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Appendices
Methodology

The internet was the main instrument of research for this project. Google and Google Scholar searches were undertaken to locate sources of questionnaires, which had been previously conducted by various organisations. Using search terms such as ‘heritage questionnaire’ and ‘community heritage questionnaire’ results were obtained and varied from UNESCO surveys of member nations through to questionnaires conducted by local governments in Australia. Questionnaires from other countries, such as Ireland and Canada, provided useful examples to research. Some articles about the use of questionnaires were found but few related to heritage, while examples of surveying visitors to museums gave some useful information with the connection of heritage to museum collections being explored.

Flinders University library catalogue and databases provided resources with regard to community engagement and consultation background and discussed the how long consultation had been practised. Works describing construction of questionnaires were also located here with a variety of formats being explained and the benefits and disadvantages of each style.

Emails were sent to Winnipeg Heritage and Wellington Park to obtain results which may have been available to include in the report but no responses were received.
Results

Literature Review

It can be clearly seen through literature that heritage is important to both professionals and communities. However, a divide exists between that which is considered valuable by each of the parties. Conducting questionnaires and surveys is one method by which discerning heritage valued by communities can be attained. Public surveys stress the importance of heritage for ‘protecting our identity’ a sentiment exhibited by many people in the County Wicklow survey undertaken by Dagg, and an opinion professed by UNESCO in 2007 (Russell 2010: 30).

As Turnpenny suggests, cultural heritage is very important in the development of identity and the subsequent demeanour of the population. Government in the United Kingdom, however, have found the relevance of heritage to be lacking among the community, with a possible cause being the disregard by professionals and managers of attaching value to that which people consider important. Because of this, government has advocated the augmentation of means by which individuals and communities can be involved in heritage management (Turnpenny 2004: 295). Being that cultural heritage is inherited, and expressed in many ways both by material culture and intangibly, all aspects of life constitute it. However, in England as in other countries, the worth of heritage to local communities is not part of the criteria assessed to render something significant (Turnpenny 2004: 297). Such sentiments are repeated by Russell with his suggestion that community value of heritage is associated with feeling and belief so must be ‘cared for’, rather than just physical representations which are merely tended (Russell 2010: 30).
The suggestion that the social value of heritage is a superficial consideration when assessed for significance is agreed upon by Spennemann *et al.* While community associates heritage with happenings and experience (Spennemann *et al.* 2001: 16), Turnpenny considers assessment criteria is the basis of the problem of downgrading social values (Turnpenny 2004: 297-298). This anomaly was the basis of the investigation by Spennemann and Harris in 1996, such that the different attitudes of community and professionals toward heritage can be ascertained and is the subject of the article. It was noted that public sites were most commonly recognised as heritage by the public, who tended to assign an economic or leisure worth to such places. Little differentiation was shown between natural and cultural heritage by the respondents (Spennemann *et al.* 2001: 16). This study showed the difference in opinion between the public and professionals an gap which the authors suggest need to be reduced.

Clark, conversely, suggests that Australia does identify ‘social’ values of heritage to be important just as those that exhibit values associated with ‘analysis of fabric’, as the Burra Charter is an important means by which heritage is assessed. This document is beginning to influence practices in places such as the United Kingdom which previously considered built heritage to be of the highest national importance. With Australia having such a significant Indigenous heritage, culture is held in a different perspective resulting in the necessity of traditional cultures to be acknowledged (Clark 2010: 91-92). It was this need to understand the value of places to communities that prompted the Heritage Lottery Fund, which assists funding of English Heritage sites, to conduct public ‘juries’. Members of the general public, with no specific interest in heritage, were invited to contemplate the value of
heritage from which four priorities arose. Firstly, knowledge about heritage is paramount to understanding individuals and society and secondly, that heritage gives a ‘sense of identity’ on levels ranging from personal to national. The third priority concluded that heritage should be cared for such that future generations have the opportunity to appreciate it too, with the fourth value being the uniqueness and individuality heritage brings to a community. Furthermore, the participants suggested benefits to communities included economic growth, an improved profile and reputation to the area with a reduction in ‘anti-social behaviour’ as well as an increased public pride and development of skills to individuals (Clark 2010: 94-95).

Such behaviour and damage, results in the loss of archaeological sites worldwide. As archaeological data is being used increasingly to assist in legal battles such as Indigenous land claims, as well as in cultural education via tourism, archaeologists realised the need to increase public awareness of the heritage to protect it. Pokotylo and Guppy anticipated an improved understanding and appreciation, and reduction of looting and vandalism, if this were to occur in conjunction with legislation already enacted. Such was the impetus for conducting a questionnaire in Vancouver, Canada, as few surveys to ascertain public attitudes towards archaeology had been undertaken previously. The survey was designed to gauge public knowledge, the importance assigned by the public to engaging in archaeological projects and their perception of archaeological conservation (Pokotylo and Guppy 1999: 400-401). The authors argue that public support to be crucial if legislation and funding are to develop. With an increase in public support, resultant demands on governments to address heritage concerns are more likely to be assured. The survey found the interest and concern for archaeology to be greater with age and education level,
while women showed a higher degree of understanding than their male counterparts. Generally, however, it was found through the responses that archaeological conservation was not held in high regard by the Vancouver respondents. Pokotylo and Guppy suggest this information could be utilised to develop a better education forum especially via tourism, museums and television thus providing the opportunity for the public to access ‘reliable information.’ A consequence of such a study, as proposed by the authors, could be the equivalent being undertaken in other countries to disprove the results being regionally specific (Pokotylo and Guppy 1999: 413-415).

Heritage awareness through tourism is another avenue of discussion among professionals with regard to the community’s attitude toward its use as attractions. In 1996, Jones et al surveyed the Welsh heritage agencies to gauge their opinions in this matter while also investigating funding issues, development locally and nationally and the future of Welsh heritage. The responses showed strong support for heritage and public involvement but were averse to paying to see the places though the money subsequently would fund the care of them. The common theme of identity arose in this survey as in others discussed in this report, with the opinion of heritage tourism being a beneficial extension to national pride. The advantage of improving economic and social conditions through employed was noted. However, the general consensus was that Wales had too many heritage attractions with a balance between cultures past and present being preferred. A lack of collaboration in tourism was considered to be impeding the management of heritage by the industry (Jones et al 1996: 44-48). Thus, the paper concludes that heritage management and planning is a key component to welsh heritage flourishing.
McKercher’s paper summarising his survey on a specific heritage attraction, namely a replica boat the *PS Cumberrooma*, also had a tourism focus. He acknowledges the increased awareness and appreciation of heritage via this medium (McKercher 2001: 29), but was contracted to conduct the survey to garner the importance of the attraction to the public with regard to the justification of the continued operation of an economically unviable entity (McKercher 2001: 30). While heritage tourism may revitalise interest in a district’s history, it can also increase community involvement and community pride. McKercher suggests these to be positive outcomes if the attraction becomes part of the community’s social and economic framework (McKercher 2001: 32). However, he argues that consultation such as this example can be a disadvantage if emotional links cloud the judgement of the responses. That is, the decisions and reasons for keeping the vessel in operation may not be rational but rather grasping at opportunities which, if lost, could further depress an already unhealthy economic district. McKercher states that, while consultation can assist in raising awareness and taking community beliefs into consideration, the heritage support may not have widespread appeal and can be the difference between an asset and an attraction (McKercher 2001: 40).

Museums, too, find the need to consult communities such that exhibits and content satisfy their interests. Sheffield Galleries and Museums Trust in Britain conducted a survey to implement a directive of the government to encourage a greater public involvement in decision making about heritage (Canning and Holmes 2006: 276). Questionnaires are considered one of the most efficient ways to collect information from the public. The authors cite Wolff in that such methods are less time consuming and more cost effective than employing consultants to conduct
interviews (Wolff 2005, cited by Canning and Holmes 2006: 280). However, in citing Kay’s conclusion of questionnaires being unpopular and rarely completed by locals (Kay 2000:420, cited by Canning and Holmes 2006: 280), Canning and Holmes investigate the use of a variant of the repertory grid, a psychology interview technique, used by the aforementioned museum organisation to gain an understanding into the community’s attitudes to the museum, as an alternative method to a questionnaire. Interviews of organisation leaders were conducted, allowing issues from their perspectives to be established followed by community representatives, including from various cultural groups, using the grid system (Canning and Holmes 2006: 283-284). A review showed the survey format time consuming to complete but beneficial for lower literary levels as visual prompts were used. The possibilities of being a more effective method to garner data than questionnaires was inconclusive but a future refinement could prove it to be so (Canning and Holmes 2006: 293-294).

**Community Consultation Questionnaires**

Questionnaires specifically about community attitudes to heritage management are not common. New South Wales is particularly active in fostering community involvement with regards to local heritage. It has produced a guide to community-based heritage surveys with numerous local governments in that state utilising the document. However, as suggested in it, the community is encouraged to be engaged in heritage surveys working alongside heritage consultants (NSW Dept of Planning 2007:2). In this situation, the community volunteers research and nominate items of heritage within their district while having the opportunity to also consider recommendations for future management and promotion of their local heritage.
Continuing association by the community establishes a better understanding of heritage management (NSW Dept of Planning 2007:3).

The Shires of Ballina, Young and Coonabarabran are examples of local governments which have undertaken studies using the guidelines. Few local councils, however, have begun the process of a heritage study with a questionnaire to gauge community attitudes and awareness toward heritage, instead choosing to call for expressions of interest to be involved in a study. Two exceptions are Liverpool Plains (formerly Quirindi Shire Council) and Uralla. The former, which launched a heritage study in 2004, conducted two questionnaires, firstly to assess the community’s interest in the heritage of the district and secondly, to ascertain if the residents could indicate any places they considered important to the local heritage. Furthermore, a nomination sheet was included with the survey such that details of any items or places or areas could be provided and thus, made known to the heritage committee who oversaw the heritage study (Appendix A).

Uralla Shire, on the other hand, made an inventory form available to interested community members to complete. This was akin to the second questionnaire from Liverpool Plains but also requested data of any known research which had taken place about the heritage nomination. Moreover, Uralla utilised this form to garner interest in the nominator having a more formal role in the heritage study, by being involved in the research component (Appendix B).

A questionnaire with a specific heritage site was conducted by McKercher to ascertain the community interest in a replica paddle steamer used as a tourist
attraction in Albury, New South Wales, as the boat was not an economically viable project and operated by the local council. The survey used a ‘systematic random sampling of residents,’ whose names were taken from the telephone directory, resulting in 2% of households being surveyed. The questionnaire encompassed areas such as the awareness of the *PS Cumbernaun*, its use and opinions of the residents about it (McKercher 2001: 35-36).

Leichhardt Council conducted a community survey in 2008 in which 400 of its residents were interviewed by telephone. This survey, however, was not specific to heritage management; rather its purpose was to identify attitudes to a park development. Only one question regarding heritage was included, querying the concern of residents at the possible loss of heritage features if the development proceeded (Piazza Consulting 2008: 7).

From an Australia-wide aspect, Australia ICOMOS conducted a survey in 2007 with a specific agenda, in that it was interested in research being undertaken about cultural heritage and climate change following a symposium and public forum on the topic (AIMCOMOS 2007). This questionnaire, while limited to researchers, did have its origins in public concerns and attitudes about heritage (Appendix C).

The Productivity Commission, in 2005, surveyed local government bodies to determine the part played by the latter in the recognition and conservation of historical places in Australia (Appendix D). This survey took the form of a questionnaire with a mix of open and closed formats in which ‘skip patterns’ were
included, thus allowing questions to be ignored if not relevant to a certain situation (Thomas 2004: 79).

The Wellington Park Management Trust in Tasmania, though not a local government body, conducted a survey in 2010 to measure the public interest in the park and its importance to visitors. It is not specified if the questionnaire was conducted when people visited the park or if they were directed to the Trust’s website, with it being available online. A more detailed questionnaire could also be completed but had to be forwarded by email or post (Appendix E).

From an international perspective, a number of organisations have undertaken surveys or questionnaires. UNESCO has conducted numerous surveys among member nations to raise awareness of intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO 2009). Two examples consulted were completed by the National Heritage Research Section of the Seychelles Government and the Madhukali, an organisation developed to promote Indian classical music and intangible cultural heritage (Madhukali.org 2009). These were open formats requiring the respondent to compose a personal answer rather than alternative selections being provided in a closed format questionnaire (De Vaus 2002: 99). However, being that the responses were from mainly government viewpoints and organisations, and about awareness at national and international levels, there is no indication that the community was consulted.

At the 14th Pacific Rim Conference in Kuala Lumpur in 2008, a paper was presented about a questionnaire conducted in Georgetown, Malaysia. The impetus for this survey was an application by the State Government of Penang to list Georgetown on
the UNESCO World Heritage City list in 2005. Until August 2007, the decision had been deferred, with a third evaluation pending. The government decided to obtain the opinion of residents as to the importance of their heritage compared with the money spent on the preservation and conservation of the city (Lim et al 2008:1). The questions encompassed subjects such as awareness of heritage conservation that had been embarked upon within the city. A random sample of 400 residents was surveyed with a selection from each of three districts such that the various areas for proposed conservation were represented (Lim et al 2008:3).

Winnipeg City Council in Canada is a progressive local government body, having instigated a heritage corporation to promote research, protection and establishment of heritage areas within the City of Winnipeg. In 2010, a questionnaire was distributed among prospective councillors about local heritage with the emphasis on built heritage (Appendix F). So, while not a broad-based community survey, it did ascertain information from people who live in the community and with an interest in publicly serving the local district.

County Galway in Ireland is very active in discerning the community’s interest in local heritage. It has recently produced a questionnaire about developing a community heritage website, and while not asking questions about heritage per se, is attempting to determine the best means by which people can access information from a dedicated heritage website (Appendix G). This initiative was inspired by a presentation about Placebook, a Scottish website which enabled Scottish nationals to enter the thoughts, memories and knowledge of Scotland onto a database, no matter where they resided. This domain, however, is now unavailable so the configuration
and format by which information was obtained could not be investigated. Furthermore, an extensive oral history project for the Gaelic Athletic Association has been distributed countrywide to obtain information about its ‘place in Irish life’ (Appendix J), and has been supported by the Galway City Council with a guide to recording oral histories produced by the project (GCC 2006).

Ireland’s County Wicklow has also undertaken significant numbers of initiatives to ascertain the interest and knowledge of the local community in heritage, with this being one of the objectives of its heritage plan of 2004-2008 (Dagg 2008:1). The questionnaire consisted of three sections encompassing general awareness of heritage, personal experiences with heritage and attitudes towards it, each section containing a number of subjects covered in detail. Some opportunities for personal answers were available particularly when opinions were sought (Appendix H). A small number of participants were also interviewed. These people volunteered for this part of the project, but being primarily an academic study funds were not available to enable it to be large scale and representative (Dagg 2008: 52).

Two archaeologists in Vancouver, Canada were interested in gaining an understanding of the community’s knowledge of archaeological heritage in the district. They utilised a questionnaire delivered randomly to 2000 houses spread over five postal districts, with explanations given to the chosen recipients. The survey was in a closed format (Pokotylo and Guppy 1999: 401).
Constructing Questionnaires

The questionnaire's primary role is to gather facts and/or discover beliefs and perspectives on a topic (Thomas 2004:1), with it being a convenient means of collecting data. However, adequate staffing and resources are necessary for the project to be completed, and with a design that can utilise the results (Thomas 2004:2).

Constructing a questionnaire is a complex task in which numerous elements must be taken into consideration. Most importantly, the decision on what information is required is crucial as obtaining further data, or clarification to an answer, at a later date is likely to be difficult. The way data is to be evaluated affects the information that is requested while the mechanism used to conduct the questionnaire dictates the style of questions that can be asked (De Vaus 2002: 94). For example, a survey received by post needs questions to be unambiguous compared to one that is conducted by an interviewer in which the respondent can ask for question clarification.

Question Content

Five types of questions need to be considered when planning a questionnaire. Firstly, ascertaining the role of people in everyday life, such as being a retiree or part of the work force, indicates how they participate in society while acquiring data about the individual, such as age, education or ethnicity develops a different database. Belief indicates the respondent's understanding of situations rather than the facts and knowledge determines the precision of those answers. Finally, the types of questions to determine attitudes give respondents' points of view. (De Vaus 2002: 95). A
combination of these could be utilised in a questionnaire to gather information about heritage.

Wording of Questions

The wording of questions must be precise as interpretation can be varied if words have numerous meanings, and among a culturally diverse community such as the Marion district, the questions could be misinterpreted through misunderstanding of the language. Words referring to frequency such as ‘often’ or ‘rarely’ are such examples (Foddy 1993: 43). Keeping questions brief and in simple language, including not using specialised terms, allow for better understanding of the information wanted from a respondent. Questions must be presented with unbiased phrasing such that the answer is not influenced by the form of the question (De Vaus 2002: 97-98). Glen Eira City Council in NSW distributed a questionnaire to its residents for input into future development of a rotunda. The preamble to the questions displayed a bias to the removal of the rotunda by denouncing its heritage value because it was ‘only twenty years old’ and not fitting the ‘updated streetscape’ (Appendix I). The tone of the information definitely implies that the council wish to redevelop and are downgrading the importance of the rotunda before the community has offered an opinion. Many respondents are unlikely to support the structure as the council decision appears to have been made.

Type of Question

The most common formats for questionnaires are either open or closed. The former allows for individual answers while the second provides alternatives from which the respondent chooses. A closed format must provide sufficient options to enable most
opinions to be incorporated, but explanations of answers cannot be included. However, speed upon which answers can be decided is an advantage, while persons who struggle in expressing themselves would find such a style more acceptable (De Vaus 2002:99-100).

The two local shire surveys, previously discussed, in New South Wales both used questionnaires with open formats. Liverpool Plains included questions about identifying heritage and issues about the subject considered to be significant by the residents (Appendix A), while the Uralla Shire requested information about specific places as well as wanting to gather names of those interested in being involved in the heritage study (Appendix B).

The national examples varied in the style in which the questionnaires were presented. Australia ICOMOS used a closed format with skip patterns in some questions but did, however, allow for listings of published works by the respondents (Appendix C). Opinion pieces were not required to be included in this survey. Wellington Park specifically requested an ‘answer in your own words’ but gave suggestions of values which could assist responses (Appendix E).

The UNESCO awareness surveys required descriptions or comment on the questions posed (UNESCO 2009). The documents were distributed to member nations, and as no submission date was noted, time for deliberation and thoughtful, detailed answers could be taken. The example from Winnipeg also required personal answers but allowed only one or two lines for each, implying simple responses were all that was required.
Some questionnaires use a combination of both open and closed formats, allowing participants to provide more detailed answers if it was considered necessary. The Leichhardt Council survey utilised this method in its telephone survey in 2008 (Piazza Consulting 2008: 4). The Productivity Commission used such a combination of questions, but with factual information requested rather than opinions of awareness by the councils that lay within their geographical boundaries (Appendix D). County Galway also used a combination but with a filtered system format. The qualifying answers required statements rather than opinions similar to the Productivity Commission but shorter in length. The County Wicklow example contained mostly closed questions in a Likert-style grid format, where degrees of attitude are measured (De Vaus 2002: 102), but some opportunity to provide personal opinions or information were included (Appendix H).

Pilot Testing
To ensure a questionnaire can acquire the data needed for a successful outcome it is important to test the document prior to distributing it to the target audience. De Vaus suggests some items need to checked, those being that the flow of the questions follow a logical progression, the skip patterns function as intended, and that the length of the survey keeps the respondent’s interest (DeVaus 2002: 116) while Thomas includes meaning and possible misunderstanding of questions as important that such issues are allayed(Thomas 2004: 109).

Ideally, a group representative of the target audience should be involved in the pilot testing as well as a specialist in devising such surveys (Thomas 2004: 109-111).
devised questions must be unambiguous and readily understood especially if a paper based questionnaire is to be undertaken as no clarification by the participant can occur. By using a pilot study, any problems such as wording and technical errors in design would be determined before distribution.

There was no indication of pilot testing by many of the questionnaires researched for this report, including the Shire Councils in New South Wales, before the questionnaires were distributed.

However, the Productivity Commission did trial its survey of local governments twice before its Australia-wide distribution. The first draft was tested by State government heritage agencies and the local government associations in two states. The Australian Bureau of Statistics acted as the specialist by providing ideas to create a document more straightforward in its presentation. Following comment by the nine councils involved in the second testing, the revised survey was then delivered to all councils in the country (Productivity Commission 2006: 323).

The State Government of Penang in 2005 conducted a pilot test for its survey by using ten homes from the areas chosen as the target participants. The primary interest in doing so was to alleviate fears that the intended respondents would be unable to understand the questions (Lim 2008: 3).

The survey undertaken by Dagg for County Wicklow conducted an extensive pilot test prior to obtaining volunteers to complete the survey.
Target Audience

Conducting a questionnaire in an area the size of the City of Marion needs careful consideration as to who will be involved. The district contains residents originating from 81 countries with an age range from babies to elderly citizens over 85 years old. The largest group lies in the 25 to 49 age bracket but those up to 24 years old constitute about one quarter of the residents as do the over fifty year olds (Profile id 2011).

The socio-economic structure of the city is varied with new arrivals from overseas, often unemployed for some time, tending to reside in the north eastern quadrant of the district. Many younger families live in the outer southern suburbs of Hallett Cove and Sheidow and Trott Parks while Warradale, Marion and Oaklands Park being longer established and house a larger proportion of the older residents. (Profile id 2011).

Ideally, all residents should have the opportunity to participate in a questionnaire regarding the heritage of the district but cost to Council could be a prohibitive factor. Thus, as was the case in Georgetown, Penang a representation of ages, cultural groups and social situation could be the most practical and economically viable way to conduct the questionnaire.

The means of conducting the survey, such that any interested person could have access to it, must also be considered. The most common forms of questionnaire are via post, the internet and telephone, the last of which along with personal interviews,
would be very time consuming while trained interviewers would need to be employed such that the questionnaire produced usable data.

A web-based questionnaire would incur the least cost especially if the organisation had a website, such as the City of Marion, with the main outlay being the development of the survey and its loading onto the site (Thomas 2004: 17). The access to results can be rapid with the data transferred directly to a database (Thomas 2004: 16). However, not all residents may have access to or experience with the internet so would be unlikely to participate.

A postal questionnaire, while more expensive to conduct can be distributed to all households, thus involving many more residents. Data collection would be time consuming with manual entering onto a database being necessary (Thomas 2004: 14) while response rates may only be about 50 percent (Thomas 2004:124). A survey was conducted by Charles Sturt University for the Culcairn Shire, in which two questionnaires were distributed to the 1600 households of the district, to firstly ‘assess community perception of heritage’ and secondly the community’s willingness to fund site identification. These returned only 18% responses to the first and 24% to the second, even though both were anonymous (Spennemann and Harris 1996: 2). Such low rates of response cannot give a true indication of community opinion.

Telephone questionnaires have specific problems associated with collecting data. It is necessary to have short and precise questions as the participants may not retain all the information relayed to them by an interviewer while response options should
also be fewer (De Vaus 2002: 113). Receiving an unexpected telephone call may result in insufficient information being imparted due to the lack of time to consider answers. Leichhardt Council utilised a telephone format in 2008 using options and open ended questions to expansion of answers if respondents felt it necessary. A computer-assisted system with trained personnel was used (Piazza Consulting 2008: 4) which would have made the cost of conducting the survey substantial.

Once a target audience has been established, in an attempt to combat a lack of responses, a cover letter should be included with a postal questionnaire, or an invitation on a web page for a web-based survey. This allows the proposed participants to gain an understanding of the purpose of the questionnaire and why they have been chosen (Thomas 2004: 96-97), while a return date for responses would be included in the postal format (Thomas 2004: 132). With a telephone interview format, the letter should be sent prior to the resident receiving a call, thus enabling the interviewee a chance to consider the situation and prepare with forethought about the topic. Of examples discussed in this report, the questionnaire distributed to the residents of County Wicklow, Ireland by Dagg was the only one stating the utilisation of this strategy (Dagg 2008: 45).

**Analysis of Results**

The style of questionnaire is primarily dictated by the type of information required by the organisation conducting the same. The advantage of utilising closed format questionnaires is the ease with which results can be entered onto a database, followed by statistical analysis. Two methods of entry are commonly used, with spreadsheets being the most accessible. Statistical specific software is available but
cost could be prohibitive. The responses are reduced to a number by coding which results in totals for each answer (Thomas 2004: 132). Open response questionnaires, conversely, are time intensive to analyse. Responses must be categorised into themes which in itself can be subjective if two answers are judged to mean the same thing but expressed differently. This method of enquiry does, however, allow for a greater range of information to be gathered and in the respondents’ own words with no predetermined classifications to influence answers (Thomas 2004: 46-50). The questionnaire distributed by Dagg in County Wicklow was the only example with the method of analysis defined. A software package known as Statistical Package for Social Science was utilised to perform the statistical analysis. For ease of data entry and analysis, the questionnaire was designed to suit this programme, which allows the establishment of trends from the information input. As suggested by Thomas, the open questions were analysed manually, by reading and determining recurring themes (Dagg 2008: 51).

**Themes and Issues**

A number of common themes is evident in the examples researched for this project, though results were not available for some of the questionnaires. The general consensus, whether questionnaire respondents were from local communities in Australia or the other side of the globe, both rural and urban, was that heritage is a resource that could benefit the community. The respondents from the County Wicklow survey considered heritage enhanced their quality of life (Dagg 2008: 80) with the survey of local governments by the Productivity Commission reinforcing the importance of heritage with responses indicating the bodies' increasing involvement and management of heritage over time (Sullivan 2006:2).
Being aware of local heritage is seen to be important to local peoples through the responses received in the various questionnaires. The Seychelles’ Heritage Section suggested its people were made aware of the intangible cultural heritage through promotions by the government, allowing development through education and activities held in the community, while also encouraging the use of the traditional language (Seychelles 2009: 1-2). Dagg found the awareness of heritage among the residents of Wicklow to encompass the wish for stories, folklore and cultural activities to be recorded, as well as the preservation of language and music, while built heritage such as traditional shops and markets, were important to be preserved (Dagg 2008: 62). Furthermore, a popular response was the awareness resulted in the notion that everyone is responsible for protecting heritage (Dagg 2008: 80). This last comment further stresses the idea of maintaining identity as discussed in the protection of heritage.

In all questionnaire responses, protection of heritage was a high priority. In Georgetown, while many of those surveyed preferred to live in modern accommodation, over 70% favoured protection of the city’s heritage buildings (Lim 2008: 5-6). Dagg’s analysis of the Wicklow results determined the local community’s ‘protecting our identity’ and ‘roots’ as high priorities in protecting their heritage for the future (Dagg 2008: 65). The Leichhardt Council redevelopment survey, while only having one question with regard to heritage, received an overwhelming number of people wanting heritage to be seriously considered in the plans (Piazza Consulting 2008: 7) with preservation paramount (Piazza Consulting 2008: 12).
As a way of protecting heritage, education of the community and general public was a theme throughout the results of the questionnaires. Spennemann and Harris found it important to the rural community of Culcairn Shire to utilise the local heritage as a resource in educating people about the area’s history (Spennemann and Harris 1996: 5) and thus necessitating protection. The National Heritage Research Section of the Seychelles response to the UNESCO questionnaire indicated education of the community would raise awareness. The younger members of the population were more likely to access knowledge from formal schooling while the general populus would benefit from practical instruction in areas such as music being made available. The low volume of resources and thus funding needed for the latter tasks would enable a successful programme to be developed (Seychelles 2009: 3). County Wicklow’s residents took the view, like the Culcairn Shire in New South Wales, that education through heritage was a way of understanding the past and thus augmenting the ownership of their heritage (Dagg 2008: 65).

With the education of the community by, and through, heritage the economies of the local districts can further benefit. As suggested by the Seychelles’ Heritage Department, the staging of festivals, which champion the local culture, allows a wider audience to be aware of, and appreciate, heritage while funds generated by the events allow resources to be produced to further propagate the education and preservation of the culture (Seychelles 2009: 4-5). The County Wicklow questionnaire results support the theme of economic stimulus to a community with an increased awareness of heritage. It was found that many respondents considered heritage preservation was stimulated by the benefits that tourism may bring (Dagg
2008: 83), while the responses of the Culcairn Shire strengthens the argument that the residents regard economic growth possible with the use of heritage resources, particularly via tourism (Spennemann and Harris 1996: 5). The Liverpool Plains study recognised the importance of heritage in a rural community to prompt economic development (Liverpool Plains Shire 2005: 4), with the Productivity Commission survey suggesting ‘threatened rural communities’ would benefit economically from conserved heritage peculiar to their region (Sullivan 2006: 2).

Similarly, the questionnaires also had common issues related to them. The most prevalent of these was the lack of response by the communities. The survey in Georgetown, Penang obtained the best result with two-thirds of recipients responding (Lim 2008: 3). The Culcairn Shire had the poorest response with only 18% for the first questionnaire relating to the ‘community perception of heritage’ (Spennemann and Harris 1996: 2) while Dagg had a similar outcome with the survey conducted in County Wicklow, with only 14% of the postal surveys returned. To allow for a representative sample to be achieved, further face to face interviews were undertaken thus attaining the desired minimum of 25% (Dagg 2008: 54). The survey by Pokotylo and Guppy encountered some opposition with just under half of the original 2000 randomly chosen participants returning the questionnaires (Pokotylo and Guppy 1999: 401). The Productivity Commission had the greatest return rate of 73% (Sullivan 2006: 2) but the lack of anonymity of the respondents could have influenced this result. Telephone surveys appear to have a vastly higher participation rate with no record of refusal noted in the Leichhardt Council survey nor in McKercher’s questionnaire of the people of Albury, New South Wales. The number of responses can be further complicated by the bias with
which postal returns could be inflicted. Those returning surveys could be people who normally respond to matters of community interest, so a general consensus of the population may not be received (Brannick and Roche 1997 cited by Dagg 2008: 53). An emotional involvement with a heritage item can further bias results. As seen by the results in Albury, the representation of heritage depicted in the replica boat gave the community an association it did not want to lose (McKercher 2001: 40).
However, the loss of tourism if it no longer existed and the subsequent loss of income could have been an influencing factor as well.

Age ranges of respondents were a common thread among results, with residents over 40 years old being the most common to return questionnaires. In Penang, about 28% fell within this range with the decades encompassing ages 21 to 60 years old providing about 20% of responses in each (Lim 2008: 4). Dagg’s results showed the over fifty age group provided the greatest number of responses with 38% (Dagg 2008: 57). No age ranges were specified in the other community surveys.

Education levels were also indicative of the responses received. Lim’s results indicated the vast majority, just over 50%, who were aware of local heritage, had at least a secondary education while respondents to Pokotylo and Guppy indicated levels of post graduate education to be in the majority with many being of Anglo/Franco Canadian or European background, and few Indigenous (Pokotylo and Guppy 1999: 402).
Discussion

It is apparent from the literature that community consultation is the favoured method by which professionals can gauge the awareness and interest in heritage of the public, whether it be cultural or archaeological, and through museum exhibits or tourism. It has been shown that a divide exists between professionals and the public as to the values assigned to heritage, and by consulting communities this variance can be addressed. However, as discovered by McKercher, an emotive response to heritage importance must be considered when decisions about conservation and use of heritage are planned.

The mechanism of consultation should be utilised in more communities as the results clearly indicate that communities are generally interested in their heritage. The ‘sense of identity’ was common in many responses from all types of communities while the positive attitude expressed toward heritage was dominant. The sense of worth and improving one’s community, be it through cooperation or financial gain, was indicated by many.

The major problem, however, appears to be the low response rates of questionnaires which may cloud the true feelings in a community as the outcomes may not be representative of the people as a whole. As a number of styles of questionnaire were conducted this format is probably not a factor in the low returns, though telephone formats did not indicate a lack of responses. To include as many residents as possible, it may be opportune to offer a questionnaire in a number of options, such as by post and we-based. While the telephone format seems successful, it would be costly and time consuming to conduct, with a restriction on numbers being practical.
for these reasons. The lack of a wide scope of ages and education levels creates another factor of imbalance in responses.

**Conclusion**

It is imperative that the City of Marion must assess the type of information that is wanted from a community questionnaire as this will define the type of questionnaire it presents to its residents. The decision of who will be involved is another quandary for the organisation, as the district is represented by so many cultures, ages and types of family structure. Enabling the widest variety of residents to participate will give the best representation of the community’s knowledge and interest of cultural heritage in the council area; however, the means by which they are able to participate needs to be addressed with access to the internet not readily available to all while expressing thoughts may be a challenge to those whose first language is not English. Thus, offering a questionnaire in at least two formats such as web-based and postal would allow a large number of residents to be involved. The option of assistance through Council libraries could enable still more to participate as assistance would be available if interpretive services could be accessible. With strategic planning, a successful outcome could be produced with residents of Marion becoming part of the ever-growing communities who are consulted about that which gives a ‘sense of identity’.
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