsequent claims of the commodification of museum culture, as claimed by Shanks and Tilley (Chapter One: 51). The visitor survey became a means of establishing a dialogue with the community, and in provoking debate on the validity of the role of the museum as an establishment which provides education and entertainment.

Questions were also raised about the significance of the museums and the past in general, among the general (i.e., non-visitor) public, its demographic identity, and the role of the media in fashioning its perspective. The development of the museum visitor survey was enhanced by a project
which was initiated by Bourdieu and Darbel in the mid-1960s, which combined both quantitative and qualitative data, namely the compilation of visitor statistics and eliciting of quotable opinions (Hudson, 1975: 113-14).

Research of this nature also had to acknowledge the influence of contemporary fashions on visitor fashions of thought, however apparently odious to museum staff (Hudson, 1975: 118). There was actually the rise of what Hudson calls the neighbourhood or community museum (in the pre-Heritage and ecologically minded era of the 1970s), "in which local people are closely and continuously involved from the beginning" (Hudson, 1975: 120), without any cultural or power gap between the people who plan and run the museum and the people who use it.

Since their collections were arranged in a generalised but popular nature, such community museums were "welded into the local community with a friendly solidity" (Hudson, 1975: 119). Their staff adopted the role of actors in a theatrical setting, preferring to obtain visitor responses by constant personal scrutiny rather than by questionnaire. Such a passive monitoring approach was of evergreen, personal value to the institution concerned, giving it an automatically good idea of visitor reactions to its displays, experiments and enactments.

The absence of statistical data in this method though, did not make such a base easily comparable with other institutions. The approach by Bourdieu and Darbel by contrast, seemed to
be better balanced in that it allowed scope for both computable material and direct feedback on direct subjects. It was therefore worthy of emulation.

Archaeologists were also utilising questionnaires as a verifiable means of establishing a dialogue with the community. The pilot survey which was conducted by the Cambridge Research Cooperative in 1982, arose out of the acknowledgement that "if archaeology is to change and become more accountable to the public, then it is essential that material is gathered about public opinion on archaeology" (Cambridge Research Cooperative, 1983: 24). The questionnaire consisted of home-based interviews and was limited in numbers, but it was significant in terms of its combination of statistics and opinions (like Bourdieu and Darbel), not least in the role of the media in formulating an interest in the past.

A nationwide survey which had been previously conducted by Crowther in 1978 is also of significance, because an effort was being made to elicit information from (metal detector using) treasure hunting organisations and museum staff. The focus was on the issue of treasure hunting, but questions on the nature of the relationship and cooperation (if any) between museums and treasure hunting clubs (Crowther, 1983: 10-11, 14-15) and consequent consideration of a liaison policy (Crowther, 1983: 12-13), set a good example for the composition of a question exploring the relationship between museums and (enactment) organisations at large. The nationwide
survey was also an inspiration in the composition of just such a questionnaire, so long as the limitations of generalised questions were noted.

Crowther's concluding thoughts (1983) include a concern about "alienating the very people (i.e. metal detectorists) we should be trying to reach" (Crowther, 1983: 19). In reviewing the Cambridge Archaeological Cooperative's 1983-84 national survey which arose out of its earlier pilot testing, Stone (1989) drew attention to a perceived limited general understanding or interest by archaeologists of public perspectives of archaeology and the past (Stone, 1989: 196). This tendency has already been noted, in contrast between Clarke's apparent nonchalance and Hodder's concern about this issue (Chapter One: 31).

In seeking to improve this situation, the organisers of the enhanced survey proposed to collect information on how the popular concept of the past is formed by museums, among other sources (Stone, 1989: 197). The personal interviews were in four urban centres rather than at specific locations, but a generally "strong desire, from all social classes, to identify with some form of a past" (Stone, 1989: 201) was indicated.

In addressing the aired problem of disseminating archaeological material in the media so as to justify archaeological expenses and conservation, a solution by Gregory (1983) was also advocated. This entailed the development of good relations with local journalists. This would produce a positive
presentation of archaeological material and activity
(Gregory, 1983: 8), which meant good (free) publicity.

Such an approach would help dissipate the widespread
museological isolationism which Fowler and Kavanagh have drawn
attention to (Chapter One: 40-41). Another type of survey which
was considered by Stone (1989), was the educational survey,
because "one of the most effective ways of reaching a wide
cross section of the public is through working with children"
(Stone, 1989: 201). This is reminiscent of Pearce's observation
that children are that section of 'the public' whose opinions
are not yet formed, but are open to persuasion (Chapter One:
45).

The example reviewed, of a project assessing the presentation
of prehistory and archaeology in (primary) schools, and in
particular, direct experience of monuments, artefacts and
experimental constructions of skills (Stone, 1989: 202) was
similar to Crowther's survey in that it set a good example.
In a more general, ominous sense though, Fritz and Plog's
warning which has already been cited (Chapter One: 37),
appeared to be borne Stone's concluding reflections on
archaeological complacency and disregard of public opinion.

That there were optimistic grounds for improvement,
was discerned in the ways that "archaeologists had begun to
address the public through displays and exhibitions at
excavations and, in some cases, in 'high profile' displays in
urban centres" (Stone, 1989: 204). This discernment was
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based on opinions expressed at the first annual conference of the Institute of Field Archaeologists though (Stone, 1989), and invites verification.

What was required were more specific surveys, focussed on particular museums, to ascertain if the public were responding. In undertaking such an enterprise, Hooper-Greenhill's warnings (1988) of the limitations of localised museum visitor surveys would have to be taken into consideration. Criticism is made of in-museum projects which are improved in their construction, but primarily concerned with obtaining quantitative data about the museum visitor (for the purpose of managerial policy making) which is unrelated to the locality or its indigenous population. The nationwide, concise survey of the populace and its relationship with museums (among other leisure activities) is regarded as a better "model for future research in Britain" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988: 216-17).

Hooper-Greenhill also draws attention to pseudo-anonymous 'visitor figures' being made of different user groups, some of whom do not even visit, but are themselves in an 'outreach' programme; "(collection) loan services from museums have been valued by many education institutions since the beginning of the century" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988: 213-14). This course of action would be approved by advocates of community contact (Chapter One: 51-52). The phenomenon of user groups invites further scrutiny.

In accepting the premise however, that the values of the
professionals and the public have diverged, the necessity of reversing the trend will require "the beginnings of an understanding of the experience of the visitor to the museum" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988: 215). Having already previously noted economic influences on museums (Chapter One: 44), it is also interesting to note that the case for a strong relationship with the community is actually strengthened by evidence which shows that the museum "that is succeeding best in a time of recession in the USA is the one with a well-established and qualitative relationship with the community it serves" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988: 215). The increasing educational role of the museum is also of increasing importance, and should be noted accordingly.

It is also argued that there is a need to clarify and verify the stereotypes of museum visitors, and that more qualitative information has to be obtained, so as to prevent a wrong impression of museums and their staff as being inactive, and uninvolved with the community. The firm advice to museum researchers to listen to people give their "own opinions of their needs" is a component of a flexible model of research which will help achieve this end (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988: 219). A clearer overall picture will emerge though, if such material is set in the context of general populace data. One other question which has to be considered, is if museums really are satisfying only a small percentage of the communities, and if this situation is changing for the better (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988: 223).
The necessity of discerning such a state of affairs is all the more acute, given that by the mid-1980s, museums were opening in Britain at a rate of thirty a year, and with recorded visits of circa seventy million per year (Merriman, 1989a: 153). This is of concern to Merriman (1989a), given the corresponding deficit of data about "the general role of the past in contemporary society, and specifically the role that museum visiting plays in British culture" (Merriman, 1989a: 1). It is also asserted that to understand the museum, its place in leisure activities and society as a whole need to be comprehended.

In seeking to do this, a nationwide postal survey was conducted, which was based on the straightforward claims that "museums are interesting and worthwhile places to visit and potentially do offer something to everyone in the community. The second is that it should be the aim of general 'public' museums to provide for all the community" (Merriman, 1989b: 154). Alongside this however, is the counter claim that it is the better educated and wealthier groups in society who control participation in heritage activities, because they have been socialised into participating. This view is based on Bourdieu's argument that the 'habitus' (a form of educational/family programmed system of thought and emotion) determines comprehension of and involvement with the environment, and therefore constructs museum displays as a code which can only be deciphered by those visitors with the key.
of cultural competence to appreciate it. Cultural differences in favour of an elite are actually strengthened by what is supposed to be an effort at community building (Merriman, 1989a: 161-62). It is also an example of an underlying theoretical framework, which is essential in Merriman's view (1989a), in the conducting of a museum visitor survey.

In Merriman's own research (1989a), specific museum surveys were ruled out despite their individual merits, because they lacked that necessary framework (apart from producing repetitive data). In consequence, the issues which had been raised, could not be answered adequately. Merriman (1989a) also sets a positive example in that his survey results can be utilised to support ideas for presentation improvement which have already been noted (Chapter One: 51-52).

It is observed for instance, that what people prefer is a contextual sense of the past; "objects and sites, seen in their setting, preferably out of doors; usually with an element of self-discovery, and ideally with some form of personal link, whether it be to the family or to the local community" (Merriman, 1989a: 167). This would therefore seem to advocate (among other measures) the decentralisation of museums, the promotion of self-directed trails and "the creation of a number of site museums and full-scale reconstructions (if in accessible areas) where objects can be seen in a fuller context" (Merriman, 1989a: 167).

To prevent such improvements only confirming the exclusion
of popular interests though, a more active relationship with the (local) media is proposed, and museum professionals are also advised to implement community outreach services, such as (temporary) shop exhibitions, and mobile museum tours in shopping centres, utilising a display language which non-museum visitors can comprehend (Merriman, 1989a: 168). It is also argued that as standards of living and education increase, so does the habitus change, thereby giving more people the opportunity and inclination to visit museums, and the ability to comprehend them (Merriman, 1989b: 167).

It is up to museums however, to take advantage of this opportunity with their promotions of increased educational service and improved facility design, especially because the general social improvement, being inherently under-funded by the Government, cannot be taken as being indefinite. It is the amount of that funding which has an indirect effect on the size of the group which will never be interested in museums (Merriman, 1989a). If such measures might incur censure because of the promotion of a form of commodification, they could also be commended for their decontextualising of displays in a community dialogue construction.

Following on from Hooper-Greenhill's observations (1988) on the limited information on user groups, etc., and lack of a large scale survey to remedy this, Merriman (1989b) also comments on the vicious circle of museum personnel not knowing "how people use museums and whether they assimilate the messages,"
intended or unintended, that museums give out" (Merriman, 1989b: 149). Museums and exhibitions are then rarely planned with "a clear understanding of the composition and expectations of their clientele" (Merriman, 1989b: 149). A contemporary argument for greater research presents itself in the form of the apparent contradiction as to why, when some non-visitor groups in society remain so, that "in the light of the demonstrated boom in heritage presentations, ... museums are becoming increasingly popular with a wider range of people than ever before" (Merriman, 1989b).

Whatever their shortcomings on a national basis, individual museum surveys could and did produce both quantitative and qualitative data which would be certainly of local value, and possibly at a national level too. Specific questions for specific types of display and consequent proposals, could also negate claims of uniformity while still constructing trends. One critical trend which was discerned in a 1969-70 visitor survey at the Jewry Wall Museum in Leicester for instance, was of a negative reaction to an apparent bias in displays towards "broad social history at the expense of more specifically local history. A number of visitors wished to see a greater stress on local connections, and questioned the relevance of some items" (Cruikshank, 1972: 67).

The value of a specific museum survey is also appreciated in Greene's conclusion (1978) to his Norton Priory visitor survey report in 1978. The policy of conducting the survey in
1975 was effective in that it elicited a positive response in 1975 and again in response to an updated form in 1977, in conjunction with alterations to the site and Museum. Such a survey could also be useful in a general sense, because it provides "basic information such as the area from which visitors are drawn, the size of groups, and sources of information. It also gives an idea of how visitors respond to the museum, something that figures alone will never reveal" (Greene, 1978: 9).

Another beneficial consequence (in theory), is that an improved understanding of museum visitors (receptive and discriminating individuals with individual responses) by the staff should create an atmosphere in which community building was not only feasible but desirable on the part of the personnel concerned. Not all such surveys can be as quantitatively thorough as the Jewry Wall project with its 200 completed questionnaire database, or the respective returns of 388 in 1975 and 261 in 1977 at Norton Priory.

The vague reference by Addyman (1984) to good visitor comment card results at the Coppergate excavation (Addyman, 1984: 8-9) is succeeded by a description of qualitatively sound if quantitatively non statistical research into public perceptions of the Vikings and archaeology at large (Addyman, 1989: 258). Generalised survey responses to the Jorvik Viking Centre and its theme (Addyman, 1989: 262) along with a commentator's somewhat limited straw poll on which to base his own
criticisms (Schadla-Hall, 1984: 63) also invited further survey work at this location.

An answer to the problem of how to place such research in a national context though, could be indicated by Prince and Schadla-Hall's Hull-based survey in 1985, which was designed to examine the public image of museums in that locality, and at large (Prince & Schadla-Hall, 1987: 69). The somewhat negative results which have already been observed (Chapter One: 43), though acknowledged to be possibly unique to Hull itself, show that "there is a need to replicate this type of study elsewhere, particularly in rural areas and, initially at least, by concentrating on museums where the archaeological components of their collections are primarily of local importance (Prince & Schadla-Hall, 1987: 70).

Another issue which would have to be taken into account is the contemporaneity of the data, as some forms of presentation are discarded or introduced. A positive response to an introduction of "informative push-button tape recordings" in the form of 'talking labels' or 'sound guides', to use contemporary terminology (Cruikshank, 1972: 66), is along with 'films' and 'slide shows' indicative that in 1969, the concept of audio-visuals was acceptable to the public, although they had not actually been tested at Jewry Wall (Cruikshank, 1972: 66).

The discovery that visitors tended to prefer to follow their own trail around the Museum rather than follow the chronological sequence of displays, could provoke the
researcher's 'compromise' proposal of laying out "the displays along a fixed route, suggesting the line visitors should follow by means so subtle that there appears to be a free choice of movement" (Cruikshank, 1972: 66). This would reconcile freedom of movement with the avoidance of turning the Museum into "a storehouse containing mere assemblages of curios" (Cruikshank, 1972: 66). Such fairly straightforward questions and proposals would not be so easy to compose now, given the trend in controlled visitor movements by such means as 'time rides', since the 1980s.

To check the reliability and validity of the accumulated statistical database for 1991-94, the intention was to create a context in which this research could belong, by means of other contemporaneous survey projects. The construction of a nationwide statistical background database for museums and open-air sites in 1992, would be provided by the National Audit Office publication of 'Protecting and Managing England's Heritage Property' (1992) and the Policy Studies Institute publication of 'Cultural Trends in the '90s, Parts I and II' (1996-97).

Extensive statistical research in one particular county would also be complemented by the Surrey Museums Consultative publication of 'Museums in Surrey: Visitor Research. Conclusions, Recommendations and Summaries' (1994).

Visitor statistics from the White Tower and the Royal Armouries in the Tower of London (1993) would provide urban data,
while 'School Visits' (1990), a publication by the Royal Armouries would provide educational material.

A comparison in surveys of enactments was provided by the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation's 'Report on the Military Through the Ages Survey' (1992) of its annual living history event and a private survey on the American Civil War garrison enactment at Fort Brockhurst in Hampshire, for the English Heritage Special Events Unit in 1993.

The Special Events Unit also generously provided location-based statistical information which would complete the case-study database of the 1993 commemoration of the 1950th anniversary of the Roman invasion of Britain in 43 AD (2), and which could be utilised in the case study of that anniversary in Chapter Six.

In order to discern the effects of presentation enactments and experimentations in Britain from 1991-93, a visitor survey which could be fairly considered as being nationwide would have to be constructed, although it would focus on specific locations with specific themes. A balance between uniform quantitative statistical trends and qualitative material would also have to be maintained.
THE PRESENT VISITOR SURVEY: METHODOLOGY.

Introduction.

In the light of the evaluation and experimentation which has been outlined in Chapter One, it was decided to conduct evaluative research so as to make an assessment of such museological developments possible. The focus of this research was to be on presentational themes ranging from the Romano-British to the late medieval periods, and this entailed the use of a multivariated database. Of particular importance was a cross-sectional research survey design, which was to be utilised to ascertain trends in visitor reactions to presentations at selected locations, and to consider their recommendations, in the context of other survey instruments. A related survey design was also devised and implemented to identify curatorial perspectives of their presentations. Qualitative data which had a direct bearing on the structures of presentations, and on their roles as establishing dialogues with communities or even creating communities was also utilised, where appropriate.
Methodology.

Careful thought was given to the most appropriate ways to assemble the desired information and methodologies like that employed by Merriman (1991) was considered. However, the object of the research project was to gain direct information relating to visitor experience. Therefore the idea of a sample-based survey was rejected in favour of an exit survey which allowed individual visitors to record their immediate responses to what they had just seen.

Accordingly, a pilot exit survey was conducted in 1991 at three sites (Bignor Roman Villa, Goodrich Castle and Honeywood Heritage Centre), details of which, and a copy of the questionnaire, are given in Appendices A and B (472; 478-83). Following the success of this in producing the kinds of material desired, this was extended to a full survey of an additional seventeen sites in 1992. Details and copies of the revised questionnaire are also given in Appendices A and B (474-77; 486-87). This yielded a total of 1550 completed questionnaires out of a potential total of 1700. Those 1550 completed questionnaires constitute the basis of the statistical analysis in this thesis.

In addition, two sites, the Maldon Experience Camp and Binchester Roman Fort were chosen for specialised surveys which related to the educational programme, with specially designed questionnaires (Appendices A and B: 473; 484-85). Further, a range of museums, centres and organisations in
Britain and abroad were contacted or visited in order to obtain detailed managerial information. This was elicited via the use of separate questionnaires (Appendix B: 488-95).

Firstly, the right locations had to be chosen. The pilot list for 1991 had not only provided practice in crafting the more extended research in 1992, but showed how to discern which trends required greater scrutiny. Such research would also mean direct contact with the curatorial managements, or enactment organisers concerned. In choosing suitable locations, the annual Museums Association publication, 'Museums Yearbook 1992-93: Including a Directory of Museums and Galleries of the British Isles' (Barbour, 1992) proved to be an invaluable resource, given its references to museological themes and collections.

Bignor Roman Villa and Goodrich Castle were placed on the 1991 list. This was not only because of their respective Roman and Medieval backgrounds. In the case of Bignor, open since 1815 and privately managed, its thatched edifices protecting the remains are themselves listed buildings, and a low profile form of presentation with guided school visits and plans for experimentation, was enacted in conjunction with a continuing programme of excavation. Goodrich Castle by contrast, was managed by English Heritage, and being actively promoted by its Educational and Events units. The Honeywood Heritage Centre was also chosen, because although its pre-Renaissance collection was limited, its recent opening made it a
valid example of the contemporary phenomenon of local council encouraged ventures.

While the survey was being conducted at these three sites, the millennial anniversary of the Battle of Maldon in 1991, produced an opportunity to obtain unique data, from an experimental 'Living History' camp for schoolchildren (questionnaire in Appendix B: 484-85). Finally, an educational questionnaire which was conducted in the aftermath of a school visit to Binchester Roman Fort, served as a contrast to the Maldon educational survey, in that the locations concerned had permanent if low-key, more traditional presentational facilities in a different part of the country, but which also served as a form of community dialogue and construction.

The seventeen other survey locations in 1992 were chosen on the basis of presentational format and geographical location, so as to create a catholic database with a national basis. In the East Midlands, the Verulamium Museum at St Albans, which was managed by the District Council, was overhauling its presentation in favour of hands on presentations which would involve computers, in the context of its historical and archaeological surroundings.

The open-air Sherwood Forest Visitor Centre in post-mining industry Edwinstowe, had a similar context, albeit on an environmental and ecological basis. It could also be contrasted with the indoor Tales of Robin Hood Centre in that the Robin Hood legend was only a component rather than the theme of
its overall presentation. The neighbourhood placed a constraint on expansion, as at St Albans (and Nottingham), but this was compensated for by the greater availability of space for the annual festival, all of which was District Council managed. Apart from being comparable with the Sherwood Centre, the Tales of Robin Hood was also chosen because of its status as a post-Jorvik form of presentation which had its own distinct modes of experimentation to complement a Jorvik-style time ride.

Three of the four West Midlands locations were castles, but with very different forms of presentation. Warwick Castle was selected, because its existing and projected medieval presentations were being managed by the Madame Tussauds Group, which has had long standing experience in presentation. Stafford Castle and Tamworth Castle by contrast, were similar in that they were managed by local civic authorities, as community enterprises.

The authorities in Stafford Civic Council placed great emphasis on an annual enactments programme, and a permanent presentation at the Visitor Centre which was some distance from the actual Castle ruins, but at the same time a substantial renovation and indoor presentation (and enactment) programme was underway at the Castle site. If Stafford could be compared with Warwick in that there was room for enactments, Tamworth was also comparable in that the edifice was substantially restored, and its hologram could be contrasted with the one at Jorvik.
Reconstruction was also the hallmark of the Baginton Roman Fort, which is just outside Coventry, and under Civic Council management. The primary role of this location, is as an archaeological experiment rather than as a tourist attraction, although the presentational techniques which had been utilised at this open-air site in the early 1970s, and which had enjoyed a photogenic role in the media, would make an interesting comparison with more recent types of location. The survey returns would determine the significance of this profile.

Reconstruction at Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum by contrast, was not only in stone (as opposed to the Baginton wooden structures), but just one component in the whole presentation. The excavation programme was also a display in the overall presentation (as at Baginton and Bignor), along with the hands on education programme, which also promoted the collections as a National Curriculum teaching aid. The prominent profile of the Jorvik Viking Centre in York, in popular and academic literature, and its apparent trend setting influence guaranteed a place on the survey location short list. It could also be compared with the Tales of Robin Hood Centre.

The other northern location was the Bede Monastery Museum, at Jarrow, which was interesting in that its Roman and Medieval associations were downplayed in favour of a focus on the Migration period. The actual presentation was not as prominent as at Arbeia, although both enterprises (a private Trust
at Jarrow and the Council Museums Service at Arbeia) were encouraged by the local civic authority as community building efforts in an area which was economically depressed with corresponding high unemployment. There was also the possibility of Jarrow eclipsing Arbeia, in that plans were being devised for its conversion into the higher profile 'Bede's World'.

The two locations in the South West were similar in that their themes were of Roman communities, were managed by their respective councils, and had been long established, since the Victorian era. Where they differed was in the focus at the Corineum Museum in Cirencester on its mosaic collection and progressing overhaul of its overall Roman and Medieval presentations. The Roman Baths Museum in Bath differed in that the excavated site was itself the centrepiece of the presentation, which in conjunction with the large visitor numbers, produced advantages and disadvantages for its management.

In the London area, the one location chosen was the Tower Hill Pageant in the city centre, which was another 'post-Jorvik' variation. The Pageant was privately managed by the Culverin Consortium in association with the Museum of London, and contained an explanatory display on archaeology in London.

Two of the four locations in the South East had Roman themes, and were comparatively recent developments arising out of excavated remains. The other two locations were medieval in identity and structure, one of them being identified
with a pivotal event in English history, and the other being similar to Baginton in that it possessed a photogenic media role.

Fishbourne Roman Palace near Chichester, was also similar to Baginton, but unlike Bodiam Castle, it was its 'pre-Jorvik' presentation which was managed by the Sussex Archaeological Society. This made it a 1970s trend setter in its own right, and comparable with the activities of the York Archaeological Trust in the 1980s and 1990s. Fishbourne's reconstructed Garden was also comparable with Jarrow and Arbeia, and its in situ presentation of mosaics with displays at the Verulamium Museum and Corineum Museum. Continuing excavations, as at Arbeia, Baginton and Bignor, were also an added attraction.

Fishbourne was very different to Baginton however, in that presentational changes were being made in this location, which by being part indoor and part outdoor, allowed scope for the implementation of an ambitious enactments programme, in addition to its guided tours on special overview walkways. It had also been sponsored rather than utilised by the media.

The White Cliffs Experience by contrast, managed by Dover District Council, was an entirely indoor location, only finding space for enactments on the forecourt. Although the Roman theme was, as at the Corineum Museum and Tower Hill Pageant, just one element in the overall theme of the local community, and 'post-Jorvik' in influence, some themed elements were presented 161
at the expense of others, as at Jarrow. The Experience was also more unusual, in that apart from an audio-visual enlivening of static tableaux, it promoted an unorthodox, highly critical interpretation of the Caesarean landings in Kent, in BC 55-54. This displayed but also contradicted the Roman propagandist version of events.

Battle Abbey and Bodiam Castle in East Sussex, differ from all the rest in that they are respectively managed by English Heritage and the National Trust. These are two organisations with a national as opposed to solely local set of perspectives and priorities. This encourages a strong central influence, and support (as well as restraint), which yet permits a considerable degree of autonomy and community involvement.

The Abbey, as has been noted above, also has a strong local and national association with the events of 1066, namely the Battle of Hastings, while the showcase restoration of Bodiam Castle under the aegis of Lord Curzon in the early Twentieth century, has given it a publicity usefulness as the image of a classic medieval castle, despite the reality of its automatic obsolescence on completion, circa 1400. Both locations were also comparable because of their availability of space and consequent scope for enactments, conservation limitations on structural presentations notwithstanding, in a situation which was similar to that prevailing in Sherwood Forest.

These locations were then placed in four groups within two subdivisions on a basis of presentational identity rather
than geographical location. The first subdivision consisted of the Jorvik Viking Centre, Tower Hill Pageant, Tales of Robin Hood, and White Cliff Experience. They are classified as 'innovative' in that they were of recent origin, and utilising novel techniques of presentation. The group consisting of the Bede Monastery Museum, Corinium Museum, Roman Baths Museum and Verulamium Museum by contrast, are classified as traditional in that they are long-established, and were (in part) still utilising pre-Jorvik techniques of presentation.

The other subdivision, consisted of presentations which are classified as outdoor in that they are centred on open air ruins, reconstructions, or rural settings. They included the Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum, Baginton Roman Fort, Fishbourne Roman Palace, and the Sherwood Forest Visitor Centre. They were classified as innovative in that their presentations were developed out of archaeological excavations or environmental management. The group consisting of Battle Abbey, Bodiam Castle, Stafford Castle, Tamworth Castle and Warwick Castle by contrast, were classified as traditional in that their presentations were based on historic buildings or ruins. It was on this divisional basis that the results would be presented, and their trends discerned, compared and contrasted.
In constructing a visitor survey, it is worth considering Pearce's observation (1998) that "the objective of a survey questionnaire is two-fold: to gather what is seen as useful information and to persuade recipients to complete and return it. These two aims are not entirely in harmony, and every questionnaire represents a balance between them" (Pearce, 1998: 187). Firstly, it was decided that for the purposes of my research, I would utilise the technique of personally interviewing a target number of visitors at a selected location. I would then draw up a timetable by which I could achieve my goal.

The strategy was to begin with a low key sequence of pilot surveys in the summer of 1991, because as Merriman (1991) argues, "it is essential that all of the techniques used in a full-scale survey, ..., are tested at a small scale level" (Merriman, 1991: 149). The response rate, survey structure, effectiveness of technique and phraseology could all be checked before the preparation and implementation of the greater research project in 1992. On drawing up the survey reports, interviews would then be arranged with the location managements concerned, when possible.

A standardized staff survey was also devised for locations and organisations which could not be visited in person, but which could provide comparative quantitative and qualitative information. Supplementary information, in the form of prospectuses, guide texts, (statistical) reports,
education packs, and articles, were all accumulated, as was a corresponding media database, given the apparently burgeoning interest in publicity.

In constructing the surveys, very helpful advice was sought and obtained, both from within the University, and from cooperative representatives of responsive locations which had a vested interest in the survey results. Doug Cluett, Heritage Officer for the London Borough of Sutton, was of great assistance in the composition of the 1991 pilot survey structure, and John Charlesworth, Education Officer at the Tales of Robin Hood, was also helpful in giving advice on the 1992 survey structure. John Why and Keith Bannister, Site Co-Ordinators at the Maldon Living History Experience Camp in 1991, were very cooperative in assisting in the preparation of a questionnaire which was aimed specifically at participatory adults and primary schoolchildren.

Contemporary textual information was also available, to influence the choice of questions, as in a reference in an article in a March 1990 edition (Vol.13, 3: 17-18) of a tourist magazine 'London Log', for up to three quarters of all foreign tourists visiting "a heritage site at some time during their stay and ... managers (being) quick to recognise the huge potential of overseas markets for the 1990s" (Baxter, 1990: 17). It was references such as this one on the significance of foreign visitors, which merited an inclusion in the questionnaire structure and in staff interview
enquiries.

A priority target list for 1991 was drawn up with the aid of the 'Museums Yearbook', and then an appropriately selected (managerial) member of staff would be contacted by means of the list of addresses in that same publication. On securing the agreement of the management, usually after their scrutiny of a sample copy, sometimes after an acceptance of set conditions, as set out in the enclosed letter examples concerning Bignor Roman Villa, Bodiam Castle, and Fishbourne Roman Palace, a convenient date would be agreed (Appendix B: 496-98).

The location was visited and the survey conducted at a suitable and mutually approved place at which to interview visitors as they exited. This process was initiated with a categorical assertion that I was not a member of the staff. It encouraged the interviewees to give answers which were not solely intended to curry favour with the management. This assertion was also repeated when the visitors were asked to state their opinions as to how the location could be improved, as in the enclosed example of the Bignor Roman Villa survey (Appendix B: 478-83).

The actual questionnaire comprised six sides of A4 paper, printed on an Amstrad PCW9512 word processor, and the answers were written down by the interviewer (always myself) with the aid of a clipboard. At the Honeywood Heritage Centre and at Bignor, it was possible to utilise a table and chairs,
as advised by Coneybeare (Coneybeare, 1991: 7). The low number of returns though, induced the implementation of the (approved) alternative tactic of making the questionnaires available for unsupervised completion in the Centre cafe. At Bignor, a second personal series of interviews took place, because of the greater likelihood of achieving the target.

The luxury of a sedentary interview did not exist at the Maldon and Goodrich Castle enactments however. The bulk of the visitors who were at both locations to see an event were evidently disinclined to leave the site during a performance, or to remain there afterwards. The tactics were therefore changed in that the interviewer would ask sympathetic visitors to complete their questionnaire copies at home (the details having been explained to them), and then return to the printed address.

The educational surveys differed somewhat, as seen in the example of the Maldon Camp version (Appendix B: 484-85), in that having obtained the agreement of the teaching staff, they were conducted by that same staff under classroom conditions. In both cases (Maldon Camp and Binchester Roman Fort), there was a fairly high number of returns. All the surveys were quantitatively and qualitatively interesting, and foreign interviewees, like their English counterparts, had no problem in comprehending the questions. Yet the total number of non-educational survey returns was disappointingly short of the target.
A 'Daily Telegraph' article in late 1991 on the disappointing low number of visitors for that year generally, indicated that my unrealised targets were part of an overall trend (Bedlows, 'Daily Telegraph', 'Visitors staying away in droves as spending slumps', 3rd October 1991: 8; Central Office of Information, 1993: 274, 1994: 194).

The duration of each interview however (ten minutes on average) and the number of questions (twenty-one) indicated that reductions in time and structure were required. The highly satisfactory educational results by contrast, made it unnecessary for there to be a repetition of that type of survey. The simply worded, direct but friendly questions had allowed for the age, preliminary information and learning ability of the children involved, while the interviewee teachers and other adult participants had been very responsive, especially as regards motivation and self-criticism.

A revised priority list for 1992 was drawn up, with the added factor of achievable target numbers. The 'Museums Yearbook' was again useful here, as were up to date newspaper articles, such as 'Visitors to historic properties increase by 2%' (Boggans, 'Independent', 19th August, 1991: 4), showing a list of respective paid admissions in 1989-90:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Baths and Pump Room</td>
<td>931,832</td>
<td>950,472</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Castle</td>
<td>637,056</td>
<td>685,000</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A modified form of questionnaire was constructed on a single double-sided A4 sheet (on the PCW9512), which consisted of a demographic based tick list for the observant interviewer and twelve questions, eight of which required only 'YES/NO' answers, three of which were statistical, and two of which allowed scope for more detailed and opinionated material. The completion time was therefore reduced to five minutes.

This type of survey was first tested at the Jorvik Viking Centre. Its one flaw was in its not prompting people to elaborate on what they had claimed to have learned, whereas at The Tales of Robin Hood, the unsupervised questionnaires were made available for the visitors in the Restaurant by way of experiment, a result of which was that twenty-nine out of a hundred went missing, and one was spoiled.

A more ambitious number of targets had been set, but this number had been reduced for several reasons. The Crusades Experience in Winchester for instance, was an apparently promising 'post-Jorvik' location, but had been closed due to bankruptcy. The Raunds Heritage Park in Northamptonshire was not developed (Chapter One: 58). The Canterbury Tales already had its own survey, but could not publicly release results (3). A surfeit of surveys in 1991 had induced the Vindolanda Civic Settlement and Museum to place a ban on any future such activities (4). Alternately, Laxton was ruled out, because the fact that its entire community and environment was the display, denied it a survey focal point.
Plans to conduct a survey at the Dublin Viking Centre had to be abandoned because of its closure, but Laxton and Dublin had still earned a place on the secondary list because of their presentational merits.

Seventeen managements were responsive to my initial letter, a standardized copy of which is enclosed (Appendix B: 499). A sample copy was forwarded and checked, and arrangements would then be made to conduct a survey which was usually timed to coincide with an event, so as to elicit visitor reactions to fixed and animated displays at the same location.

The production of the questionnaires would be alternately the responsibility of the location management or the University (by agreement), or by myself. A standard format was utilised, only extremely minor word variations being made to allow for on site circumstance, as in the enclosed example of the Fishbourne questionnaire (Appendix B: 486-87).

Additional demographic questions concerning membership were also included in the Battle Abbey questionnaire, at the behest of the English Heritage Events Unit. Overall results were mixed in that some targets were easier to achieve than others, but the overall 1992 total of 1550 completed surveys only fell short of the 1700 total by 150. This study now had a reasonable visitor database, especially if the Jorvik and Tales of Robin Hood results could be added.

The Sherwood, Warwick, York, Bath and Bodiam surveys were completed on the same day on which they were begun.
One return visit was made to Tamworth, the Tower Hill Pageant, Battle, Fishbourne, and Dover to make up the shortfall. St Albans and Stafford required more than one visit. In the cases of Baginton, South Shields, Jarrow, Cirencester, Stafford and Nottingham, unsupervised self-completion (after agreement with the staff) was made. A total of 150 questionnaires went missing, and the quality of (unsupervised) results from some fifty questionnaires was in part, varied, but the results tended to be adequate.

A secondary location target list was also compiled by similar methods to those utilised in the selection of the survey choices, and the process of the staff interviews duly began. An expansion of that list was made in 1992-93, owing to the nationwide commemoration in 1993, of the Roman invasion of Britain, and the general effect of local governmental structural changes on established museums.

Another significant factor was the localised effect of the impending opening of the Channel Tunnel on establishments in the Home Counties. University travel grants also facilitated a series of interviews in Germany in 1991 and in France in 1992. Out of all the establishments and organisations contacted for the purpose of completing an introductory questionnaire if a personal interview was not possible, as shown in the enclosed examples (Appendix B: 488-91), only a handful declined.

The reasons tended to be the one given by the City and County Museum management in Lincoln, in that it had been closed
for restoration work (5), or the world of Robin Hood management in Haughton, Nottinghamshire, which had a policy of not giving interviews (6). In a similar situation to that prevailing at Vindolanda, the management of the Hastings Museum and Art Gallery, was also obliged by such increasing demands on staff time and activity to decline any future requests to participate in any questionnaires (7).

This research process was maintained throughout 1994-95, a particular region at a time being visited for the purpose of interviewing the staff and studying the displays, in addition to discussing the visitor survey results where this was possible. My wide-ranging if historical theme constrained database could then be divided into three sections which would form the basis for chapters. The Jorvik influence is one theme which has already been aired in this chapter and previously, in the devising of a theoretical template (Chapter One: 65), which ultimately formed the basis for Chapter Two.

The extent of material from the 1992 survey locations will form an alternative chapter on displays by way of comparison. A chapter on enactments could be similarly assembled, and would be quite distinct, as would a specific study of managerial reactions to survey results, acknowledgements of the Jorvik influence, and a separate assessment of a national event commemoration in one other chapter. This would facilitate a balanced, tripartite discussion of the results in the final chapter.
A basic premise of the visitor survey was that it focussed on the museum visitor, to the exclusion of the non-visitor. It was the purpose of this research to elicit direct reactions to particular presentations. The number of targets was ambitious, and this had an effect on the financing of the project. Yet although the non-achievement of a 100% target on a single unit was disappointing in one sense, a survey which required three visits for completion, was less of a 'snapshot' survey, and allowed scope for discerning visitor trends and reactions to different enactments (if held) over a greater period of time, albeit within the same (tourist) season.

The unsupervised nature of some surveys meant the kind of problems that have been noted (Merriman, 1991: 145), namely the misunderstandings, partial completion, or influenced answers. Only a few were spoilt beyond redemption though, and a solid foundation of 1000 fully completed questionnaires now existed. The supplementary questions were also utilised as a support, so as to ensure that such original data had a context. The large number of museum staff returns was also respectable, and although time and circumstances dictated the depth of the responses, it was a foundation for more detailed follow-up enquiries, when required or suitable, aided by often kindly forwarded supplementary material.

The visitor research survey was the cornerstone of my research and it is felt that Coneybeare's description of "this simple and effective market research tool" (Coneybeare, 1991: 3)
is a justified one. Its role as an aid in museum planning, design, and marketing, eliciting public expectation and response, especially to new developments (Coneybeare, 1991: 4), is one which is demonstrated in the subsequent chapters. It also established a better dialogue with the location personnel, and facilitated a better appreciation of the practicalities of the presentations and their construction.

Logistical considerations had imposed a numerical limitation on my 1992 shortlist, but although limited visitor numbers and other factors had ruled out the possibility of achieving a completed questionnaire target at individual locations, and an overall target of 1700-2000 returns from twenty locations, the actual number of 1550 returns from seventeen locations was a more than adequate database on which to discern visitor trends.

Locations which merited attention for the sake of their presentations if not their questionnaire feasibility could also be utilised to provide supplementary information, once they had been chosen from a very wide selection. These choices were subdivided into locations which merited a personal interview, locations at which it was not possible to arrange a personal interview on a visit, but from which data could be obtained by means of an equivalent postal survey, and locations about which requests for information could be made. Even if a personal visit was not possible, such data could be of value in determining nationwide trends.
This database was quantitatively supplemented by independent or staff sponsored questionnaires, and qualitatively by critical or apologetic articles in academic publications and in quality press publications (sometimes by the same author). Guide books, reports, prospectuses, newsletters, and educational information packs were also all useful in that in purporting to serve as methods by which a dialogue could be established, they also displayed the rationale and motivation underlying the forms of presentation by the managements concerned.
CHAPTER THREE FOOTNOTES.


(2) From a letter from Karen Cooper, Special Events Unit, English Heritage, dated 29th March 1996.


(4) From a letter from Robin Birley, Director, The Vindolanda Trust, dated 28th January 1992.

(5) From a letter from A B Page, Manager/Curator, Recreational Services Department, Lincolnshire County Council, dated 24th January 1994.


CHAPTER FOUR. ANALYSIS OF THE VISITOR SURVEY INFORMATION IN RELATION TO THE MUSEUMS AND CENTRES.

Introduction.

It was decided that in order to extract as much interesting and useful information as possible from the visitor survey, the institutions examined would be divided into four groups. Each group would be based on a clearly identifiable theme which would make comparison possible within the group. This would make it possible to carry out a discussion of the overall trends in the context of independent contemporary survey trends, before drawing suitable conclusions. In dividing the number of location based survey returns into four groups, the intention was to concentrate on the permanent presentations at these sites rather than their educational facilities and short-term enactments, which are considered in Chapter Five.

The original responses and commentaries of the managements concerned who were approached would then be noted, to give a fuller understanding of visitor trends and managerial responses, which with the aid of supplementary original material concerning the acknowledgement of the Jorvik influence, or the AD 43 commemoration, from these, and from other establishments which were not involved in the survey process of 1992, would provide a solid body of data.

To create and begin with an 'innovative' group of indoor establishments which would contain the Jorvik survey
returns would pick up on the extended consideration given to
Jorvik in Chapter Two, and so draw on the critique and trends
examined there. This innovative group would then be balanced
by an analysis of a 'traditional' group of museums which
had not changed their presentations in line with the innovative
group, at least in 1992. A parallel division of the outdoor
locations would be made with those which had centred on mainly
original structures which had remained in existence since their
construction, albeit in varying states of repair, and those
which had been developed out of council or other initiatives.

That the numbers of each group are unequal and their (Roman to
Medieval) composition is mixed, is not considered to be a
handicap in this consideration of the results. It is the
discerned trends in the overall returns which are important.
The locations listed below will be subsequently referred to by
their stated abbreviations in four groups in order to be brief;

A. Innovative Indoor Establishments.
Jorvik Viking Centre (JVC).
Tower Hill Pageant (THP).
Tales of Robin Hood (TORH).
White Cliffs Experience (WCE).

B. Traditional Indoor Establishments.
Bede Monastery Museum (BMM).
Corineum Museum (CM).
Roman Baths Museum (RBM).
Verulamium Museum (VM).
C. Innovative Outdoor Locations.
Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum (ARFM).
Baginton Roman Fort (BRF).
Fishbourne Roman Palace (FRP).
Sherwood Forest Visitor Centre (SFVC).

D. Traditional Outdoor Locations.
Battle Abbey (BM).
Bodiam Castle (BC).
Stafford Castle (SC).
Tamworth Castle (TC).
Warwick Castle (WC).

In presenting the results of each group, a demographic identification of the visitors is followed by an analysis of the ways in which they claimed to have benefited from their visit, before concluding with an overview of their reactions to the presentations concerned, and proposals for change. The 1550 or 91.17% survey returns (out of a theoretical total of 1700) were considered to be quite adequate, on the basis of Merriman's calculation of an average 66% response rate being acceptable for research of this nature (Merriman, 1991: 153).

The percentages which are now listed on the following pages concerning each group, and the summarised total combinations of group totals, are derived from the usable number of questionnaires, to wit 1550 or 100%. The 150 questionnaire forms which were never returned by the establishments concerned, form no part of these percentage calculations.
GROUP A: INNOVATIVE INDOOR ESTABLISHMENTS.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

There were 370 survey returns in this group.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>(11.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>(12.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Private Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Industry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(4.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(3.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(5.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>227 (14.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiib) Public Sector Occupational Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service &amp; Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(6.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>138 (8.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### (iiiia) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>(18.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(5.48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iiiib) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(2.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(1.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iiic) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(2.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(3.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(4.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(2.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(2.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 'Local' refers to York in the case of JVC, Greater London in the case of THP, Nottingham in the case of TORH, and Dover in the case of WCE. 'County' refers to Yorkshire in the...

(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42 (2.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72 (4.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105 (6.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76 (4.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40 (2.60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32 (2.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(va) How They Learned About The Establishment.

**Quantitative Breakdown.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>20.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Other Information Source Subdivision.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Description</th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Museum Info.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past visits</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(vi) **Group Identification Of Each Visit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) **Number of Visits.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO. WHAT HAD BEEN GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

(i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>(23.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>(13.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>(9.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>(18.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>(23.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) A Decision to Return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>(16.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(6.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wouldn't say | 1   | 1   | 8    | 2   | 12    | (0.77) | 186
(vi) **Good Facilities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>327 (21.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41 (5.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wouldn't say</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (0.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>TORH</th>
<th>WCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Group A, Section One Results.

(i) The gender difference broadly balances out into a 50/50 division. This suggests an equal attraction for either gender.

(ii) The occupational background is approximately twice as likely to be private as public, the principal occupations being likely to be some form of service provision or educational role. The occupations least likely to be represented were non-professional (i.e., no paid occupation or retired) or governmental.

(iii) A clear majority of the participants were British, foreign visitors in this group making up only 5% of the whole.

(iii) Out of this latter number, the majority were Europeans, followed by the North Americans, although these locations were by no means entirely unattractive to visitors from the other continents.

(iii) The largest single group of British visitors was derived from the Midlands, the geographical distribution of the sites notwithstanding. The 'County' total is also significantly larger than the 'local' group, although one 'local' visitor at VM was unique in recalling that another source of information had been Mortimer Wheeler in the 1930s excavations of the site. The other main English groups are approximately equal, with only minority representation from the other British nationalities.
(iv) The largest single group of visitors is in the 31-40 range, followed by the 41-50 and 21-30 age groups. This may reflect the large proportion of families, and in the case of the 21-30 age group, couples at these locations. The two smallest groups were of those visitors under 21 (lone child or teenage visitors being rare), or over 61.

(va) The proportion of visitors who learned about the locations by means of the media, amount to only 3%.

(vb) Television is the main source of information in this group.

(vc) Out of the other sources of information, hearsay was the largest single cited source, except at THP. The contrast is there being an unusually large 'in the area' group. This can be explained by the location of the THP being adjacent to the prime English tourist attraction of the Tower of London. Advertising and tourist information are also well represented.

The smallest groups by contrast, were of those visitors who had learned about these locations on account of their English Heritage membership, information provided at other museums, and research into the subject of these locations. Of the two visitors who had received information from other museums, the one at THP cited the Museum of London, and the one at WCE cited The Canterbury Tales.

(vi) The largest single group was a family based one, followed by the couples, and then the friends. Only a few
visitors by contrast, were on organised visits in the form of tours or school visits.

(vii) The majority of participants in this group were on their first visit to the establishment concerned, making up 20% of the whole. The other groups are not so well represented, although the number of visitors who have been to these locations at least four times, is actually slightly larger than those who are on their third visit. This suggests the existence of a small but increasing group of 'regulars'. One visitor to THP for instance, stated that they were on their sixth visit.
Analysis of Group A, Section Two Results.

(i) Of all four locations concerned, a clear majority of participants found the staff to be cooperative. Nobody claimed not to have seen any staff.

(ii) There is only a 4% difference between those visitors who did and did not buy souvenirs, which is not encouraging for the management from a commercial point of view, although there is a fair majority of visitors who did buy souvenirs at each location. Those eight TORH visitors who stated that they did not know, added however, that they had yet to actually go into the souvenir shop and make a decision.

(iii) A larger majority of visitors who felt that they had learned something from their visit is recorded, as is an unusually high figure of 'wouldn't say' TORH visitors. This could be explained by this question in their individual questionnaires being unanswered. This might suggest that they had not learned anything, but did not want to admit this.

In this group, visitors tended to learn about Vikings, the finds and skull reconstruction at JVC, the different phases of London's history from the Roman settlement to the Great Fire at THP, Robin Hood at TORH, and the Roman invasions & Roman Britain at WCE.

(iv) No such uncertainties exist in this section. An outright majority at all the locations considered their visit to be enjoyable.
(v) The trend in answers to this question indicate that approximately one quarter of visitors to innovative indoor establishments do not intend to return.

(vi) A large percentage of visitors were also satisfied by the facilities at these establishments. In this group, the visitors tended to make reference to the time ride, village and exhibits in JVC (although this experience was passive), the time ride, audio-visuals, and archaeological displays in THP, the time ride, displays, archery, audio-visual and Silver Arrow trail in TORH, and the Roman audio-visuals in WCE.
Analysis of Group A, Section Three Results.

(i) In this section, the trend of facility approval is explored further. A minority group had no comment to make about the presentation, approximately one third advocated its retention in its present form, and a two third majority commented on the presentations and how they could be changed. In the individual establishments concerned, the trend of those satisfied with the existing arrangement was proportionally one half to two thirds of those advocating change.

At JVC, visitors tended to commend the Viking Village area. There was also opposition to the smells. Visitors requested a clearer commentary on a slower ride, shorter queues and more space in the exhibits, along with more orientation information. One visitor compared JVC with TORH, in that both time rides were too quick. Another recommended staggered queues and ticket sales at particular times, as at the Science Museum in London.

At THP, visitors tended to commend the displays. There were also requests for a longer time ride and more information about the post-medieval history of London. More tactile displays would also be welcome. Two comparisons with JVC were made in that one visitor requested a walk-through 'real' section as at JVC. Another visitor commended the THP time ride for being longer than the one at JVC. One other visitor suggested that the staff could learn from the presentation techniques at the Epcot Theme Park in Walt Disney World, Orlando, Florida,
in the form of light and sound use, computer controlled robotics, and a reverse projection of animated characters, so as to make history less didactic and more entertaining.

At TORH, visitors tended to commend the layout. Apart from remarks about access, parking and prices, there were requests for more animated presentations, less child orientated, wordy presentations, and dramatic performances. One visitor compared TORH with WCE, commending the latter for its permitting the visitor to enjoy a leisurely visit.

At WCE, the overall layout was commended. There were also requests for more visual and scenic displays which were more comfortable for adults to examine, and less to read. An information gap of Dover's history from between AD 400 and 1940 was commented upon, together with a general deficit of information about the town and Dover Castle. One visitor resented the souvenir shop being placed before the exit.
GROUP B: TRADITIONAL INDOOR ESTABLISHMENTS.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

There were 347 survey returns from this group.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Private Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational</th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiib) Public Sector Occupational Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational</th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (iiia) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>16.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iiib) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iiic) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: 'Local' refers to Jarrow in the case of BMM, Cirencester in the case of CM, Bath in the case of RBM, and St Albans in the case of VM. 'County' refers to Tyne & Wear in the case of BMM, Gloucestershire in the case of CM, Avon in the case of RBM and Hertfordshire in the case of VM. The 'North' figure 7* in the BMM list excludes Jarrow and Tyne & Wear, The 'South' figure 20* in the CM list excludes Cirencester and Gloucester, and the 'South' figure 7* in the Avon list excludes St Albans and Hertfordshire. No such distinction is made in the absence of local or county visitors from the RBM list.

(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(va) How They Learned About the Establishment.

Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>21.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Information Source Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Hall*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: 'Congregation*' refers to the congregation of St Paul's Church in Jarrow, which is part of the English Heritage maintained Monastery site, and 'Friends of the Hall' refers to the voluntary society which assists in the management and maintenance of BMM.

(vi) Group Identification of Each Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) Number of Visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO. WHAT HAD BEEN GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

(i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>(19.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(2.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>(9.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>(11.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>(16.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>(5.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>(22.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) A Decision to Return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>(17.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(3.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) Good Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>(21.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RBM</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep <em>it as it is</em></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

203
Analysis of Group B, Section One Results.

(i) There is a slight majority of male participants in this group, the main difference being at VM.

(ii) In this group, a visitor was approximately twice as likely to be from a private as from a public background, the two most well represented private occupations being in a service provision, or non-professional role, with education being the most probable public occupation represented. An industrial or governmental background are the two least likely forms of visitor occupation.

(iii) In this group, approximately three fifths of the participants were British.

(iii) Of the remainder, the largest single non-British group was North American, followed by the Europeans. Visitors from the other continents were present in small minorities, or in the case of the Pacific (mainly Australian) group, a sizable minority.

(iii) The largest single British group was from the Greater London area, closely followed by the Midlands. The other English groups were more substantial in numbers than the other British nationalities. There is more of a good county representation than a specifically local one, and in the case of CM, fourteen of its twenty visitors from the South were also from the West Country.
(iv) In terms of age distribution, visitors in the 41-50 age bracket were the largest single group, closely followed by the 31-40 range, reflecting the familial interest in these establishments. A significant over 61 group, and visitors aged from 22-30 are also more likely to visit than those under 21.

(va) Less than 3% of visitors in this group had learned about these establishments by means of the media.

(vb) The press was the sole source of information.

(vc) Of the other sources, some form of association with these establishments in the forms of society or even congregation membership is to be discerned here, but schools would appear to have been the primary source of information, followed by hearsay or a local background. This implies a strong link with the surrounding community. The 'local' statistic here is larger than in (iiic), but a county background or status as an ex-local may be taken into account. Apart from English Heritage membership, information from other museums and previous visits are the least likely ways of learning of this type of museum.

(vi) An outright majority of visitors were over twice as likely to be from a familial background, as in a couple. The sizable groups of friends or people on their own were slightly more likely to visit than those on a tour or educational visit. The large number of those who 'wouldn't say' reflects the proportion of those visitors who did not answer the question at all. It might indicate that they were alone.
(vii) A clear majority of participants were on their first visit, followed by sizable minorities of returnees, both for the second and fourth times at least, unlike those visitors on their third visit.
Analysis of Group B, Section Two Results.

(i) An encouraging majority of visitors answered this question positively, only less than 1% expressing dissatisfaction. There is a sizable minority of visitors who 'wouldn't say', but the fourteen visitors to Bath in this group, stated that they had not seen any staff.

(ii) Not so good a statistic from a commercial point of view, is the majority of those visitors who did not buy souvenirs at these establishments. Allowing for the possible answers of the missing guests, the probable exception is BMM, because of its stocked book section on Celtic Christian literature and culture.

(iii) A majority of visitors did find these locations to be educational, although there is a significant minority who challenge this assertion. Of this minority, visitors to CM and RBM are more likely not to have learned anything, than at the somewhat more progressive BMM and VM.

In this group, visitors tended to learn about Celtic Christianity, Bede, the Monastery of Jarrow, and manuscript illumination at BMM, the mosaics, lifestyle and layout of Roman Cirencester at CM, Roman civilisation, the history, archaeology and layout, along with the water engineering works of the Roman Baths at RBM, and mosaics, funerals, the lifestyle, artefacts, army and settlement of Roman Verulamium at VM.
(iv) The locations were almost universally considered to be enjoyable places to visit, by contrast.

(v) It is therefore not surprising that a large majority intended to return, although there was a sizable minority of visitors who would not do so. Uniquely, CM is the one institution with a large number who 'wouldn't say'. These may actually be statements of intent not to return, in the form of blank spaces.

(vi) An overwhelming majority were satisfied by the facilities at all four locations however, dissatisfaction being expressed by only less than 1%. In this group, visitors tended to make positive references to the audio visuals at BMM, the Roman room and garden lifesize reconstructions at CM, and the tactile facilities, computers and audio visuals at VM. The RBM differed somewhat in that ninety-three of its visitor participants did not use the audio phones, although six of the seven who did use them, approved.
Analysis of Group B, Section Three Results.

In this next section, this majority is subdivided into minorities of participants with no comment to make, more out of certainty than indecision, and a majority proffering advice about the presentation, followed by a very sizable minority advocating an unchanged presentation. As regards individual locations, the difference was even less significant, with the exception of CM. This could be due to visitors who registered their satisfaction with the existing arrangements by not bothering to make any statement here.

Visitors to BMM tended to request more seating and catering, accepting the existing displays and approving the projected (Bede's World) development, when indicating an awareness of it. There were also suggestions for more use to be made of the Monastic Garden.

Visitors to CM tended to request more tactile settings, especially for children, with more audio visuals and post-Roman information. The existing three dimensional presentations were approved of. One visitor criticizing what they described as the 'garish' wall paintings in the reconstructed Garden, said that the J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu, California, was more successful at giving visitors the feel of a garden.

Visitors to RBM tended to comment on the crowded and hot corridors, although the unique technique of displaying the same information on each wall was noted. There were also
Some requests for working audio-visuals, cleaner water, more informative and entertaining guides, as at the nearby Costume Rooms according to one visitor, and better, more interactive interpretations of the different layers of architecture, and improved lighting. One visitor, admitting a dislike of Barry Cunliffe's interpretation of the site, was particularly critical about the use of spotlights on single stones, considering that the highlighting of the different levels would enable children to relate to the site.

Apart from requesting better access to the site, visitors to VM tended to comment (favourably) on the relatively new layout (despite the space), and on the tactile and audio-visual facilities, usually because of their benefits for children, and on the freedom of movement around the layout. There were also comments about the sound pollution from the audio displays in other rooms, and on a lack of (cartographic) information to enable visitors to relate to the site. One visitor suggested that there should be a bigger building, as at the Glanum Roman site in southern France. Another visitor requested a JVC-style time ride, or more seating. One other visitor saw great potential in a JVC-style centre.
COMBINATION OF RESULTS FROM SECTIONS ONE TO THREE FOR THE INDOOR GROUPS A AND B.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>22.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Private Sector Occupation Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Industry</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iib) Public Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service &amp; Government</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (iii) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>(34.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>(11.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iii) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(4.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iii) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(3.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>(6.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(5.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midlands</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>(8.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(4.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(4.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(va) How They Learned About the Establishment.

Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Source</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (vc) Other Information Source Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Area</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Museum Info.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Visits</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (vi) Group Identification of Each Visitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>18.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vii) Number of Visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>37.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION TWO. WHAT WAS GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

(i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>(43.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(2.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>(23.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>(20.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(1.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>(34.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>(8.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>(21.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>(45.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) A Decision to Return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>535 (24.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>153 (9.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76 (4.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) Good Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>661 (42.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46 (2.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 (0.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>(14.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>(23.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Comparative A & B Groups' Statistics.

Section One.

(i) There were more female and male participants at A than B.

(ii) For Engineering & Industry, and Finance & Trade, A leads. For Non-Professional visitors, B leads.
Service is the largest single group for both groups, and Engineering & Industry is the smallest.

(ii) There are virtually equal educational majorities, and equal healthcare minorities. A leads B governmental numbers by a ratio of two to one.

(iii) The British are in the majority, A leading, although B leads the minority foreign visitors.

(iii) For foreign visitors, A leads in the European group, but B leads for the North American and Pacific visitors. Minimal Asian and African numbers are virtually equal.

(iii) There are over twice as many local A as B visitors. There is less of a majority for A county visitors. A leads in small Midlands, northern and southern minority groups. B leads in a comparatively bigger Greater London group.

(iv) The largest single group is 31-40 in A, compared to 41-50 in B. A also leads in the under 30 groups, especially in the 21-30 range. B leads for visitors over 40, especially in the over 61 range.
(va) Media sources are in the minority, but four times as likely to be cited by A as B.

(vb) Television is the largest single group, entirely in A. It is the same for the minority radio group, but for the press, A leads B by only a small majority.

(vc) Society memberships tend to be in B. Almost twice as many cite advertisements and hearsay in A. A also leads for those in the area, posters, and other museum information, while it virtually monopolises leaflets and past visits. There is parity in research. B leads in being local, at almost 2 to 1, and in reading, signs and tourism, an outright majority also citing school.

(vi) A's lone visitors slightly leads B's, with bigger majorities for couples and friends. The A & B largest single groups are families, A leading B by a fair majority. B has almost twice as many tour groups and four times as many educational visitors.

(vii) There are outright majorities for first time visitors, more so for A than B. Yet there are more B than A second and third time returnees, along with a large majority who have been back on even more occasions.
Section Two.

(i) Majorities found the staff to be cooperative, more so in A than B. This is possibly because more B visitors did not see any staff.

(ii) Fair sized majorities bought souvenirs, A leading B at approximately 4 to 3. Fair sized majorities found the visit educational.

(iii) A also leads B by a fair majority.

(iv) Outright majorities found the visits enjoyable, A leading by a fair sized majority.

(v) Older majorities planned to return, somewhat more to B than A.

(vi) Bigger majorities also considered the facilities to be good, but B leads A. There is a much higher minority in A which does not consider the facilities to be good, at a ratio of 8 to 1.
Section Three.

Over twice as many B as A visitors had no ideas for change. The large minorities wanting A or B to be kept unchanged, were almost equal. In the majority group, A lead B in wanting change at a ratio of 4 to 3.
GROUP C: INNOVATIVE OUTDOOR ESTABLISHMENTS.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

There are a total of 364 survey returns.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Private Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 237</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiib) Public Sector Occupational Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 105</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (iiiia) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>(20.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(2.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iiiib) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iiiic) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(2.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(6.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(4.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 'Local' refers to South Shields in the case of ARFM, Coventry in the case of BRF, Chichester in the case of FRP, and Edwinstowe in the case of SFVC. 'County' refers to Tyne & Wear in the case of ARFM, West Midlands in the case of BRF, West Sussex in the case of FRP, and Nottinghamshire in the 224
case of SFVC. The North number 10* excludes local and county visitor figures in the ARFM list, the Midlands number 39* excludes local and county visitor figures in the BRF list, the South number 36* excludes local and county visitor figures in the FRP list, and the Midlands number 28* excludes local and county figures from the SFVC list.

(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(va) How They Learned About The Establishment.

Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(1.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>(20.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(1.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vc) Other Information Source Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(4.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(4.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Museum Info.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(1.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(1.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(vi) Group Identification of Each Visitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) Number of Visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION TWO. WHAT HAD BEEN GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

(i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>332 (21.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31 (2.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>187 (12.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>161 (10.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>264 (67.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49 (32.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51 (3.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>360 (23.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) A Decision to Return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) Good Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>22.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARFM</th>
<th>BRF</th>
<th>FRP</th>
<th>SFVC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Group C, Section One Results.

(i) Overall, there is a small majority of male visitors, although the reverse is true for ARFM and BRF.

(ii/a/b) A visitor to one of these outdoor locations is twice as likely to be employed in the private sector as in the public one. The provision of a service or a non-professional activity are the two most well represented forms of occupation, followed by educational employees in the public sector. Employees in industry or in government are least likely to visit these locations, judging by the low turnout.

(iii/a) A clear majority of visitors were British, although there was also a fair sized minority of foreign visitors, particularly at FRP.

(iii/b) The single largest group of foreign visitors was North American, followed closely by the Europeans. At FRP, the two groups were evenly matched. These types of location have also attracted minor interest from Pacific and Asian visitors.

(iii/c) Of the British visitors, those claiming to be from the county (if not the immediate local vicinity), formed the largest single group, followed by those visitors from the Midlands, particularly at BRF and SFVC. This implies strong local and regional community links. This claim is echoed at FRP, where over half of its visitors were from West Sussex or elsewhere in the Home Counties.
(iv) In terms of age, the largest single group is aged from 31-40, followed by those aged from 41-50. This reflects on the large number of family visitors, especially at the SFVC. The other age groups are in two approximately equal groups, those aged over 61 or between 22-30 being slightly more likely to visit than those aged under 21 or between 51-60.

(va) Small, equal minorities of visitors either learned about these locations via the media, or did not know how they had learned about them.

(vb) Of the media informed group, the press had been the primary source of information for the majority.

(vc) Of the clear majority of visitors who had learned about these locations by other means, those claiming to have local knowledge were in the majority. The individual figures support the idea of strong community links at FRP and SFVC at least, although the equivalent low number number at BRF is compensated for, by the largest single hearsay group, in the second largest overall group. Those readers who learned about these locations by reading about them also make up a sizable minority. Visitors who claimed past visits or information provided by other museums as their sources of information are in the two smallest groups.

(vi) The largest single type of group to which visitors belonged is the family based one, particularly at SFVC. This is followed by a sizable minority of couples, and then
two approximately equivalent groups of people who were alone, or with their friends. The two smallest groups were of those in an educational group or on a tour. The unusually large number of 'wouldn't say' visitors at BRF and to a lesser extent ARFM, could be ascribed to a number of them being alone, and deciding to leave that question unanswered.

(vii) A fair majority of participants were on their first visit, particularly at BRF. This is followed by sizable minorities of visitors on their second visit, and those who had been there at least four times, particularly at SFVC. The smallest group (by a small margin) was of those on their third visit, apart from a few who 'wouldn't say'.
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Analysis of Group C, Section Two Results.

(i) An outright majority of visitors considered the staff to be cooperative at all of the locations. The sizable minority of 'wouldn't say' visitors at SFVC can be explained by their tending to state that they had not actually seen any staff, which compromised their ability to answer the question. Three visitors at ARFM also claimed not to have seen any staff.

(ii) A small minority of visitors were more likely to buy souvenirs generally, the largest single group being at FRP with its well stocked shop, closely followed by SFVC, in comparison with the somewhat more limited commercial stock at ARFM and BRF. The margin of difference may be smaller however, if the 'wouldn't say' group of visitors at ARFM and BRF actually meant their non-answers to be registered as a 'NO'.

(iii) A larger majority of at least half the visitors did consider their visit to have been educational at all four locations, and particularly at FRP and SFVC, despite the small but significant minorities at those two locations who did not believe this to be the case. The large number of 'wouldn't say' visitors at BRF could be a combination of visitors who had learned nothing, and those who could not be bothered to write about what they had learned.

In this group, visitors tended to learn about the Fort of Arbeia and Roman Britain at ARFM, the Fort of Baginton and Roman Britain at BRF, the Roman army, the Palace and its
lifestyle at FRP, and Robin Hood and Sherwood Forest at SFVC.

(iv) An indisputable majority at all four locations had had an enjoyable visit, FRP receiving a uniquely absolute accolade in this respect.

(v) An outright majority also intended to return to these locations, although there were small but significant minorities who did not intend to do so, particularly at BRF.

(vi) FRP again enjoyed maximum approval of its facilities, as part of a general outright majority. The handful of visitors who were slightly more disaffected at SFVC than elsewhere, tended to be influenced in their judgement by the damage caused to the buildings and trails by the previous night's storm. In this group, visitors tended to make positive references to the semi-reconstructed layout at ARFM, the reconstructions, Granary and its exhibition at BRF, the Palace, layout, the excavated Garden and audio-visual at FRP, and the Visitor Centre exhibition at SFVC.
Analysis of Group C, Section Three Results.

A sizable majority of visitors did have ideas however, as to how the presentations could be updated, particularly at FRP. Approximately half that number were content with the existing arrangements, while a sizable minority, particularly at BRF, had no ideas at all on this issue. Visitors to ARFM tended to request more activity and reconstruction, along with interactive material (for children). One visitor requested more craft activities as in the Colchester Castle Museum, such as pottery lamp manufacture for children.

Visitors to BRF tended to request more information, especially around the site, criticising existing information signs. There were also requests for better maintenance and more reconstructions, more (audio-visual) animation in the Granary, catering, and an activity area for children. One visitor requested that the site be stocked with farm animals, as at the reconstructed Mountfichet Castle in Essex, on the grounds that children like them.

Visitors to FRP tended to be complementary about the layout, the souvenirs section being seen as not too commercial, or the presentation as too academic. There were requests for more excavations, and better facilities for the blind and elderly. There were also requests for more activities and information translations for (foreign) visitors, along with better overall orientation. One visitor advocated an A4 sized, returnable orientation sheet, as at Chichester.
Cathedral. Another suggested that there should be a taped commentary, as at Dover Castle. A third suggested that the Cypriot Tombs of the Kings at Paphos, would give the staff good presentational ideas. A fourth visitor considered the site presentation to be better than at Lullingstone Roman Villa though.

Visitors to SFVC tended to commend the site trails. They also requested more activity (for children) and information, especially about the history of Sherwood Forest and Robin Hood, with an updated exhibition and more hygienic, better organised facilities. One visitor unfavourably compared this site with the World of Robin Hood Centre in Haughton. They took the view that the County Council had not yet grasped the concept of what tourism can do, and that the most can be made of a ready made legend.
GROUP D: TRADITIONAL OUTDOOR ESTABLISHMENTS.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

There are 469 survey returns in this section.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Private Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Industry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiib) Public Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service &amp; Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iiiia) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>24.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiiib) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continent</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiiic) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midlands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 'Local' refers to Battle in the case of BA, Bodiam in the case of BC, Stafford in the case of SC, Tamworth in the case of TC, and Warwick in the case of WC. 'County' refers to East Sussex in the cases of BA and BC, Staffordshire in the cases of SC and TC, and Warwickshire in the case of WC. The 'South' 239
numbers 24* and 34* exclude local and county visitor numbers from the BA and BC lists respectively. The 'Midlands' numbers 15*, 54* and 29* exclude local and county visitor numbers from the SC, TC, and WC lists respectively.

(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(va) How They Learned About The Establishment.

Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vc) Other Information Source Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Area</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vi) **Group Identification of Each Visitor.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>15.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) **Number of Visits.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO. WHAT HAD BEEN GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

(i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>27.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>21.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>29.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) **A Decision to Return.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>(27.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) **Good Facilities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>(28.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Group D, Section One Results.

(i) A sizable majority of participants in this section were male, at a ratio of two to one.

(iiia) An outright majority were employed in the private sector, the largest single groups being involved in the provision of a service or non-professional role. These are followed by sizable minorities in finance & trade, and in engineering & industry.

(iiib) Of the minority of public sector visitors, the largest single group had an educational occupation. In this subdivision, there are more governmental employees than healthcare employees, at a ratio of two to one.

(iiiia) An outright majority of visitors were British.

(iiib) Of the sizable minority of foreign visitors, mainly at WC, BA and BC, the largest single group was European, mainly at BA and BC, while the second largest single group of North Americans was mainly at WC. There was also a minority interest in these locations from Pacific and Asian visitors, particularly at BA.

(iiiic) Of the British visitors, the largest single group was Midlands based, mainly at SC, TC and WC. The second largest group was southern based, mainly at BA and BC. There were also significant county and in some cases, local representations. All this indicates strong regional community links.
The two smallest groups are from Wales and Scotland, along with a fairly sizable minority from the North, mainly at WC.

(iv) On a basis of age, visitors aged between 31-40 were the largest single group, followed by those aged between 41-50 and 22-30. This reflects their largely family or couple based backgrounds. There were also sizable minorities of those aged between 51-60 or over the age of 60. The smallest group as such, was made up of visitors aged under 21, as there were comparatively few unattended child or teenage visitors.

(va) An outright majority of visitors did not learn about these locations by means of the media.

(vb) Out of the minority who had, the largest single group had cited the press to be their source of information.

(vc) As for the other visitors, local knowledge was the largest single source of information, which supports the idea of good community links, although the Friends of Stafford Castle support group is not so well represented. General hearsay is the second largest source, followed by sizable minorities who were in the area (near BA in particular), who have read about these locations or utilised Tourist Board facilities (at WC in particular), and utilised or belonged to a national organisation, namely the National Trust (in the case of BC). Advertisements, leaflets and signs are the three main (equal) minority groups, with sizable school-based and English Heritage member groups. One of the visitors
who cited tours at BA had also learned about it at Hastings Castle, while one who cited school at BC, also referred to Chartwell House in Kent as a source of information.

(vi) The largest single group of visitors in this category is family based. It significantly outnumbers the second largest group of visitors in couples, with the largest single individual group at BC, closely followed by that at TC. There are also small but significant minorities of visitors who were with friends or alone, together with a somewhat smaller tour based minority, mainly at WC. The smallest group generally, was educational, and non-existent at BC, SC and TC. The surveys concerned however, tended to be conducted in the summer holidays, or on bank holiday weekends in the case of TC. This would probably rule out formal school-based visits on these occasions. The large number of visitors to SC who did not indicate which group they were in, could indicate that they were alone.

(vii) A clear majority of visitors were on their first visit to these locations, mainly at WC, followed by equal numbers at BA and TC. The second largest group was made up of those who were on their fourth visit at least, followed by those on a return visit. There was also a fair minority of those who were on their third visit.
Analysis of Group D, Section Two Results.

(i) An outright majority of visitors considered the staff to be cooperative. The large number of 'wouldn't say' visitors at BC tended to be due to the tendency of those visitors to say that they had not seen any staff, in addition to one of the ten at SC, and the one visitor at TC.

(ii) A sizable majority of visitors by contrast, tended not to buy souvenirs, particularly at BA, BC, and TC at a two to one ratio, although the numbers were more balanced at SC and WC. The small but noticeable minority of 'wouldn't say' visitors at BC can be explained by these visitors tending to state that they had yet to actually go into the souvenir shop at the exit and make a decision.

(iii) A clear majority considered the visit to be educational however, despite small but consistent minorities at BC, TC and WC saying otherwise. There was also an unusually large number of visitors who could not really state if they had learned anything at BC. Yet they also tended to state that the primary purpose of their visit was to enjoy a walk around the grounds rather than seek out and examine any presentations as such.

In this group, visitors tended to learn about the Abbey, and the Battle of Hastings in BA, the Castle at BC, the Castle at SC, and the Castle at TC. The visitors who had seen the Richard III exhibition at WC, also tended to learn something from it.
(iv) An outright majority certainly regarded their visits as enjoyable, at all five locations.

(v) An outright majority also intended to return to these locations. The small but significant minority who did not intend to do so, has been embellished by the somewhat above average number at BA.

(vi) There was also a slightly larger majority which approved of the facilities. Critics tended to be mainly at BA and BC, and perhaps also SC, as suggested by its 'wouldn't say' figure. In this group, visitors tended to make positive references to the Gatehouse exhibition at BA, the open layout of the site at BC, the visitor trail at SC, and the Norman exhibition at TC. At WC however, just over half of the participants had not seen the Richard III exhibition, and there was a mixed response to it by those who had.
Analysis of Group D, Section Three Results.

Finally, a sizable minority were in favour of change, the trend at BC being somewhat higher than average. There was also a large minority who were content with existing conditions, especially at WC, and a small minority with no idea at all, possibly augmented by the number of 'wouldn't say' visitors at SC.

Visitors to BA tended to be complementary about the site trail and maps, although more clearer orientation was also requested. There were also requests for a better, more modern audio-visual display. More information and hygienic facilities were also requested. One visitor requested that the audio-visual might be better placed in a room, as at BC. One other visitor advised the installation of army emplacement markers, as at the Culloden battlefield site in Scotland.

Visitors to BC tended to commend the non-commercial nature of the site, although there could be more information signs and better access to the battlements, safety features and more information about the occupants, in addition to an extension of the good audio-visuals.

Visitors to SC tended to suggest an extension of the Centre, or a reconstruction (or at least better maintenance) of the castle ruin. More living history was also recommended, as was better maintenance of the trail and its information signs. One visitor suggested a permanent encampment on the site.
with occupants, as at the Black Creek Pioneer Village in Ontario, Canada. One other visitor unfavourably compared the site with TC, in that more effort should be put into site development rather than the modern housing development in the surrounding vicinity.

Visitors to TC tended to commend the ongoing development programme. It was recommended that more of the rooms be opened up with better access and more furnishings, and their purpose explained, and that guides could be provided. Displays that were neither too static, visual or mixed were also recommended, so as not to ruin the atmosphere or make it too commercial. One visitor suggested that there should be people in period costume, as in the Aston Hall Sonnets event at Birmingham. Another visitor referred to Aston Hall in suggesting that there be more furniture.

Visitors to WC tended to commend the visitor flow and Tussauds arranged displays. There were also recommendations for more information in the rooms (as to their purpose), and of the medieval castle, together with more waxworks (albeit of a different period to the Edwardian one), but not a commercial or theme park inspired atmosphere. There were also mixed comments about the Richard III exhibition, in that it was educational, but could do with less words and more objects. One visitor felt that there was no cohesive interpretation of history, unlike Blenheim Palace. One visitor had avoided the exhibition, having visited Bosworth Battlefield Centre.
COMBINATION OF RESULTS FROM SECTIONS ONE TO THREE FOR THE TWO OUTDOOR GROUPS C AND D.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>21.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>31.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Private Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>17.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiib) Public Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iiiia) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>(45.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>(8.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiiib) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(3.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(3.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiiic) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(5.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>(11.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(3.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midlands</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>(12.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(3.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(8.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(va) How They Learned About the Establishment.

Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>49.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vc) Other Information Source Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Museum Info.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Visits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (vi) Group Identification of Each Visitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (vii) Number of Visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>31.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION TWO. WHAT WAS GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

#### (i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>48.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>23.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>28.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>38.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>53.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) A Decision to Return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>48.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) Good Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>50.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>18.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>26.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of C and D Groups' Comparative Statistics.

Section One.

(i) There were slightly more female participants at D, and vice versa at C, with a 2 to 1 ratio in either case.

(iiia) Service is the highest occupation in both groups, followed by the Non-Professional, C leading slightly more than D. There are twice as many Engineering & Industry and Finance & Trade visitors at D as C.

(iiib) Education is the highest figure in both groups, slightly more so at C. Healthcare is equal, but governmental figures at D are at a 2 to 1 ratio to C.

(iiia) There are fairly more British visitors at D than C, with nearly twice as many minority foreigners.

(iiib) In all four categories, D leads C, including by over twice as many Europeans.

(iiic) D had more local visitors than C, but less from the country. D has more Londoners and Southerners, but C has more Midlanders and Northerners. The non-English minorities balance out.

(iv) The highest age groups for both C and D were 31-40, D leading by a fair majority. This lead was repeated in all groups by varying margins from being almost equal under 21, to over twice as many between 22-30.
(va) Media sources are definitely in the minority, but C is three times as likely to notice media references as D.

(vb) In this subdivision, C is nearly four times as likely as D to read press references, and slightly more likely to see television references. Radio references are almost equally scarcely noticed.

(vc) Advertisement figures and other museum information sources are virtually equal if low. Hearsay is also equal, but somewhat higher. C alone has membership figures, and leads those who were in the area, or who cited leaflets, school, and tourism, or who were local. D however, leads in past visits, posters, reading and signs.

(vi) In both C and D, the family groups are the largest, although D leads, as in all the groups, except for those who were alone. There are over twice as many couples and three times as many tour visitors in D. Educational visitors are equal.

(vii) In both C and D, the majority of visitors are first timers, second time visitors are equal, C's third time visitors outnumber D's, but D's fourth time visitors outnumber C's.
Section Two.

(i) In D and C, the majority of visitors found the staff to be cooperative. Slightly more visitors in D than in C either did not know or had not seen any staff.

(ii) Souvenir buying numbers are virtually equal, although approximately twice as many D visitors as C visitors did not.

(iii) Clear majorities found the visits educational, but more in D than in C did not.

(iv) There is virtual parity in those finding the visits enjoyable.

(v) There are outright majorities of those planning to return. The minorities not planning to do so are virtually equal.

(vi) There are clear majorities who found the facilities to be good. There are also more D than C visitors who did not think so.
Section Three.

More C people had no ideas for change than D. Over twice as many D visitors did not want change. Of those who did want change, D leads C by a fair sized majority.
COMBINATION OF RESULTS FROM THE THREE SECTIONS FOR THE INDOOR/OUTDOOR PAIRS OF GROUPS.

SECTION ONE. VISITOR IDENTIFICATION.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>(43.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>(53.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(2.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Private Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(8.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Trade</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>(12.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>(18.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>(27.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>(66.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(9.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiia) Public Sector Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service &amp; Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(3.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>(21.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>(5.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>(30.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iiia) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>(80.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>(19.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiib) Foreign Nationality Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(7.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>(8.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(3.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iiic) British Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>(9.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>(18.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(9.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midlands</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>(20.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(7.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>(13.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>16.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>22.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(va) How They Learned About The Establishment.

**Quantitative Breakdown.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>91.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vb) Media Sources Information Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vc) Other Information Source Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the area</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Museum Info.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Visits</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vi) Group Identification of Each Visitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>18.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>46.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) Number of Visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>74.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO. WHAT WAS GAINED FROM THE VISIT.

(i) The Cooperation of the Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>(92.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>(7.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Souvenirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>(47.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>(49.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(3.42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) An Educational Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>(72.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>(18.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>(9.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>(98.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) A Decision to Return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>(83.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>(13.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(2.64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) Good Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>(93.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(4.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION THREE. IDEAS FOR CHANGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>33.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice for change</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>50.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't say</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Comparative Indoor and Outdoor Group Combinations.

Section One.

(i) There were more AB than CD female participants, and more CD than AB male participants.

(ii) Service occupations are the largest single majority groups, with CD leading AB, as in all other private occupation groups, except for Finance & Trade. Engineering & Industry form the smallest groups.

(iib) Education forms the largest single public occupation groups, AB leading CD, with healthcare in a minority. Governmental employees are the smallest groups, CD slightly leading AB.

(iii) British visitors are in the majority, with CD leading AB, although AB leads the non-British minority.

(iiib) AB has the largest European and North American majorities. It is the same for CD, in leading the Pacific, Asian and African minorities.

(iiiic) The Midlands visitors are the largest single minorities, with AB leading CD, followed by the county, southern, and local minorities. CD leads in the Greater London, northern and non-English minorities.
(iv) Families are the largest groups, with CD leading. Next are the couples, CD having a smaller minority. Both are almost equal in their groups of visitors who are alone. AB leads in the friends, those on an educational visit (by 5 to 1), and in the tours minorities.

(va) Visitors who cite media sources are in the minority. AB visitors are twice as likely as CD visitors to cite them.

(vb) In this minority, press and radio numbers are almost equal, with AB slightly leading, especially in the press. For television, there is a much bigger lead.

(vc) AB slightly leads in advertisements, and in societies. It leads slightly more in hearsay and for those who were in the area, along with leaflets, past visits, posters, research and tourism. It also leads in those who cited school, at a ratio of 2 to 1. CD leads in local visitors at a near 4 to 1 majority, and also leads in reading and in signs.

(vi) Those aged from 31-40 are the largest groups, with CD leading, as for those aged under 21, from 21 to 30, and over 61, by not so large majorities. AB leads in the 51-60 range by a small majority.

(vii) There are clear majorities of visitors on the first visit, AB leading CD. CD leads AB in visitors on their second, third and fourth visits, the fourth group being at a ratio of 3 to 1.
Section Two.

(i) Majorities in both groups cite staff cooperation, but twice as many CD as AB minorities did not know or see any staff.

(ii) There are slightly more CD than AB visitors who bought souvenirs, but overall, more CDs did not buy souvenirs, compared to AB visitors.

(iii) Majorities in both groups found their visits to be educational, with CD leading, its visitors seeming to be more sure that they had learned something.

(iv) Outright majorities in both groups found the visit enjoyable.

(v) Outright majorities also intended to return. Out of those who would not, AB leads CD by a ratio of 3 to 1.

(vi) Outright majorities found the facilities to be good. Slightly more AB than CD visitors are in the minority who did not think so.
Section Three.

Slightly more CD than AB visitors did not have ideas for change. CDs lead ABs in large minorities which want these establishments and locations to be unchanged. Clear majorities in both groups advocated change, CD visitors having a clear lead.
Conclusion.

It may be discerned from the results that visitors to these locations in 1992 tended to be middle-aged, in some sort of group, usually family based, and employed in a private occupation which was service based. Such people were also usually visiting these attractions for the first time, although there was a small but growing group who were making their visits as a matter of routine. It is also noticeable that governmental employees and school-age visitors were in minorities. This is disturbing, as the least represented group may theoretically be the most influential at present, and the other will be, in the future. At present though, the younger the visitor, the more likely it is that he or she would be visiting an innovative establishment.

Most visitors were also likely to be English, the other British nationalities in that pre-devolutionary era tending to stay away. Other European visitors tended to favour the innovative establishments, while North Americans and Pacific visitors frequented the traditional establishments. The media was not as effective a form of advertising as might have been thought, but the innovative establishments did have a higher profile in it. The traditional establishments, unsurprisingly, tended to have been learned about in school or read about in books, by virtue of being long-established. The same should happen to the innovative establishments in time. Community and regional interest in these locations is shown to be strong,
especially in those innovative establishments which still have some novelty value.

In the Second Section, there are generally positive majorities as regards staff cooperation, education, enjoyment, plans to return and facilities. Staff at outdoor locations do not seem to be as available for assistance or information as their indcor counterparts though. There is also a significant trend of visitors not buying souvenirs. This may have been more to do with less well developed marketing facilities at some (traditional) institutions than with the recessionary state of the economy in 1991-92.

There was a general trend which advocated change, and which approved of existing development plans at some locations. The limited influence of JVC however, can be discerned in its being referred to by only four out of fourteen hundred and fifty participants apart from the JVC interviewees, along with two solitary references to TORH and WCE. As speculated at the start of this chapter, a solid body of information which is coherently presented with an awareness of local surroundings is significant.

It does seem important that visitors are properly orientated about that information and the nature of its presentation, especially at the start of their visit. Activities involving the visitor, such as tactile displays are also sought or approved, so long as the overall atmosphere is not spoilt. Nor does there seem to be much sympathy for verbose
displays, although many visitors are capable of learning a local or national theme. Visitors are also quick to notice if there are errors in the display, gaps in the narrative, or if something is malfunctioning, and this could affect their overall attitude and intent to return. As a rule though, innovation and experimentation in permanent presentations would appear to have been generally welcome in 1992, so long as this did not have a negative effect.

To complete the picture of what visitors thought and felt about such developments in 1992, it is necessary to consider the original information which was obtained about visitor responses to 'enactment' style events and education, where they occurred. Managerial reactions to these trends will also subsequently be considered, as will their directly acknowledged influence by the Jorvik Viking Centre, before an analysis of how the ultimate event of the 1950th anniversary of the Roman invasion of Britain, and its effects on the presentations concerned, was enacted.
CHAPTER FIVE. A CONSIDERATION OF ENACTMENTS AND EDUCATION.

Introduction.

Although the previous Chapter focussed on identifying the main types of visitors to four types of permanent presentation, what the public gained from such visits, and what they thought could be done to improve the presentations, references to temporary enactments and their effects on visitor response trends were conspicuously omitted. This was so as to make possible a separate study of such enactments and their significance in their own right, as a recognition of their great importance, before incorporating the findings in a revised consideration of the overall results and discerned trends.

An 'enactment' is here defined as a particular event, often involving theatre and costume, which may have a limited number of repeats but which is not a permanent feature of the museum/centre, and which is intended to celebrate a specific historical event. These 'enactment' findings would reflect the influence of events on interviewee attitudes as to what had been gained from their visits, as well as present visitor ideas as to how those enactments could be improved.

This presentation would facilitate the identification of any consequent trends, along with relevant education related data from the 1991-92 visitor and schoolchild surveys. This will complete the process of presenting the original visitor
survey statistical data that has been gathered for the purposes of this thesis. It would then be possible to discuss the trends, managerial responses, and overall implications as a unified whole.

For the sake of continuity, and to avoid confusion, the format which was used in the previous Chapter to present the original statistical information is utilised, the same group types are used, and the same abbreviations are employed.
Analysis of visitor survey information from the centres: what had been gained from the enactments, and what could be done to improve them.

Group A: Innovative Indoor Establishments.

JVC. No enactment took place within the JVC itself, but the survey was on 29 February 1992, during the annual Jorvik Viking Festival in York. Fourteen interviewees had already seen a Festival event, and twenty-nine would do so. Forty-seven had no plans to attend the Festival, and ten were undecided. This suggests that the Festival was not a consideration for over half of the interviewees in their reasons for being in York and visiting the JVC. Nor, recollecting the Chapter Four, Section One (vc) subdivision concerning 'other information sources' (184), did any interviewee cite Festival literature.

There is an apparent absence of any link between JVC and the Festival, other than in the requests by two interviewees for the Centre to provide festival information. Although the Festival could be useful in boosting the JVC visitor numbers in the midwinter months of January and February, the indication is that the Centre rather than the Festival is seen as more worth visiting, from the point of view of the visitors.

This would suggest that it is the Festival which has more to gain from the Centre, than the Centre from the Festival. Although the JVC benefits from the Festival in terms of off-season tourist numbers in York, the promotion of the
Viking theme for the benefit of the general public and (international) media, and in the free publicity which is generated, the indication is that however essential the Festival is to York, it is not an essential component in the well-being of the JVC, except as a costless, organisation free means of advertising.

THP. No event had an influence on interviewee responses.

TORH. No event had an influence on interviewee responses.

WCE. No event had an influence on interviewee responses.
Group B: Traditional Indoor Establishments.

BMM. No event had an influence on interviewee responses. The references which were made to the 'Northern Scribes' temporary exhibition, are not within the scope of this case-study.

CM. No event had an influence on interviewee responses.

RBM. No event had an influence on interviewee responses.

VM. The part of the survey which was conducted on 25 April 1992, took place on the occasion of the 'Treasures and Trinkets in Archaeology' (one day) Conference in the Museum Conference Room, which was jointly hosted by the Hertfordshire Archaeological Council and the Council for British Archaeology Group VII. The part of the survey which was conducted on 14 June 1992, took place during the 'On Guard' talk on Roman arms, armour and the army, inside the Museum, with a hands on demonstration of facsimile weapons and armour, by two members of the Legion XIII Living History Group.

Just three of the fifty interviewees on the first occasion, were attending the Conference. One of them had learned about the Museum because of the Conference. Three visitors had learned something from the Conference about the Snettisham treasures, ancient treasures and trinkets in general, and about how archaeological excess finds could be used in education and in schools. Twenty-one of the twenty-nine interviewees on the second occasion, attended the 'On Guard' event, of whom 286
seven were to state that they had learned something about the Roman army, such as the ingenuity and purpose of even minor items of equipment, or the continuity of military ideas. One also said that their visit had been specifically to see the event, and that perhaps the staff could always dress up.

One interviewee gave advice relating to the Conference, stating that there should be a bigger conference room. Three gave advice relating to the 'On Guard' event. Two of them requested more enactments, or were more specific in requesting regular Legion XIII events "with the same enthusiasm", and that being allowed to try on arms and armour added to the interest for parents and children. One said that the legionaries had added to the atmosphere.

When the interviewees were asked if the staff had been helpful, four commended the legionary re-enactors for their interesting talk and excellent demonstration. In referring to activities, two interviewees cited the Conference. Twelve stated that they had only listened to the legionaries, and another one had spoken to the legionaries, asking questions. Just one other had stated that apart from asking questions, they had also tried on a piece of Roman armour.

Apart from noting that visitors attending 'On-Guard' were more likely to participate in the survey than visitors attending the Conference, their reaction tends to be positive if passive, only one complaint being registered, and that one relating to the trend of comments about the overall limited space.
Only one third of those visitors who had attended 'On-Guard', stated that they had learned something from it. The question though, had been framed to ascertain what had been learned from the Museum as a whole, rather than just its enactments. Both the enactment and the Conference were also significant in that they enabled specialists and the public to learn about places and themes which were only indirectly related to VM.

The 'On-Guard' enactment is also significant for an absence of criticism of its potentially controversial, militaristic theme. This could be because the presentation, given in the 'third person' style of delivery which eschews the concept of role play, was objective in its utilisation of archaeological and primary literary evidence, and straightforward in its layman interpretation. This pragmatic form of presentation only seems to have provoked limited enquiries and less tactile involvement by the interviewees though.
Group C: Innovative Outdoor Establishments.

ARFM. On 15 August 1992, when the survey was first conducted, a 'Roman Events' day was taking place at ARFM, which involved Museum personnel and the associated Quinta V Gallorum Living History Group.

Of the thirteen interviewees who had taken part in activities on this occasion, just two were passive, in stating that they had been in a playlet audience. Another had tried writing in Roman style, four had been food tasting, three had been weaving, and three had been both food tasting and weaving. Four other interviewees intended to participate in some activity, and thirteen had not participated, or had plans to.

In comparison with VM, more interviewees seem to have been actively involved in the activities, possibly because there was more room for them, more variety, and because the (domestic) activities were ones which they could relate to. The overall varied nature of the enactment, in the form of hands-on activities, guided tours and playlets, would also seem to have contributed to the higher number of visitors who had learned something from their visit. Ideas for improvement do not indicate opposition to this form of presentation as a whole, but rather that it should be more frequent, with more variety in (tactile) activities.

In referring to what had been learned from their visit, the twenty-six on this occasion who had learned something
specific, tended to do so because of the hands-on activities such as weaving, the playlets with their varied themes of the supply depot role of the Fort, and the ceremony of a Roman wedding, together with more traditional guided tours of the site by Museum staff, which provided information on the latest excavations, and specifically about the significant discovery of the pre-Roman era hut, which indicated a military takeover of a hitherto civilian site.

Six interviewees had comments to make about the event. One made a qualified criticism, in that the Roman clothing looked too new. One other interviewee requested Colchester Castle Museum style activities, such as pottery lamp making for children. One visitor said (in what was then a pre-National Lottery era) that it was a pity that there wasn't the funding to make activity days available on request, "as it was better than a sterile day looking at stones". One said that there could be a good supply of information about the site at events.

One requested more demonstrations, including the handling of arms and armour, and one commended the playlets, although they could have been placed in the context of an audio-visual introduction. Finally, one interviewee who was not at this enactment, subsequently recommended that apart from there being more reconstructions, there should be volunteers dressed up as legionaries, "or just working in a house".

BRF. No event had an influence on interviewee responses.
FRP. On the first occasion on which this survey was conducted, on 20 June 1992, it was also the first day of a 'Roman Activities Weekend' which involved the staff, the Ermine Street Guard Living History Group, and independent Roman activity re-enactors, such as a Roman culinary specialist. One of the interviewees had learned about FRP by reading a leaflet (Chapter Four, Group C, Section One, vc: 226), and one specified an Ermine Street Guard leaflet.

A total of thirty-eight visitors referred to the event when asked if they had taken part in the activities. Fourteen of them saw the Guard drill, and another two asked questions. Eight saw the drill and tasted food. Five others were passive in that they just saw the drill and some other activity. One other passive visitor saw the camp. Ten others were active participants. Three of them made mosaics. One attempted some Roman-style writing, one was food tasting and making candles, one was learning about lamps, one was learning about cooking, one was learning about wool turning and mosaics, and one tasted food, and learned about cooking and clay lamps.

In answering the question as to whether the staff were helpful, sixteen specified that they felt able to ask questions, five found the independent participants to be helpful, five commended the mosaic makers in particular, and five also commended the Guard. One other visitor was pleased that someone was available to answer questions about the Museum. The event also had an influence on what was learned, nineteen stating
that they had learned about the Roman army, five of them having also learned about the army and the Palace, or activities.

One other visitor who had learned about the army and the palace, had come there specifically to see the Guard, because it was educational for children. Fourteen others had learned about Roman activities and lifestyle, one of them commenting that "hands-on was no longer just on paper".

In commenting on the event, one who stated that the entire site should be excavated and organised, added that it was the Guard display and Roman kitchen stand which brought it to life. Thirteen others had advice to give. Just one of them was hostile to the event, being antipathetic to Living History as a whole, and requested that the guides be dressed normally. This interviewee did commend the more traditional guides though, for their explanation of mosaic construction and decoration. Seven requested more activities and activity days. Four expressed a desire to see more (dressed up) guides or people giving talks and demonstrations, although one acknowledged that "the staff had otherwise done all that they could". Finally, one visitor who had only learned about the event by accident, asked if the Classical Departments of schools could be notified in advance, in future.

There is a balance in this form of presentation, in the numbers learning about the army or lifestyle. Both forms enjoy a higher profile in the survey than the traditional guided tour of the site, as at ARFM. There is also a noticeable larger number 292
involved in activities than in drill, as at VM. Nor, as at VM also, is there antipathy to the military activities, despite its high profile numbers and aggressive manoeuvres.

This survey was conducted on 9 August 1992, which was also the last day of the eighth Robin Hood Festival in Edwinstowe. Virtually no references were made about the event activities however, in terms of what had been gained or lost, except for an occasional comment about having learned about orienteering, which was one activity. Nine interviewees did have something to say about the event though. One of them had enjoyed a dramatic performance titled 'The Silver Arrow'. Another however, said that there could have been a bigger arena with rain cover for the actors.

One wanted to know where the tactile crafts were, significantly adding "if there were any this year". One other who had seen some crafts and woodcuts, said that more should be available, and one who said that the crafts, etc., were exceptional, added that there should be events like this more often. One requested that there could be more active learning facilities. One also said that there should be staff and archers around permanently. One requested more guides for the forest trails, one requested more information listings and locations signposts in the Festival, and one who liked the stalls displays, requested more variety.

This event, taking place both inside and outside SFVC, does not seem to have had as much impact, both positively and
negatively, on the interviewees, as the Centre itself. Apart from comparatively low profile activities on site being further obscured by the large numbers, the interviewees tended to be more preoccupied with the facilities and their (weather affected) difficulties at this location. The trend relating to the event, is actually positive, in that there is a desire for better event facilities and participatory activities, with related staff, rather than an outright rejection of it all.
Group D. Traditional Outdoor Establishments.

BA. On the first occasion on which this survey was conducted, on 21 June 1992, the Corridors of Time Living History Group staged a 'Monastic Life in the Middle Ages' presentation in the Abbey. Just twenty-five of the seventy-five interviewees on this occasion actually saw the event. Five had learned nothing, but twenty had learned something, of whom five had learned about the Abbey, eight had learned something about the Battle of Hastings, and seven had learned something about both the Abbey and the battle.

Three interviewees had not liked the event, but twenty-two were positive about it. Some of them did have ideas for improvement however, requesting better seating or more space, or a presentation with "more to it than just monks", or for all the presenters being generally good, or good speakers, and not only one out of three. Four of the interviewees did not consider the presenters to be approachable either, but the other twenty-one thought that they were so. One of them liked the idea of the presenters showing the exhibits to the audience, and one other was impressed by the way that the presenters had welcomed questions from the audience. There were also comments from interviewees about the difficulty of access to the presenters to see what was happening.

Elaborating on their answers, eleven were satisfied with the content and presentation, but two were unimpressed. Ten were more specific, five of them commenting on the lack of 295
space, and on the potential that the event had for being good, had it been possible to see it. Apart from calls for more space, it was also felt that there could be less talk and more action. Two felt that the lecture was overlong, and would have benefited from a break, or from hands on facilities. Two said that there should have been more information. One condemned the event as consisting only of "a man talking to a crowd".

Two other interviewees gave detailed opinions about the presenters, which are worth noting. One of them stated that the event was very good and very professional, and thought that the main presenter was very knowledgeable, but the two assistants were a bit hesitant. It would have been better if they had projected their voices more, and turned their backs to the audience less. The other interviewee also thought that the presentation was very good, adding that it came over well. When the drawings and artwork were shown around however, they were held low. The spectators at the back of the room could not see them. This interviewee felt that it would have been better if the presentation had taken place outside, or on higher ground.

Finally, while two interviewees felt that there should be more enactments, one of them adding that they should be staged for the benefit of children, as "history here was too static". The other thought that plays or dramatic presentations would be a better idea to the type of event which had just been seen. A similarity to the VM Living History enactment exists in
that both presentations involved less than four presenters, addressing the audience in an enclosed space, and utilising a third-person, strictly factual but colloquial form of narration, with the aid of facsimile implements from the era concerned.

The audiences at both locations also seem to have been mainly passive. The events differ however, not only in the overall professionalism of both sets of participants, but in the location which they utilised. At the VM, both participants were not only knowledgeable, thus allowing scope for variety in what might have been a limited theme, but experienced in their presentational routine. Although the presentation took place in the central area of the Museum, it had large exits on all four sides to the other rooms, making viewing or ease of access and exit, relatively easy and comfortable.

At BA by contrast, at least one participant was a novice, who could have benefited from a rehearsal, if only to test the acoustics and equipment handling. The potential for variety did exist however, given the roles of the participants (one monk, one novice and one knight), in which the experienced member could be responsible for the talk, while the others were directed to display the props as such, and allow the audience to handle them.

The choice of location however, which would have been challenging for an experienced team, only made this particular group's task harder, in that the stone crypt-like,
Dorter Range (Dormitory) where it was staged, had limited, narrow window spaces, and access only by means of a narrow entrance and down steep steps, onto a sandy floor which lacked seating. There was little room for a crowd to do much except watch, if that was possible. It would seem that whatever advantage may have accrued to the event in terms of its atmospheric and authentic setting, was nullified by the inconvenience and discomfort which was caused to the audience, and which tended to exacerbate the weaknesses in presentation by the less experienced participants.

This combination of circumstances was what provoked such a mixed response from the interviewees. This is unfortunate, because those interviewees who were closer to the participants, tended to be more positive in their opinions. The subterranean choice of venue and limited on-site advertising at a location which covers a wide area, also operated against the event, in that thirty other interviewees on this day, did not even see the event, apart from the twenty who had visited before it took place.

On the occasion on which this survey was conducted, on 26 July 1992, the National Trust were staging a 'Family Day' fair of activities and events, for children and adults. A total of sixty-two interviewees stated that they had taken part in Family Day activities. Twenty-six of them had taken part in archery practice, twenty had seen the Punch and Judy show, four had tried on armour, and the rest had taken
part in other activities, including the treasure hunt (fourteen), the pony ride (three), the painting (two), the blacksmith's forge (two), and a musical performance (one).

Of the thirty-eight interviewees who claimed not to have taken part in any activities, only one stated that they had intentionally avoided them, and that was only because they had been put off by the sight of a very long queue at the archery range. Only four visitors had advice to give concerning the event. One of them had approved of the hands-on arms and armour presentation, and claimed that they had overheard other visitors saying that there should be more such presentations. One approved of the Punch and Judy show on the grounds that it was good for children, and requested more such events. One visitor just requested more events, and asked for the end of the 'Family Day' and the closing of BC to be synchronised.

As at JVC, the majority of interviewees to BC had come to visit the location rather than the event, but in the case of BC, that majority is a slender one. The activities do not seem to have had a didactic effect on interviewees, in terms of history, but the majority of actively involved interviewees really were active, in that they were actually doing something or making something, rather than being just passive spectators. What would have helped create such a positive impression on visitors was the variety of activities, both active and passive, for all the family. There was also the space for it all, in the form of the National Trust.
owned field surrounding the Castle and Moat, into which the archery firing range could be comfortably and safely fitted.

SC. On the first occasion on which this survey was conducted, the Sealed Knot Living History Society were presenting an English Civil War era military encampment on the site. On the second occasion, an evening performance of 'The Wars of the Roses' production (a combination of Shakespeare's Henry VI, Parts I & II, and Richard III) took place on the site, utilising the Castle ruins as a stage and backdrop.

Twenty-five interviewees participated in the survey on the first occasion (27 June 1992), and twenty-seven did so in the aftermath of the performance on the second occasion (8 August 1992).

The events were a source of information about the Castle insofar as one interviewee had learned about it from an actor relative, and another was a friend of a production manager of 'The Wars of the Roses'. In talking about activities, twelve interviewees on the first occasion said that they had spoken to the Sealed Knot participants, four of them adding that they were very cooperative. On the second occasion, the play was a solely passive experience for the audience.

When citing what had been learned, nine on the first occasion referred to Seventeenth century history and warfare, as well as battlefield dentistry and surgery, courtesy of a good participant who was in the role of a surgeon. On the second occasion, two visitors had acquired a better
understanding of the Shakespearean plays and the Wars of the Roses. As for ideas for improvement, one interviewee proposed that there should be a permanent encampment, similar to the Black Creek Pioneer Village in Toronto, Ontario. On the second occasion, one visitor requested that the Shakespearean productions be continued. One other visitor, though commending the very good torchlight tours, suggested daytime performances in warmer weather, as they would be popular.

Out of the seventeen subsequent unsupervised interviewees, one had also seen the Sealed Knot encampment, and three had seen a Shakespearean performance. There were requests for craft fairs, and for more of the types of event which had taken place in 1992. One asked if special occasion activities such as fine weather playlets, could be utilised to help fund the overall restoration project.

On both occasions, interviewees tended to be passively involved in the enactments. Knowledgeable and communicative participants made the first one educational though, and a well-staged performance which used its location to good dramatic effect, made the second one enjoyable. The role of the Castle Bailey as a natural stage, is one which had been appreciated and creatively utilised by the production team. There was no registered antipathy to either event, but rather a tendency which was inclined towards more of the same, with even more variety.
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may have been on trails in the Castle grounds, which were at a
distance from them, or only on a visit to the Centre. If the
visitors at either event were passive, this was due to the
nature of those enactments, in which visitors were meant to be
an audience at a play, and spectators at an encampment whose
occupants were minding their own business. There was no
aversion to hands-on activities however, given the favourable
references to such medieval facsimiles in the permanent
exhibition in the Visitor Centre.

TC. On the first occasion on which this survey was conducted,
on 5 May 1992, a falconry presentation was taking place in the
Castle Courtyard. There was also a temporary exhibition on the
(locally important) Cook family, which is technically outside
the scope of this case study. Although it was also technically
not associated with the TC administration, the annual town May
Fair in the adjacent Castle Field was an influence on
interviewee answers, in a way which the playlets being enacted
in Dover Town Square, as a part of its 'Smuggling Weekend'
themed events, close by the WCE, by contrast, was not an
influence on the WCE survey, in that they were never mentioned.

Thirty-seven TC interviewees intended to go to the Fair,
and ten were going somewhere else. Just one interviewee
mentioned having seen the falconry event. Nobody stated that
they had learned about falconry as a result of their visit.
In commenting on how the overall presentation could be
improved, one interviewee opined that re-enactments and
more acting could be a stimulus, as much of the furniture and decorations, such as tapestries, appeared to have been only installed then left as they were, in inanimate displays. The event within the Castle had an extremely low profile, so as to be virtually unnoticed by the interviewees. Even though a higher profile event was taking place adjacent to the Castle, it is noticeable that as at JVC and BC, more interviewees were visiting the location specifically to see the permanent presentation rather than the enactment.

On the occasion on which this survey was conducted, on 10 May 1992, a performance by the Hereburgh Morris Men took place within the Castle grounds. Fifty-four of the interviewees considered it to be good, even though one of them added that they did not like morris dancing. Four did not think that the event was good, and forty-two did not see it. This was possibly because, as one interviewee stated, the rain put them off spectating this event. A Castle employee in the guise of 'The Red Knight', was also referred to, if only in passing, as in a failure to answer visitor questions.

Nobody stated that they had learned anything from the event, or had advice to give about events. As at TC, this enactment seems have been so low key as to be unnoticeable, and the permanent presentations also seem to have been the main focus of interest on the part of the interviewees. No hostility towards enactments was manifested however. This is also true of the other 1992 survey locations.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF 1992 ENACTMENT RESULTS.

(1) Had attended an event elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Would attend an event elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Had no plans to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JVC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Had attended an on-site event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>37.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Made complimentary references about the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>31.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Made critical references about the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Gave advice about improving events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Had learned something from the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) The cooperation of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for events, two of the 1991 pilot survey locations may be compared and contrasted, in that no enactments took place on either occasion at which the survey was conducted at Bignor Roman Villa, on 24 August and on 14 September, 1991, as opposed to a presentation of medieval pageantry by the Medieval Heritage Society at Goodrich Castle, on the occasion of that survey on 6 October 1991.

Six of the interviewees who visited Goodrich Castle, did so because they had read English Heritage literature relating to the event. It was also learned that twenty-eight of the interviewees found the event to be informative, and all twenty-nine found it to be entertaining. Twenty-five considered the participants to be approachable, as opposed to just one who did not think so, and three who did not answer this question.

In commenting on event participation, twenty interviewees just described themselves as spectators, although four approved of such activities as medieval dancing, especially for children. Five others described how they had recorded the event by means of a video camera, taking photographs, or asking questions of the participants. Four interviewees actually participated in the dancing.

When asked about what they had learned at the event, three visitors had learned nothing, seven had learned
about medieval life, ten had learned about archery, five had learned about archery and dancing, and four had learned about medieval archery. Twenty-eight interviewees commented on the content and presentation of the event, twenty-five of them being complimentary, albeit with the occasional comment on participant professionalism, and a perceived over-long dancing presentation. There were more critical comments on the general nature of the event, the lengthy intervals, or the dancing and seemingly impersonal (by reason of being tape recorded) commentary which the narrator had apparently used.

In advising as to how the Goodrich event could be improved, there were suggestions for better viewing facilities, for a greater variety of activities which would appeal to visitors of all ages, and for a better organised, less lengthy programme of events of which visitors could be notified in advance. There was total agreement on seeing such an event again, for both children and adults. There were no objections to the militaristic elements of the event, which were regarded as contributing to its entertainment value, especially for children. One Australian interviewee added that this type of event was "wonderful for tourists of younger countries and made the ruins more interesting and atmospheric and alive".

At the event-free location of Bignor Roman Villa, a few requests for Living History were made, and also qualified, in that the staff should not commercialise it, or that re-enactments would be gimmicky, but acceptable to
children. Other interviewees said that they could tolerate the presence of Roman re-enactors on the site, so long as they were professional, and not anachronistic. A warning that events can easily become excessive and actually harm a location, was modified by a belief that an on-site event which was a coordinated part of the Arundel festival could be a success.

Requests for Living History were also justified, in that they gave people a better idea of the location, as in the childrens' 'era games' at BC, or that apart from being enjoyable for children, it would be a source of employment for students, as in Canada. One interviewee actually seemed to prefer enactments to innovative permanent presentations, in that the National Trust set a good example in its staging of occasional events, although there should also be "no talking dummies croaking in corners". One interviewee was opposed to events in that they could be too militaristic and expensive.

The results from the Honeywood Heritage Centre survey of February to April 1992 were so disappointingly few and incomplete as to be worth attempting to incorporate in this overall assessment of the 1991-92 surveys, their results and trends. Occasional interviewee comments are worth noting however, as in the observation that "children and adults often take in more if they play a more 'non-passive' part in an exhibition on display". Another interviewee also felt that Honeywood's events could be improved by better (local) advertising.
Apart from providing information on events, the Bignor and Goodrich survey results also provide other information. Unlike the 1992 survey results, this information is not as quantitative, but it does have qualitative value. At Bignor, thirty-three had learned something new from their visit. Eighteen of them referred to the mosaics, and six to the craftwork. Eight had learned about other aspects of the site and its history, and one had learned about Roman Britain. Twenty-nine also wanted to learn more about the site, or about Roman Britain. One of them apparently intended to learn more about the latter by visiting FRP. One other visitor was motivated to visit RBM and VM.

Twenty-four did not disagree with the interpretation. One of them added that there should be no artificial pretences, and another stated that this location was good in that it did not give too much information, but allowed visitors to formulate their own opinion. It was noted that the traditional museum style presentation concentrated more on archaeological aspects of the site than Roman Britain. Six disagreed with it, taking issue with the information provided, the 'inaccurate' thatched buildings sheltering the remains, or with the lack of dates on the plaques. It was also felt that the installation of larger diagrams would "place the villa in the context of its surrounding environs. The presentation of the villa was too inward looking; it was the centre of a community". There were also requests for an audio-visual room and for a reconstruction over a mosaic.
In commenting about what had been enjoyable about the visit, seventeen cited the mosaics. The rest referred to the general layout and relaxed family atmosphere. One interviewee added that "Bignor could also be a 'stepping stone' to other sites, but would need more stimuli for the visitor to imagine daily life. To do this, there should be more talks on this and other nearby sites, as well as on Roman Britain. Audio guides could be made available, and there could be more diagrams.

Comments on the provision of education and entertainment included requests for more information signs, especially for children, more guided tours (though the existing guide was commended), and for more excavations. There were also requests for more information about the people who actually lived on this site, and about its post-Roman history. Apart from the comments about enactments, the concepts of Living History and reconstructions drew a mixed response. One interviewee noted that it was because Bignor was a quiet agricultural site, that what as acceptable at the Parc Asterix in Paris, was not so here. A visit to Bignor should still be children-led though, not a guilty 'hour of culture'. The main concern was that this location should not be spoilt by commercialisation.

Almost all the interviewees commended the staff for being helpful, five of them giving the guide special praise for being informative, and capable of pointing out items of special interest, or explaining the workings of the hypocaust system. Six interviewees had no suggestions for improvement.
Seven of the rest had ideas concerning the visitor facilities, namely the shop and the cafe. The remainder mooted ideas for more excavations, for information about recent excavations and find displays, and for play facilities for children.

There were also requests that there should not be too many improvements, as this could spoil the site. One interviewee actually compared Bignor with FRP, in that the former was a casual 'family' site, whereas the latter was 'anonymous' in that no one was available to answer questions. Nor was Bignor packed with visitors, unlike other sites in the rest of this county. This is what made Bignor a site worth visiting. Finally, thirty-three would return, if there were more excavations, or show others around.

VISITOR IDENTIFICATION OF BIGNOR INTERVIEWEES.

(i) Gender Quantitative Breakdown.

Female 13
Male 22

(ii) Occupational Quantitative Breakdown.

Non-Professional 8
Finance & Trade 7
Engineering & Industry 3
Education 8
Government 5
Service 4
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(iii) Nationality Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Age Quantitative Breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) Source of Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadsigns</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearsay</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the area</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vi) Group Identification of Each Visitor.

Alone 3
Friends 6
Family 25
Society members 2

(vii) Number of Visits.

First 29
Second 4
Third 2

STATISTICAL INFORMATION FOR GOODRICH CASTLE.

(i) Source of Information.

Press 2
Advertisement 10
Hearsay 5
Local 3
Leaflet 1
English Heritage 8

(ii) The Cooperation of the Staff.

YES 26
NO 1
Wouldn't Say 2

(iii) An Educational Visit.

YES 28
NO 1
(iv) An Enjoyable Visit.
YES 29

(iv) Good Facilities.
YES 27
NO 7

Interviewee concerns were about catering, rubbish disposal and toilet facilities.
Analysis of Education Related Results.

One other factor in the presentation of these researched locations in 1991-92 which had to be taken into consideration, was of their value to children. Comments on the presentation at Bignor had included favourable references to the actual and potential facilities for children, such as a play area or games. There had also been positive comments on this subject from interviewees at the Maldon and Goodrich events.

Turning to the 1992 survey returns, references were made to the queue being too long at JVC, and the Time Tunnel being too short for children. It was also felt that there could be a better schedule for children, as well as displays for them. The provision of a children's guide would also have been useful. There were also favourable comments about the THP being good for children so long as they were not too young. This was also the case at TORH, one child interviewee noting that what children liked about it was that its presentation was very good at relating tales and legends.

Another interviewee stated that TORH was entertaining, with lots to look at and participate in. At WCE, some adult interviewees approved of the play area and hands on facilities for children which were located in the second half of the building, thereby making that section more interesting for them than the other. It was also felt that WCE promoted a light-hearted form of learning.
A schoolchildren's display on Bede which was incorporated in the overall exhibition of the 'Northumbrian Scribes' at BMM, drew a favourable response, together with its educational service. It was also felt though, that while the Monastery site beside the Museum gave children a space in which to play, it was also felt that the Museum itself could be made more interesting, as in the provision of hands on facilities, or quizsheets.

Interviewees at CM, felt that it was good for children for reasons of education (depending on age), and also because of the presentation. The existing questionnaires, quizzes and brass rubbing facilities were deemed to be good in that they kept children occupied. The display settings were open and accessible, with easy to read signs, in addition to the interesting reconstructions of domestic households, and visible displays, especially in the latter sections. This was what enabled the Museum to bring proper knowledge alive. The clearly laid out, simple exhibitions also benefited from clear visual aids and clearly laid out exhibits. A few criticisms tended to be on the academic, 'grown-up' nature of the displays, lacking visuals, sound and interaction, with too much writing.

The teaching of history was considered to be an important reason why the RBM was good for children, together with the Museum presentation. The information boards in particular, were commended for being at an easy to read low level height, and easy to understand. The visual attractions of this
site, namely the running water and pools, were also felt to be advantageous, although it had to be ensured (particularly in the Museum) that the children did not lose interest. There were also concerns about safety, and crowding in the corridors.

Interviewees at VM also tended to think that it was a good Museum for children, because of its educational content and facilities. The hands on displays were favourably commented on, especially as they were positioned at an accessible low level, together with the exhibits. The audio-visuals, cartoons and investigative drawers were familiar to children who had handled school trays. Not too much was on display so as to be overwhelming however, and a variety of different stimuli was available. It was also noted that the Museum presentation, especially its computer displays, associated the artefacts with life and fun. It was also good that there was space in which to move around, look at, listen to, or touch displays, and that visitors could return to what they particularly liked, rather than be compelled to stick to a one way trail.

The gate reconstruction at ARFM was felt to be useful for children, in their National Curriculum studies, and in helping them to reinterpret the site. The hands-on facilities were also felt to be better than books. Children were also felt to have an interest in Romans because of the Asterix books, and ARFM broadened their horizons, as well as instil in them a sense of local pride. What also helped children and made it a good location for school projects, was its interesting combination
of hands-on facilities, excavations, a fort site, and Museum. The open spaces and the quizzes were also approved, the latter inducing children to look around more clearly. Space (for games) was also felt to be good for children at BRF, and the reconstructions good for interpretation. There was plenty to look at and explore, and the site's Museum was felt to be a good introduction to Roman military life.

At FRP, it was felt that the layout was good, together with a children's section with cheap souvenirs. The audio-visual was also easily viewable, and though the Museum might be difficult for younger children to comprehend, or the mosaic area a not very good place in which to visualise the original edifice, this location was also educational, with easily viewable displays and mosaic making facilities. Interviewees at SFVC who felt that it was good for children, tended to say so because of its links with Robin Hood. This enhanced its educational and entertainment qualities. It was also an excellent place in which to play.

At BA, it was just felt that there could be enactments for the benefit of children. It was also felt that it was a good repository of English history for them. BC was considered to be a place in which there was much for children to do, not just in an event, but because of the play value of the spacious site, despite some concern about safety, as regards the battlements and moat. It was also a very educational location, in terms of history. The Castle videos were useful in this respect.
It was even claimed that it was one of the best National Trust sites for children.

It was felt at SC that more facilities for children with scaled down arms and armour (as in the existing Visitor Centre display) would be a good idea. One suggestion to make TC more interesting for children be contrast, was for computer displays to be installed. Finally, interviewees at WC opined that the Richard III exhibition was unsuitable for children, being too long on words and short on exhibits, and that there should be a quicker flow through the (medieval) waxworks displays for their benefit, together with more child orientated souvenirs, and that a nature trail for them would be a good idea.
Analysis of Supplementary Information from the Two Centres Employed in the 1991 Pilot Survey: Educational Survey Returns.

It would now be appropriate to review the results from two educational surveys which were conducted at Binchester Roman Fort on 5 March 1992, and at the Maldon Experience Camp from 3 to 11 June 1991. Not only do the findings possess some qualitative and quantitative value, but their reflection of the views of schoolchildren and of specialists in education and Living History, creates an interesting comparison with the views expressed by mainly laymen adults in the 1991-92 surveys which have hitherto been analysed. Useful insights are also provided into what could be the trends of the future which will be popular among the visitors of the future. It is also important to determine what children gain from, and like about these locations if they are to become those visitors, and develop sympathetic attitudes towards archaeology.

The purpose of the visit of a primary schoolgroup to Binchester Roman Fort, Piercebridge Bridge, and Escomb Saxon Church, under the guidance of the Witton Park Educational Centre staff, was to give them an idea of what a Roman fort was like, discover how a Roman heating system worked, and how it was used to heat Roman baths. They were also to see and walk along an uncovered, paved Roman road on the site, and use the enquiry method to discover what they could about Escomb Saxon Church. The role of the teacher of this group was firstly to obtain maps and other visual material from the Centre,
then arrange a plan for the day with the Guide concerned, and ensure that the children knew something of the Roman invasion and settlement of Britain prior to the visit.

The children were felt to have responded very well, in the teacher's opinion. It was noticed that while a few tended to monopolise the opportunity to ask questions, working in groups at the Church was probably the most successful part of the day, because "every child was involved and felt as if he or she was fulfilling a role". What they had most enjoyed were the anecdotes about Roman life, and the acting as detectives at the Church; "there was no time for children to feel bored, cold, or hungry, etc.".

As for how the visit could have been improved from the teacher's point of view, more time could have been spent at the Church, and "it might have been a good idea to return to the Centre to complete and collate our findings".

Finally, the teacher felt that the visit, and what the children learnt on it, related very well to National Curriculum guidelines on the teaching of Roman history. The children had looked at changes over a period of time, given reasons as to why this was so, and recognised that some things change over time, while others stay the same. They also had an increased understanding that deficiencies in evidence may lead to different interpretations, and had learned about acquiring evidence from historical sources.

The answers of the children themselves, indicates that
the Dere Street Road Section and the Fort Bath remains on the site, was what made the most significant visual impact on them. This tends to have been in a general, rather than a detailed way. Only two out of the group of twelve actually imagined themselves as Romans, but they all felt that they had done something, or benefited from it all in some way. What detailed information was acquired about the location, was mostly due to the Guide from the Education Centre. The impression on them was favourable, and there were no indications that they had been bored.

Roman road construction tends to have been what was most widely learned, probably because they knew that they had been walking on one, and had the aid of maps to help them get an idea of the importance of roads in the area. Copies of the comparative area 'Then' and 'Now' themed maps are enclosed (Appendix B: 500-501). The children were also capable of realising that people who were capable of road construction, could also design and operate forts and baths. The varied, detailed facts about armour weight, or garrison numbers which were learned, indicates that they were sufficiently interested in the site and the Guide, to listen to and remember details.

The walk was appreciated by some, rather than all. Yet where the children did not feel that they already knew it all, or felt let down by the real (rather than imagined) state of the sites, they mostly seem to have reacted well to the experience. The Church certainly made a good impression on
them. Finally, the majority appear to have been sufficiently impressed by Binchester, to want to see another Roman fort. This tends to be either because they consider such sites to be interesting, or would like to show the sites (as guides) to their families. Having learned something from the visit, they could have become more interested in wanting to learn more about the Romans, or educate others.

Reviewing their comments in the context of the teacher's perspective, pre-school preparation for a visit puts them in a receptive frame of mind, so long as they do not have false expectations about the site, or feel that information acquired there would be superfluous. Interestingly anecdotal information which is supplied by the Guide is more likely to give them a practical idea of the site and its surrounds, and to be able to make a comparison between the area and its surrounds, then and now. Despite on site activities, or a walk along a Roman road, they do not mostly appear to have imagined themselves as detectives though. The good impression which was made on them by Escomb Church, could be because they felt that they were actually doing something worthwhile, as well as educational.
The Maldon Anglo-Saxon Experience Camp Surveys.

Unlike the sites which were the foci of the Binchester Roman Fort visit (and consequent survey), the Experience Camp was a one-off, temporary establishment in the playing field of a school in the centre of Maldon, for ten days in 1991. It consisted of a large tent in which the 'Saxon Village' was located. This took the form of various activity areas with their respective artefacts and tools from the period. These activity areas were the concerns of a wood worker, a leather worker, a blacksmith, a loom worker, a coin maker, and a clerk. A pole lather was occupied in an enclosure which was adjacent to the tent. Other participants included a cook, and various volunteers from Nuclear Electric, sponsors of this enterprise, who assisted the craftsfolk or minded the livestock.

Two other participants were in the roles of Brithnoth, hero of the Battle of Maldon, and his Reeve. Their task was to guide the children into an annex of the tent at the start of their visit, which operated as a 'Time Tunnel' into the main tent. Within this annex was an exhibition of information, exhibits and photographs relating to the post-Saxon history of Maldon. The Living History presentation in this area was first-person, but knowledgeable of the 'future', whereas in the main tent, it was strictly first-person, with knowledge confined to the time and locality of 991. After their induction, the children would be split into small groups and set to work in an
activity area, changing with another group after a period of
time. The idea was that the children (already dressed in home-
made Saxon clothing) would have the chance to participate in
all the activities, and have something made to leave with,
after a farewell address by Brithnoth.

The crafts folk and volunteers were all managed by a project
coo-ordinator, although their backgrounds varied. The volunteers
were previously employed as Nuclear Electric public relations
guides, whereas the crafts folk, had an autodidactic interest
in the period, at least one of them being employed or connected
with the West Stow Anglo-Saxon Country Park. The crafts folk
preferred to differentiate themselves from re-enactors in that
they were interested in educating the public. They were also
aware though, that this task was difficult when the public
were unaware of even the basics of that era, or had only twenty
minutes in which to make something, in a hands on activity.

Other problems which could arise, were that the children had
been given the wrong preparation, or that the teachers would
use anachronistic language and assert their 'modern' authority.
At least the participants had the benefit of having worked
together before, and could develop their characters in
consequence. A feature of the Experience Camp was a contrived
argument between the blacksmith and wood worker, as to who
had the most important role in their community. Apart from
enlivening the visit, this served to demonstrate how the
different activities all had a significance in the
existence of a subsistence settlement. A role-play practice was also organised in April 1991, for the benefit of volunteers and teachers.

The crafts folk intended to expose primary schoolchildren to some of the tasks and activities of an Anglo-Saxon settlement in a hands-on way, and give them an idea of what life may have been like (for children) in England a millennium ago. It was subsequently felt that these objectives were achieved. From the perspective of the crafts folk, the children tended to react enthusiastically and in a thoughtful way. One participant also noted that the children appeared to lose themselves into the period, and gain knowledge on a whole range of careers which have been used up until the modern day. Another stated that the children had had to use a certain amount of concentration and involvement which was not too easy or difficult, but which made their experience interesting and fun.

What the crafts-folk had enjoyed most was the change of lifestyle, the team-work, and the involvement of the children in a positive enterprise. It was also felt that there could have been better preparatory work as regards the 'Time Tunnel', the role of the teachers, and the time allotted for each activity. One participant also stated that the schools also had to put in better preparatory work, as regards costumes, and that all watches should be banned on site, to enable the children to fit in.
As for what had been learned, it was felt that experienced helpers would be useful, especially if the Camp was to be a 'live-in' arrangement. In role-playing, it was better to be someone ordinary, and close to your real personality; "history is made up of ordinary people. You just have to transmit yourself into a different time and act in much the same way as you would in normal everyday life". Although the Experience set a good example in teaching history, and could be utilised in presenting other periods, more sponsorship was required. Also important was preliminary discussion and planning with everyone who was to involved, discovering their knowledge, experiences and skills, before using them, securing the commitment of everyone, and making it stimulating and enjoyable for them. Having a knowledgeable and skilled inner group, as at Maldon, was also a good idea.

Finally, the crafts folk felt that the educational value of the Experience was high, in that it gave children an awareness of the conditions (and rigours) of the Tenth century, which could be compared with the Twentieth century. It also taught them about contemporary manual activities, and how to use their imagination. One important criterion was for such an enterprise to be financially accurate, which is something that the Maldon Experience managed fairly well, given its setting.

The teachers of the participatory schoolgroups became involved in a comparatively casual way, with the inducements of Maldon millennium lectures and an education pack. Having been
invited to participate by friends or colleagues, they then undertook background studies into the era, and prepared the children by means of costume and character preparation, and visits to historic sites in Essex. On site, they tended to adopt the same roles as the volunteers, assisting the children in an informal way. Their intention was for the Experience to be a stimulating, convincing recreation of Saxon Maldon, which would also complement and enhance existing work in the classroom, and give them a better insight into history, by means of first-hand experience. One teacher also stated that they wanted the children to participate, and to "arouse their imaginations into believing that they really were passing through a time lock into Saxon times. It is to be hoped that learning through experience, especially for young children, will produce lasting memories".

It was subsequently felt that this had been accomplished, although there could have been more preliminary preparation and role-play. The effort to inculcate Saxon history and technology had apparently been successful. The children were considered to have been very positive generally about the Experience Camp, especially its hands-on nature, and to have enjoyed their involvement. What the teachers themselves enjoyed, was that involvement, which enabled them to have less of an educational role. The hands-on realism of the site was also appreciated. There could have been improvements in training and preparation, more time for activities, and for there to have been a more imaginative 'Time Tunnel'. The teachers had learned of
the value of preliminary work, by cooperation with the crafts folk, and by role-playing interaction. It was also felt that the children could benefit better from spending more time at a craft to which they had been apprenticed, and if they had been presented with a role playing situation. Something which was not required on site was a notebook. The Experience was judged to be limited in terms of educational value by itself, but not in a wider programme. It gave good personal hands-on experience which would be better remembered than passive studying, and which would be useful for the 'Invaders and Settlers' KS2 C5U1 Unit in the National Curriculum. One teacher concluded that in increasingly accepting the plausibility of the Experience, the children saw themselves as real time travellers.
STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF SURVEY CARRIED OUT AT MALDON AMONG THE
SCHOOLCHILDREN WHO VISITED THE EXPERIENCE CAMP.

The numbers listed below, are of the children who had answered
the listed question, out of the total number of 264 survey
returns.

(1) References to the 'Time Tunnel' display, in stating what
had been learned. 103

(2) Number of children who had worked with at least two
crafts folk. 256

(3) Number of children who felt able to work with the crafts
folk. 198

(4) Number of children who could specify what crafts they had
learned. 91

(5) Number of children who stated that the crafts folk had
helped them with their work. 253

(6) Number of children who had learned about at least one
craft. 92 330
(7) Number of children who had learned some Anglo-Saxon history. 170

(8) Number of children who had enjoyed working on some activity. 132

(9) Number of children who had enjoyed being taught some activity. 131

(10) Number of children who had not enjoyed something about the Experience. 112

Reasons cited included boredom, tiredness, the weather and food.

(11) Number of children who had not enjoyed working with someone. 84

Reasons cited included strictness, being quarrelsome and uninformative.

(12) Number of children who had no complaints. 68

(13) Number of children who wished to participate in a similar experience. 223 331
(14) Number of children who did not.
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Conclusion.

In terms of numbers, the number of interviewees who attended on-site events in 1992 is not extremely large, amounting to approximately one third of the total of 1550. There is sufficient evidence from all four groups however, together with the supplementary evidence from the pilot surveys, to discern trends which indicate public attitudes towards events. These in turn, contribute towards an understanding of public reactions to traditional and innovative presentations. Something of the significance of events has also been indicated. They are contributory elements in an overall presentation, not entities on which that presentation is dependent. Nor should they be dismissed as irrelevant gimmicks, whether staged within or without the confines of the location concerned.

JVC has been shown to be an exemplar of the relationship between the location and the event. In a tourist saturated city like York, visitor numbers were not too much of a concern, especially since the financial backers of JVC were repaid. It is rather the York tourist authorities who have taken up the Viking theme, and put it to commercial use, JVC being a passive beneficiary in terms of publicity. The lack of space at that site in any case, militates against the provision of enactments there, making an expansion in presentation developments elsewhere, not only inevitable but realistic.

Space is a major consideration in events, as has been shown in the survey returns, especially at VM and BA. It is
essential not only for the sake of visitor comfort and observation, but also participation. The interviewees at events at least, seem to have been frequently passive. This seems to be due to a lack of engagement by participants or a lack of space, rather than a disinclination to be involved. Too much space at a location by contrast, which lacks an enactment focal point, can be just as negative however, as at SFVC or paradoxically, BA. In these instances, advance publicity and orientation are also significant.

Not only is the professionalism of the participants an important factor, again as at VM and BA, but the variety of activities too, as at ARFM and BC. Not only have there been interesting developments in hands on, with especial attention to children, as at FRP and BC, but also in the use of drama, as at ARFM, SFVC, and SC. Variety can be counter-productive if it seems to be ill-coordinated, as at the Robin Hood Festival at SFVC. Where visitors have objections to events, it tends to be because of the communicative (in)ability of the participants rather than objectionable content. Presentations of the Roman army for instance, were not deemed to be controversial.

Variety is also possible at a didactic level, as in the VM's ability to present archaeological conferences and activities under the same roof. What is learned, may also extend to information beyond the site itself, and into general themes such as lifestyle, as at ARFM or FRM. The participants who
are referred to in the surveys, tended to belong to independent societies rather than be employed by the museums/centres or archaeological sites, except at ARFM. The value of these societies, if they are good, is not only in accomplishing a good form of presentation, but in freeing the permanent staff for other duties, as at ARFM and FRP with their guides, which only adds to the variety and its appeal. A form of contact with the community is also achieved.

To be good in such presentations is essential, as shown by the successful events at SC and BC, and more mixed receptions at BA, SFVC, and Goodrich Castle, because the success or failure of a presentation tends to be associated with the location at which it took place. Success involves co-ordinated organisation which is focussed on a clear theme, good pre-publicity and on-site orientation, presentation practice which the location management would be well advised to check, a good setting for performers and audience, and good timing, as in any other dramatic production.

A visitor is more likely to be at a location to see the permanent presentation rather than the enactment, but this does not permit the enactment to be a negative influence, even if events do not seem to be a major source of publicity for locations. It is ultimately the responsibility of the manager - organisers of a location enactment to determine the most suitable form that it takes, as advised by Bignor interviewees, and to achieve the right balance, as at BC.
Managerial and participant professionalism is as important in educational presentations as in enactments. The crafts folk who were commended at the Maldon Burh for instance, had already worked as a team in the Maldon Experience Camp. School survey returns together with those from Binchester, also indicate trends of organised plausibility, creative audience participation, and of scope for variety. Such trends are also noticeable in the educational elements of the permanent presentations, which have been noted in this chapter.

It would seem from the visitor public trends, that it is not the question of permitting enactments or school education orientated presentations which is at issue, but the form that they take. While the relevance of such presentations to children is in their didactic and entertainment value, adults can also be impressed by these innovations and experimentations.

The process of setting out the visitor survey returns for 1991-92 and discerning and illuminating the underlying trends, has now been completed. The next Chapter will discuss managerial issues, including the influence of Jorvik upon the other sites, and the impact of a single large event, that of the 1993 commemoration of the Roman invasion of Britain.
CHAPTER SIX. MANAGERIAL PERSPECTIVES, INFLUENCES, AND COMMEMORATIONS.

Introduction.

The presentation of information now culminates firstly in an appraisal of the managerial responses to the survey trends and related interviewee comments and criticisms of their respective presentations. By exercising their right of reply, those managements which were in a position to comment on the findings, contribute to this study by explaining why certain types of display have or have not been constructed, and place them (where appropriate) within the context of an overall established presentation or formative development plan. Their perspective of, and interaction with the people who visit their museum/centres is also revealed, as is how this awareness influences the presentation construction.

A consideration of the data relating to the influence of the Jorvik Viking Centre on the other nationwide locations which have been researched in this case study, is also made. In doing so, the intention is to determine just how significant that influence is, whether in isolation or in conjunction with other presentational influences on these selected examples. Having considered this form of influence and effect on presentations which have a (forseeably) permanent basis, there is then a shift in theme.

A consideration is then made of a nationwide commemoration
of a national anniversary theme. Given that the resultant examination of the form of influence and effect on displays and enactments by something which had only a transitional basis is made, this in itself forms the foundation for the essential comparison and contrast. In these circumstances, the historical difference between the respective themes of the Jorvik Viking Centre and the anniversary of the Roman Invasion of Britain in AD 43, does not matter. What does matter is what can be learned from these influences on display and enactment, and how they relate to the broader issues of presentation. To help facilitate this comprehension, the special abbreviations which have hitherto been utilised, as in referring to the Jorvik Viking Centre as the JVC, are again employed here, so as to avoid confusion.

The reason for the choice of the JVC as an influence on other developments has already been made clear in previous chapters. To recapitulate, the high-profile nature of this presentation, based as it was on the professional publicity enhancement of the perennially fascinating theme of the Vikings, demanded attention. Whether this innovative establishment was itself an enhancing or baleful influence on other presentations, depended on the true significance of that influence. Having already considered the JVC's own reported claims to this effect, and presented image in the media, in Chapter Two, an independent verification was made by means of analysis of the relevant findings from the visitor and staff surveys.
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The attractions of researching the commemoration of the AD 43 anniversary, in contrast to Jorvik, were in its quite different characteristics and legacy. There was a superficial similarity in that, like the Vikings theme, this Romano-British theme was securely placed within the chronological parameters of this study. It was a theme which was also manageable in scope, given that there is actually scant archaeological or historical evidence for the events of AD 43, compared to the English Civil War for instance, which commemoration had been envisaged to consist of a rolling programme over a ten year period (1).

Paradoxically though, its theme was one which could be and in some cases was, adopted by those same establishments which were being researched for evidence of the Jorvik influence. The serendipity of this circumstance could form interesting comparisons and contrasts.

Another reason for choosing this particular anniversary was that it would be possible to analyse the commemoration of a national theme at a local level, in contrast to the implementation of a localised form of presentation nationally. Finally, another form of contrast existed in that the anniversary, though not an unqualified national success with an unlimited lifespan (unlike the continuing media factual and fictional Viking theme), might arguably have had a significantly qualitatively if not quantitatively more durable effect at local level, on individual presentations and enactments.
The ultimate bringing together and rounding off of these themes encapsulates the previous considerations of presentation, enactment and influence in the previous chapters, and finally makes a discussion of these topics possible. It could also be learned why this particular anniversary, and by implication, anniversaries in general, was considered to be significant and worth commemorating from the perspective of the planners.
Managerial Responses to Interviewee Visitor Trends.

The material presented in this section, has been elicited from the managements which agreed to cooperate in the 1992 visitor surveys, and which were in a position to subsequently discuss the findings. The response by the management of Bignor Roman Villa to the findings from the 1991 pilot survey concerning its site, has been added, by way of interest and relevance to the overall review of this material. To maintain continuity, the abbreviations by which the 1992 visitor survey locations have been identified in previous chapters, are employed here, as is the order in which they are listed.

In responding to the survey results at WCE, the perceived 'gap' between the Roman and 1940s periods was acknowledged, but it was felt that it was more important to focus on those periods. Apart from the Town Museum, Dover Castle was very good at covering the history in between. The requests for a more comfortable presentation had been heeded though, and there were plans to make it more accessible for (disabled) visitors. The large number of visitors in family groups was believed to be due to a burgeoning trend of parents who had been sufficiently impressed by the account of a school visit to arrange a return trip. As for the souvenir statistics, it was observed that visitors tended to spend more in the summer months (2).

At the BNM, the (interviewee) sense that the Monastic Herb Garden could be better utilised, had been acknowledged by
the management. Planted in 1982, it had followed on from the original 1975 development, but pre-dated the 1985 overhaul. Now it was to be incorporated in the Bede's World development. Visitors would be better informed of the audio-visual, and the existing site and Museum presentation would remain unchanged for at least the next two years. The Shop however, which had been observed to be popular, would be moved into the new buildings, and the space would be used for exhibitions (3).

The positive interviewee opinions about tactile displays and audio-visual facilities at the CM, had been noted. It was intended to provide more such provision. The priority however, was to install new facilities to ensure visitor comfort and comprehension by 1995, including information translations (4).

At RBN, it was acknowledged that surviving items of masonry should be in their proper positions. Cornices for instance, should be "in the air, not on the floor" (5), as in the examples of the Temple Entrance and Luna Pediment restorations. Only fragments specifically relating to the Great Bath should be placed there, to let visitors appreciate the structure properly. Other fragments (and their concrete bases) should be removed. It was also intended to remove the largely unused Infobars. That eight out of one hundred interviewees had used them was considered to be unusually good. Yet although alternative systems, as at The Canterbury Tales had been considered, the arising complexities made them non-viable, with one exception which permitted complete freedom of
movement and control of the programme.

As for crowd control, guides and monitors were on hand to regulate the flow, but only in certain areas. It was out of necessity that groups were broken up and delayed. The humidity was also acknowledged to be a problem. Air conditioning though, if good for the visitors, would be bad for the remains. The emphasis had always been, and must remain on conservation. Visitors would just have to accept the conditions, including pools which were unusable for recreation purposes (6).

At the VM, the prevailing philosophy was that "museums are a living reflection of what goes on in the community" (7). The identity of the visitors was considered to be a thorough selection. If a museum is visited by children, it is acknowledged that it must be a museum for children. Although a combination of three audio tapes and a black ceiling had created a claustrophobic atmosphere, it was considered impractical for earphones to be installed to isolate the noise from the audio-visual facilities. The Posthumus video display was itself a good example of an unforeseen, recent addition to the presentation, becoming one of its mainstays. The Museum being also one for children, it was felt that such displays added to the atmosphere, and would not distract the majority.

Although it had been noted that the Gate model was missed however, the managerial attitude was that it was old fashioned, and unsightly. As for providing maps, such texts
were already available in the guide book and on the walls. Despite requests for more general and background information, the official policy was also that "the Museum was one for Roman Verulamium" (8). A database was available for the sub-Roman site, but the history of St Albans was presented in the Town Museum. Roman Britain by comparison, was too vast a theme to be presented. This policy was felt to be consistent with that of other museums.

At FRP, which had established a tradition of innovation and (re)development, a willingness to bend if not break the rules of conservation was admitted, in the interests of interpretation. It also overcame the hazard of a thematically unbalanced presentation by asserting its role of being "a repository of mosaics" (9). Despite survey trends, the language facilities were considered to be good, although the Talking Post was a cause for concern. So was the interpretation of the Garden, as regards orientation. By entering the Garden first, it was hard for visitors to understand either it or the Museum. Development plans were being made, but it was felt that there should be more contact and interaction with visitors (10).

At Battle Abbey, although the trends regarding catering and access had been noted, the Gatehouse was not considered to be suitable for either, especially as disabled access to the top floor was not possible. Development trends at other English Heritage sites had been noted however, and plans
were being made. The vandalism problem could only be dealt with by increased security though, nor would there be a rubbish collection, as it was time-consuming, or on-site catering, because English Heritage also managed an adjacent restaurant (11).

In response to queries about the Moat at BC, the paths were maintained, and the banks checked for signs of crumbling. Despite health and safety regulations, the management had no legal responsibility for accidents, while the absence of a sign made the site more visually attractive (12). Nor could visitor facilities be built closer to the Castle, because it was a Grade One Scheduled Ancient Monument (13).

At SC, what began as a safety and preservation development, became the promotion of the theme of 'the town that found its castle'. A phased development plan was initiated, but had been delayed in mid-progress. Improvements to the trails were acknowledged, especially as there was a vandalism problem, and it was felt that there could be more displays and interpretation of the excavations. In noting the survey trends, it was conceded that there was a need for more security. In one combined form of community dialogue and counter measure, a 'Castlewatch' liaison scheme had been established (14).

A development plan had also been established at TC. This had encouraged a local awareness of, and interest in the site and personalities with which it was associated. Some other
considerations of survey findings, included an acknowledgement that the visitor trail could be clarified, and audio-visual seating arrangements improved (15).

Finally, it was accepted at Bignor, that as the pilot survey findings indicated, the presentational emphasis was on the structure rather than the community. Other survey trends had indicated visitor approval of reconstruction, increased presentation and improved information on the original inhabitants. Such developments might cause problems for the management though, and only cautious changes were made (16).
The Jorvik Inheritance.

In the survey, individuals were not asked directly about JVC. It can be argued that more responses could have been elicited had this been done. However, the approach by which they forwarded such data in an uninfluenced way is considered to be preferable, in that it reveals the true worth of its significance (to the interviewee) in a more genuine way, than an instinctive, unreflectively positive answer in a reflex recognition of the automatically recognisable word 'Jorvik'.

The museum/centre managements which have independently acknowledged a JVC influence on their presentations in this case study, form a minority, which may be summarised as: 5/356.

This type of influence may also be qualified by the managements concerned. It is no surprise that the Archaeological Resource Centre (ARC) and the JVC enjoy close ties, such as financial support by the York Archaeological Trust, or that the idea for the ARC developed out of a JVC visitor survey which indicated "an interest in an archaeological 'museum'" (17). In being asked to acknowledge external influences on development however, the response was that "the ARC is unique and the first of its kind" (18). It was also claimed (in 1995) that several (unnamed) museums were based on the ARC's design.

It is not a surprise either, for The Canterbury Tales to have close links with the JVC. It has been claimed that the Tales has 100% accuracy, thanks to the Heritage Projects...
Department in York. A comparison is also made with the WCE's emphasis on authenticity (19). Elsewhere in Canterbury, the Roman Museum does acknowledge that there was "something of (the) York Archaeological Trust's 'ARC' in our ideas" (20). The hands-on facilities in particular, were intended to be based on the ARC example (21).

Other non-JVC influences are also acknowledged however, namely Norwich Castle Museum, the Museum of London, and Colchester Castle Museum (22). A similar combination of influences exists at the Brighton Museum and Art Gallery, which incorporates the JVC and ARC together with Colchester Castle Museum and local examples such as Worthing Museum & Art Gallery in "a whole range (which) have been looked at" (23). The Lincoln Archaeology Centre also refers to JVC and ARC, but makes a distinction in that "Jorvik first made archaeology exciting, but the ARC was in preparation shortly before. We used and adapted some of their ideas" (24). It is also noted that the English Heritage Education Office was also a good source of inspiration. Finally, a combination of influences from JVC, the Carvoran Museum of the Roman Army on Hadrian's Wall, BMM and the Museum of London, is acknowledged by the City Museum in Lancaster (25).

Abroad, JVC has been cited as being a major formative influence in the development of the Dublin Viking Village. The public awareness and archaeological background of Dublin's Viking past already existed (Chapter Two: 88, 120-123).
Yet an interpretative centre was only begun after the Director of the Irish Life PLC, was so impressed on visiting JVC, that he subsequently initiated negotiations with the Director of the National Museum of Ireland, as to how a similar venture in Dublin could be developed and sponsored (26). One other location in Dublin has also acknowledged a JVC influence.

The Dublinia Centre however, differs from the Viking Village in that it does not acknowledge a single influence, but rather follows the English trend in acknowledging a combination of influences. In this case, the specific influence was "the National Museum in Dublin to an extent, regarding the display of the Wood Quay artefacts on loan from them" (27). The influences on Dublinia as a whole though, were the consequence of visits by its staff which "were made to centres throughout Ireland and Britain, e.g., Tralee County Museum, Jorvik Centre, etc" (28).

Apart from the ARC, those locations which are directly associated with JVC by reason of their (semi) shared management, have themselves been a source of inspiration. The management at the Cumings Museum in Southwark for instance, noted that some ideas for their own temporary 'Pilgrim's Way' exhibition in 1994, came from The Canterbury Tales. The Southwark exhibition was not an imitation however, in that by being confined to one room, only "part of it was a trail and part of it wasn't" (29).

The Tonbridge Castle presentation differed somewhat,
in that Heritage Projects did act in an advisory capacity in its development. A consequence was that "there were ideas for a scenic route" (30). Apart from these museums, an influence was also acknowledged by a related organisation. Living History Workshops had arisen out of discussions "with people inside the museum network and finding out what visitors wanted. This point was particularly relevant in the educational aspect of museums" (31). It was the ARC however, which provided the means for trial sessions about the Vikings to take place, for the benefit of child visitors, and which subsidised the (organiser) for this purpose. Specific museum examples are not claimed to have been an influence in the development of this enterprise however. Instead, it was the (organiser's) experience and "research to put the subject into a 'hands on' format" (32).

In considering other locations in this case study so as to form a contrast, it may be noted that the example set by JVC is one which can be deliberately avoided, as at the West Stow Country Park, with its audio tape commentary in which "unlike Jorvik, visitors can stop when they want to, and have the ability to be in control" (33). It is also possible for a proposed Jorvik-style presentation to find favour with the developers of a presentation, but not the inhabitants in its locality, as in the already cited instance of public opposition to a Borough Council proposed Jorvik-style centre in Hastings (Chapter Two: 128).
Nor is JVC an automatic choice of influence for a location with a Viking theme. The Irish National Heritage Park at Ferrycarrig, with its Viking harbour reconstruction for instance, does not appear to have had any external influences. Instead, each display was "planned by a professional archaeologist specialising in the particular period" (34). It does not seem to have been an influence in the development of the Vikings and Normans exhibition at Dublin Castle either (35). In commenting on their presentation designs, as in the specific incorporation of Viking remains in the King John's Castle in Limerick presentation, or generally, no reference was made to JVC, by the RWPR partnership design company (36).

If JVC is not as major an influence on other museum presentations as it may appear, then the indicated trend of museums utilising a combination of influences is one which has to be further explored. The Colchester Castle Museum presentational development programme management of the early 1990s for instance, while not citing any direct influences, did state an awareness of "new developments in other museums such as Verulamium (St Albans) and Tullie House (Carlisle)" (37).

Circumstances rather than influences, may also dictate the form that a presentation takes. In the British Museum, it is accepted that the curators of the Romano-British Gallery "all have conscious subliminal impressions of good and bad practices in museums elsewhere. They also have to be aware
of the current thinking in archaeology. But it depends on the nature of the collection. There must be a balanced appearance" (38). What in other circumstances would be the advantages of treasure trove law and generous funding, which enabled the Gallery to be a showcase of the main Romano-British treasures, actually created an imbalance, in that there were "far more fine silver objects than ordinary ones" (39).

Although FRP could set a theoretical example, in that its mosaic collection was made into a strength, "the National Curriculum means that (the British Museum) must show ordinary things" (40). The British Museum Trustees also had their own priorities, in that they preferred the Museum to be an art museum (41). A somewhat different situation applied at the Chelmsford Museum. Its curator had attended a meeting at VM in 1991, so as "to avoid repetition and duplication. Each museum (was) to concentrate on its own strength" (42).

The timing of this meeting was important, in that Chelmsford, VM, Colchester and the Museum of London were all set to initiate redevelopment programmes. In fact, there were some minor emulations, as in the installation of a birdsong soundtrack which was similar to the one at Colchester. Yet although part of the original Chelmsford plan was for there to be a full Iron Age roundhouse reconstruction, only a slice could be installed, due to a lack of space. The original role of the Museum as "a repository of material" (28) and the need to maintain the integrity of the Victorian rooms in
which they were stored, have created a challenge.

It is possible however, for a traditional part of the display to be a focal point. A Roman stone coffin which had long since been installed in a Chelmsford Museum room, was now placed on a podium, and the rest of the display was then built up around it. This was a similar situation to that at VM, where the existing mosaic displays were too heavy to lift if not clean. A virtue was therefore made out of necessity in making this collection the foundation of the overall redesign of the Museum (44). Changing concepts of conservation have meant that a solution to this type of problem, of breaking up the mosaics into moveable panels, such as happened at Reading Museum, are no longer acceptable or feasible, even though a present management may put such a fait accompli to good use in its development programme (45).

Rival attractions on-site could also have a negative impact. This is regarded as being a potential difficulty of the Beaulieu Abbey presentation by its designers, the RWPR partnership. Their work however, has since been commended for being "not too brainy or intrusive" (46) by the Abbey's management, which has itself acknowledged a presentational problem in the form of a shortage of artefacts.
The Anniversary Inspiration.

The original impetus for the AD 43 commemoration was not the impending anniversary itself, but the example which had been set by the 350th anniversary in 1992, of the outbreak of the English Civil War. It had been exemplary in terms of planning, and cooperation between organisations and museums, namely the Royal Armouries and the Museum & Galleries Commission. The preparations had also taken place over a five year period. This was not the case in 1993. What had made the 1992 activities possible, namely a large organisational staff, coordinated quarterly information service, national exhibition focal point, interesting advertising, cooperation between museums and enactors, a "short and sweet programme" (47), and most important, plenty of time and funds, were unavailable on this occasion.

Only two people, each representing the Royal Armouries and the Museums & Galleries Commission, were on hand to organise the separate Roman databases on a belated, part-time basis. The rationale for the '1950th' commemoration was that it would be another fifty years before there could be another such school syllabus related occasion. Nor had the public been averse to the concept of the '350th' anniversary in 1992. Work began on the databases, and a meeting was arranged at Colchester, but the English Tourist Board was not interested. This made the task of obtaining inexpensive national publicity and sponsorship all the harder. Another difficulty arose
at the Colchester meeting. Although the VM and Colchester Castle Museum representatives were interested, on the grounds that their new Roman themed galleries which they wished to promote had been opened, no one was prepared to stage a major exhibition, not even the Tower of London, which had scant Roman remains and other priorities.

A second meeting took place at York, but it was reportedly not motivated (48). Although there was a sort of achievement in that it was the first time that representatives of the Roman and Celtic Living History societies had assembled for the first time to discuss a common issue, a further problem emerged in the form of coordination. The idea of such meetings was to coordinate the museums' interest in the re-enactors, who were themselves keen. Unfortunately, comparatively few museums had experience of working with re-enactors, or knew how to get the best performance. This is crucial, as keenness is no substitute for competence (as witnessed by the Maldon re-enactment), and it is the task of a museum "to sort out what's what and a quality control" (49).

Ideas were discussed, namely the re-enactment of the invasion, which would include German, Polish and North American groups. Such a venture though, was handicapped by the lack of staff for organisation and fund raising, and by a major exhibition on which to launch the event. Although the commemoration of 1642 would end and theoretically free resources for the purposes of organisation, the reverse was true as the 1643 commemoration
commenced. The Roman database organisers, now working together, had lost their priority access to their telephone systems. Government funding for the Museums & Galleries Commission was also being cut. Nor did most museums seem ready for it. It was therefore decided to focus on a military database, and obtain sponsorship. A newsletter was also drafted.

Yet although the first newsletter, published in October 1992, cited thirteen museums and organisations which had ideas for Roman-related exhibitions (apart from English Heritage and the Royal Mail), there was a sense that museums would act independently of each other. This is reflected in the 'Roman Update' Editorial of that newsletter, in which it was acknowledged that "due to lack of resources, the database was not able to continue national coordination whilst funds for further staff could also not be found. An information and network service, however, is still available and is much in demand" (Taylor, 1992: i).

The Editorial went on to state that the information which had been derived from museum staff surveys and other sources was for the purposes of information, not recommendation, and could be updated at will. The existence of the newsletter also depended on the funds from the Royal Armouries, the Museums & Galleries Commission, and by subscription. When the next newsletter was published in the spring of 1993, it now combined information on the Civil War and Roman anniversaries. A total of twenty-six projected exhibitions, events and lectures
were listed, but some listings amounted to advertisements for
galleries or enactments which actually had no connection to the
anniversary as such, but which could plausibly claim to have a
'Roman' theme.

The tendency to act independently was also confirmed, as in the
English Heritage Event Unit's autonomous 'Roma Victrix!'
programme of events. This development was not considered to be
a problem from the point of view of the database organisers
however. Input into the newsletter itself varied, as did the
commemorative presentations. It depended on the personnel
concerned, some of whom were more positive than others.
The potential also existed for subsequent cooperation with
re-enactors, as was the case with the 1642 commemoration.
Care had to be taken not to antagonise other organisations or
upset their arrangements, even if they were independent.
Museological Commemoration.

In noting how the museums commemorated the anniversary, it is the sites which were the locations for the 1992 visitor surveys which will be considered first. For the sake of uniform convenience, the name coding will continue to be used. This case-study is also an opportunity to consider how they normally handle events. The anniversary was irrelevant for obvious reasons, insofar as the JVC and TORH were concerned. Nor did it apply to the THP, because its theme of the history of London began with its foundation in c.AD 50. The WCE however, had already established a varied events programme which incorporated study units, school days, and parental previews, but which would concentrate on Living History, with the Bathhouse site as a resource.

A link with the Ninth Legion, a Kentish Living History society had also been established, together with the tradition of an annual Festival in September. The 1993 Festival would be the third such occasion. Unlike the Jorvik Festival, there was a preference for variety, in that the 1994 Festival for instance, would have a Second World War theme, just as the 1992 festival had focussed on pre-Twentieth century smuggling (Chapter Five: 302). The Claudian invasion anniversary, like the other Festival themes, was considered to be relevant to Dover, and accordingly adopted as the theme for the 1993 festival.

Although the highlight of the Festival would be a living history event on 25th September 1993, to commemorate the
(possible) occasion of the Emperor Claudius's arrival in Britain (at Dover?) in person, it was decided (bearing in mind the importance of visitor comfort), that the WCE would not be a suitable venue, given the likelihood of bad weather, and the perceived unsuitability of the participant Ermine Street Guard, on the grounds of its too serious presentation for the WCE (unlike FRP in 1992). The event took place at Dover Castle instead, with the assistance of English Heritage. It was suitable in that apart from possessing an authentic Roman site in the form of a Pharos, it had more scope for space, and a more didactic form of presentation which complemented that of the Ermine Street Guard.

The WCE was instead used as the venue for a 'Roman Revels and Cantiaci Capers' event, which included Celtic face painting and Roman style hair braiding, with the assistance of the experienced Cantiaci and Legio IX Hispana Living History societies. There was also a commemorative exhibition in the Dover Museum. One feature of this exhibition, a new model of Roman Dover, could also be a permanent display, in that it could fit in with other models which depicted the town and port at key stages of its development. It was felt that advance planning and direct experience of 'Roman' events were also of experience (50). One other development was the publication of the 'Dubris Express', with the assistance of Associated Kent Newspapers. The intention was to make this topic entertaining and educational for young readers, their parents and teachers.
The WCE also focussed on a child orientated coin trial, and a continuity of object use themed temporary exhibition. It illustrated the items which were introduced to Britain as a result of the conquest, and which are still in use, such as the skipping rope, cabbages and closets. The value of the WCE's contribution to the anniversary may therefore be considered to be significant, in that a realistic assessment of the lack of conditions which were prerequisites for an appropriate Living History event was made, which ensured that the comfort of the visitors and consistent entertainment based form of presentation were not outweighed by the managerial preference for Living History.

This concession that WCE was not a suitable venue, became a means to strengthen cooperative links with Dover Castle and by implication, English Heritage however. There was also some originality in the form that the temporary exhibition took. It focussed not so much on the events of AD 43, as on the practical links between that era, and that of the late Twentieth century. This is in itself, a practical way of emphasising the significance of that anniversary. The inclusion of the coin trail was also an acknowledgement that there have to be different interpretations for different audiences.

The temporality of these displays and unique nature of the festival, though not bequeathing a direct permanent legacy, was of value to the management in presenting such an enactment, in combination with at least one other location.
This achievement, apart from indicating how to conduct other broadly based 'Roman' themed events in future, would by demonstrating competence and attracting revenue, strengthen the managerial case for an extension of its contract. Such an act, although couched in admittedly commercial terms, would serve as a vindication of the way in which the Romans were presented at this location.

There was no direct involvement by the CM in this anniversary, although a promotion of the Museum in association with it had been considered (51). Starting in 1995 however, the Roman displays were to be thoroughly redeveloped. As for the RBM, its only involvement consisted of a photo-shoot for the Royal Mail commemorative stamp folder. Otherwise, it had absolutely no association. There was not even an ordinary events list or temporary exhibitions programme, other than some autumnal activities for children, and two annual on-site lectures (52).

An established programme of events existed at VM by contrast, for which advertising is specifically reserved. This was a sign of managerial awareness of its importance. The events could take the form of Living History events, 'goodwill promotions' in association with other Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire museums, a 'hands-on roadshow' (utilising a converted double-decker bus), all day events, and lectures. The purpose of such events was for them to tie up with the displays and make people aware of them. There was also a strong educational element in the form of weekly lectures and oversubscribed courses,
in addition to children's activities. Finally, Living History events could be staged with the aid of the Legion XIIII Living History Group (53).

Despite the scholastic nature of the BRF site, its management have not disdained to enact 'fun' weekends at this location, in the form of special events at which Living History groups re-enact Roman army training and drill programmes. Although the site is supposed to date from the AD 60s (actually later than the original London), such activities took place here in 1993, as its contribution to the anniversary commemoration. Finance permitting, they would continue to do so (54).

At FRP, events had been increased in number since their introduction in 1990. The policy was to have something new each year, and because it was also varied and participatory, repetition was not a problem. What also helped was that there was a varied pool of enactors to draw on, in the form of the Ermine Street Guard, Legio II Augusta, and independent hands-on specialists. Despite archaeological evidence to indicate FRP's credentials as a supply depot in the events of AD 43, it had not been possible to arrange a special commemoration on economic grounds (55).

Ideas for a banquet or a half marathon from Bignor Roman Villa to FRP by way of Stane Street were only considered. There was still a programme of summer events and activities in 1993, although one such event clashed with the stronger attraction of a Goodwood race meeting. Overall though, the introduction
of events to FRP had done something to reverse the decline in visitor numbers, as can be seen from the table below.

Table 2.1. Statistical Summary of Visitor Numbers At FRP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>VISITOR NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>90,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>76,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>78,605 (INTRODUCTION OF EVENTS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>81,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>83,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>83,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At BA, there is a preference for events which are as varied as possible, the big re-enactments being the more profitable ones. Visitor numbers had never been a problem on such occasions. Third party events, which did not involve English Heritage, but were hosted by the Rotary Club for its 'Classic Car shows' for instance, were very popular. Care had to be taken though, to ensure that such venues do not damage the site. This is because English Heritage still has cultural responsibility for monuments. The annual event season from April to October is designed to coincide with the high season for visitor numbers. All events, including the 1066 battle re-enactments, were scheduled to take place on weekends, irrespective of the actual date, such as 14th October for the 1066 event (56).

The AD 43 anniversary was irrelevant to BA, although the related English Heritage events elsewhere were to confirm the Events Unit's own perception (in the aftermath of the 1992
Preparations were underway instead for the 900th anniversary of the consecration of the Abbey Church in 1094. As in the case of the 1066 anniversary, the actual consecration anniversary date in February was not considered to be a feasible fixture for commemoration. An open day would be arranged in April however, together with an ecumenical mass in the Church or at the Harold Stone. A story teller was booked to do four tours each day, from Friday to Sunday. There would also be tours for school groups on a Monday, the theme being the history of the Abbey.

The anniversary was irrelevant at BC, although there have been varied events, and as at FRP, evidence for a Roman era port (58). The main annual event at BC was actually a jazz evening. The number of events had actually been cut in 1991, but were now increasing. They were an introduction to the National Trust and complemented the site. The question as to what sort of event the locals wanted was also taken into consideration, in the planning of such activities (59). The awareness of community feeling about enactments and their effects on the locality is itself a form of making and strengthening community contact.

The anniversary did not apply to SC either. It specialised rather, in an annual Shakespearean festival which was organised by the Gatehouse Theatre Company. This was permitted by the Council so long as the site was not damaged (as at BA), and the event audiences made up one fifth of an average number of
50,000 visitors. Other events at this site included three annual re-enactments. Their theme however, could not be only medieval, as it would become repetitious. The range however, could be extended. An Anglo-Saxon event for instance, would not be a problem.

Nor did the events at SC have to be specifically about its history, although its history could be subtly introduced in the process of presentation. There was even innovation in the form of an Afro-Caribbean event, which reflected the composition of the community (60). This shows an awareness of the sort of community with which the management was to make contact.

Group-visitor interaction was actively encouraged, although it depended on the group. One medieval longbow group had a good rapport with visitors. Recently published English Heritage Events Unit guidelines were an indirect influence, although the management liked to check standards for itself.

TC has only a limited Roman collection and low profile cultural presence, which ruled out involvement in the AD 43 anniversary. A varied events programme was enacted with the aid of the Friends of the Castle (a Stafford-based support group) however. One such example was the annual Christmas Candle Festival, which could have a medieval theme on occasion. There could also be Living History enactments, which featured 'The Vikings', a Dark Ages Living History society. This society could present a varied programme of crafts and activities. One such event in 1994 was the Castle's
contribution to National Archaeology Day (61). WC had absolutely no connection with the anniversary.

Apart from the 1992 survey locations, one of the 1991 pilot survey locations, Bignor Roman Villa, may also be considered. Each year, for four years, there had been an annual activity day, although visitor numbers had actually decreased on each occasion. In a change of policy, more advertising was to be arranged however, and the possibility of combining an event with a school hands-on display was being considered (62).

Timing was important. The combination of the Young Archaeologist's Club Day with the August Bank Holiday in 1992 only provided extra work for the limited staff. Yet there was also some variety, in that although the AD 43 anniversary was not considered to be relevant to Bignor, a reasonably successful falconry display was staged. The partial reconstruction of the field boundaries and the annual excavations had also attracted interest, as at ARFM.

Having noted the contributions which were made by locations which had been the foci for the visitor surveys in this case-study, a further twenty-five English locations which had participated in the staff survey, also acknowledged some form of commemoration. They are listed in order of county, alphabetically. The descriptions of the means by which the anniversary was commemorated, have been elicited from the findings from the managerial and society questionnaires, copies of which are enclosed (Appendix B: 488-95).
LOCATION

**Tullie House, City Museum and Art Gallery, Carlisle, Cumbria.**
'In passing' (63). No details were given.

**Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter, Devon.**
Roman Army Exhibition and the opening of a new Roman kitchen display (64).

**Dorset County Museum, Dorchester, Dorset.**
Small display with reference to the Hinton St Mary Christian Villa mosaic, as featured in the Royal Mail commemoration (65).

**Burnham Museum, Burnham-on-Sea, Essex.**
Had presented (actually in 1992) the County Museums Officers' mobile display on the theme of 'Invaders!' for eight weeks (66).

**Chelmsford and Essex Museum, Chelmsford, Essex.**
Jointly commemorated the anniversary with National Archaeological Day on the August Bank Holiday, in the form of a Roman exhibition and workshops on Roman mosaics (67).

**Castle Museum, Colchester, Essex.**
Participated in launch of the post office stamps; "there were very few other coordinated activities anywhere. The anniversary was not really one of great significance" (68).

**Tewkesbury Museum, Gloucestershire.**
Presented locally found coins which dated from the period.
Within three weeks though, they were stolen (69).
Letchworth Museum, Hertfordshire.
Held 'Roman Days' for schools and the public in July 1993 with a Roman re-enactment group, and highlighting its own "excellent" Roman collections (70).

Watford Museum, Hertfordshire.
Had only limited involvement as the Roman collections were too limited at that time to make up a specific exhibition on this theme. The Museum was included though, in the 'Hertfordshire's Roman Trail' leaflet in 1990-91, which had been covered by a newspaper and county-wide launch (71). This leaflet was compiled by a Hertfordshire Leisure marketing initiative, published in 1990, and reprinted in 1991. It provided information on eighteen Roman sites or displays within the county, together with related information. It had also won an English Tourist Board Award for Tourism in 1990 (Anonymous, 1991).

Welwyn Roman Baths, Hertfordshire.
Contributed and subscribed to the Roman database. As the new information boards were coincidentally installed in 1993, it was a sort of commemoration. Otherwise though, there was neither the time or the staff (72).

Hull City Museums and Art Gallery, Humberside.
"Found the idea of celebrating the 1950th anniversary bizarre. In 43 AD, East Yorkshire was still native territory and remained so until about 71 AD. The anniversary really meant nothing ... , but (the staff) did do the ..."
'Celts and Romans' presentation. The only galleries ... open were Iron Age and Roman" (73).

Dartford Museum, Kent.

In commemorating AD 43, the focus was on Roman Dartford. The staff worked with the local archaeological group to examine changes in the local area. They then utilised the whole archaeological area. There were replica costumes, mannikins, open displays, a room, hypocaust and mosaic. It was mostly drawn from their own collection, and the idea was to enthuse people. There was also back up material for schools; "it was a good exercise in getting information together" (74). The benefits of the presentation were that a very large gap had been filled. It was also very useful for schools, in that they had a facility for making armour and mosaics; "they could use their local museum" (75). It had also been learned, as regards the process of creating community links, that "an easier focus causes a new rapport" (76).

The presentation had been such a success that a sequel display for June to December 1994 was being planned, on the theme of medieval Dartford. One other consequence was the textbook, 'Roman Dartford', which was published in December 1993, by Dartford Borough Council. It was written in such a way as to make local archaeological discoveries and sites the material for the different themes, such as leisure time, or school. It also placed an emphasis on the impact of the 'mixed blessings' of the conquest in the district;
Dartfordians had to learn to think and behave like Romans - whether they liked it or not" (Boreham & Baker, 1993: 5).

The theme of integration is echoed in what constitutes the second permanent consequence, namely the 'Roman Dartford' school information pack. It was stated in the Introduction that "now there are so many rules and regulations to obey" (Boreham, 1993: 1). It would seem from these texts that an effort to establish a form of identity with the Romano-British Dartfordians was also being encouraged by the presenters. The plight of the Britons was stated in such terms as to encourage (subliminal) parallels with the 1990s debate as to the degree of English involvement in the European Union. This in turn creates an interesting comparison with late Twentieth century images of the Vikings (Chapter Two: 83-93).

The Painted House, Dover, Kent.
There was a literary competition on AD 43 which started at Sandwich, and which extended to other Kentish schools. The results were displayed here (77).

Lullingstone Roman Villa, Kent.
This location was used by the Royal Mail for its commemoration. There were also hopes that an event would take place here (78).

Maidstone Museum, Kent.
The theme of 'Daily Life in Roman Kent' was regarded as a nice contributory idea to the anniversary, but there was ultimately just the one "top to bottom" case (79). This was due to a
lack of time and money. It was speculated that more could be made of this theme however, and that it could be linked up with more activities.

Richborough Castle, Kent.
The invasion was commemorated "by a very successful" weekend event with the Ermine Street Guard, Legio II Augusta, and other re-enactment groups from Belgium and Holland (80). The overall presentation was not affected. The Ermine Street Guard agreed with this view (Anonymous, 1994a: 194).

Jewry Wall Museum, Leicester, Leicestershire.
As was subsequently explained in a report by the Director of Museums and Arts to the Leicestershire Archaeological Committee on 'The Romans are Coming!' event, it seemed appropriate for this museum to be involved. According to the Background Section 2.2, "Leicester was a regional capital during the Roman period; the Roman collections curated by Leicestershire County Council Museums, Arts and Records Service are of national importance, and it was considered important to hold an event which took place on 1 May 1993" (Anonymous, 1993a: 1). Their experience, as noted in Section 2.3, is also emphasised, in that "having the contacts and experience of five successful 'Bringing the Past to Life' events, it was felt that it would be possible to organise a similar, but smaller event incorporating displays and 'hands-on' activities relating to the Roman period" (Anonymous, 1993a: 1). The intentions of the organisers were subsequently stated as follows;
AIMS

3.1 Raise awareness about Leicestershire's Roman heritage.
3.2 To raise awareness about the anniversary of the Roman Invasion.
3.3 To promote Leicestershire County Council's Museums, Arts and Records Service.
3.4 To provide an opportunity to learn about Roman Britain in an exciting and interactive environment.
3.5 To take up the opportunity of participating in National celebrations" (Anonymous, 1993a: 1).

A working party of six members of staff was duly established to organise the event, although it was acknowledged in Section 4.1 that there were also "many other members of staff (who) were involved both in preparation and on the day" (Anonymous, 1993a: 1). In Section 4.2, the sixty or more volunteers who also assisted were also commended; "the event would not have been possible without their cooperation" (Anonymous, 1993a: 1).

Pre-publicity was to be thorough. It constituted 5000 A4 leaflets, and a smaller number of colour A3 posters, which were produced by the Leisure Department. They were then distributed around museums, libraries, schools, leisure and tourist information centres in the county. In the month before the event, four weekly articles on the invasion were printed in the 'Leicester Mail', and there were also articles as well as other references in the 'Leicester Mercury'. On the eve of the event, a paid advertisement appeared in the latter news publication. There was also an hour-long preview on Radio Leicester's
'Talk Back' programme; "staff and volunteers were able to preview many of the days events" (81).

The actual participants of the event were a varied group. Some volunteers on a postgraduate diploma course had formed the Corieltauvi Living History group. They would be engaged on crafts such as spinning, weaving and face painting. The Museum staff by contrast, operated a Roman army recruiting stand, with activities such as trying on the Lorica Segmentata armour or a Gallic coat, and throwing the pilum. There would also be outdoor activities, including hands-on pottery and glass, which would be managed by the Archaeological unit, along with Roman board games, food tasting, polystyrene mosaic making and fresco making. Representatives from the School of Anatomy would also be explaining the (human) material, and there would be tours of what had been the Roman town (82).

If this programme seemed ambitious, especially as it involved visitor participation, it was also one which was based on experience. With the exception of the 'Throwing the Pilum' activity, everything else had either been enacted before in 'Past Alive' events, or the participants had done something analogous. Modifications to the routine were on practical grounds, in that there was to be less archaeology in this presentation. This was not because of a desire not to make it too technical, but so as to focus more on the Romans. In fact, an opportunity had been given to academics to solve certain puzzles, such as the best means of wearing a brooch.
There was very little in the routine that had been unpopular. The only anticipated difficulties were in role play and numbers.

Whereas the 'Roman' participants had no problem about staying in role all day, the Corieltauvi group could find this a harder task. As for visitor numbers, while a minimum of 1000 and maximum of 2000 was considered to be acceptable, a number of 3000 would be beyond the resources of the staff, as on the previous occasion when no less than 300 people had taken part in the Roman town tour. Except for the food tasting, entry to this event was to be free. The reason for charging this popular activity was to cover the expenses of the volunteers.

As for education, although the event was to be on a Saturday, it was expected that teachers would attend, so as to obtain useful ideas for the classroom (83). Theoretically at least, this event was one which would appeal to specialists and the general public alike, as well as be one in which specialists and the public could participate. Clearly defined roles and activities had been designated for all concerned by coordinators who had the benefit of experience.

A total of 2765 people attended the event. With the sole exception of the trying on a toga activity, which had been much too time consuming and cumbersome, it had all worked very well. The 'Throw a Pilum at the Briton' activity was busy, while the food and badge making activities were popular. The Roman and Iron Age re-enactors had been good. The overall visitor...
response was judged to be excellent. Although there was no formal survey, there had been the impression of "very satisfied customers!" (84). The overall media response was also excellent, with very good coverage both before and after the event. What the organisers had learned was that publicity certainly helps, that Romans are "a very good marketing point", and that modest charges for a few events would pay for "a whole day" (85).

In the subsequent Report to the Advisory Committee, it was stated that there had been nineteen separate activities, virtually all of them containing an interactive element and successful. Apart from the above listed activities, there had also been a collage of the invasion, and two special displays on the themes of Causeway Lane and the Shires, and on Roman dogs, which had been prepared by the Archaeological Unit.

The Events Section 6.3, notes that they had been retained in the Museum for display (Anonymous, 1993a: 2). Visitor numbers were reported to be nearly three times the projected number. Shop income was noted to have been at a record high, thanks to foresight in stocking up the shop for the day. In Section 7.3, visitor satisfaction was noted as being very high (Anonymous, 1993a: 2). Apart from noting equal opportunities implications, in that as full as possible access for wheelchair bound visitors had been made, in Section 8 (Anonymous, 1993a: 2), some conclusions were made.

In Section 8.1, it is stated that: "the event was an
unequivocal success. Despite a relatively small financial outlay, a high profile publicity campaign managed to produce a very good attendance figure" (Anonymous, 1993a: 2). In the subsequent three sections, the enthusiasm of the staff and volunteers is cited for producing "a highly entertaining day for all the visitors", in Section 8.2 (Anonymous, 1993a: 2). The possibility of future Spring events was also aired as being worthy of consideration, albeit with the caveat that this event had taken place on the one day of really good weather over the holiday, and the resourcefulness of a member of staff in obtaining external (apart from Council) funding was commended.

Museum of London.
The staff had discussed the anniversary with the Royal Mail, and the Head of Hadrian exhibit was used for the commemorative set of stamps. Apart from the rationale though, that London was not yet in existence in AD 43, there was no activity as its own new Roman Gallery was not yet ready (86).

Rowley's House Museum, Shrewsbury, Shropshire.
This establishment had been indirectly involved through the total conservation, restoration and reinstatement of the Hadrianic Wroxeter Forum inscription, along with a redisplay of the Roman collections (87).

Wall Roman Site, Staffordshire.
The AD 43 event at this open location was the first of its kind here, and complemented the site. Apart from this unique occasion, the site had also been used for a photo-
opportunity for the Royal Mail's philatelic Commemoration (88). Apart from the presence of the Legio II Augusta with its drill for children, and a Celtic re-enactment group, there had also been a drill display by a Sealed Knot (English Civil War) Living History group. In a unique form of community connection building on a unique occasion, there had been an 'Open Gardens Trail' (89).

**Bourne Hall Museum, Ewell, Surrey.**

The AD 43 events day and activities which were staged here, were convenient. This was because the Council had been debating the closure of this location, which was on a debit list. The events were mainly derivative from an event at Guildford, and the adapted Roman crossword had not been a success. It was also at the wrong time for schools, being staged on 10th August. It was well managed however, by both the staff and one legionary from the Roman Army Research Group. The visitor numbers had also been good (90).

**Wallsend Heritage Centre, Tyne and Wear.**

Although this Centre was closed in 1993, occasional re-enactment events took place on the Roman Fort site (91).

**Swindon Museum and Art Gallery, Wiltshire.**

There was a weekend of children's activity on Roman mosaics (92).

**Doncaster Museum and Art Gallery, South Yorkshire.**

As at Hull, it was noted that this region was not part of
the Roman Empire until the AD 70s. A drama presentation of the advantages and disadvantages of Romanisation was staged at this location however, by the Time Travellers Group (93).

**Sheffield City Museum, South Yorkshire.**
In 1993, it redisplayed one of its Roman cases (94).

Two Welsh locations and one Scottish one which participated in the staff survey were also involved.

**National Museum of Wales, Cardiff.**
It was not directly involved, on the grounds that Wales had not been invaded until much later. Events had been held at its offshoot, the Roman Legionary Museum in Caerleon in 1974, to celebrate the 1900th anniversary of the Roman conquest of Wales. In 1993, however, the involvement was more passive, in that a Caerleon gemstone with the image of ROMA was used by the Royal Mail for its commemorative stamps (95).

**Segontium Roman Fort Museum, Caernarfon, Gwynedd.**
It was passively involved in the launch of the Royal Mail's 'Roman Britain' stamp issue (96).

**Trimontium Trust and Roman Fort Site, Melrose, Border.**
A stand-alone exhibition of the 'Roman Britain' stamps was borrowed from the Royal Mail and installed in the Exhibition Reading Room. Material was also donated for the Corridor Display. The Honourable Secretary displayed photographs from visits to Richborough, Dover and Reculver at the entrance to the Exhibition, with a note of the significance of the...
date (97). Reference was also made to the anniversary, albeit briefly, (Anonymous, 1993b: 11), and to the display and attendance by Trust members at the 'Roma Victrix!' events, subsequently (Anonymous, 1994d: 12-13).

Six Living History societies which were involved in the survey, also commented on their varying degrees of participation.

**Brigantia Living History Society (Southern England).**
It participated in the 'Roma Victrix!' event at Maiden Castle (98).

**Corridors of Time (Southern England).**
It had actually approached English Heritage with a plan for the anniversary in December 1991, and attended the Colchester meeting. The impression was given however, that although the potential for a major commemoration was appreciated, the commercial side of its funding was not. This meant that the potential was not realised. While some ideas from the plan appear to have been adopted by English Heritage, as in the display of Roman cavalry, Corridors of Time was not itself invited to participate (99).

**Ermine Street Guard (nationwide).**
Apart from its participation in the 'Roma Victrix!' events, as already noted in the reference to Richborough Castle, the Guard was also involved in a promotional photo-shoot for the Royal Mail stamps. Its performances were favourably
reviewed in 'Exercitus', its own magazine. It was also noted that it had been an opportunity to test the innovatory display of Roman cavalry, and work with other Living History groups, despite some extremely differing degrees of authenticity (100).

Legio II August (Southern England).
It also participated in the 'Roma Victrix!' events, but was more pessimistic as to what had been achieved. The question was also posed as to what the public actually knew and learned from such occasions (101).

Quinta V Gallorum (North Eastern England).
Based at ARFM. It celebrated the birthday of the Emperor Claudius on 1st August. Being a Third century themed group though, the anniversary was not particularly important to them. They liked to stress the point that the Romans were not the same throughout the period that they were in Britain (102).

XIII Gemina Martia Victrix (Netherlands).
It participated at the Richborough and Maiden Castle events in collaboration with the Ermine Street Guard (103). It had had no problems in doing so, although it was inclined to retain a strong element of entertainment in its presentation.

Wandsworth Museum, Putney, London.
Although it was not involved in this research study, this location also staged an event. This was in a collaboration with the Roman Army Research Group. It took the form of re-enactors parading as legionaries and the
Emperor Claudius. Its purpose was to draw attention to the theory that at least one contingent of the invasion force had crossed the Thames at Putney (Anonymous, 1994b: 168).

The Museums in Guildford and Haslemere provided information which also indicates the form of their participation.

**Guildford Museum, Surrey.**

A 'Roman Revelry' event which was staged on 3rd July, was jointly organised with the City Council, the Surrey Archaeological Society and the Surrey Young Archaeologist's Club. Located in the Castle Cliffe Garden, the event included Living History displays, and competitions. A guide which was prepared for the event, was partly a source of information about the invasion and Roman Surrey; partly an explanation of the activities, partly a promotion of the societies and the museums of Ewell, Guildford and Haslemere, and partly a quiz book. There had also been some lectures on Roman Surrey in July, and Museum holiday activities in August. The activities included the themes of mosaic manufacture and villa interior decoration, which were relevant to the National Curriculum KS2 C5U1 Unit 'Invaders and Settlers' theme (Anonymous, 1993e: 16), just as the Maldon Experience Camp had been (Chapter Five: 329).

**Haslemere Museum, Surrey.**

The 1993 Report refers to a lecture by Dr Rudkin in February, a temporary display of local Romano-British urns, and the participation of volunteers at Guildford (Muir, 1994: 381).
Apart from the above forms of commemoration, there was the Romano-British contribution. It has already been noted that it was parallel with, but not coordinated with the other enactments. Nor was the entire organisation involved, only the Events Unit. It acted in collaboration with the staffs of selected properties, in which Lullingstone Roman Villa was not included.

An indication of the lack of involvement from other English Heritage Departments, is in an article in the Autumn 1993 edition of its Education Service, 'Remnants'. In this article, titled 'Experiencing the Past - the Romano-British Way', a detailed account was given of the reconstruction and occupation of a Romano-British house at Chysauster Ancient Village in Cornwall in June. Not once was this early technology project for children associated with the anniversary (Butts, 1993: 7-9).

Statistics have been provided by the Events Unit for a total of four 'Roma Victrix!' enactments. They are listed in order of visitor numbers, out of a total of 202 events in 1993 (104).

Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Visitor Numbers</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>New Members</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maiden Castle, Dorset</td>
<td>7/8th August</td>
<td>5,391 visitors</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>£14,219.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6th highest (5,391 visitors).
1,918 or 35.6% were members.
340 or 6.3% became members.
£14,219.00 was raised.
Richborough Castle, Kent (15/16th May).
7th highest (3,905 visitors).
2,492 or 63.8% were members.
219 or 15.5% became members.
£7817.00p was raised.

Wroxeter Roman City, Shropshire (26/27th June).
19th highest (3,526 visitors).
1,407 or 39.9% were members.
247 or 7% became members.
£8955.00p was raised.

Wall Roman Site, Staffordshire (26/27th June).
75th highest (1,843 visitors).
1,191 or 64.6% were members.
25 or 3.8% became members.
£2640.00p was raised.

From the point of view of the Events Unit, the 'Roma Victrix!' season (in addition to events at Corbridge and Dover) had been good in terms of popularity, experience and promotion.
Logistical organisation was found to be essential for events at open, unsupervised sites, but they had also been proved to be successful. A sense that Romans were more popular than monks (as at BA) had also been verified, and it had been discovered that the Ermine Street Guard, which had itself made a positive impression, as had the Legio II Augusta, could be augmented by the XIII Gemina Martia Victrix Group from the Netherlands.
In terms of appearance and activity, it was virtually
identikit. That the groups as a whole had tended to conduct their activities separately however, was disappointing. Yet a sure sign that they had made a good impression was in their being all booked for the 1994 season. This would repeat the 'Roma Victrix!' theme (Anonymous, 1994b). It would have the same number of events, but now at Lullingstone Roman Villa (at which the Brigantia Group also featured), Wroxeter Roman City, Portchester Castle, and Aldborough Roman Town.

Old Sarum was also included, in what might be termed an anniversary sequel, in that the description of this event in the English Heritage Events Unit Guide in 1994, referred to its "Iron Age town (being) captured by the Romans in 44 or 45 AD" (Anonymous, 1994b: 9). In one further season in 1995, events were scheduled to take place at Richborough, Wroxeter, Wall, and Old Sarum. There was now a departure from the AD 43 theme though, in that Living History societies which could present different themes from the Romano-British era were being employed for the Wroxeter event at least. The purpose was to "contrast victorious Roman legionaries of the First century with embattled Imperial troops of 400 AD, who faced Pictish warriors" (Anonymous, 1995: 7). It also showed a concept of the longevity of Roman rule in Britain, and of its development and decline during that era. Ultimately though, the real continuity is in the form of presentation, not the theme. Although another contrasting form of enactment took place in the 1996 events season (Anonymous, 1996: 30), no further 'Roma Victrix!' themed events took place.
The difference between the 'Roma Victrix!' programme and one other form of commemoration was, apart from the latter differing in that it was in a published rather than in an enacted form, in its longetivity. No time limit had been set for the 'Roma Victrix!' theme, whereas the 'Roman Surrey' leaflet which was devised and published by the Surrey Museums Consultative Committee in 1993, was. It was estimated by the designers that it should last three years, partly on the grounds that a transformed archaeological basis for a major rewrite would be unlikely before 1996, but also on financial grounds (105).

For the Committee, the anniversary was a good means by which the museums could promote themselves, even though they were largely small and voluntary. The anniversary was something relevant to Surrey, and there would also be more press coverage if the Surrey promotion was linked to the promotion of a national theme. The leaflet that was duly prepared was written by David Bird, author of a pre-Reformation history of Surrey, and would contain references to archaeology. Such a format could be linked to the National Curriculum, and it was intended to be part of a wider heritage offering. If the marketability of the product itself was limited, it was yet meant to be the first in a series about the history of Surrey.

Despite contributions from various local government organisations and promotions of special exhibitions and County Archaeological Unit activities, funds were only
available for the preparation of the Roman leaflet. It was then agreed after discussion, that allowing for people's perceptions, this leaflet would be part of the educational process rather than a focus on Surrey in isolation. A total of 20,000 copies were published and distributed around Surrey leisure outlets. Despite the estimates as to its longevity, the text was drafted in such a way as to be timeless.

This would make copies cheap to print. It was also made less academic. Sporadic changes in the National Curriculum though, ruled out an educational version. A total of five A1 glossy colour posters were produced however. These utilised a combination of text, maps, reconstruction pictures, photographs and engravings. The themes were 'Fringe Benefits' (Surrey Before the Romans), 'AD 43' (the Roman Conquest of Southern Britain), 'Living Proof' (Roman Settlement in Surrey), 'Mixed Blessings' (Religion and Ritual), and 'Returned Goods' (Trade and Industry).

The feedback came in the form of occasional requests by museums for more leaflets. The confidence of its planners was such that funding permitting, a Victorian themed leaflet might yet be drafted, as might a Tudor themed one, especially because of the close proximity of Hampton Court. As for preparing a related trail however, although the example set by the 'Hertfordshire's Roman Trail' leaflet was appreciated, sites in Surrey needed better interpretation. Nor could its displays or the Surrey County Archaeological Unit generate funds for this purpose.
It had been learned, though, that if a local theme was linked to a national one, at least one year would be required for the preparation of whatever the form takes, especially if there was to be a display. Commemorating the English Civil War anniversary had actually been a more difficult task for them. It had also been learned that a travelling roadshow only works if there is a big museums service to cope with it (106).

Finally, one undeniably national form of commemoration was in the form of the commemorative stamp issue by the Royal Mail. Before undertaking this effort however, market research was conducted in a series of home-based interviews. It was learned that the public was positively responsive to the concept of the anniversary and a related stamp issue. If the '1950th' date itself seemed a little odd, would-be customers were otherwise not too fussy, and they liked the idea. A number of artists were commissioned for the task, subject to approval and selection. The British Museum was also consulted. It was ultimately decided by the Stamp Advisory Commission that images were better than photographs, and that the 'Roman Britain' theme was the best (107).

The artist John Gibbs was chosen to design the issue. He was to subsequently state that "these designs are the outcome of extensive research which took me to museums and sites in England, Scotland and Wales. The brief was to depict a range of typical Roman items (such as mosaics, pottery, sculpture, jewellery, coins, etc) that reflect life in Roman Britain."
Consultation with various experts led to the conclusion that the set should definitely include depictions of the Emperor Claudius and Hadrian and this stipulation led to the final selection of the Claudian coin and the bronze head of Hadrian. This choice in turn suggested that the rest of the set should also feature heads, so further research concentrated on mosaics and artefacts that incorporated heads within their designs. The objects chosen were the tiny gemstone of the Goddess ROMA and the Mosaic of Christ. The fifth (and eventually not required) item was a terracotta 'head pot' from the Yorkshire Museum" (Anonymous, 1993c: 202-04).

One other form of commemoration took the form of two special stamp covers, portraying the Ermine Street Guard and an engraving of the Claudian coin respectively, in limited editions (Anonymous, 1993d: 2). To ensure the absolute success of the overall issue, there was a good national PR campaign in the consumer media, national television advertisements, and a feature on a children's television programme. Although customers have a preference for stamps depicting animals, the 'Roman Britain' issue turned out to be the most popular of the year. Thirty-five million stamps were printed and sold in a national distribution campaign. The feedback had been good, and there had been no mistakes. Although this archaeological set had originally been intended to be unique, its success had prompted a consideration of preparing similar issues, which would be based on other areas of British history.
Yet although the anniversary seemed to have effects which would persist beyond 1993, this was not the case for the Civil War/Roman Database. In the Autumn issue which was published in August 1993, it was announced in the Editorial that it had not been possible to obtain further funds for the project, or for the Museums & Galleries Commission database 'Magnet', and that the next issue would therefore be the last (Taylor, 1993a: i). Other data was now included and encouraged, on the grounds that this would facilitate a Royal Armouries military database, which would be based on this one. Subscribers were invited to contribute.

Apart from the commemorations which have already been listed, an Autumn half-term Living History display at the Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum (complete with the Ermine Street Guard) was listed (Taylor, 1993a: 5), and the Colchester Castle Museum programme. The latter did not include enactments which were related to the anniversary, but rather events which were "back by popular demand" (Taylor, 1993: 9). These were pottery workshops, first person interpretations by pseudo-slaves and aristocrats, and opportunities to discuss artefacts and other related work with curators. The highlight would be a staged (three metre tall) puppet show, on the life and times of Boudica. VM also outlined its 'Celtic Week' themed series of lectures and workshops (Taylor, 1993a: 10).

Just one lecture, 'Celts and Conquerors' could be regarded as being related to the anniversary, the other two being on
the subjects of 'Metal and Money', and 'Celtic Art and Craft',
together with appearances by the Legion XIII Gemina Martia
Victrix Living History Society (Taylor, 1993a: 10).
The installation of the five information panels at the Welwyn
Roman Baths site was also announced (Taylor, 1993a: 10).
The Editorial in the Winter 1993 issue, confirmed that
this newsletter was the last (Taylor, 1993b: i). Its focus
was now on listing forthcoming anniversaries from 1994 to 2004,
and on providing information (as opposed to recommendations)
of re-enactment groups and related manufacturers of Living
History items. The listings included the participatory groups
in the anniversary, in addition to other Roman and Celtic
themed groups from England, Germany and Hungary (Taylor,
1993b: 5-9).

In retrospect, the advice of the planners of this database to
anyone considering a similar venture, was to have funding to
begin with, and plenty of time in which to organise.
The anniversary impetus itself had to come from the museums,
which also had to participate, keep in contact, and cooperate,
if only for the sake of self-interest. That the Civil War
exhibition in Hull had had 50,000 visitors in its first week
alone, was a good example of how a museum can justify its
existence and funding to its council. A leaflet or newsletter
was needed to keep all informed and everything coordinated.
There also had to be a major exhibition or shiny new gallery on
which would-be sponsors could focus (108).
Conclusion.

In considering the managerial responses to the visitor survey findings, it may be observed that the trends in visitor reactions to the presentations were ones which tended to corroborate other investigations of visitors to these establishments, and which the managements concerned were well aware of. Where there was a notable exception, namely the comparatively high number of visitors using the Infobars at the Roman Baths Museum on the occasion when the visitor survey was conducted there, this did not affect the overall context, as it had already been decided to discard the Infobars.

It is also noticeable that the visitor surveys were being conducted at a time when even traditional museums were implementing or devising development plans, which would radically alter the entire nature of the presentations. Fishbourne Roman Palace, Stafford Castle, Tamworth Castle, and the Verulamium Museum are shown to be operating in an atmosphere change for instance, while the Battle Abbey, Bede Monastery Museum, and Warwick Castle managements are drawing up their own blueprints. This was not a universal situation however, Baginton Roman Fort remaining virtually unchanged since its own innovative presentation had been installed in the 1970s, but that would be to misunderstand its original purpose.

Nor are these presentation plans rigid, following a single, unchangeable formula. The Verulamium Museum is shown to
have turned an archaeological discovery into a high profile audio-visual display, while Stafford Castle has had to accept the need to reconsider components of its development plan. There is also thrift, in that although, as the Fishbourne Roman Palace management have conceded for instance, what were innovative techniques of presentation in the 1960s would be unacceptable in the 1990s, it is still possible to overhaul and recycle components of existing displays in the new blueprint, as in the plan to update and incorporate the Monastic Herb Garden at the Bede Monastery Museum into the 'Bede's World' development.

In some instances though, it has to be accepted that it is the presentations themselves that are literally rigid, as in the example of the mosaics at the Verulamium Museum. This presents additional challenges - but also opportunities to the authors of these museum narratives in creating a coherent, original theme which the visitor can comprehend. Such challenges may even safeguard the presentations from losing their material identity in a plethora of commercially motivated, meretricious technological gadgetry which only serves to alienate the visitor from the collection.

It is in the innovative and experimental presentations such as the new one at the Verulamium Museum which seem to cope best in introducing a balanced development plan, in that no component is allowed to outweigh the rest. Apart from the collections, the site itself may also place constraints
on the presentation, if its conservation is not to be sacrificed. That requires realistic expectations by the visitors as much as by the management at the Roman Baths Museum. It would help the latter though, to enable the visitor to understand why the presentation has to be in such a way, as at the Roman Baths Museum, or at Baginton Roman Fort.

There are common managerial trends in appreciating the importance of such issues as visitor comfort and orientation, and the need to address problems such as site maintenance and vandalism. A sympathy for visitor needs does exist, which may convert into original initiatives to build on existing local appreciation for, and pride in these establishments, as at Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum, Stafford Castle and Tamworth Castle, and create strong community links and interrelationships.

If Bodiam Castle is careful to nurture good relations with its community, Stafford Castle has shown an awareness of the different ethnic groups which comprise the local community, and a willingness to involve rather than exclude them, in its presentation. The Corineum Museum has also displayed originality in encouraging an interest by its community in the development plan, while the Verulamium Museum is being far sighted in investing in ways of showing that schoolchildren are welcome.

It may also be discerned that managements are not necessarily inclined to conduct their responsibilities according to
the (transient) preferences of the public, and can actually be strong willed in adhering to a presentation, or its components, which have provoked adverse comment, as at the Verulamium Museum or Battle Abbey. It is the responsibility of the management, however, to elucidate the visitors on these issues, and to encourage a sense of participatory responsibility, which is another form of community dialogue and construction. Ultimately, what is indisputable, is that such a construction should take place, preferably before even the presentation itself, as the Jorvik Viking Centre has so spectacularly pioneered.

Yet although the Jorvik Viking Centre and its satellites can be shown to be such a formative influence on other locations and organisations, independent of its own claims, it is clear that the number of locations in this case study which consciously acknowledged that influence, is an extremely small number. That influence is not necessarily fortunate either. The Dublin Viking Village for instance, had to close. Nor is that influence predominant.

The inferred indication from this small sample is that in looking for presentational ideas, the examples set by a mixed group of museums are considered, then adapted according to circumstances. It may be considered therefore, that the influence of Jorvik is not as all pervasive as it might seem, and that the predictions by Pearce and Fowler as to the limited number of imitators (Chapter Two: 68) can be
interpreted as being valid.

It has to be acknowledged that the anniversary is comparable with the Jorvik Viking Centre influence in terms of the extremely small number of locations in this case study which acknowledged being affected. What has been gleaned from those managements which were involved however, has been instructive. The stated lessons which had been learned by the original database organisers from this experience, are not in dispute.

It may be added that museum personnel like the would-be sponsors, are more likely to be inclined to be involved, if it is to their advantage. There were excuses of non-participation on the grounds of inappropriate chronology, as in the case of the Moyse's Hall Museum in Bury St Edmunds (109), or geography, being the reason given by the Royston and District Museum (110), and City Museum of Lancaster (111), or even nationality, as in the case of the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow (112). These are likely to be only excuses, given that other museums which could make equally plausible claims, such as Hull, were not accordingly inhibited from even a vicarious participation. Inadequate funds, limited relevant collections or other commitments to other presentations and enactments were the more frequent reasons which were given, and which would have been exacerbated by inadequate time in which to be organised.

Fortunately, there are also positive lessons which may be useful, and which may also be echoes of presentations
which have been encountered elsewhere in this case study.
The White Cliffs Experience coin trail for instance, with its element of detective work, is reminiscent of the means by which children could become constructively encouraged to actively comprehend the presentation of Escomb Roman Church (Chapter Five: 321-323). Although it was a military invasion which underlay the theme of the anniversary, there appear to have been no accusations of the presenters promoting militaristic enactments.

The emphasis rather seems to have been a highlighting of aspects of Romano-British civilian life, and of the practical effects which reverberate to the present day. Apart from containing a broad-based educational appeal, this approach is also one which the public seems to be able to relate to. These presentations have also on occasion, provided a basis on which to enhance or augment permanent displays, or some form of contact with the community, and with specialist Living History groups in a cooperative context. These efforts also seem to fit into a pattern of innovative enactment projects in general, as at Stafford Castle and Bodiam Castle, which are truly locale orientated, but not parochial.

In comparing the anniversary planning with the Jorvik Viking Centre, two criticisms may be made. Firstly, unlike the York Heritage Trust as previously noted (Chapter Three: 150), no effort had been made to conduct market research to ascertain the public awareness of the anniversary and response to
proposals for its commemoration. The sole exception would seem to have been the Royal Mail. This is surprising, because the positive indications from the results of that survey would suggest that had there been a larger such undertaking generally, the likelihood of stronger positive results would have been a major resource in attracting managerial and financial support.

It would also have given the planners a better idea as to what kind of presentation would be most successful, as well as raise public consciousness of that anniversary. It must be noted that significant percentages of visitors to the 'Roma Victrix!' events were English Heritage members. This suggests that a large proportion of them attended, not so much because of an interest in Roman anniversaries or enactments (novelty value notwithstanding), but because of the (event) concessions and benefits which arise from membership.

The other criticism is that there was a failure to achieve publicity for the anniversary by tapping into the popular consciousness of the Roman myth at least, in the way that the Jorvik Viking Centre management had exploited the Viking myth. The low-profile, exclusive employment of the actor Sir Derek Jacobi to autograph the Royal Mail commemorative covers (Anonymous, 1993d: 2), is only likely to appeal to those people who can remember and appreciate the BBC television dramatisation in 1976, of the fictionalised life of the Emperor Claudius (in which Sir Derek starred), by the author
Robert Graves.

This criticism is equally applicable to a reference to a 1991 statuary display in the British Museum as enabling visitors to enjoy the illusion of rubbing shoulders "with the cast of I Claudius" (Spawforth, 1991: 20). A further criticism of the anniversary is that it may have made little contribution to what can actually be learned about AD 43 itself, but that was not the point of the commemoration. What matters in the anniversary commemoration, is in showing how it can relate to the present. What this requires is not so much a divorce from academic considerations of the context, as an enhanced awareness of its practical import.

It is this emphasis which makes the anniversary more relevant to the community and thereby involves the community, rather than the political establishment. Such an approach is also achievable without necessarily deleting the political and military context (if applicable), but without causing offence either, by the promotion of a particular doctrine.

On the contrary, the foci of presentations being on the conquered as much as the conquerors (possibly more so in some instances), facilitated an atmosphere in which the different interpretations of AD 43 and of its consequences could be made. This particular commemoration may have been flawed, but it was still a useful experience in terms of national coordinated experience between museums, organisations and Living History societies.
It was also an example of localised individual achievement, which if varied in quality and quantity, still provided innovative or evolving forms of adaptable experimentative presentation which cannot be assessed, modified or discarded without being at least tested. It is for these benefits, which however counterproductive they may have seemed at the time, that the anniversary commemoration should be appreciated, for so long as a culture is inclined to commemorate anniversaries.
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CHAPTER SEVEN. DISCUSSION OF THE INFORMATION DERIVED FROM THE CENTRES.

Introductory Overview.

To facilitate a discussion of the data which has been under review in this thesis, an overview of what has been discerned is required. In determining that the purpose of this thesis was to analyse the consequences for the presentation of the past, and of the contemporary debate and developments concerning the relationship between the past and present, the intention was to focus on selected British presentations which were somehow related to themes ranging from the Romano-British to the late medieval eras.

A literature review was undertaken in consequence, to show the significance of the debate and its reasons. If the view that the past should be made more publicly accessible and that the museum/centre was the best means of achieving this objective was to be accepted, its (influential) presentational ways and means of doing so would have to be identified, and their effectiveness verified in the form of a statistical analysis of visitor responses.

In this review, it was discerned that there were two significant, conflicting collections of archaeological theories on the past and its role in society, which have been collectively labelled as New Archaeology and Post-Processualism (or Positivism). What these theories have in common is a
concern for the well-being of the remains of the past and the integrity of their connection to the present. The concept of the past as a resource was subsequently aired, as was the need to identify the public with which a presentational dialogue was being sought.

Theoretical concepts of presentation in the form of (politicised) deconstructions and reconstructions were considered, together with appraisals of the role of the curator. Critiques of existing presentational theories and practices were then noted. It was concluded that although extremes of politicised and neutralised forms of presentation merited criticism, innovations and experimentations in presentational technique should be encouraged (under controlled conditions) rather than be automatically discriminated against, so that the theoretical debate on the presentation of the past would have a somewhat updated practical basis.

The assessment of the material under consideration, commenced with a case study of the Jorvik Viking Centre and its apparent role as an exemplar in pioneering innovative presentations, and in being the predominant formative influence on other presentations. Its status as such, from both an academic and a popularised perspective, was assessed, and its close involvement with, and presentation of the popularised image of its Viking Age material was shown to be a skilful manipulation of contemporary socio-economic trends.

There were indications, however, that for all its ability
to remain in touch with those trends and evolve its own presentation, that the Jorvik Viking Centre had actually been derivative in terms of its presentational technique, and that its all pervasive influence had a more secure foundation in a good relationship with the media, than in reality. What did deserve to be imitated however, was the ability by the management of the Jorvik Viking Centre to publicise its archaeological database extremely well, and have firmly established links with the community even before the Centre itself had been constructed.

To create that practical basis required practical information, in the form of original museum/centre visitor survey findings. To prove the validity of this method though, it firstly had to be shown as operating within an established tradition, of learning the identity of the visiting public, and what it did and did not want. Although such a trend could be regarded as encouraging the process of commodifying museums, it also provided a basis on which to construct a dialogue and bond with a genuine, as opposed to stereotypical community.

Examples of museological statistical projects which had been conducted to this end in the 1970s to 1980s, were highlighted, such as visitor perceptions of innovative museum trails and audio-visual presentations. This was not just to consider the results as a basis for future research, but to compare the varying methods which had been utilised to achieve those ends, and accordingly determine what would be the most
suitable means of constructing an original statistical database.

Chronologically, the focus of this database would be on the period of 1991-93, so as to follow on from what had been already constructed. Contemporary statistical projects elsewhere were noted, and their relevance to this study stated (Chapter Three: 152-53), so as to provide a context for the consideration of the original data in this chapter. In order to be comparable with these other databases, the original survey structure would have to be capable of revealing trends in visitor identities as well as trends in visitor perceptions of particular presentations and enactments. After a pilot test in 1991, a nationwide survey at selected sites was conducted in 1992. Information was elicited from the managements concerned, and from other locations, whilst educational surveys were also conducted. Supplementary material was obtained from other sources.

The focus of the research then shifted to the findings of the 1992 visitor surveys. Although the surveys were divided into four separate groups, which were associated with innovative and traditional museums or open-air sites, collective trends were discerned and determined.

In combining the group trends, it was shown to be indisputable that all of these locations were family attractions, although younger visitors tended to be more inclined to visit innovative institutions. A majority of interviewees were 415
also visiting for the first time, and likely to be employed in some service profession in the private sector. More worryingly, small minorities of those who were employed in some governmental or educational capacity were also registered. This should be of concern to the designers and authors of museum/centre narratives, in that two essential components of the community with which a contact must be made, are the administrators of the present, and the potential visitors of the future.

Results identifying visitor nationalities were also revealatory. The British visitors who were seen to be in the majority at all of the locations, were largely derived from local and then regional backgrounds, rather than from other parts of the British Isles, particularly the non-English regions. This gave the innovative establishments in particular, a numerical basis on which to develop strong local community and regional links.

Although the non-British visitors were in the minority, an interesting division was also discerned in that the Europeans tended to favour the innovative establishments, while the rest preferred more traditional presentations. Given the context of the close relationship between the Jorvik Viking Centre and the media, there was also the surprising discovery that the media was generally not a noticeable form of advertising. It appeared however, to be a more noticeable source of information for innovative establishments.
Traditional establishments though, seem to have been better known in schools.

In ascertaining what effect the locations had on their visitors, there was a general consensus of interviewees having found the staff to be cooperative and the facilities good. They had also found their experience to be both educational and enjoyable. The majority also intended to return, or were at least more inclined to do so when interviewed. This image of perfect presentation and management was not total however.

From the perspective of visitors to the outdoor locations, it was not so easy to find staff for the purposes of assistance or information provision. Nor were they as likely to buy souvenirs, although there were significant trends of visitors who were not inclined to do so, in all of the groups. This raised the issue as to whether it was because of poor marketing on the parts of the managements concerned, or of recession induced frugality on the part of the visitors.

Despite the low profile of staff at the outdoor establishments though, visitors to these locations had found them to be somewhat more educational than the visitors to the indoor establishments. Facilities were also somewhat comparably better, and it is possibly for these reasons that more visitors to indoor locations registered a disinclination to return. A reflection of overall satisfaction with the outdoor locations was to be found in the significantly comparably larger minority of outdoor visitors who did not see a need for change.
The trend is still a minority however, in comparison with the large majorities in all groups which were not only in favour of change, but had ideas as to what needed to be changed. This in itself indicates that these locations did not provoke only a passive response by visitors.

Yet although there was a consensus favouring change and such development plans as were in existence, the role of the Jorvik Viking Centre in influencing these changes, appears to have been virtually non-existent. It seems to have been of more importance to visitors that a coherent presentation of a solid but not incomprehensible body of information is made, and which shows an awareness of the locality.

It was also learned that interviewees prefer to be properly orientated about the information and the form that its presentation will take, and that interactive displays are acceptable on condition that the integrity of the atmosphere was maintained. Visitors were also shown to be capable of distinguishing between local and national themes, and to spot even minor errors in the narrative as well as display mechanism malfunctions.

This had an important influence on visitor perceptions of the presentations and inclinations to return. Clearly therefore, the author of the display narrative had to be as much of a professional as the display technician, and sensitive enough to be aware of the capacity for erudition and criticism on the part of the visitor. One other important overall trend
was that the academic consensus at the start of the 1990s in favour of innovative and experimental presentations, was one which was shared by the visiting public. Apart from creating a positive atmosphere in which the development plans of the mid-1990s were made acceptable at large, it is clear that the public were aware of these changes and prepared to comment on them if asked. This form of consensus was therefore in itself a form of community dialogue and construction.

Having established discerned trends in visitor identity and perceptions of presentations, a consideration was then made of visitor perceptions of enactments and educational facilities. It had been already established that children are possibly the most important component of what constitutes the public, on account of their being supposedly unprejudiced for or against the past, a special structural case study of two respective temporary and permanent presentations which were intended specifically for children, was made.

Although only approximately one third of the fifteen hundred interviewees in the general 1992 visitor surveys could actually claim to have attended an event during their visit, the trends which were revealed in their answers were interesting in that as in the case of the permanent displays, there are assertive views as to what characteristics the enactments should possess. Visitor-friendly space, participant professionalism and organised variety were all regarded as being important factors in the success or failure of an event.
The last factor is particularly significant in terms of its potential for education and in its greater scope within an enactment, by reason of its temporary, well advertised, high profile nature, than in a permanent presentation, particularly one which cannot have a programme of temporary displays. Although the participants at such venues tended to be drawn from Living History societies rather than location personnel, their competence was essential, given that the success or failure of an event, from the viewpoint of the visitors, reflected on the location rather than on the society concerned.

It was also established from the visitor trends, that for a location management to ensure that its enactment was a success, co-ordinated organisation work with the participants on what should be a straightforward theme was also required, together with high profile pre-publicity which made a positive impact, and unconfusing on-site orientation. A vetting process of the participants who should have a good sense of timing, and who would also require room for manoeuvre, was also mandatory. A suitable venue would be as much in the interests of the public as the participants, not just in terms of inestimable visitor comfort, but also interaction.

This is of particular significance when the enactment has a strong educational content, whether it is for the sake of visiting adults or children, and when the factors of organised plausibility, creative audience participation,
and scope for variety are welcome by adult and schoolchild
interviewee alike. As in the case of the presentations, it is
not the issue of innovation and experimentation which is at
stake, but the degree of professionalism which is utilised to
this purpose.

This is of heightened importance in those presentations which
are particularly intended for schoolchildren, and which demand
a correspondingly greater form of interaction and involvement,
than for an ordinary visitor. Such presentations have to be
clearly shown to be educational and entertaining, and to
impress upon the children their own importance in being
involved, whether as apprentice craftsfolk, or trainee time
detectives.

This suspension of disbelief and heightened sense of drama
therefore requires an even stronger sense of cooperative
professionalism by the management and participants.
A heightened awareness of, and sensitivity towards the
schoolchild participants is also required, because they will
constitute the community, or the future one with which a
constructive dialogue is sought. It is also theoretically
initiated at least, in the best way, by means of shared
creative activity by all concerned.

Having thus far focussed on the visitors, the perceptions of
the managements were considered. Secondly, the indication that
in actuality, the significance of the Jorvik Viking Centre was
as limited amongst managements as visitors, was borne out
by the minuscule number of acknowledgements amongst the managements which were contacted for the purpose of this study, that it was a formative influence in only a handful of development plans. What it verified was that the Jorvik Viking Centre had not so much a powerful influence elsewhere, as a plausible promotion of itself. The predictions as to the limited number of imitators, had also been verified. If Jorvik was to be the thin edge of the wedge, it was not in the mushrooming of such centres after all, but in the increasing variety of presentational techniques since then.

Finally, this research study culminated in the construction of a case study of the 1993 commemoration of the 1950th anniversary of the Roman Invasion of Britain in AD 43. In combining as it did, presentations and enactments, this was an opportunity to consider how innovations and experimentations were put into practice from the perspective of the managements, planners and participants, and what had been achieved for themselves and for visitors, in their own opinion. That this particular commemoration was neither an unqualified success or failure was also significant for the purposes of this research, in that it could be learned from experience what constitutes a successful commemoration.

An extremely limited number of locations (out of the total contacted) had acknowledged an involvement in the anniversary commemoration. It was accordingly learned from the answers of the majority which was not involved, that while the
chronology might be a good pretext, it was for the more prosaic reasons of limited collections and funds or prior commitments that participation was ruled out. Positive trends which emerge from those locations which were involved though, indicate not only an ability to innovate and experiment or at least improvise on limited material and resources, but a positive receptiveness on the part of the visitors.

Nor was there issue taken by the visitors and by implication the public, with the military theme. This absence of public antipathy towards what is arguably a militaristic theme, together with a similar public tolerance if not admiration of the image of the Viking as resourceful entrepreneur, signifies a public disinterest in the academic advocacy of politicised or depoliticised presentations. There is no echo of such a theme in the survey findings, except in terms of relating the presentation to the community. It would otherwise seem to be the means which are more important to the public than the ends.

In the case of the AD 43 anniversary at least, although it did not make an outstanding impression generally, the promotion of the theme of its relevance to contemporary Britain, and of its long-term practical effects, in the absence of archive media footage or surviving witnesses as in the World War commemorations, would seem to have been a better option, in that it was favourably received at large. The promotion of an earnest, inclusive debate on the ethics of subjugating
(comparatively) uncivilised native tribal societies by a (comparatively) civilised imperial colonial system, or of the issues of an attendant form of dilution of native racial purity, or exacerbation of the formative class struggle, is unlikely to be popular at large.

This does not mean that such aspects of the anniversary should be ignored altogether. On the contrary, they can and to an extent should be introduced, but not at the expense of the coherence of the narrative, the integrity of the atmosphere, or the clarity of the presentation.

If the anniversary commemoration by a museum/centre is to be the ultimate form of innovative and experimental presentation and enactment by which the community dialogue and ultimately, its construction can be achieved, then it is all the more essential to make contact with the public to learn its perception of the anniversary, and by implication, what its reaction to the proposed commemorative presentations is likely to be.

Should the response be positive, as indicated by the unfortunately limited research into public perceptions of AD 43, this could only be of benefit to a planning management which sought justification for its associated spending budget and requisition of other resources from neutral or even antipathetic public and private authorities. Such a procedure could also generate greater public interest in the occasion, and even the sort of (media promoted) debate as to its
nature, which politicising or depoliticising theorists could advocate.

Another interesting issue which has been raised, is how and when to utilise the myth of the material, as much as the genuine historical and archaeological content in a presentation and its promotion, apart from political connotations.

The success of the Jorvik Viking Centre could in part be ascribed to a managerial awareness of the contemporary way in which the public wanted to regard the Vikings, as much as the way in which they actually did. This actively popularised form of the subliminal contemporary influence on the contemporary image of the past, markedly contrasted with a limited attempt to utilise a dated media stereotype. This also raises the issue of the role (if any) of the popular media (archival) characterisation of the material in museological presentation.

That the anniversary may also be an opportunity to (subtly) correct popular misconceptions of the theme and related issues was one which seems to have been largely overlooked in this instance, in the way that it was not overlooked at the Jorvik Viking Centre. This could be borne in mind in the promotion of such themes in future. If the actual material database of the Roman invasion was extremely limited, not to say debatable, this is not the case overall, given the combination of new discoveries, re-interpretations of existing evidence, and sporadic academic debates as to its content and meaning, as well as significance at both local and (inter)national
levels.

The qualified achievement of the anniversary was concluded to have been in its focus on preventing its contemporary relevance, in pioneering national cooperation between museums, organisations, and Living History societies. If that cooperation was limited, it had at least been attempted. The varied presentations and enactments which had taken place, though mostly uncoordinated (with the exception of the 'Roma Victrix!' programme, showed what could be done even with a poorly presented theme and limited local resources.

These efforts, like the other innovations and experimentations of 1991-93, have been ultimately shown to be valuable in that they leave a legacy. This can not only influence theoretical debates as to the form of presentations that should be developed in this millennial era at least, but also the development planners who have actually experienced the practical effects, without which no test result can be defined.
A Consideration of the Findings in the light of Other Research Studies.

Although it is the contention of this thesis, that the innovations and experimentations of the 1991-93 era, and corresponding visitor reactions are of significant value in not only verifying or disproving contemporaneous theories relating to these issues, but pioneering consequent presentational developments and provoking theoretical debates, the integrity of this research cannot be allowed to be weakened by being perceived in isolation.

It is therefore worth considering other museological visitor research projects of the period, as previously outlined (Chapter Three: 152-153). These can place the original findings in an overall context which provides scope and depth for their consideration, as well as validation.

The publication of the 'Protecting and Managing England's Heritage Property' report by the National Audit Office in July 1992, serves as a useful introductory overview. Its remit, as stated in the Summary and Conclusions Section 3, was to review "the measures taken to maintain and manage the heritage properties in government care and their marketing and presentation to the public" (Bourn, 1992: 1). In doing so, it was argued in Section 5.3, 'Managing and Presenting Property in Care', that "historic properties are an important part of the tourism and leisure industry" (Bourn, 1992: 33). The basis for this claim was the estimated number of 58 million
visits to historic buildings (excluding churches) in 1990, out of a total of 290 million visits to leisure attractions. This indicated that "performance in heritage property can therefore make a significant contribution to overall economic development in leisure and tourism" (Bourn, 1992: 33). Despite this emphasis on the commercial motivations, the report does not neglect the educational role. In commenting on the English Heritage quality of presentation for instance, it is noted that it "varied widely and appeared to be unrelated to either the entrance charge of the popularity of the site" (Bourn, 1992, 5.33: 42).

Some sites in particular, were commended for the quality and extent of their interpretation, on the grounds that taped audio tours were utilised, together with explanatory panels which had "helpful text and pictures (which) emphasised special features" (Bourn, 1992, 5.34: 42). Other sites however, were difficult or impossible to comprehend by visitors who did possess a guide book, and which might or might not be itself up to date, and accessibly interesting. The facilities at Battle Abbey for instance, were only given an overall 'Fair' assessment, although it had attracted 153,000 visitors in 1990. Its signposted access, visitor reception and shop, and its quality of interpretation were all classified as 'Fair', but its extent of interpretation and refreshments were classified as 'Poor'. None of its key aspects of presentation were classified as 'Good' (Bourn, 1992, 4.10, Figure 7: 43).
A problem in improving such interpretations however, is a consequence of what was actually meant to be a key objective for English Heritage. This was identified as being the maintenance and presentation of "an efficiently managed estate which produces sufficient income to meet an increasing percentage of its total cost" (Bourn, 1992: 5.47: 47).

The problem occurs in the forced transfer of resources away from improving visitor facilities, in order to keep maintenance of properties at an acceptable level; this has, for example, resulted in a deferral of substantial visitor related projects" (Bourn, 1992: 5.47: 47).

Yet although English Heritage had itself introduced some "'general performance indicators for presentational activities', ... their plans provide no yardsticks or clear targets as a basis for determining how far standards of presentation vary between individual properties, or how far these needs or opportunities for improved presentation which are unsatisfied" (Bourn, 1992, 5.48: 48).

It is noted in paragraph 5.50 however, that "English Heritage acknowledge that present presentation at each of their properties needs to be thought through carefully and have recently introduced Integrated Site Interpretation Schemes. These aim to improve presentation of individual properties through more deliberate and co-ordinated planning ... English Heritage are drawing up guidance on the standards of presentation to be achieved for all sites. Setting these
standards and assessing compliance with them, will help
English Heritage identify and plan improvements in presentation
where appropriate" (Bourn, 1992, 5.50: 48). The corresponding
Historic Royal Palaces 1991 corporate plan also recognised that
"the quality of presentation and favourable visitor response
are critical to successful long-term development. This factor
has already influenced much of their substantial investment
programme and their other initiatives" (Bourn, 1992, 5.51: 48).

It was accordingly concluded that English Heritage and Historic
Royal Palaces, together with the Royal Armouries, had "given
increasing attention in recent years to improving the display
and presentation of the historic buildings and contents in
their charge; and the survey and other information available
suggested that across much of the field there was a high level
of visitor satisfaction. But standards and customer
expectations are growing all the time, and further efforts
appear to be needed to improve visitor presentation and visitor
facilities" (Bourn, 1992, 4.1: 3).

It was also noted that despite satisfactory growth in terms of
numbers and income "in an expanding market" by English Heritage
in particular (Bourn, 1992, 4.1: 3), a problem facing all three
organisations was that they faced "increasing competition from
other heritage organisations and leisure attractions" (Bourn,
1992, 4.1: 3). The future trend would clearly have to be one of
careful planning and allocation of resources which "will
obviously be needed to ensure that priorities to improve
the marketing and presentation are weighed against the primary need to maintain, protect and preserve the properties concerned. Strategic planning and longer term management of properties is accordingly being given increasing attention in all three organisations" (Bourn, 1992, 4.1: 3).

One other detailed overview of visitor statistics and identities in the early 1990s, was made by the Policy Studies Institute, and published in two volumes in 1996-97. In the first volume, 'Cultural Trends in the '90s, Part I', Issue 25, 1995, Vol.7, No.1, it was stated in the 'Introduction' that museums and galleries "have been under considerable pressure to increase their economic efficiency, earn more of their income, and deliver better services to the public" (Selwood, 1996: ix). Despite this increasing private sector influence, the 1995 annual report of the Museums & Galleries Commission was quoted in advising that "the Department of National Heritage should champion the cause of museums ... and its overall policy aim should be to create the conditions under which museums and galleries can best flourish for the public benefit" (Selwood, 1996: 21).

Further recommendations included local authorities having "a duty to ensure adequate museum provision in their area. They should also have a museums policy to be reviewed every five years" (Selwood, 1998: 21). Individual museums were also advised to have "forward plans detailing conservation, collection care and public access strategies" (Selwood,
In noting more specialised reports on museums and galleries' management and service quality in an era of increasing visitor numbers since the 1980s, it was noted that "the concerns voiced in these reports have, in general, been influenced by notions of economic efficiency and service to the public" (Selwood, 1996: 40).

Despite the overall upward trend of visitor numbers in the UK, there had been fluctuations. There had been an overall upward trend from 1985 to 1994. Yet although numbers in England alone, had risen from "20.9 million in 1985 to 21.1 million in 1986, (they) then fell for the next few years to a low of 19.4 million. In 1990, the number of visits started rising again until 1992 to 22.95 million. They fell again in 1993, but improved to 22.9 in 1994" (Selwood, 1996: 42).

Yet despite this general inconsistency and particular slump from the late 1980s to early 1990s, "the signs for the late 1990s are more positive. How much this is to do with increased efforts made by institutions to attract visitors and good exhibitions, and how much is to do with the easing of the recession blighting the early part of the 1990s is not clear. There is also no clear evidence from the figures available that the existence of admission charges by national museums has a detrimental effect on visitor numbers: trends in visitor numbers to national collections in England which do not charge are not visibly better than those to collections which do not charge" (Selwood, 1996: 44). Nor was it "yet clear" what the
developments of the changes of the early to mid 1990s would be; "they may cause serious damage to museums and galleries in the UK. On the other hand, they may have some positive effects in that museums and galleries become increasingly responsive to their public and more efficient in the way they run their operations" (Selwood, 1996: 44).

In the second volume, 'Cultural Trends in the '90s, Part II', Issue 26, 1995, Vol.7, No.2, similar fluctuations are to be found in the statistics which relate to visits to historic properties, although they tend to be more regionally varied. It was noted that from "1990 to 1994, overseas visitors in the UK increased by 3 per cent from 35 to 38 per cent of all visitors. During the same period, overseas visitors in England increased from 34 to 38 per cent of all visits" (Selwood, 1997: 73).

In Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland however, the numbers actually decreased. Within England itself, the highest regional proportion of foreign visitors was in London, which rose from 65 per cent in 1990 to over 70 per cent in 1994. There were also rises in the North West, East Anglian, and in the Southern regions, allowing for boundary changes in the last two regions. In Northumbria, the West Country, the South East, and the Heart of England however, the numbers actually dropped (Selwood, 1997: 74).

Yet in dividing up the overall percentage of visits to English properties, the London percentage fell from 22.7 per cent
in 1985 to 19.1 per cent in 1994, and the West Country's percentage fell from 13.6 per cent to 13.5 per cent, even though the actual number increased by 0.4 million to 7.8 million. Increases were registered in the North West, Heart of England, East Anglia, and the Southern regions (Selwood, 1997: 73).

Conclusions that were drawn included the observation that the Gulf War and world recession "may have been contributory factors" in halting the late 1980s trend of the overall increase of visitor numbers to historic properties (Selwood, 1997: 89). There had actually been a decline in the numbers visiting government owned sites, but the numbers visiting National Trust and private properties had increased. So had the numbers of overseas visitors to English historic properties (Selwood, 1997: 89).

Having noted the (independent) national statistical background of the early 1990s, attention is now focussed on a museological assessment of one county and its presentational potential in that period. In the summer and autumn of 1992, a programme of quantitative research, followed by a programme of qualitative research between March and May 1993, was conducted on behalf of the Surrey Museums Consultative Committee.

Three of the four objectives of the quantitative programme were "to establish the current visitor profile of museums in Surrey and thereby, to identify gaps in the market ... to evaluate levels of frequency and thereby, to inform the
ways in which museums promote themselves" (Powell, 1994: 1), and "to assess the effectiveness of current promotional tools and thereby, to inform future strategies" (Powell, 1994: 2). The principle objectives of the qualitative programme by comparison, were:

i) To evaluate levels of awareness of museums in Surrey;
ii) To assess reasons for visiting or not visiting, and to identify tangible and intangible barriers to attendance;
iii) To evaluate the positive and negative images of individual museums and of the joint offer;
iv) To explore methods of encouraging first-time and/or increased frequency of attendance" (Powell, 1994: 2).

Among other observations in a summary of the quantitative findings, it was observed for instance, that:

a) "the majority of respondents (26.3%) used 'other' sources of information (as opposed to those listed) to find out about a museum, and 19.1% used personal recommendation as a source of information";
b) "as a main source of information, most respondents (20.7%) (20.7%) used personal recommendation";
c) "nearly half of the respondents (49.2%) were making their first visit to the museum where they obtained the questionnaire";
d) "45.8% of respondents stated that they were 'very satisfied' with their visit to the museum in question, and only 0.6% were 'dissatisfied'";
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e) "various improvements were suggested by respondents in order to make the museum better for visitors. 28.5% of the sample made a variety of suggestions; 17% suggested more signposting/onsite information, and 16.3% suggested more space/bigger premises";

f) "of those respondents who had visited in an organised group, 38.7% visited with work colleagues";

g) "40.8% of those who were not visiting in an organised group were accompanied by one other person";

h) "27.4% of respondents had visited with family and friends, and 24.8% had visited with other family members";

i) "the majority of respondents (65.4%) were from Surrey";

j) "42.2% of respondents lived less than three miles from the museum that they had visited";

k) "22.6% of visitors were aged between 35 and 44, and 18.6% of visitors were aged between 45 and 54.

l) "96% of respondents described themselves as Western/European";

m) "31% of the sample was employed full-time, and 21.1% was retired";

n) "of those in paid employment, 28.2% were professionally qualified, and 25% were in other types of occupation" (1994: 39).

The percentages were derived from a total sample of 1451 self-completed questionnaires which had been distributed at "a total of sixteen different museums within the County" (Powell, 1994: 40). The qualitative programme by contrast, was based on
a total of nine focus-group discussions, at four Surrey locations. Those nine groups were placed in three broad categories which consisted of 'Regulars' (i.e., three or more visits to one or more Surrey museums since January 1991), 'Irregulars' (i.e., one visit to a Surrey museum since January 1991), and 'Non-Visitors' (i.e., no visit to a Surrey museum since January 1991, but attendance at an arts/cultural event instead). Each of these three categories were subdivided on the basis of age; 16-24, 25-44, and 45+. The exception was the 'Non-Visitors' group, who were aged between 16-34 and 35+. The third subdivision in this category, which also included 'Irregulars', was in the 16-34 age group (Powell, 1994: 40).

A summary of the findings of this programme, included trends which indicated that "while they accepted museums overall, respondents were strong rejectors of particular kinds of museum and had a variety of negative feelings towards more traditional facilities" (Powell, 1994: 24). These (principal) positive and negative images and perceptions which were common to all the groups, were set out in a 'map' arrangement; "the horizontal axis relates to positive and negative feelings towards individual aspects of museum visiting, and the vertical axis to the frequency with which those individual aspects were cited in the research programme. The purpose of the map is to provide indicators of the aspects which people most enjoy or feel most negative towards, and thereby to suggest the main benefits that should be stressed in horizontal activities" (Powell, 1994: 24).
**Figure 2.1.**
Feelings Towards Museums: Positive and Negative Images.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST FREQUENT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>POSITIVE FEELINGS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE FEELINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up-to-date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass boxes/cases</td>
<td>Dinosaurs</td>
<td>Cold atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>Quiet/Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed</td>
<td>Mummies</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>places</td>
<td>Schoolchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Being watched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by guards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It was noted that apart from the 'Regular' visitors over the age of 25 who would be very familiar with local museums, the rest were influenced by large national or London museums (the Jorvik Viking Centre not being referred to by the participants), overseas holiday visits, and school visit memories. What had been learned was that there was consensual enjoyment of interactive displays, because "they liked opportunities to participate in and/or watch event activities" (Powell, 1994: 26). Open air facilities were accordingly approved, but not the (memory based) images of being hot and but not the (memory based) crowded. Interactive museums were also approved, with a corresponding criticism of objects in glass cases. Participants in the 'Non-Visitor' and 'Irregular' visitor 16-24 age groups (also) held more negative perceptions of museums as irrelevant and boring. This was linked with a perception that museum atmospheres were alienating.

Generic images and perceptions of museums in Surrey were also recorded, respondents having been "asked to describe what kinds of museums they expected to find in Surrey, and to provide an overall description of current provision" (Powell, 1994: 27). The results were set out by using the same 'map' format.

This time, the horizontal axis related to good and negative feelings towards aspects of visiting Surrey museums, and the vertical axis related "to the frequency with which those aspects were cited during the research programme" (Powell, 1994: 27). It was also stated that the purpose of this map...
was also "to identify the aspects which respondents most enjoy and thereby to highlight them when promoting the benefits of visiting museums in the County" (Powell, 1994: 27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST FREQUENT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>POSITIVE CONNOTATIONS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE CONNOTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Local history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No parking</td>
<td>No parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad signs/hidden/hard to find</td>
<td>Bad signs/hidden/hard to find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always the same exhibits</td>
<td>Always the same exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dusty</td>
<td>Dusty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In an effort to develop a public concept of the ideal museum, the respondents were asked to rank in their own order of importance, ten potential features of a museum. Despite some different preferences, "an overwhelming consensus" was agreed on the two most important features being "a welcoming atmosphere and the subject matter of the exhibition" (Powell, 1994: 30). These factors, and the "things to touch and do" factor were recorded "far above other factors listed" (Powell, 1994: 30).

The overall responses were set out in the following way:

**Figure 2.3. MOST IMPORTANT**

- Subject-matter of exhibition
- Welcoming Atmosphere
- Things to touch and do
- Free Admission
- Facilities for children
- Facilities for the disabled
- Talks & discussions
- Car parking
- Shop/merchandise
- Food & drink

**LEAST IMPORTANT**

(Powell, 1994: 30) 441
In comparing the responses, it was noted that respondents aged from 16-24 in all categories, stated that having things to touch and do was the first priority. For respondents over the age of 45, and all regular visitors over the age of 25 though, it was the exhibition subject-matter. The Non-Visitors had a higher sense of importance about the provision of special facilities for children than the other groups. The same was true of regular visitors over 45, as regards talks and discussions.

On being asked what types of people presently visited Surrey museums, the older age groups tended to feel that a wide range was being catered for. Younger (irregular) respondents tended to specify academics, tourists and students. There was also an overall trend, in perceiving that "younger people were not attracted and/or not catered for, particularly the 16-24 age range" (Powell, 1994: 33). Finally, in suggesting improvements, there was a trend in all the respondent groups, to advocate developments in displays, activities and exhibitions" (Powell, 1994: 37).

The consultative report titled 'Surrey Heritage Strategy. Key Issues and Proposals' was then commissioned and published by Surrey County Council in May 1993. The aim of the strategy, as stated in its Preface, was "to conserve our local heritage and encourage public interest in and enjoyment of it" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: iii). To facilitate the necessary preliminary consultation and debate process, the report set out
"a series of issues and various proposals to tackle them" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: iii). Included among the issues raised, were a selection which related to the theme of heritage promotion. Of particular interest to this study, is P1: "there is at present an uncoordinated approach to heritage promotion in the County. How can effective promotion and the best use of resources be encouraged?" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993, P1: ix). There is also P2: "standards of heritage sites open to the public vary. What could be done to raise standards where appropriate?" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993, P2).

In setting out the general principles and main objectives of the Heritage Strategy, it is stated under the title of Public Awareness (2.16) that "greater awareness of the value of the local heritage is of special importance for everyone ... . Of particular importance is the need to give children a knowledge and appreciation of their surroundings. Self discovery can be particularly stimulating to long term interest. Provision of information, interpretation and educational resources is essential and should be made in the most cost-effective and high quality ways" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 6).

Finally, in the (Fifth) chapter which was on the theme of promotion, the two key issues in Section 5.2 were identified as being that:

(a) "the interpretation of heritage sites has been developed piecemeal, with varying standards, and there is
considerable opportunity for new interpretation" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 33) and:

(b) "there is potential for increased publicity so that people are more aware of the value of the local heritage, of the need to protect and look after it, as well as of the enjoyment to be gained from it" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 33).

Under the sub-heading of Interpretive Planning, interpretation is defined in Section 5.6 as being "the art of making the significant meaningful, instilling appreciation, enhancing appreciation, enhancing understanding and encouraging conservation in its broadest sense. A planned approach to interpretation could be a valuable tool in developing effective heritage promotion" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 34). In tackling Issue P1, it was therefore proposed in Section 5.10 that "an interpretive plan for Surrey should be produced, as a joint effort involving all appropriate organisations and those who have a direct interest. The Plan would identify three new elements: markets, resources and themes, and would explore the relationship between each of the key elements. The plan should be based on appropriate research and should aim to guide the management, development, promotion and marketing of Surrey's heritage in a structured way, making best use of resources" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 34).

In Promoting Good Practice under this next sub-heading, in acknowledgement that standards of facilities within the County varied widely, it was noted in Section 5.12 that:
"good practice in interpretation and visitor management relies on the success of site managers in recognising and providing for a number of inter-related aspects which include:

- the widely varying knowledge, interest, observation and comprehension of visitors;

- the potential for encouraging an active exploratory response from visitors;

- the need to provide good quality car parking, signposting, catering, lavatories, etc." (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 34).

It was added in Section 5.13 that "there is a need at many sites within the County to take a fresh look at the effectiveness of the interpretation and the quality of ancillary facilities, to establish the potential for their development, bearing in mind the resources available" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 35). In tackling the Issue P2, it was firstly proposed in Section 5.15 that "a number of individual site interpretive plans should be prepared by the site owners, for key areas and sites as identified in the county-wide interpretive plan, to act as models for site managers" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 35).

To aid this process, it was advocated in Section 5.16 that "training courses and seminars on a self funding basis, should be organised for site managers as a means of raising overall standards, promoting better co-ordination of effort and to enable the exchange of experience and good practice"
Education was treated separately, in Section 5.17, in which it was noted that "a very important market for heritage sites is that of school visits, not only in their own right, but as catalysts for subsequent visits of families and friends. Visits to heritage sites can fulfil an important part of the requirements of the National Curriculum. The number of such visits will continue to rise and in future there will be greater emphasis on recording and enquiry rather than just looking" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 35).

"Schools presently have difficulties in knowing where to go and what is on offer at each site. To attract education, visitors sites need a basic level of provision and information. Sites that have prepared material, geared to different ages and abilities, and have Education Officers, are likely to be popular. Museums in Surrey are making efforts to increase their provision for schools. In addition to visits to sites, there is great potential for increasing educational use of local heritage themes for work within the classroom and in school grounds" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 35).

In one final proposal in Section 5.33, relating to public ways and means of discovering Surrey's heritage, it is stated that "consideration should be given to the development of 'gateway centres', which could provide information about Surrey, its museums and heritage sites and introduce people to new aspects of the heritage through changing themes."
Gateway centres could include some of the functions of a tourist information centre. They could be part of existing facilities such as museums or libraries, or could be purpose built if resources permit" (Hawker & Bailey, 1993: 38).

Two surveys which were conducted at the Tower of London, differ from the Surrey Museum surveys, in that by concentrating on this single location, more detailed presentational and educational trends in findings were consequently discerned. The first survey, which was conducted from April to December 1993, consisted of visitors comments in a suggestions book in the White Tower. In commenting on the resulting trends, the Deputy Master of the Royal Armouries subsequently noted that although the majority of comments were positive, there were also calls for displays to be more varied and selective, and for more atmosphere (e.g., music). In addition, the re-creation of times past, the use of foreign languages, the provision of information leaflets, guided tours and/or live explanations, an audio visual, hands on, direction signing and better labelling, were also advocated (Hammond, 1993: 1-2).

Of the 332 visitors who made such comments in October and November 1993, 313 felt that the exhibits were good, and 18 did not. 289 felt that the information about them was helpful, but 42 did not. They tended to take this view because of labels which were missing or lacking information relevant to the ordinary visitor, or because these were monolingual or indecipherable. 271 found the staff to be helpful, and the
43 who did not, tended to take this view because the staff concerned had not offered help without being asked (Hammond, 1993: 5). Only 58 of those visitors then answered the question as to how what was on offer to visitors could be improved, but it was possible to tabulate their answers:

Information in foreign languages: 14
Better printed information: 12
- object labels
- gallery guides
Shorter tour
More seats 8
Fewer stairs
More torture: 5
More realistic displays: 4
Handling of objects: 4
Guiding/personal interpretation/proactive staff: 4
Interactive exhibits: 3

(Hammond, 1993: 6).

In another such survey, which focussed on the Royal Armouries in December 1993, 379 visitors answered. 345 of them thought that the exhibits were well presented. 29 did not. 296 thought that the information was helpful. 70 did not. 288 found the staff helpful. 54 did not (Hammond, 1993: 7). On this occasion, in a selection of ideas as to what could be improved,
35 requested foreign languages;
11 wanted better information and interpretation;
12 wanted hands-on;
10 wanted guided tours or personal interpretation. But only 5 wanted audio-visuals, videos, or interactive computers. 5 wanted re-enactments, 4 wanted the sound guide to have improved availability or operation, and 3 wanted more for children (Hammond, 1993: 10).

It is in the visitor survey which was conducted by four students from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Massachusetts, in July 1992, that more detailed visitor attitudes and opinions discerned. Tower visitors from a variety of nationalities participated in this survey, although it was acknowledged that linguistic problems made a representation of European visitors impossible (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 19).

Approximately 26% were British, 49% were North American, 10% were European, and 10% were from elsewhere (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: Figure 1, facing 19). Over 70% of visitors were reported to be very satisfied with the overall museum, with no trends in complaints (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: Figure 2, facing 20). In more detailed findings, it was found that 20% of the 200 visitors found exhibits memorable because they were different or unusual, as opposed to the 13.5% who found them interesting (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 21). It was also learned that 21.8% did not like repetition of exhibits, as opposed to 13.8% who found them to be boring, ordinary and interesting (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 24).
Having noted that most exhibits contained only the object name and date on the display labels, the conductors of the survey asked the interviewees if they preferred the objects to their contextual background. 32.5% opted for the object, 26.9% for the background information, and 40.6% opted for both, although this last option had not been proffered. Most of this group reportedly took the view that "it was really not possible to separate the objects from the stories behind them. Combining the two can prove a vital link in visitor education. The Museum should consider this when planning nature exhibits, since many of the current displays focus solely on the objects, ignoring the stories behind them" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 36).

Visitors also expressed a desire to see included on such labels (in order of importance), (A) historical significance, (B) use, (C) background stories, and (D) how the object was acquired by the Museum. This comparatively least important item was also given the qualification that it should only be included if there was an interesting story behind the transaction, or if it had been owned by a famous person (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 27). In responding to the query as to how the overall presentation could be improved, there were requests to make it relate more to people and to provide foreign language interpretation. It was also requested that "videos, sound tours, pamphlets and guided tours be incorporated into the galleries for a more complete educational experience" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 36).
Options that were chosen as being likely to enhance visitor enjoyment, including furnishings (most popular), followed by a video, hands-on, dioramas and a sound tour, and architecture, in order of preference. Music was the least popular option, a majority of those who mentioned it actually disapproving of its provision (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 30-31). It was also felt that to maximise visitor appeal, "there must be made a clear connection between the objects of the display and the history of the White Tower" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 30-31).

Interesting anecdotes could complement the factual data to make it more memorable, and furnishings could be used in conjunction with the displays "to better convey a sense of the time period in a manner more easily for the visitors to identify with" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 30-31). The corresponding mood would also serve "to remind the visitor that the White Tower was indeed an important medieval fortress and not solely an armour museum" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 36-37).

Using a similar technique to that involving reconstructed town town and port models at the Dover Museum (Chapter Six: 359), dioramas could also be "used to depict rooms as they may have been at different periods of time. This would also serve to prevent any slant towards a specific time period in the history of the Tower" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 451
1992: 37). An installed traffic route could channel visitors in a better way, and give them better access to the exhibits, while seating could be installed to enhance comfort, as in the respective requests for such comforts at the Verulamium Museum and Battle Abbey (Chapter Four: 210, 251).

Having concluded the survey, the conductors then recommended that there be more information provided, on themes such as the different time periods and practicalities such as a detailed floor plan (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 40). Installing display descriptions in different languages was also important (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 41), as would multi-lingual sound tours, and 'the human touch' in exhibit descriptions (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 42). It had been learned that apart from this desire, another one expressed by "typical visitors" was to see "exhibits organised and explained in a more chronological order, so that a clear progression can be seen. When many similar items are placed together, visitors need to be enlightened on the changes and differences between the objects, which may not be obvious" (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 43).

In response, the staff were also asked to comment on the presentation. It was felt that negative aspects included too much information, too small and over stylised labels, and the best displays being inconveniently located. Proposed changes included the provision of better signs, more informative
object or display labels, a 100% historically accurate presentation, leaflets explaining the historical significance of the building and its themes, multi-lingual information about the lifestyles of people, a more obvious and accessible floorplan, and larger, clearer labels (Borkowski, Boucher, Schongar & Wolanski, 1992: 46).

In a more specialised survey of teacher and parent attitudes, not just to the Tower, but to museums in general, ideas as to how presentations could be improved, were elicited. It was discovered that "the stereotypical picture of the museum was of a building in which there were glass cases filled with objects which children could look at but could not touch and whose relevance to everyday life was a little obscure" (Anonymous, 1990: 30). Ideas for improvement included:

(a) proper preparatory work by the teacher organiser "so that they could bring the exhibits alive";

(b) a focussing on a limited number of display objects for study purposes;

(c) a clear connection between the exhibits and the school work;

(d) a member of the staff who could "talk knowledgeable and in a lively manner about what the children were looking at" (Anonymous, 1990: 30). Most importantly, the museums had to develop participatory 'touch and do' exhibits to give the children something to do in what had become an
There was also a parental trend advising museums to become market-friendly and visitor friendly. One way to achieve this would be to develop live exhibits. One parent for instance, was quoted as categorising 'Yorvik' (sic) as a 'semi-live museum'; "there's plenty to interest the children - sights and sounds and smells" (Anonymous, 1990: 31). While it was conceded that 'touch and do' or hands-on would be not so easy to develop at a national monument or stately home, it was still felt that there could be practical demonstrations of authentic chores in the building. There could also be visits to schools by people in suitable costumes with exhibits to explain their use, and lastly, reconstructions and re-enactments for the children to see and experience.

This last reference to enactments, leads onto the next consideration, which is of enactment surveys. The first was actually conducted in a 'Military Through the Ages Event' at the Jamestown Village site in Virginia, by the Education Department of the Jamestown-Yorktown Federation on 1st April 1992. Though geographically outside the scope of this study, some of the 51 self completed answer trends, are comparable with those of the original findings. It was learned that 51% of visitors would return to another such event, and that 3% were either 60 or over, or 16-19. 55% had come specifically for the event. Out of the other 45%, 24% did so for their children's education, and 24% for their own (Herschel,
20% had read papers about the event, 10% saw brochures, 4% saw TV, no one saw posters or heard radio, and 33% cited other reasons (Herschel, 1992: 4), of whom 16% cited word of mouth (Herschel, 1992: 8). 63% were on their first visit, 16% were on their second visit, 4% on their third visit, and 18% were on their 4th or more visit (Herschel, 1992: 8). 84% were at their first such event, 12% were at their second, 2% were at their third, and 2% could not answer. Of the 40% who would not return, 20% just said that it was too far to travel. Only 2% had not enjoyed it. 98% of all visitors would recommend it to others, and 55% considered it to be excellent (Herschel, 1992: 6).

In an age breakdown,

16 were 20-29. 14 were 50-59.  
29 were 30-39. 6 were 60+.  
28 were 40-49. 8 did not state their age (Herschel, 1992: 7).

14% were local, 35% were from elsewhere in Virginia, and 49% were from elsewhere in the USA. A racial breakdown showed that 92% were white, 2% were Hispanic, and 4% were 'Other', i.e., African American, Indian, Asian, or Pacific Islander (Herschel, 1992: 7). Finally, 16% enjoyed the authenticy, 16% enjoyed the opportunity to speak with re-enactors, and 14% enjoyed the variety. 8% did not think that it could be improved, 8% advocated the improvement of the structure of field 455.
displays, 4% wanted more food samples, and 4% wanted more re-enactors (Herschel, 1992: 8).

One other visitor survey was conducted at an English Heritage location in 1993, but with an American civil war theme. Its main purpose was to discover how the 100 interviewees had learned about this event at Fort Brockhurst in Portsmouth, Hampshire. 54% were locally based, 27% had come from elsewhere in Hampshire, and 19% were from outside the County (Rhodes, 1993: 2). In learning about the event,

26.9% cited the Special Events Diary.
23.1% cited the press.
19.2% cited the garrison leaflet or poster.
10.8% cited roadsigs.
10.01% cited 'Other' sources, including tour groups, participatory relatives, or just passing by.
6.2% cited hearsay.
3.1% cited 'Fanfare' (an unidentified source of information).
0.8% cited radio (Rhodes, 1993: 5).

95% were satisfied with the event. 95% would also return. 2% wouldn't, and 3% didn't know. 34% were members of English Heritage, 13% being local, 16% from elsewhere in Hampshire, and 5% from outside the County. The results indicated "a very heavy bias towards age groups - children under 16 with parents/guardians in their late 30s/early 40s (Rhodes, 1993: 16). It was concluded that "a high profile locally ... seems to be the most efficient means of publicity leading up to such
an event, concentrating on effective press coverage/advertising and leaflet/poster distribution" (Rhodes, 1993: 18). As for English Heritage members, the Special Events Diary seemed to be the "most effective publicity outlet" (Rhodes, 1993: 18). It was also learned that the American Civil War Garrison theme appealed most to family groups (Rhodes, 1993: 19).
Implications Raised by this Study.

To conclude, it is clear that there is some form of public approval of presentational innovations and experimentations, and that such developments are not subject to a single trend. The incessant developments in technology though, and sharpened sense of special responsibility only increase the perceived pressure to develop good, relevant presentations. These presentations have to adapt to changed circumstances, especially as they seldom enjoy the same context as the exemplars, which may themselves have presentation handicaps.

The Jorvik Viking Centre for instance, has benefited from the fact that York was already a honeypot tourist centre in the 1980s, complete with old shops and houses, walls, cathedral, castle and legends. As in the Roman Baths Museum though, if there is a captive audience, there is also a captive management, because of the conservationist constraints on redevelopment. Alternately, museums may have to follow the tendency of commerce to gravitate towards out of town shopping and leisure complexes, which they may perceive as 'rivals' (Lees, 1999: 21). It may provide more space, but at what cost of commodification?

The cutting edge of the presentation is in its educational role, but there is pressure here too, as children who may yet be open-minded about a subject, will have higher expectations about the way in which it is taught, and the resources which are used. To give one example, the encouraged 'detective'
style form of enquiry in school visits to open air sites, as noted in the Binchester survey, is also encouraged by Corbishley (Corbishley, 1994: 396). Yet despite this encouragement of such innovations by the English Heritage Education Unit, it was reported to the Department of National Heritage in 'A Common Wealth. Museums and Learning in the United Kingdom' (HMSO, 1997) that "approximately 50% of museums ... make no deliberate provision for education" (Anderson, 1997: vii). It may be that even such experimentations as have been noted in this case study, will be overtaken by such developments in the Internet for instance, in pursuit of the objective of an on-line connection between museums and schools, in a broadening and deepening of the cyberspace community. This could also provide a new kind of forum (as opposed to traditional surveys), in which to establish contact with the community.

This should not mean that the actual resource on which the presentation is itself based, is lost or even just taken for granted. Apart from the continuing threat to the archaeological environment from development, war, etc., the author of the museum/centre narrative who is using technological innovations to construct the text, should be aware that the text itself is subject to change in the event of archaeological developments and discoveries, as well as historical reinterpretation.

While such interpretations may remain academic, the designer of a presentation must make allowance for the unexpected,
such as the example of the Verulamium Museum layout having to incorporate a display of well preserved Roman lead coffin and contents (Chapter Six: 343), or the management of the White Cliffs Experience having to redraft the next phase of its development plan to find a place for the discovery of a well preserved prehistoric boat (1).

To take the AD 43 anniversary as one other example of how open the past as a resource is to change and interpretation, a conference in October 1999 which was hosted by the Sussex Archaeological Society, at which the theory that Fishbourne was the real invasion landing place prevailed, has continued but not concluded a ten year old debate (Fleet, 1999: 23). This provoked a strong defence of the traditional academic view that Richborough had been the landfall site, and that the recent installation of a monument commemorating the decisive battle, by the Medway at Snodland, near Rochester, was quite correct (Nicolson, 1999c: 2). This, and continuing finds, such as the discovery of a possible AD 43 fort near Faversham (Denison, 1999: 4), indicates that this debate will continue.

This is positive in terms of community contact, in that apart from attracting public interest in the subject, and in the presentations which interpret it, such partisan claims may (within reason) enhance local support of and even pride in the respective museums/centres which make them, as has happened at Snodland (Nicolson, 1998: 7), or at Fishbourne (Selkirk, 1999: 341). This dispute has made a dialogue.
When the continuing developments in scientific interpretation of the data also occur, it is possibly unwise for curators to use its paucity to justify uninvolve. The discovery of contemporary amphora remnants in the Orkneys for instance, apart from shedding new light on a legendary association of those islands with the AD 43 invasion, may also prove that it had had wider political and cultural implications than had been hitherto thought (Fitzpatrick, 1989: 33).

Nor has the debate on the nature of the Vikings been concluded either, as a recent article considering their effect on the English Church (Cubitt, 1999: 14-15), or articles variously commenting on archaeological evidence for Viking urban renewal initiatives, and atrocities in the same journal (Denison, 1999a: 5; Denison, 1999b: 3) demonstrate. That there is still interest in the Vikings, is reflected by the broadcasting of three Viking themed documentaries on British television in 1999 alone (‘The Viking Saga’, Channel Four; ‘Secrets of the Dead: the Lost Vikings’, Channel Four; ‘Secrets of the Ancients: Viking Voyage’, BBC 2).

This theme remains the means by which the York Heritage Trust and its developments can flourish, and can also inspire an ambitious Dublin and Roskilde based, Viking warship reconstruction and voyage from Denmark to Ireland in 2005 (Kennedy, 1999: 9). Yet it is not a popularity which should be taken for granted or considered to be applicable to all aspects of the period. A temporary exhibition in the Museum
of London to mark the 1100th anniversary of the death of Alfred the Great, has been given the title of 'London's Forgotten King'.

Apart from the obvious need to update survey findings, as in this case-study, it may be advisable for more specialised museum surveys to be drafted, for visitor and management alike, which focus on issues such as education, politicisation, gender, influence, and innovation. It could also be built on the encouragement of the Department of National Heritage in 1996, of museums/centres to at least make more thorough and corroborative visitor figure calculations (Department of National Heritage, 1996: 21).

Such a study could identify a more omnipotent form of presentational template, which could also be adapted to issues such as anniversary commemoration. There are lessons from the 1993 commemoration for instance, which may be borne in mind in the run-up to the next major Romano-British commemoration which can be related to high-profile museums and archaeological sites. This is likely to be the 1900th anniversary of the construction of Hadrian's Wall in c.2022.

The geographical context only applies to Northumberland, Tyne & Wear, Cumbria, and possibly the Borders, although the Hadrianic policy of urban development in Britain may be a useful serendipitous basis for presentations at locations such as the Museum of London or Wroxeter Roman city. There would also be issues of conservation to be taken into consideration,
the Wall already being a (too) high tourist catchment area.

Yet such an enterprise would not be an aberration but an extension out of proposals for enhanced interpretation, as in the call in 1976 "to interpret a specific theme or locality of the Wall, as opposed to the whole wall" (Dartington Amenity Research Trust, 1976: 89), and subsequent observation in 1984 that the prime objective of Wall museum/centre managements is likely to be "the elucidation and exposition of historic features that are associated with a Roman site of international importance and which large numbers of interested visitors come to see and experience" (Hadrian's Wall Consultative Committee, 1984, AIV.5: 29).

More recently, The Hadrian's Wall Tourism Partnership, working within the context of the (1996) Hadrian's Wall Management Plan by English Heritage, has declared (in cyberspace) one of its objectives as being "to stimulate visitor interest in, and support for, the management and conservation of the World Heritage Site" (Hadrian's Wall Tourism Partnership, 1998-99, [http://www.hadrians-wall.org/hwt.htm]: 1).

If past examples of coordinated as opposed to individual enactments may be learned from, as in the example set by the commemoration in 1993 of the Roman invasion of Britain, opportunities can and will arise on which to test enactments and presentations in the long term run up to the anniversary, such as the opening of the Segedunum Archaeological Park.
in Wallsend in 2000 (Hodgson & Griffiths, 1999: 289), a new exhibition and study centre at Birdoswald Roman Fort (Wilmott, 1999: 301), and the Carlisle Gateway City Millennium Project (Zant & Giecco, 1999: 306).

Other forthcoming regional or thematic anniversary opportunities include the opening of the Hadrian's Wall National Trail in 2002, and the anniversary in 2000, of the walk along the Wall in 1800 by the Antiquarian, William Hutton. A precedent already exists, given in that in 1999, the English Heritage Events Unit in cooperation with the Past Pleasures Company, presented an enactment of the activities of John Clayton, the Victorian excavator of Chesters Roman Fort, at that location (English Heritage-Events Unit, 1999: 47).

This event, which may itself be regarded as a logical extension of a presentation which consists of the display of "a Museum within a Museum" (2), to wit the collection of Roman statuary which has remained unchanged since 1896, may also be the harbinger of a new form of enactment, in which it is the interpreter (of the past) who is presented.

In another such event at Stonehenge in 1999 (English Heritage Events Unit, 1999: 13), a Past Pleasures actor portraying John Aubrey, the Seventeenth century Antiquarian, toured the site with an associate, discussing its history and legends, and engaging in conversation with visitors. Their technique involved informal discussion and even gossip, but only of 1670, in an alternative 'present' perception of the past.
Finally, if the presentational template is an alloy in composition, it may be possible to utilise a theoretical template by which it may be refined. The Annales system is one possibility. In an endorsement of that paradigm, Bintliff (1991a) argues that it could offer a methodology which can tackle the role of the individual in the past (or present), short-lived events, and "personal time conditioned, subjective needs of individual researchers" (Bintliff, 1991a: 3). It could also be a solution to problems raised by Post-Positivism/Processualism, and in comprehending the phenomenon of simulated 'time tunnels' or 'frozen moments in time'. The encapsulation of (at least) one period of history within a real or contrived theme or story, could utilise just such a tool, if only to decode these apparently contradictory time conundrums in one presentation.

It has certainly benefited Pearce (1995: 52-53) in her research on the role and significance of European collections. It would certainly be of value in comprehending the contraction or extension of time (sometimes simultaneously) in one display. The 'mirror image' Tenth century market day in Jorvik which is supposedly connected with its contemporary version up above in Coppergate by what purports to be a time tunnel in the Jorvik Viking Centre, the visitor moving away from present to past "shopping crowds" (Addyman & Gaynor, 1984: 11).

The compression of the chronology, events and route of The Canterbury Tales into a thirty minute trail which
showcases just five out of the original twenty-four tales, and a similar 'day/night/day' sequence at the Tales of Robin Hood Centre in Nottingham (as a template for the display of various undated outlaw legends rather than fixed Chaucerian narratives) are all examples which may be contemplated.

The Jorvik Viking Centre is a particularly significant example, as ever, because instead of presenting fiction or legend, it displays a supposed reconstruction of the (arguably) fact-based saga of events in the Viking Kingdom of York in October, AD 948, utilising material from other disciplines ranging from the Ninth to the Eleventh centuries.

This has to be considered in the context of the claim that such interpretation centres do no more than beautify and mystify the past by means of the simulacrum, a post-modern pastiche (Walsh, 1990: 286-87). They could also be claimed to promote the "instantaneous time" of an increasingly marketised post-modern economy and culture" (Urry, 1996: 60). Urry argues that it is because of the increasing flow of images, ideas, information and people across borders, that the processes of social remembering become even more disjointed, speeded up, hybridized and fractured (Urry, 1996: 61).

It is in this context that the observation of the detailing of the "exceptional significance of images of the past" and present 'golden ages' and eras of "phenomenally rapid social change" is noted (Samuel, 1996: 62). It must also be taken into consideration in an analysis of contemporary theoretical
models of the Vikings in general, and Jorvik in particular, as in Chapter Two. The Annales analytical framework could therefore enable the researcher to disentangle such strands of time, especially the themes that are beyond living memory.

SHORT TERM - EVENEMENTS

HISTORY
OF
EVENTS

Narrative, Political History;
Events;
Individuals.

MEDIUM TERM - CONJUNCTURES

STRUCTURAL HISTORY

Social, Economic History;
Economic, Agrarian,
Demographic Cycles;
History of eras/regions,
societies;
Worldviews, ideologies,
(Mentalites).

LONG TERM - STRUCTURES OF THE 'LONGUE DUREE'

Geohistory: 'enabling and constraining;
History of civilisations,
peoples;
Stable technologies,

Figure 3.1. The Annales paradigm (after Bintliff, 1991a: 6, Figure 1.2).
In the Annales model of time (or rather duration), historical time is controlled by three groups of processes which have a clearly formative effect on human societies. These operative processes are contemporaneous but fixed at different wavelengths in time (Bintliff, 1991a: 6). There has been criticism of the division of three temporal process wavelengths and their resolution into 'common time' as being arbitrary (Bintliff, 1991a: 27). Yet there is also recognition of the scope for its extension into disciplines, such as political history (Bintliff, 1991a: 31).

An attraction of the Annales framework of approaching the past is in its combination of separate disciplines to create "a single elaborate methodology for understanding pre modern societies" (Bintliff, 1991a: 2). The popular success of Le Roy Ladurie's Annales based texts of 'Montaillou' and 'Carnival' (Bintliff, 1991a: 5) does not indicate a problem with habitus either, although this success is in literature rather than museology.

The construction of the framework is contingent on interdisciplinary collaboration, and on the replacing of scholarly authority and textual criticisms of sources with the search for "vast new databases (which are) amenable to statistical treatment" (Bintliff, 1991a: 5). This is relevant, given the use of multi-disciplinary material by interpretation centres, in their presentations, as at Jorvik. If the plausibility of such pre-Renaissance past era microcosms cannot be
reliably verified due to their distinct isolation from living memory, this may be compensated for by the application of Braudel's model of historical time (outlined in Chapter Seven, Figure 3:1: 467) which made his text on the Sixteenth century Mediterranean world "a wonderful physical and human complexity" (Bintliff, 1991a: 11).

The concept of researching the social and economic context of a mentalité as the appropriate explanatory conditions for its origin and role in history, is used for an exploration of the effect on human concepts of the logic of everyday life (Bintliff, 1991a: 12). It is also possible to critically analyse the presentation of the societies and associated mentalities which are promoted, especially as the interplay of the different timescales of the past, enables the placing of a unique event in the context of long-term structures, again as at Jorvik.

If there is a denial of predictability of direction that a dynamic natural system may take, there is also an affirmation of a fundamental tendency for endlessly recreated structure and stability (Bintliff, 1991a: 16), which might suggest that there is nothing new about the creation of an artificial past (Bintliff, 1991a: 16). The acknowledgement of a relativity of knowledge and subjectivity of scholarship (Bintliff, 1991a: 18) should also be taken into consideration, as should the claims by Hodder and Walsh of there being a (post) modern control of the presentation of the past.
Fabure's quoted claim (made in 1949) that each age has necessarily the age it needs (a critic might add 'merits'), and that the organising of the past in accordance with the needs of the present, is the social function of history (Bintliff, 1991a) is one which should be tested in the assessment of the interpretation centres in subsequent chapters. If Bintliff (1991a: 19-26) is capable of utilising their insights and models in a (classical) archaeological research case study, then they could also be applied in presentational research. In this thesis alone, the varying presentational relationships with time can be discerned, in the consideration of the 'Time Travel' concept in permanent presentations (Chapter Two: 78; 131-132), temporary exhibitions (Chapter Two: 123-24), educational Living History (Chapter Five: 321; 329), and also enactments (Chapter Six: 385).

It may be a fad, but the millennial preoccupation with time, whether it is in the temporary 'The Story of Time' exhibition at the Royal Observatory in Greenwich, which will "serve to underline the impact of our profound relationship with time" (Barrett, 1999: 5), or in the Burgundian Archedrome's global presentation of the development of time (Malone & Stoddart, 1998: 731), could justify further ways and means of presenting and researching such experimentations and innovations.
CHAPTER SEVEN FOOTNOTES.


(2) Personal communication by Georgina Plowright, Curator, English Heritage Hadrian's Walls Museums, 1st October 1994.
APPENDIX A. PILOT VISITOR SURVEY LISTINGS.

Pilot surveys.

A total of three visitor surveys were conducted between Easter 1991 and Easter 1992. These were the pilot surveys.

1991 PILOT VENUE DURATION


(2) Goodrich Castle, Herefordshire. 6 October 1991.


Actual Number of Participants Targeted Number

(1) Bignor Roman Villa: 25 25

(2) Goodrich Castle: 29 50

(3) Honeywood Heritage Centre: 18 25

Actual Total: 72 100 Target Total.

Method

(1) Bignor Roman Villa: personal exit questionnaire.

(2) Goodrich Castle: personal exit questionnaire/distribution.

(3) Honeywood Heritage Centre: made available in cafe.
Educational Surveys.

(1) Maldon Living History Camp, Essex.

3 to 11 June, 1991.

(2) Binchester Roman Fort and Witton Park Educational Centre, Co. Durham.


Actual Number of Participants.

(1) Maldon Living History Camp: 264 schoolchildren (out of 11 teachers. 7 schools).

5 enactors.

(2) Binchester Roman Fort: 12 schoolchildren (out of one school group of 25).

1 teacher.

Method.

(1) Maldon Living History Camp: self-completion in school.

(2) Binchester Roman Fort: self-completion in school.
Visitor Survey, Based on Exit Questionnaires.

A total of 17 visitor surveys were then conducted between February and December 1992. The abbreviations listed here are used to refer to the establishments concerned, in the remainder of this section.

1992 DATABASE VENUE DURATION

(A) Innovative Indoor Establishments.

(1) Jorvik Viking Centre, York (JVC).
   29 February.

(2) Tower Hill Pageant, London (THP).
   7 and 8 August.

(3) The Tales of Robin Hood Centre, Nottingham (TORH).
   25 and 27 April.

(4) White Cliffs Experience, Dover, Kent (WCE).
   19 September and 26 September.

(B) Traditional Indoor Establishments.

(1) Bede Monastery Museum, Jarrow, Tyne & Wear (BMM).
   14 and 16 August, and August.

(2) Corinium Museum, Cirencester, Gloucestershire (CM).
   1 August, and August.

(3) Roman Baths Museum, Bath, Avon (RBM).
   2 August.
(4) Verulamium Museum, St Albans, Hertfordshire (VM).

25 April, 14 June and 22 June.

C. Innovative Outdoor Establishments.

(1) Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum, South Shields, Tyne & Wear (ARFM).

15 August, and August to September.

(2) Baginton Roman Fort, Warwickshire (BRF).

13 June, and June to September.

(3) Fishbourne Roman Palace, West Sussex (FRP).

20 June and 20 July.

(4) Sherwood Forest Visitor Centre, Edwinstowe, Nottinghamshire (SFVC).

9 August.

D. Traditional Outdoor Establishments.

(1) Battle Abbey, East Sussex (BA).

21 June and 11 July.

(2) Bodiam Castle, East Sussex (BC).

26 July.

(3) Stafford Castle (SC).

27 June, 8 August, and August to December.

(4) Tamworth Castle, Staffordshire (TC).

5 May and 30 August.

(5) Warwick Castle (WC).

10 May.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Number of Participants</th>
<th>Targeted Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) JVC:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) THP:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) TORH:</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) WCE:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) BMM:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) CM:</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) RBM:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) VM:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) ARFM:</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) BRF:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) FRP:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) SFVC:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) BA:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) BC:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) SC:</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) TC:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) WC:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Total:</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target Total:
Method

A.
(1) JVC: personal exit questionnaire.
(2) THP: personal exit questionnaire.
(3) TORH: made available in restaurant.
(2) WCE: personal exit questionnaire.

B.
(1) BMM: personal exit questionnaire,
or made available in Museum shop.
(2) CM: personal exit questionnaire,
or made available in Museum foyer.
(3) RBM: personal exit questionnaire.
(4) VM: personal exit questionnaire.

C.
(1) ARFM: personal exit questionnaire,
or made available in Visitor Centre foyer.
(2) BRF: personal exit questionnaire,
or made available in Granary Centre.
(3) FRP: personal exit questionnaire.
(4) SFVC: personal exit questionnaire.

D.
(1) BA: personal exit questionnaire.
(2) BC: personal exit questionnaire.
(3) SC: personal exit questionnaire/distribution.
(4) TC: personal exit questionnaire.
(5) WC: personal exit questionnaire.

VISITOR QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA, BIGNOR, WEST SUSSEX, ON 14th AUGUST, 1991. PREPARED BY M.J. MALONEY, THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT, LEICESTER UNIVERSITY.

SECTION ONE

(1) WHY DID YOU VISIT BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA?

(2) HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THE ROMAN VILLA?

(3) HOW DID YOU TRAVEL TO BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA?
   (a) BY FOOT
   (b) BUS
   (c) CAR
   (d) TRAIN
   (e) OTHER ( PLEASE SPECIFY )
( SECTION ONE )

(4) IF NOT ALONE, WHAT SORT OF GROUP DID YOU COME WITH?
   (a) FAMILY
   (b) FRIENDS
   (c) SCHOOLPARTY
   (d) OTHER ( PLEASE SPECIFY )

(5) IF YOU HAVE VISITED BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA BEFORE, PLEASE STATE HOW MANY TIMES.

(6) WAS IT EASY TO FIND YOUR WAY HERE? YES/NO

(7) IF YOU SAW AN EVENT OR A TEMPORARY EXHIBITION, WHAT DID YOU THINK OF ITS CONTENT AND PRESENTATION?
SECTION TWO

(1) HAVE YOU LEARNED ANYTHING NEW ABOUT ROMAN BRITAIN?

(2) IS THERE ANYTHING AT BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA ( OR CONCERNING ROMAN BRITAIN ) THAT YOU WISH TO KNOW MORE ABOUT?

(3) IF YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT ROMAN BRITAIN AND YOU DISAGREE WITH THE INTERPRETATION OF IT HERE, PLEASE STATE WHY.
SECTION THREE

(1) WHAT DID YOU MOST ENJOY ABOUT YOUR VISIT?

(2) WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE:
    (a) MORE EDUCATION? YES/NO
    (b) MORE ENTERTAINMENT? YES/NO

(3) IF SO, WHAT WOULD YOU SUGGEST?

(4) HAVE THE STAFF BEEN HELPFUL? YES/NO
( SECTION THREE )

(5) DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS ABOUT HOW BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA COULD BE IMPROVED?
SECTION FOUR

(1) ARE YOU: (a) FEMALE?  (b) MALE?

(2) WHAT AGE GROUP ARE YOU?  
   (A) 8-16  
   (B) 17-21  
   (C) 22-30  
   (D) 31-40  
   (E) 41-50  
   (F) 51-60  
   (G) 61+

(3) WHAT IS YOUR NATIONALITY?

(4) WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION?  

(5) WHAT IS THE NAME OF YOUR TOWN AND DISTRICT?

(6) WOULD YOU LIKE TO VISIT BIGNOR ROMAN VILLA AGAIN? YES/NO  
   PLEASE SAY WHY.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
Sample of Questionnaire for Educational Survey.

Questionnaire for schoolchildren who participated in the Maldon Anglo-Saxon Experience Camp from 3rd to 14th June 1991.
Prepared by M.J. Maloney, the History Department, University of Leicester.

(1) When did you go?

(2) What did you see?

(3) Which crafts folk did you work with?

(4) What were they like?

(5) What did they do for you?
(6) Did they help you?

(7) What did you learn about the Anglo-Saxons?

(8) What did you like?

(9) What didn't you like?

(10) Would you like to do it again?

Thank you for answering the questions.
Sample Questionnaire Used For Visitor Survey, 1992.

VISITOR SURVEY FOR FISHBOURNE ROMAN PALACE ON
PREPARED BY MICHAEL MALONEY, THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT,
UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER, UNIVERSITY ROAD, LEICESTER, LE1 7RH.
Fishbourne Roman Palace has kindly allowed me to conduct this
survey. I hope that you will be kind enough to complete it.

Female/Male. Time: (Group: ) Visit: 1st/2nd/3rd

Were souvenirs bought on this visit? YES/NO

Info. source: advert/poster/press report/radio/signpost/
Visitor Board/TV/word of mouth/other:

1. Did you enjoy your visit? YES/NO
2. Were the Museum facilities good? YES/NO
3. Were the staff helpful? YES/NO
4. Was it easy to find your way here? YES/NO
5. Did you take part in any activities here today? YES/NO
   Please specify.
6. Were the event participants helpful? YES/NO
   Please specify.
7. Do you want to learn more about Fishbourne Roman YES/NO
   Palace and/or visit it again?
8. Where are you from?
9. What is your occupation?
10. What is your age group? To 21/22-30/31-40/41-50/51-60/61+
11. What did you learn about Fishbourne Roman Palace and Roman Britain?

12. Do you have any comments, enquiries, requests that facilities are maintained, or suggestions for improvement, about Fishbourne Roman Palace?

Thank you for answering this questionnaire.
Sample Of Museum/Centre Staff Questionnaire For Managerial Survey.

STAFF SURVEY FOR
COMPLETED BY:
ON:

1. How was the Museum established?

2. How was it funded?

3. How were the (Roman to Medieval) displays planned?

4. What other museums, etc., influenced the display's design?

5. What major display changes have taken place since opening?
6. How is the Museum accessible for disabled visitors?

7. How many (local) staff are employed?

8. What educational facilities are provided?

9. What links are there with the National Curriculum?

10. Is the local council involved in the Museum administration?
11. Are there links with other museums, etc., in

12. What advertising is done for the Museum?

13. What are the links with the local & national media?

14. What arrangements are made about signposting?

15. What events take place at the Museum?
16. Approximately how many people visit each year, and has there been a drop or increase in recent years?

17. What are the (main) nationalities of visitors, and what language variations of information are available for them?

18. What are the annual income & expenses?

19. How was the Museum involved in the 1993 anniversary of the Claudian invasion?

20. What are the future plans for the Museum & its displays?
Sample Of Member Questionnaire for Living History Group Survey.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR (A LIVING HISTORY ORGANISATION).

COMPLETED BY:

ON:

1. How did it develop & why?

2. How was it funded?

3. How many members does it have, and what district(s) are they from?

4. Has it changed much since its foundation?

5. Has any other living history group had an influence on its development?
6. Does it have any links with other living history groups in Britain (and elsewhere)?

7. What educational service does it provide?

8. Is it linked to the National Curriculum?

9. What advertising does it do?

10. What links does it have with the local and national media?
11. How many events does it take part in each year?

12. Where do the events usually take place?

13. What transport arrangements are made to them, and how many people usually see an event?

14. What does it do at events, and does the public take part in them?

15. How was it involved in the 1993 commemoration of the Claudian invasion of Britain?
16. Can its members talk to foreign visitors (in French, German, etc.,) at events?

17. How has it learned to stage a good event?

18. What authorities and organisations is it linked with?

19. What is its general annual income and expenses?

20. What are the future plans for

Mr. M. Maloney
10 Cotswold Road
Belmont
Sutton
Surrey SM2 5NL

Dear Mr. Maloney,

We are in receipt of your letter dated 6th August about a possible visitor survey.

We have had some survey work done in the past which has not proved very satisfactory. We find visitors are not at all keen to have the burden of completing a questionnaire however well it is presented.

You may try a visitor survey at Bignor provided you work on the following guidelines.

1/. Agree the questionnaire with us prior to the survey date.

2/. Conduct the survey on an interview basis so that you actually write down the answers, not the visitor.

3/. Our staff do not have the time to assist you with the survey, other than informing people that you are carrying it out.

A questionnaire which we just ask visitors to fill-in with no personal input from you, in our experience would not work and would not be acceptable to us.

We hope this is of some use.

Yours sincerely,

T.R. Tupper.
(Manager)
Michael Maloney,
The History Department,
University of Leicester,
University Road,
Leicester,
LEI 7RH

11th May 1992

Dear Mr Maloney,

Thank you for your letter, my apologies for the delay in replying.

I have looked through the copy of your survey. I would be quite happy for you to use this on our visitors. As I think I mentioned previously, we have carried out visitor surveys here at Fishbourne before, but they tend to have more of a bias towards discovering the efficiency or otherwise of our publicity, I will be interested to see the results from your survey.

I'm afraid that we do not have any special events arranged for July or August. The main one is on the weekend of 20th/21st June! In consequence the choice of date in July or August is entirely yours. I am enclosing current publicity/information leaflets on the Palace for your information.

Yours sincerely,

David J Rudkin,
Director
Mr Michael Maloney
10 Cotswold Road
Belmont
Sutton
Surrey
SM2 5NL

14th April 1992

Dear Mr Maloney

SURVEY - BODIAM CASTLE

Thank you for sending the survey you wish to carry out at Bodiam Castle on Sunday July 26th.

We are happy for you to carry out your survey on that date, however I must ask you to keep to the following guidelines.

On arrival and departure please call in at the ticket office up by the castle, in order to let the administrator Mr Jim past know you are starting the survey.

Please carry out your survey in the car park area only. You will probably find that this is the best place to do so as your questions refer to the shop and restaurant facilities that are situated here anyhow. The day will be extremely busy so please ensure that entrances/exits are not blocked by you or anyone you are talking to.

We would be grateful if you would wear a badge stating that you are Michael Maloney from the University of Leicester, would you also make it clear that the survey is being carried out for your own thesis/records.

Finally, I know I do not need to ask you to ensure that peoples visits are not upset or hindered in any way by your taking of this survey.

I hope the survey proves significant for you, and I look forward to receiving the results.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Dando, Regional Information Officer
Dear

I am a student researching Roman to Medieval centres and sites for my PhD. I am writing to you to ask for information on ... . I am particularly interested in ... .

In 1991, I conducted adult and school visitor surveys and staff interviews at selected centres and sites. I am now revising my type of survey as a result of the findings from my past questionnaires. Your information would enable me to make the survey more relevant to ... .

If I do have your permission to conduct a visitor survey during ... , I would then send you a prototype copy for your approval, or advice on changes that might be required. Arrangements as to the timing and the most convenient method of conducting the survey could also be agreed upon.

After I have prepared a report on the survey results, I would appreciate an opportunity to discuss them with a member of your staff. I also request your permission to enquire about the development of ... in that same interview, and to be allowed to study the design and facilities during my visit.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Maloney
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APPENDIX C. LIST OF LOCATIONS WHERE RESEARCH-GATHERING TOOK PLACE.

List Of English Locations Where Personal Contact Took Place.

Abertanet Excavation.
Aldborough Roman Town.
All Hallows Church Crypt, London.
Arbeia Roman Fort and Museum, South Shields.
Bagshot Archaeological Centre.
Battle Abbey.
Battlefields Trust.
Beaulieu Abbey.
Bede Monastery Museum.
Bignor Roman Villa.
Birdoswald Roman Fort.
Bodiam Castle.
Bosworth Battlefield Centre.
Brading Roman Villa.
Brancaster Roman Fort.
Brigantia.
British Museum.
Bromley Museum and Orpington Roman Villa.
Brooks Centre, Winchester.
Burnham Museum.
Buckinghamshire County Museum, Aylesbury.
Calleva Museum, Silchester.
Canterbury Heritage Centre and Westgate.
Canterbury Tales.
Castle Acre Priory, Castle and Gate.
Chelmsford and Essex Museum.
Chesters Roman Fort, Corbridge Roman Town and Housesteads Roman Fort.
Chichester District Museum.
Corineum Museum, Cirencester.
Corridors of Time.
Cumings Museum, Southwark.
Dartford Museum.
Dover Castle
Dover Museum.
Dover Painted House.
East Stoke Battlefield.
Elms Farm Excavation Centre, Heybridge.
English Heritage Events Unit.
English Tourist Board.
Ermine Street Guard.
Ewell Museum.
Fishbourne Roman Palace.
Fleur de Lis Heritage Centre and Museum, Faversham.
Goodrich Castle.
Hastings Castle.
Hastings Shipwreck Centre.
Heavenfield and Otterburn Battlefields.
Hindford Historical Enterprises.
Honeywood Heritage Centre, Carshalton.
Italian Academy, London.
Jewry Wall Museum, Leicester.
Laxton Visitor Centre.
Legio II Augusta.
Legio V Gallorum.
Legio XIII Gemina.
Lewes Museum.
Living History Workshops.
Lullingstone Roman Villa and Eynsford Castle.
Lympne Roman Fort.
Lyndhurst Forest Centre.
Maidstone Archbishop's Palace.
Maidstone Museum.
Maldon Children's Living History Experience and Battle Anniversary.
Medieval Merchant's House, Southampton.
Michelham Priory.
Museum of Antiquities, Newcastle.
Museum of London and Tower Hill Pageant.
Othona Saxon Shore Fort and St Peter on the Wall, Burnham.
Park Farm Archaeological Trail, Snettisham.
Pevensie Castle.
Portchester Castle.
Reading Museum and Abbey.
Reculver Visitor Centre.
Richborough Fort.
Rochester Castle.
Roman Baths Museum, Bath.
Rowley's House Museum, Shrewsbury.
Royal Armouries, Tower of London.
Royal Mail.
RWPR Design Partnership.
St Augustines Abbey, Canterbury.
St Bride's Church, London.
Sherwood Forest Visitor Centre.
Shrewsbury Abbey.
Shrewsbury Quest.
Sounds Alive Company.
Sounds Natural Company.
Stafford Castle.
Surrey Archaeological Society.
Surrey Museums Consultative Committee.
Tales of Robin Hood, Nottingham.
Tamworth Castle.
Tonbridge Castle.
Verulamium Museum, St Albans.
Verulamium Roman Theatre, St Albans.
Villa Faustina Excavation, Scole.
Vindolanda Roman Museum.
Wall Roman Site.
Warwick Castle.
Welwyn Roman Baths.
Wesley Museum, London.
West Stow Country Park.
White Cliffs Experience, Dover.
Winchester Heritage Centre.
Winchester Museum and Westgate.
Wroxeter Roman City.
List Of English Locations Which Were Approached For Information.

Alnwick Castle.
Anker's House Museum, Chester Le Street.
Archaeology Centre, Newport.
Arundel Museum.
Badbury Rings.
Baginton Roman Fort.
Bedford Museum.
Binchester Roman Fort and Witton Park Centre.
Birkenhead Priory.
Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery.
Bishop's Stortford Museum.
Blore Heath Visitor Centre.
Border History Museum, Hexham.
Brighton Museum and Art Gallery.
Camborne Public Library and Museum.
Canterbury Roman Museum.
Central Museum and Art Gallery, Nottingham.
Chanctonbury Ring and Cissbury Ring.
Chedworth Roman Villa.
Cheltenham Art Gallery.
Chiltern Open Air Museum, Chalfont St Giles.
City and Council Museum, Lincoln.
City Museum and Art Gallery, Peterborough.
City Museum, Lancaster.
Cockley Cley Iceni Village.
Colchester Castle Museum.
Conisborough Castle.
Connections Discovery Centre, Exeter.
Devizes Museum.
Doncaster Museum and Art Gallery.
Dorset County Museum, Dorchester.
Edgecote Battlefield.
Ermine Street Trail, Hertfordshire.
Felixstowe Museum and Walton Castle.
Glastonbury Abbey Gatehouse Museum.
God's House Tower, Southampton.
Great Wortley Villa.
Guildford Museum.
Ham Hill Trail, Somerset.
Hertford Museum
Hull City Museum and Art Gallery.
Ipswich Museum.
Jorvik Viking Centre.
King's Weston Villa.
Leatherhead Museum of Local History.
Leeds City Museum.
Letchworth Museum.
Lincoln Archaeology Centre.
Lydney Park Museum and Roman Temple.
Maiden Castle.
Marlipin's Museum, Shoreham.
Martinhoe and Old Burrow Roman Fortlets, Devon.
Milton Keynes Archaeological Unit.
Mountfichet Castle.
Moyse's Hall Museum, Bury St Edmunds.
Museum of South Somerset, Yeovil.
Norton Priory, Runcorn.
Nottingham Castle.
Once Brewed Visitor Centre.
Oxford Archaeology Unit.
Pedder's Way Trail, Norfolk.
Pontefract Castle Visitor Centre.
Rainster Rocks, Derbyshire.
Raunds Area Project.
Ribchester Independent Museum of Antiquities.
Rotherham Museum and Templeborough Roman Fort.
Royal Albert Memorial Museum, Exeter.
Royston and District Museum.
Saffron Walden Museum.
Salt Museum, Northwich.
Scunthorpe Borough Museum and Art Gallery.
Senhouse Roman Museum, Maryport.
Shaftsbury Abbey, Dorset.
Sheffield City Museum.
Sherborne Museum.
Spelthorne Museum.
Stamford Museum.
Stonea Camp and Stonea Grange, Cambridgeshire.
Stroud District Museum.
Surrey Museums Consultative Committee.

Sutton Hoo.

Swindon Museum and Art Gallery.

Tattershall Castle.

Tewkesbury Museum and Battlefield.

Tullie House, Carlisle.

Wallsend Heritage Centre.

Warwickshire Museum, Warwick.

Watford Museum.

Wells Museum.

Weoley Castle.

West Mercian Archaeological Consultants Limited.

Whitehaven Museum and Art Gallery.

Winchester Cathedral Education Service.

Woodbridge Museum.

Worthing Museum and Art Gallery.

Yorkshire Museum, York.
Welsh Locations At Which Personal Interviews Were Conducted.

Beaumaris Castle.
Caerleon Roman Baths and Amphitheatre.
Caerphilly Castle.
Conwy Castle.
Cosmeston Lakes Country Park.
Criccieth Castle.
Segontium Roman Fort, Caernarfon.
Trefriw Roman Spa.

Information Received From Other Welsh Sites.

Aberffraw Roman Site.
Bangor Museum.
Carmarthen Museum.
Llyn Brenig Archaeological Trial.
National Museum of Wales, Cardiff.
Newport Museum and Art Gallery.
Offa's Dyke Interpretation Centre, Rhyl.
The Old Bell Heritage Centre, Montgomery.
Scottish Sites At Which Personal Interviews Were Conducted.

Trimontium Trust Fort and Exhibition,
Corn Exchange, Melrose.

Information Received From Other Scottish Sites.
Bannockburn Heritage Centre.
Dumfries Museum.
Falkirk Museum.
Hunterian Museum, Glasgow.
Kinneil Roman Fortlet.

Information Received From Northern Irish Sites.
Archaeological and Mythological Visitor Centre, Navan.
St Patrick's Trian, Armagh.

Information Received From Isle of Man Sites.
Odin's Raven Museum, Peel.
Other European (And North American) Sites At Which Personal Interviews Were Conducted.

France
Agincourt Visitor Centre, Azincourt.

Germany
Xanten Archaeological Park.

Greece
Byzantine Museum, Thessaloniki.

Ireland
Dublin Castle.
Ferrycarrig Irish National Heritage Park.
Glendalough Visitor Centre.
National Museum of Ireland (for Dublin Viking Village).
Office of Public Works (for Fore Abbey, Glendalough Visitor Centre, Clonmacnoise Abbey and Trim Castle).

Netherlands
Archeon, Alphen Aan Den Rijn.
VII Gemina Martia Victrix.

United States
Saratoga National Historical Park, New York State.
Milites Normannorum.
Information Received From Other European Sites.

Belgium
Bruxella, 1238

France
Azincourt Museum.
L'Archeodrome, Beaune.
Paris Archaeological Crypt.
Musee de la Tapisserie, Bayeux

Germany
Aalen Limes Museum.
Archaeological Crypt, Koln.
Frelichtmuseum Romerhaus Schwarzenacker.
Imperial Palace Museum, Paderborn.
Museum, Munster.
Paderborn Museum, Berlin.
Porta Nigra Gate, Trier
Romisch-Germanische Museum, Koln.
Saalburg Roman Fort, Bad Homburg.
Wikingere Museum, Schleswig.

Ireland
Cahir Castle.
Celtworld, Tramore.
Dublinia, Dublin.
Dunmore Caves.
Wexford Heritage Centre.
Switzerland
Romerstadt Augusta Raurica
Vindonissa Museum, Windisch.

Hungary
Familia Gladiatoria.

United States
Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation, Virginia.
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