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Abstract

This research project aims to explore the factors constituting ‘sense of place’ for individuals in the North Pennines who are engaging with their heritage through volunteer, leisure or other ‘safeguarding’ activities. The PhD draws on an analysis of in-depth interview data collected in 2008 amongst people engaging with their heritage in the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The research explores and analyses the bond between people and place. A review of the literature from environmental psychology finds sense of place explored through notions of ‘place identity’, ‘place attachment’ and ‘place dependency’ and in Chapter Four data is discussed in relation to these ideas. Drawing on an identity process model introduced in Chapter Four, the relationship between people, place and time that represents the contribution of heritage to sense of place, is the focus of discussion in Chapter Five. Chapter Six concentrates on the involvement of local people in heritage activity. Evidence is presented in support of the view that human, social and identity forms of capital can be developed through engagement with heritage. Chapter Seven introduces supporting data to explore the potential presented by the ecomuseum paradigm. The chapter proposes that there are solutions within ecomuseology to some of the issues raised by the previous chapters. These are issues of the plurality of heritage values, the three-dimensionality of sense of place and the urgent need for an alternative heritage paradigm that has capacity for a more democratic involvement of local people as ‘agents’ of sense of place. Synergies are found between the objectives within the AONB Management Plan and the principles of ecomuseology.

The dissertation concludes by noting the limitations of the existing heritage discourse to recognise the ways in which local people find expression for their heritage values and argues for an ‘alternative heritage discourse.’ This discourse accepts the experience of heritage as a cultural process such as the social interaction of festivals and exhibitions and the reminiscence woven through everyday chatter during such engagement. Protection of heritage that democratically involves ordinary people and acknowledges their many ways of ascribing meaning is therefore demanded.
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1. Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Sense of Place in the North Pennines

This thesis examines sense of place in an upland area of North England. Its central research questions are: How does heritage contribute to sense of place in the North Pennines and can the principles of ecomuseology offer solutions for the sustainability of efforts to safeguard sense of place there?

In the rural northern uplands of England, some residents are exploring ‘sense of place’ through engagement with their heritage. This research project has set out to explore the contribution of heritage to this ‘sense of place’ and what the principles of ecomuseology have to offer in this context. Community sustainability and sense of place are threatened in the North Pennines region by changing social and economic circumstances (Soane and Nicholson, 2005:3) and this perhaps galvanises those with an interest in heritage to act upon it. Community sustainability is affected for instance, by limited opportunities for local employment (AONB, 2009b), which have led to the out-migration of younger people. Simultaneously however, the region’s wilderness charm and its designation by the government in 1988 as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), appeals to those with sufficient wealth to establish residence in the area. These ‘in-migrants’ either commute to urban centres for work, or are seeking to enjoy the countryside in their retirement years, a trend contributing to an ageing of the population (Ward, 2006: 129).

The North Pennines region is therefore experiencing a period of social transition through which residents are navigating their identity. The ecomuseum is a heritage management model commonly established in places that demand a coherent approach to place identity and its principles, particularly the emphasis on the participation of local people, lend themselves to the circumstances described above. This research project set out to investigate the salience of these principles in the development of a sustainable approach to safeguarding sense of place in the North Pennines.
1.1.1 Research question aims and objectives

In addressing the ‘gap’ presented in Chapter Two section 2.4.1, the central research questions for this thesis are detailed in the section above. This research questions can be split into two elements, the first being: How does heritage contribute to sense of place in the North Pennines?

The following aims and objectives have guided the specific work needed to address this question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Define sense of place</td>
<td>1.1.1 Critically review literature to define the specific requirements of the concept of ‘sense of place’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Critically review literature to define the contribution of heritage to the concept of ‘sense of place’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Critically review literature to examine approaches used in the empirical investigation of ‘sense of place’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Scope elements of cultural heritage that provide a sense of place in the North Pennines</td>
<td>1.2.1 Characterise the cultural heritage of the region as presented in literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Construct a methodology informed by critical analysis of the literature (objectives 1.1.1 and 1.1.3) that is achievable within practical parameters. Recognise and anticipate these practical parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.3 Implement data collection techniques according to methodology constructed in relation to literature (1.2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.4 Prepare a data analysis strategy an apply to a critical examination of the data collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.5 Critically discuss sense of place illustrating with examples of data and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Investigate the ways in which people explore and safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines</td>
<td>1.3.1 Construct a critical illustration of the discourse of community engagement with heritage using analysis of literature and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 Deduce a methodology that will allow for this investigation within practical parameters. Appraise these practical parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.3 Implement defined data collection techniques (1.3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Critically</td>
<td>1.4.1 Use critical review of academic literature (objectives 1.1.1 and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflect on the elements of cultural heritage that provide reference points for sense of place in the North Pennines

1.4.2 Construct a theoretical model that accounts for the way in which heritage contributes to sense of place in the North Pennines

1.4.3 Advance existing theory in relation to the benefits of engagement with heritage, particularly in terms of forms of capital

1.5 Critically reflect on the ways in which people explore and safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines

1.5.1 Apply critical reading of the literature to analysis of the data

1.5.2 Construct theory to account for the motivation of individuals participating in engagement with their heritage

1.5.3 Advance existing theory in relation to the benefits of engagement with heritage, particularly in terms of forms of capital

The second element of the central research question is: Can the principles of ecomuseology offer solutions for the sustainability of efforts to safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines?

Again, the following aims and objectives have guided the specific work needed to address this question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Define ecomuseum</td>
<td>2.1.1 Critically examine literature to trace the development of the ecomuseum ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Critically examine literature to interpret the contemporary requirements of the ecomuseum paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Appraise the benefits of ecomuseology for the sustainability of heritage and communities</td>
<td>2.2.1 Critically examine literature to investigate how ecomuseum philosophy can be successfully used to sustain heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Critically examine literature to investigate how ecomuseum philosophy can be successfully used to sustain communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Examine the applicability of</td>
<td>2.3.1 Apply results of aim 1.3, to identify synergies between principles of ecomuseology identified in aim 2.1 (objective 2.1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.2 Organisation of the thesis

Chapter Three discusses and presents the methodological approach to addressing the above aims and objectives. In the penning of tight introductory chapters the intention has been economy to allow for the production of generous data discussion chapters. As a result, the four chapters that form the trunk of this thesis will be noticeably robust in comparison to the three that came before. The body of the thesis examines the data in four ways. Chapter Four draws on literature from environmental psychology (indicated in Chapter Two, 2.3.4) in more detail to explore sense of place. Chapter Five looks at the contribution of heritage to sense of place and references literature from gerontology and sociology alongside that of human geography and environmental psychology. Chapter Six discusses the benefits of community engagement with heritage, whilst Chapter Seven brings discussion back to new museology (2.1.1) to examine the potential found within the principles of ecomuseology to support the safeguarding of sense of place by local people in the North Pennines. The conclusions drawn in Chapter Eight include reflections on the methodology, outcomes of the research and possible implementation.

The research uses qualitative methodologies and the approach is set out in Chapter Three. The two introductory chapters which are to follow summarise the context of the research. Chapter Two reviews theoretical contexts in terms of engagement with heritage and sense of place, before providing the rationale for the project, introducing the research aims and objectives and organisation of the thesis in its final section (2.4). This first chapter describes the context in which the project was conceived, the nature of the collaborative PhD studentship and issues of action research before outlining the
North Pennines as a region in terms of history, heritage and its contemporary issues. In the next section, a summary of the key findings of this research is presented.

1.1.3 Summary of findings

This thesis explores what constitutes sense of place in the North Pennines and Chapter Seven suggests an alternative heritage paradigm that offers solutions to supporting and safeguarding it. Concepts are derived inductively from data which are collected using qualitative methodologies described in Chapter Three. Findings will be presented that demonstrate that the heritage contributing to sense of place in the North Pennines takes many forms. Sense of place takes as its reference point not just tangible heritage - sense of place is related to nature and the landscape - but the people interviewed drew on heritage in their experience of sense of place in much less tangible forms. Respondents often described sense of place in terms of intangible heritage, from a particular community ‘disposition’ derived from shared experience, lifestyle and environment, to the ‘everyday chatter’ that placed themselves and others in a history of durable interpersonal relationships (Chapters Four and Five). Indeed the contribution of heritage to sense of place will be demonstrated as the inalienable relationship between the people-place experience and the awareness of time and history that contributes to it (Chapter Five).

In particular this thesis focuses upon community-driven engagement with heritage, exploring the motivations and rewards experienced by those actively involved with heritage in the region (Chapter Six). Respondents described gains as a result of their participation in heritage projects that related to theories of social, human and identity capital. Such forms of capital strengthen communities leading to social sustainability. Some respondents appeared compelled to engage with their heritage by a visceral awareness of the social change taking place around them. Newer residents perceived their participation in heritage projects as an effective way to develop their sense of belonging to the place and better integrate into the community.
Chapter Seven argues for the applicability of alternative heritage management approaches, particularly in circumstances of socioeconomic change when the community is engaged with its heritage. The Chapter specifically refers to the approach lauded by the ecomuseum movement. Ecomuseology has salience in the North Pennines through its principles of democracy that allow for shifting notions of heritage value. The holistic approach of the ecomuseum paradigm integrates heritage with wider notions of sense of place. Moreover through emphasis upon volunteer action, joint ownership and management, multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches and research at a number of levels, ecomuseology has the potential to more effectively recognise the values of ‘insiders’ allowing them to find their ‘voice’. The ecomuseum ideal is also found to have potential in guiding the AONB Partnership’s five-yearly Management Plan, and there is a synergy of approach with emphasis upon a fragmented site with conservation of heritage in situ, and a coordinated and sustainable approach to tourism. Key findings are discussed in more detail in Chapter Eight, whilst the aims and objectives of this research project and the structure of the thesis are presented in the final section of the following chapter (2.4).

The next section begins by summarising an earlier research project from which this thesis was born, before describing the collaborative nature of the PhD project (1.2). A background to the North Pennines region is briefly given in the third section of this chapter and the final section indicates its heritage and contemporary issues. Chapter Two then contextualises the study in terms of existing theory before providing a rationale for the study, introducing the research question, aims and objectives and concluding with an overview of the thesis structure.

1.1.4 Sense of place project

In 2006 research was conducted that aimed to identify if, and how, elements in the cultural landscape of upland Northern England might contribute to community
sustainability (Convery and Dutson, 2006a: 213). The research was commissioned by the International Centre for the Uplands (ICU-C) as part of a wider ‘sense of place’ project. This section gives a brief introduction to the ICU-C and this year-long project.

The International Centre for the Uplands (initially referred to in short as the ‘Uplands Centre’ but later with the relocation of the Centre to the University of Cumbria, more commonly abbreviated to ICU-C) was set up in 2004, in response to the devastation caused by 2001’s Foot and Mouth Disease outbreak and the work of the Hills Task Force in 2000 (Soane and Shaw, 2006: 117). The ICU-C was funded by the North West Development Agency via Cumbria Vision (a subregional economic development organisation) and Cumbria County Council and was managed within Lancaster University for its first three years, before moving to the University of Cumbria. With a remit broadly to support upland communities as they are compelled toward change, the ICU-C set out to implement applied research, challenge thinking, celebrate the landscapes and communities of the uplands and look, “broadly at the national and international experiences in order to help develop a sustainable future for these precious landscapes” (Shaw, 2004).

The Sense of Place Project was delivered in 2006 as a year-long action research project and took the notion of the ecomuseum as its point of departure:

This ‘Sense of Place’ project has its origins in a visit by two members of the project team to the Ecomusée du Mont Lozère in the Cévennes National Park, France; their enthusiasm for the concept of the ecomuseum, supported by the International Centre for the Uplands, lead to discussions about whether this approach to development and sustainability might be applicable in the Leader+ areas of Northern England.

(Davis, 2006: 2)
The project had five main aims. It aimed to: identify if, and how, elements of the cultural landscape of upland Northern England might contribute to community sustainability and development; explore the meaning of terms such as ‘sense of place’ and ‘cultural identity’ to upland communities; identify community based activities and organisations which might provide the basis for future projects and actions; provide events, training and reciprocal visits for participating communities; and finally to test whether the concept of ‘sense of place’ could be used as a tool for development (Shaw, 2004). Alongside the ICU-C, the project was developed by a number of partners including Newcastle University, Leader + and Hidden Britain. Leader + is a grant programme funded by the European Union (EU) and the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), which supports sustainable economic and community development in rural areas. The project involved the three Leader+ groups of: Cumbria Fells and Dales Leader +, North Pennines Leader +, and North Northumberland Leader +. Hidden Britain is a charity-run initiative to encourage communities to achieve tourism in lesser known areas of the countryside by providing a more meaningful experience for the visitor and the Hidden Britain Centre’s Cumbria Project also contributed to the partnership.

The main outputs of the Sense of Place Project were: the commissioning of research into the experience of sense of place in the northern uplands presented in April 2006; a meeting held in June 2006 entitled, ‘Sustainable Uplands: Future Scenarios for People, Environment, and Landscape – a Future Vision Conference and Workshop for the Uplands’ (Soane and Shaw, 2006: 117); a conference taking place in December 2006 entitled ‘Sense of Place – Cultural Heritage and Identity’; and finally in the following summer 2007, reciprocal visits were organised whereby community members who were engaged in ‘sense of place’ activities (in practice, community-based heritage projects) in the three Leader+ areas could visit one another and share best practice. Guidelines for ‘sense of place’ activities were developed into a ‘Sense of Place Toolkit’ produced by independent consultancy Bowles Green Limited. This sixty six page document offers comprehensive ‘Guidance for Heritage-based Rural Regeneration Projects’ and suggests guidelines for managing projects, involving local people, interpreting heritage and evaluating (Bowles et al., 2008). In a personal communication, Steve Green of Bowles
Green Limited explained that it is unclear to what extent those embarking upon small scale heritage initiatives in the uplands are aware of the document’s existence, since its completion coincided with cessation of the ICU-C’s activity and it is possible that this limited the dissemination of the work (Green, 2010). Taken as a whole it is clear that the Sense of Place Project made specific reference to ecomuseology throughout; the Toolkit begins with an overview of ecomuseum principles and the Sense of Place Report set out to explore the potential of the paradigm in the uplands. It is the Sense of Place report which has most significance for the purposes of this research project.

The Sense of Place Report, commissioned by ICU-C was produced by researchers within the School of Natural Resources at the University of Central Lancashire. Its applied aims were to identify ways of providing assistance to community-based heritage projects. Its intention was to highlight issues relevant to community heritage projects, and underpin the setting of objectives in helping such projects. Such objectives it was felt, would be likely to increase social capital and assist community empowerment (Soane, 2006: 1). These objectives were actualised with 2007’s reciprocal visits programme. The research asked what people in upland communities who participated understood by some of the key terms of the project, what issues currently affected these communities and which issues participants felt were a priority (Davis, 2006: 2). Focus groups were held in the three Leader + areas (Convery and Dutson, 2006a: 213) and the report presented an analysis of in-depth conversations with these groups.

Key themes emerging from the research were ‘Production Systems,’ ‘Landscapes’ and ‘Community’. The theme ‘Production Systems’ included subcategories of employment, housing, young people’s needs, farm succession and a loss of traditional skills (Convery and Dutson, 2006a: 213 - 214). ‘Landscapes’ was a theme reflecting the focus group participants’ concerns about the changing nature of the landscape, the decline of industry, but also landscape’s importance as a palimpsest for history and identity (Convery and Dutson, 2006a: 215). Within the theme of ‘Community’ issues were raised
about time spent locally, family ties and social bonds. Amongst the four recommendations emerging from the project, was the need for further research in other Leader + areas to allow for triangulation of the findings (Convery and Dutson, 2006b: 28). The Report’s Executive Summary indicates scope for further research: “In research terms the concept of ‘sense of place’ is seen as a useful ‘hook’ for further work, perhaps with a detailed study of selected small communities…” (Davis, 2006: 3). It is from this recommendation that a PhD Studentship was conceived; a detailed study of communities engaging with heritage in the North Pennines, the findings of which are presented here. The next section describes briefly the nature of this Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Studentship, and also describes the collaborators, the researcher and the project’s situation within the field of action research.

1.2 Collaborative studentship
The discussion above has indicated the key findings of the research and the context within which this research project was conceived. Funding was secured for the project through the Arts and Humanities Research Council’s (AHRC) Collaborative Doctoral Award (CDA) Scheme. There were some initial negotiations since the project was intended as a collaboration between North Pennines Leader + and Newcastle University, but uncertainty surrounding the Leader + scheme’s future necessitated the identification of an alternative collaborating organisation. The North Pennines AONB Partnership agreed to become involved as an alternative collaborator. This Partnership is the body responsible for coordinating efforts to conserve and enhance the North Pennines. The AHRC’s CDA schemes are intended to encourage and develop collaboration and partnership between higher education institutions, and non-academic organisations and businesses (AHRC, 2010) and the next section describes CDAs in more detail.

1.2.1 AHRC collaborative studentships
Collaborative studentships have a distinct character in that they seek to develop what is a relatively long-term relationship between researcher, institution and non-academic collaborative organisation (Macmillan and Scott, 2003: 101). This section will describe in
general terms, the value of collaborative research, before indicating the issues and challenges of researching in this way. Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 will discuss more specifically the collaborating organisation, the researcher and applicability of notions of action research to this PhD project.

Collaborative research is valuable in a number of ways. More generally, there are social, cultural and economic benefits to wider society (AHRC, 2010) associated with collaborative research projects. The contribution of CDA schemes to the development of knowledge and skills in the cultural sector in the North East for example, has been recognised (Cross and Pickering, 2008: 132). The benefits for the higher education institution (HEI) and the non-academic collaborating organisation involved, lie in the transfer of knowledge and expertise between the sectors and also in the enhanced access to resources and materials that a collaborating organisation can provide (AHRC, 2010). CDA projects are planned to address issues that hold particular interest for both the collaborating organisation and the HEI. Such research projects can also help establish important relationships with key policy and practice audiences who, “are not without influence in their fields and localities” (Macmillan and Scott, 2003: 104) so that the opportunities for implementation are therefore increased. More immediately however, CDA schemes are seen to have value for the researcher, enhancing their employment skills through first hand experience of a non-academic environment. It is suggested that CDA holders develop an in-depth understanding of their collaborating non-academic organisation which can be advantageous in the post-PhD jobs market.

So whilst it is accepted that CDA schemes have value for researcher, HEI and collaborating organisation, they do present issues and challenges. In a reflection on the experience of collaborative doctoral research published in 2003, three key issues were identified and these were of ownership, access and confidentiality (Macmillan and Scott, 2003). The authors suggested that ownership within a CDA project is ambiguous and that whilst the researcher remains the lead stakeholder, others are involved in the research design, facilitation and examination of results which means that at different points in the
research, the level of ownership has to be negotiated (ibid: 202). One way in which the collaborative nature of this particular research project was successful, was the level of access to the research population that the collaborating organisation were able to provide. Access is the second issue of research collaboration discussed in the 2003 paper.

The non-academic collaborating organisation is able to act as ‘gatekeeper’ to the research population but this benefit must be balanced against the way in which it will also inevitably lead the research. Consequently there is an unavoidable bias in collaborative research which has often been channelled in a particular direction by the collaborating organisation. On the other hand however, the association of the researcher with both a non-academic organisation and a HEI can also be of benefit, in terms of what has been described as ‘transient positionality’ (Macmillan and Scott, 2003: 103). This means that in order to gain access to differing research participants, the researcher may choose to align themselves with more emphasis to the non-academic organisation in some circumstances, whereas in others, the dominant use of a university letterhead for example might encourage greater cooperation. Association with the AONB Partnership in this research project had its agency and challenges and these are discussed in Chapter Three’s examination of epistemological tensions in section 3.1.2.

The final issue in relation to collaborative research which ought to be discussed is that of confidentiality. The identity of research participants is usually disguised in the presentation of findings and this is effective when the findings are being discussed in the academic fora of journals and conferences. The issue with collaborative research however is the manner in which the research is conducted in a ‘small world’ (ibid: 104) where individual participants might well know, or know of, one another and where the collaborating organisation might well recognise respondents from the tone and content of the data. It has been suggested that this can mean that more is at stake for individuals choosing to participate in a setting where ‘local interests (in the research) are heightened’ (ibid).
It can be seen then that researching in collaboration presents issues and challenges and these are examined in more detail as part of the methodology discussion presented in Chapter Three. Collaborative research is often a complex ongoing discussion between researcher, HEI and non-academic collaborating organisation on the differing needs, understandings and expectations that surround the project. To this end, researching in collaboration demands compromise and in many cases can be a steep learning curve for all involved. In this particular CDA project however, the researcher could not have wished for a more interested and supportive collaborating organisation and it is to this organisation, the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership that discussion now turns.

1.2.2 North Pennines AONB

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are areas of landscape designated by the government for their outstanding natural features. The North Pennines (figure 1) is one of forty AONBs in England and Wales (Appendix One) and was designated in June 1988. When the future of a collaboration between Newcastle University and North Pennines Leader + became uncertain, then Assistant AONB Officer, Peter Samsom expressed interest. Since by ‘natural beauty’, the AONB designation is taken to, “mean much more than just the look of the landscape... natural beauty includes ... the rich history of human settlement over the centuries” (AONB, 2009a: 31), the CDA project finds harmony with the interests and concerns of the North Pennines AONB. Now Deputy Director of the North Pennines AONB Partnership, Peter Samsom has been an invaluable collaborator in the project. The following section describes the North Pennines AONB.
The counties of Northumberland, Durham and Cumbria meet within the designated AONB boundary in the North Pennines. AONBs are the product of the *Countryside Rights of Way Act* (2000) which in its earlier form as the *National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act* (1949) produced the National Park designation (AONB, 2009a: 31). AONBs sit within the International Union for the Conservation of Nature’s worldwide
category of ‘Protected Landscapes’ (ibid). There are thirty-six AONBs in England accounting for fifteen percent of the landscape (Appendix One).

The North Pennines AONB boundary spans from Allendale in the North to Derwentdale and Weardale in the East, Teesdale and Balderdale in the South and the Cumbrian Fells and South Tynedale in the West and encompasses several local administration authorities (figure 1). Counties and councils are united through the AONB Partnership whose mission is to conserve and enhance natural beauty. The Partnership, “brings together organisations and interest groups across the North Pennines to help protect (the) rich environmental heritage” (AONB, 2007) and acknowledges the needs of rural industries and the social and economic needs of communities (AONB, 2004: 4). The AONB Partnership’s Management Plan sets out a strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the North Pennines AONB. The 2004-2009 Plan recognised several pressures on the quality of the landscape including the threat of wind energy development, mobile phone communication masts, changes in agriculture, new housing development, increased traffic, mineral developments, the military use of the area, unsympathetic management of roads, out of keeping conversion of traditional buildings and the gradual loss of historic features (AONB, 2004: 18). The current plan for 2009-2014 recognises the above pressures, noting the danger of a ‘gradual erosion of rural character’ that can accompany development.

Moreover, communities are under pressure: from rising house prices pushed up by the desirability of rural homes for wealthy urbanites (BBC, 2008, AONB, 2004: 68); the resulting loss of key services; low wages; and employment opportunities limited by declining agricultural opportunities (AONB, 2009a: 5, AONB, 2004: 18). Economically, tourism is welcomed, but the AONB Partnership acknowledges that it needs to be managed carefully to ensure it does not detract from the special qualities of the area (ibid). Threats to what might be described as local distinctiveness or sense of place - the cultural landscape- include loss of traditional skills, unsympathetic conservation and restoration of buildings with an accompanying loss of traditional and historic features
and the diminishing heritage of traditional dry stone walls and hay meadows (AONB, 2004: 25). This research examines the concept of sense of place in the North Pennines AONB context of a rich cultural landscape experiencing the pressures of change. It is precisely this interest in the agency of heritage during socioeconomic change that brings the researcher to the project. The following section sets out the researcher’s interests and experience in more detail.

1.2.3 The researcher
Coming to the CDA project from a career in museums education and primary school teaching in a former coalfield region, the researcher had delivered a Coalfields Regeneration Trust funded outreach project in Yorkshire as an outreach worker for the National Coal Mining Museum for England. The project sought to reinforce sense of place, developing local pride through education, reminiscence and awareness of the experiences of communities in former coalfield settlements. Working with a costumed ‘living history’ interpreter to deliver outreach sessions that incorporated performance, object handling, discussion and music, it was possible to experience heritage as a process of reminiscence, tradition, education and interpretation with local people both young and old. The role with the National Coal Mining Museum also involved participating in a local heritage festival at Castleford, to which this dissertation later refers as an example of heritage working as a cultural process (Chapter Five, section 5.1 and Chapter Seven, section 7.2). Having completed a Masters Degree dissertation that focussed on interpretation at sites of industrial heritage opening as museums, these experiences combine to leave the researcher with an enduring interest in forms of popular, local heritage in contexts of socioeconomic change and the notions of memory and identity with which they are associated. It has been suggested that the role of heritage in identity processes, whilst often taken for granted, is rarely examined (Smith, 2006:48) and this collaborative studentship presented opportunities to explore these ideas. The nature of research as collaboration between researcher and organisation is examined in the following section’s discussion of ‘action research’.
1.2.4 Action research

Applied research with an emphasis on participation can be described as action research (Herr and Anderson, 2005: 2) so it seemed relevant when embarking upon a collaborative research project to explore whether it should be viewed as ‘action research’ and what the criteria of such research might be. In its early years, action researchers were academics who sought to involve their research participants more than was typical in conventional research (ibid). One of the founding fathers of action research for example, Kurt Lewin, who developed his ideas in the 1930s, was motivated by a desire to give workers a greater say in their work contexts (Whitehead and McNiff, 2006: 21). By the 1950s in the USA, action research was being used in the field of education research (ibid). But it wasn’t until the 1970s that action research achieved popularity in the UK. The early forms of action research in the UK were less true to some of Lewin’s more challenging ambitions in relation to the empowerment of research participants. For example, in the earlier work of John Elliot, who is well known internationally for his contribution to the development of the theory and practice of action research, Lewin’s goals were less well achieved. In Elliot’s early work power remained with an external researcher who looked into other people’s practices, interpreted the findings and assessed validity so that power, “never really devolved to the practitioners” (ibid). Perhaps the most important feature of action research is that it should shift power and control from the academic researcher to those who are usually described as the subjects of the research (Herr and Anderson, 2005: 2).

Denscombe gives a key feature of action research as its concern with participation (cited in Costello, 2003: 6). On examination of the development and guiding principles of action research, the only clear relationship between this CDA project and the action research approach is that that it is conducted as a collaboration. The word ‘action’ in the term ‘action research’, implies that action is taken by participants within the organisation or whatever community of practice is engaged in the research. The action is observed, reflected upon, exploratory changes are made as a result of this observation and new actions are taken. Action research is therefore practical and focussed on change. Lewin’s 1964 model suggested that action research should be a cycle of planning, acting,
observing, reflecting and re-planning (cited in ibid: 7) and above all, this process is conducted with participation. If the description above is accepted as an appropriate summary of the key features of action research, then this CDA project does not fit the model. But the CDA project’s similarities lie however, not just in the collaborative nature of its development.

This research project shares similarity of epistemology with action research and epistemology is explored further in Chapter Three. The guiding values of action research have been described as a commitment to truth, social justice, compassion and respect for pluralism; action researchers strive to accommodate multiple value perspectives (McNiff and Whitehead, 2002: 17). This research project agrees with the principles of action research in empowering people to make decisions and recognising their plural ways of valuing heritage. Like traditional research, traditional heritage management too can be accused of, “lifting decisions from the village square” and placing them with “experts or outside agencies” (Bryant 2001 cited in Todhunter, 2001). But this project did not involve the collaborative partner in a systematic examination of its actions and the subjects of the research were not primarily employees of the AONB Partnership. It is fair then, to conclude that this CDA project fits into the early stages of an action research cycle and whilst not a cyclical participative research project in itself, might be described as the ‘reconnaissance phase’ of action research (McNiff et al., 2003: 60) leaving scope for further research.

The project examines sense of place in the North Pennines and before the theory (Chapter Two), methodology (Chapter Three) and findings (Chapters Four to Eight) can be discussed, it is appropriate to pen for the reader, a portrait of the region. Respondents in the North Pennines referenced the legacy of its history alongside its natural features when describing their sense of place and present-day concerns. What follows is an overview of the North Pennines’ history, before the final section of the chapter discusses its heritage and contemporary issues, all of which are relevant to an understanding of the interviews later quoted.
1.3 A history of the North Pennines

Nature and culture combine in the North Pennines. Breathtaking vistas bear the rich patina of history, the ghostly beauty of which engages the senses and captures the imagination. The acclaimed twentieth century poet, W.H. Auden drew particular inspiration from his personal experience of the landscape:

I see the nature of my kind
As a locality I love,
Those limestone moors that stretch from Brough
To Hexham and the Roman Wall,
There is my symbol of us all.

Always my boy of wish returns
To those peat-stained deserted burns
That feed the Wear and Tyne and Tees,
And, turning states to strata, sees
How basalt long oppressed broke out
In wild revolt at Cauldron Snout,
And from the relics of old mines
Derives his algebraic signs.

The derelict lead-smelting mill
Flued to its chimney up the hill,
That smokes no answer any more
But points, a landmark on Bolt’s Law
The finger of all questions. There
In Rookhope I was first aware
Of Self and Not-Self, Death and Dread:

There I dropped pebbles, listened, heard
The reservoir of darkness stirred.

(Auden, 1940 'New Year Letter' cited in Myers, 2004)
The North Pennines experience is characterised by exhilarating expanses of landscape accented by the derelict ruins of a once flourishing lead mining industry. These spectral remains of an industriousness now consigned to history, are romanced by the likes of Auden (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 140), who in a moment of inspiration, at the ruins of a Rookhope smelting mill, chose for himself the poet’s life (Myers, 2004). He went on to pen verses that bore reference to the sense of place he experienced in the North Pennines. Poems such as ‘Alston Moor’ and ‘The Old Lead Mine’ (1924), ‘New Year Letter’ (1940) and ‘The Age of Anxiety’ (1947) (Mendelson, 1991) are evidence of the North Pennines’ distinctive and enduring appeal. What follows offers the reader some context to the field within which this research project was conducted and the experiences of cultural heritage upon which interview respondents drew. This section will introduce the North Pennines in terms of its history and the chapter concludes with a summary of its heritage and contemporary issues (1.4).

1.3.1 Social history

...fell scenery, miles of dry-stone walling, sturdy stone buildings, isolated buildings standing against the skyline, peaty water bubbling over the rocks of burn and beck, the remains of old lead and ironstone workings, humps and bumps on the ground hinting at the ancient past; these are all to be found in the dales.

(Crosby, 1993: 8)

The story of humankind’s inhabitation of the North Pennines begins 10,000 years ago (AONB, 2009a: 9) and human activity has profoundly influenced the landscape. In recent centuries the exploitation of the area’s rich mineral resources has determined the appearance of the North Pennines fells and dales. The affects of human activity manifest in the landscape in the legacy of industrial archaeology but also through the patchwork of associated settlement and agriculture (ibid). Settlement peaked in the North Pennines in the eighteenth century lead mining heyday, when employment in the lead and iron
industries and in quarrying attracted newcomers. At this time population figures reached 27,000 (AONB, 2009a: 28) and evidence of this migration from other parts of the UK still remains, the girls’ name Tamar for example, is still found amongst young people in the North Pennines today, in recognition of their family’s Scottish lineage (Crosby, 1993: 7).

The 1871 census for Killhope in Weardale however, reveals the dreadfully hard life of the North Pennines resident, living in isolated communities and eking out a living with work in the lead mines supplemented by produce from small-holdings. The census gives the average age for these communities as just 21 years old (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 154). Mining supported the community with 88% of people dependent on their income from lead mining (ibid). When the price of lead fell, entire families were left without economic support. This, combined with the dangers involved in the work, meant life was fragile, with one in three households home to a widow or widower (ibid). This social history is captured by the folk song, ‘Four Pence a Day’ which describes the plight of the families who sent their boys to work as ‘washers’ cleaning waste from the freshly mined and crushed lead:

The ore’s a waiting in the tubs, the snow’s upon the fell  
Canny folk are sleeping yet but lead is reet to sell;  
Come, me little washer lad, come, let’s away  
It’s verra hard to work for four pence a day.

(Anon cited in folkinfo.org)

Life was hard but the people had a number of distinctive diversions the legacy of which survives as living tradition today. Needlework is a craft for example, that continues to be important. Quilts were originally made by women for use in the home and were stitched with painstaking attention to detail. This intangible heritage of quilt making is kept alive through the practice of local quilting groups (see for example Emms, 1991). Miners smuggled fluorspar from underground and developed their own unique folk art in the form of the spar box, “a three-dimensional world created in a box with mirrors and a candle reflecting the glorious colours and crystals of the spar dug out from the mines” (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 155). This tradition however, has not survived as the once flourishing mining industry is now consigned to history and it is the history of lead mining to which discussion now turns.
1.3.2 Lead mining

The North Pennines’ rich geology is of international significance and has been exploited through extractive industry since as early as the Roman period (Turnbull, 1975: 8-9). Veins of lead (galena or lead-sulphide) also contain other minerals such as fluorspar and barites (Duerden, 1990: 105). Use of minerals has characterised North Pennines habitation and recent archaeological excavations at Bollihope have revealed the remains of metal working to suggest that Romano-British farmers were using their local geological resources to make tools or even weapons (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 140). This early exploitation of the geology was very much a cottage industry and mining remained at a small scale until the mid eighteenth century. From as early as 1154, when Hugh, Bishop of Durham was granted rights to lead mining by his nephew, King Stephen, lead mining was actively encouraged in Weardale (Turnbull, 1975: 9) with mines leased to a variety of individuals (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 144). Lead went on to dominate the industrial history of the region. Early extraction involved mining the lead at points where the vein outcropped, or digging vertically into the ground then mining outwards from the base of this shaft in a ‘bell pit’. Lead, silver and iron were extracted in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 144, Turnbull, 1975: 9-10) but from the sixteenth century the demand for lead began to rise. By 1698 Sir William Blackett of Wallington Hall became ‘moor master’ in Weardale, controlling the mining there (Dingwall, :12, Turnbull, 1975: 13). He already owned all the Allendale mines and estate and for the next two centuries the region’s lead industry would be controlled by members of this family (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 146).

The Blackett family through marriage became the Blackett-Beaumonts and founded the Blackett-Beaumont Company. Alongside the London Lead Company (often known as the Quaker Company), the Blackett-Beaumont Company brought large-scale lead mining to the North Pennines so that between 1760 and 1800 income from the commercial exploitation of lead surged (ibid: 82, Crosby, 1993: 7). From the mid eighteenth century until the early twentieth century the North Pennines was dominated by lead mining,
transforming the landscape into one, “studded with mine complexes, dressing floors and smelt mills... leats... flues... and tracks and railways” (AONB, 2009a: 25). The mining companies influenced new villages and larger more established settlements for example the villages of Nenthead, Garrigill, Allenheads, Carshield and the medieval settlements of Stanhope, Middleton-in-Teesdale, Alston and Allendale (ibid: 26, Turnbull, 1975: 78-79).

It is argued that the genuine interest in the welfare of their employees set the lead mining companies apart from their coal mining counterparts and the lead companies were indeed responsible for the provision of libraries, health centres, public houses and evening classes (Duerden, 1990: 106). The companies supported new schools in Teesdale, Weardale and Allendale along with reading rooms and other institutions (AONB, 2009a: 26). Mining engineer, Thomas Sopwith for example, in the mid nineteenth century had a particular interest in the welfare of the miner, setting up libraries at New House and Allenheads (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 150), opening schools in Allendale, Allenheads, Carshield and Sinderhope (Turnbull, 1975: 81) and increasing the monthly subsistence allowance for miners, whilst cancelling all outstanding debts (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 151). He created security for the communities by developing a culture that disparaged debt thereby supporting the businesses of tradesmen such as blacksmiths and shopkeepers (ibid : 150-151). This combined with an enthusiasm for Methodism (discussed below) led observers to report of North Pennines miners in glowing terms: “Frank and free in their manners, kind and hospitable in their homes, remarkable for helping and assisting each other, it is not to be wondered they are strongly knit to their native hills” (Featherstone, 1840 cited in Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 147).

1.3.3 Farming
Knit to their native hills the lead miners were indeed, not only through a sense of community but also through the investment in the land they made by applying themselves to its cultivation. Miners commonly also had agricultural small holdings. But whilst initially it was the farmers who chose to combine their farming year with extra
income from mining, as the lead mines attracted migrants to the area and swelled the population, the companies began to actively encourage their miners to turn to farming and supplement their income (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 55). For them, the smallholdings kept miners tied to the land and restricted their liberty to wander towards more lucrative employment when times were hard. Hard times came often too and the highs and lows of lead profits in the mid eighteenth century have been described as a ‘rollercoaster’ (ibid: 150). Farmsteads of cottage, byre and loft were common and their derelict remains still pepper the landscape (AONB, 2009a: 26). Farming continues to be a key feature of life in the North Pennines, the landscape patched with evidence of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries’ enclosures. Today it is accepted that arable farming is unsustainable in this region; the relics of lime kilns in the landscape are indicative of man’s battle to cultivate the soil. Whilst cattle or ‘beests’ are still farmed today, the majority of pastoral herds in the North Pennines are sheep. In the lead mining past however, the land was worked for a variety of produce. Those miners who lived at distance from the mines would leave their small-holding for a week at time, packing their food supplies in a ‘wallet’ setting off on foot and staying in the mine ‘shops’ where there were beds and a fire to dry out their clothes (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 148).

1.3.4 Methodism

For these isolated families whose lives were characterised by toil on and under the earth, the Church of England held little appeal, seen as the preserve of the upper classes with little regard for the welfare of the poor. Crosby has suggested that the great power exercised over the industrial workforce by employers, led to the notion that outsiders were exploiting the communities and she claims that many held the Church of England to blame through its neglect (1993: 8). When John Wesley came to the dales to preach in the latter part of the eighteenth century therefore, non-conformity through the teachings of Methodism found a receptive audience. In response to this spiritual awakening, enthusiastic followers built chapels, that at Newbiggin in Teesdale being the oldest still in use (Coggins, 2003: 13) and High House Chapel in Weardale the second oldest (though much altered in the nineteenth century). Crosby considers that as a result, “The image of the dalesman as violent, hard drinking and uncivilised gave way to
that of a God-fearing community bent on improving themselves, helping each other and showing considerable enterprise in their activities” (1993: 7).

1.3.5 Demise of lead mining

With mounting competition from Spain, the North Pennines region lost its international importance in lead production by the mid nineteenth century (Turnbull, 1975: 18-19). The need for lead to support Great Britain’s enduring industrial revolution meant a continued home demand, but by the end of the century the lead mining industry was in serious trouble as imports became significantly cheaper. The London Lead Company’s attempts to cut costs resulted in a drawn-out strike in 1871 and twenty years later lead mining was, “virtually finished” (Coggins, 2003: 14). Whilst some extractive industry continued into the twentieth century, most notably for fluorspar which was used in the Sunderland glass industry for example (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 156), and iron which was mined at an industrial scale at Tow Law and Stanhope Dene, its effects in offsetting the decline in lead mining were limited (AONB, 2009a: 26). Today in the North Pennines, the economy hinges upon farming and the appeal of the region to visitors, who through low level tourism, explore this story of man’s endeavours to exploit geology. For visitors, the story unfolds at a number of heritage sites and the following discussion overviews these, the attractions and heritage resources of the region.

1.4 Heritage

A shared theme emerging from ICU-C’s Sense of Place Report and from this CDA project, is that of landscape as a palimpsest for history, as the following Weardale resident writes:
All around are the physical remains of past activity: terracing and strips in ancient fields, derelict miners’ cottages, the remains of old smelt mills, lime kilns and mines, empty quarries – now the home of the oystercatcher and the merlin. They are a great source of interest for both local people and visitors, but also sad reminders of opportunities for earning a livelihood which have been lost.

(Crosby, 1993: 7)

The North Pennines landscape is a rich heritage resource in terms of industrial archaeology and its associated visitor attractions, dramatic landscape spectacles formed of distinctive geology, nature and wildlife and the social history of North Pennines, each of which will now be discussed in turn.

1.4.1 Industrial archaeology
The absence of any major industry to replace lead mining combined with the isolation of the region and the sturdy construction of its mining complexes, means much material evidence of the mining industry survives today (Davis, 2003: 61). From the shafts sunk for deep mining, the evidence of hushes whereby dams were filled then broken to sweep away surface rocks and reveal the lead, to spoil heaps and chimneys, patterns of settlement and the miner-farmer landscapes, the imprints of mining’s legacy remain (AONB, 2009a: 08). Those visiting the region can explore this legacy at a number of visitor attractions, most notably the lead mine sites of Killhope in County Durham, Nenthead Mines in Cumbria and also the Weardale Museum in County Durham. Writing in 2003, Davis suggested that the social history of the dales was told at four key sites in the North Pennines, noting also the heritage interpretation provided by the Allenheads Trust in Northumberland (2003: 61). However in the years that have followed, with investments made in the expansion of both Killhope and Nenthead, it is fair to suggest that Allenheads has less significance for visitors today.
Run by the Allenheads Village Trust, the interpretation in this small Northumberland village tells the story of life surrounding the Allenheads lead mine which was worked by the Blackett-Beaumont Company. Discussion in Chapter Seven will show that the Trust developed their interpretation in response to a newspaper article in the 1980s that suggested theirs was a dying village. So in 1985 the Trust sought to revitalise their village using its industrial heritage as, “a cornerstone for social, economic and environmental enhancement” (ibid). A heritage centre was housed in a historic seventeenth century building and the nearby Blacksmith’s Shop was used for exhibitions (ibid). Today the Trust has reconsidering the viability of a dedicated building for heritage displays and sought funding for revitalised interpretation displays which were scheduled for completion in October 2010 (Walker, 2010).

Conversely, a site that has experienced growth as a visitor attraction is the Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre in Cumbria. The Rampgill vein at Nenthead Mines was worked by the London Lead Company and the mine’s remains include mine buildings, arched stone entrances to mining levels, spoil dumps and underground workings in a remarkable condition of preservation (Davis, 2003: 63). Founded in 1987, the North Pennines Heritage Trust (NPHT) developed the site at Nenthead as a visitor attraction and, now a limited company, NPHT use Nenthead Mines as their base. Describing the Rampgill Mines restoration and conservation as their ‘flagship project’, the Trust has developed offices alongside the Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre, for the administration of their heritage work which branches across and beyond the North Pennines region. Since 1997 this five-year programme of work had a budget of £5 million (NPHT, 2006). Today the 500 acre site offers the visitor holiday accommodation in one of its three converted bunkhouses, a number of nature and heritage trails, presentation and interpretation of the former smelt mill complex, a picnic area, public access to the buildings and head of the mine’s ‘Brewery Shaft’, interactive displays in the form of mineral panning activities and the spectacular Power of Water exhibits, and underground tours of Carr’s Mine (ibid).
Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre risks replicating a story told to award-winning success at the Killhope Lead Mining Museum which can be found on the other side of Alston Moor in Weardale, County Durham. Boasting a dramatic water wheel which drove machinery on the dressing floor (figure 2), the mine at Killhope was built by the Beaumont Company between 1876 and 1878 (Turnbull, 1975: 96). In the 1980s Durham County Council developed the site as a tourist attraction. Visitors can take a guided tour into an original drift at Park Level Mine, where reconstructions are used to interpret the experience of a Victorian lead mine. Education facilities at the site have won the Sandford Award for heritage education and the Guardian’s Family Friendly Award. Alongside woodland trails, visitors can also experience the dressing and washing floor, exhibitions that interpret the history of lead mining and display the museum’s fascinating collection of spar boxes, and a reconstructed mine ‘shop’ complete with artificial rats. An unsuccessful bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund in 2009 required Killhope to work with Nenthead in order to address overlaps in interpretation and properly share the visitor load but the success of these attempts to integrate their interpretation remain to be seen. The sites continue to compete for visitor revenue.
The Weardale Museum on the other hand is a charming compliment to its local industrial attractions. The second oldest Methodist chapel in the North Pennines is High House Chapel at Ireshopeburn and a volunteer museum has been established in its neighbouring cottage. Like the heritage centre at Allenheads, the Weardale Museum was founded in 1985 in response to concerns about a waning sense of identity in the village (Davis, 2003: 64). Here displays of a locally donated and owned social history and photography collection tell the story of life in a lead mining community. Like Allenheads, the Museum has not benefited from the expansion of either the Nenthead or specifically the Killhope experience, since visitors are more likely to spend a full day at one of these sites, rather than complete their visit with a trip to the Weardale Museum. A dedicated team of volunteers however, remain committed to the maintenance and development of the Museum, and recently won funding from the AONB Partnership for better and more environmentally sustainable lighting for its displays.

1.4.2 Natural and ‘earth’ heritage

The underlying rocks and geological processes that have shaped the North Pennines are described in terms of millions of years of ‘earth history’ (AONB, 2009a: 7). The layer of hard black dolerite known as the Whin Sill for example produces spectacular waterfalls at Low and High Force and Cauldron Snout at Teesdale and outcrops along the cliffs of High Cup Gill. In recognition of this wealth of geological inheritance, the North Pennines became the first British European Geopark and in 2004 the North Pennines AONB and European Geopark became a founding member of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) Global Geoparks Network.

These majestic geological scars across the landscape, now softened by nature, provide habitat to an unusual variety of plant and wildlife. This includes special grasslands, some of which can have up to forty plant species per square metre. The North Pennines AONB has over 40% of the UK’s upland hay meadows which the Partnership are determined to restore (AONB, 2009a: 15-16). Moorland landscapes contribute to the experience of ‘wilderness’ in the North Pennines and 45% of the AONB is covered by expanses of
peatlands the majority of which are designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) (ibid: 18). The AONB in fact has a high concentration of conservation sites and areas, with 50% of the AONB designated SSSI (ibid: 5). This is a landscape in which black grouse can be spotted along with breeding waders such as curlew, snipe and lapwing (ibid: 16-117). It is distinctive and special but also a landscape experiencing considerable pressure and it is the contemporary issues to which the last part of this chapter turns.

1.4.3 Contemporary issues

The AONB Partnership suggests within its Management Plan for 2009-2014 (2009a: 5) that some of the pressures facing the AONB include threats from nascent wind energy development, new housing development and increased traffic and changes in agriculture. The plan details erosion of the rural character of the region in the form of a gradual loss of historic features and out of keeping conversion of traditional buildings. It goes on to describe low wages, the loss of key services and limited employment opportunities as factors exerting pressure on communities and suggests that the sensitive management of tourism has potential as a positive force in the local economy (AONB, 2009a: 5). The loss of key services and lack of employment are described here as examples of two key socioeconomic factors experienced by those living in the North Pennines today.

As Spanish imports drove down the price of lead between 1878 and 1883, for many the only alternative was to leave the North Pennines (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 140). In 1880 the Teesdale Mercury newspaper reported, “...never have so many left Barnard Castle as last year” (Coggins, 2003: 14). There are North Pennines miners who have shared their expertise in far flung destinations such as America, Australia and South Africa (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 155). So as the twentieth century saw population levels decline throughout much of the region, a fall from the mid eighteenth century’s population of 27,000 to today’s figures in the region of 12,000 (AONB, 2009a: 28), village shops, chapels, schools and pubs all gradually became redundant (ibid: 26). Many of the isolated smallholdings in the dales now lie abandoned or restored as second homes and
holiday lets (ibid). Moreover whilst population ageing is recognised as a widespread trend, “demographic ageing is happening earlier and more markedly in rural areas…” (Ward, 2006: 129).

An ageing of the population may well be accelerated by limited employment opportunities and this is certainly the perception of uplands residents (Convery and Dutson, 2006a: 214, Crosby, 1993: 7). Extractive industries cannot provide significant or secure employment; the closure of the cement works at Eastgate in March 2003 meant 147 workers were offered redundancy (Hardie and Hammond, 2007: 103). Moreover, whilst there are work opportunities in agriculture, it has been suggested that for young people uplands farming holds little appeal (Burton et al., 2005: 94-95). For young adults, the remuneration from farming is inadequate and the changing conditions of work present them with a career stripped of enjoyment and satisfaction (ibid). The failure to keep young people within the region combines with the pressures described above to threaten a particular sense of culture and heritage that has been passed on from one generation to the next within communities in the North Pennines. It is within this climate of change that residents are engaging with their heritage to safeguard their particular sense of place and it has been the project of this research to explore their experiences.

Conclusions
The purpose of this chapter has been to contextualise the research presented within this thesis. It has done so by summarising the findings and the situation in which the project was conceived in section 1.1. Section 1.2 examined what it means to conduct research within a collaboration, describing the nature of the AHRC CDA scheme, the North Pennines AONB Partnership as a collaborating organisation, the researchers’ background and interests and the project’s relationship to the field of action research. The third section of this chapter endeavoured within limited words to paint a picture for the reader of the North Pennines’ history and the social, lead mining, agricultural and religious stories were summarised. Finally section 1.4 examined the special qualities of the North Pennines in terms of the legacy of natural and cultural heritage inherited from
its past. Section 1.4.3 brought discussion to the present day, highlighting some of the contemporary pressures experienced by the participants of this research and indicating the threats to sense of place which it will be argued are experienced there. Chapter Two will review the theoretical context for notions of sense of place and community engagement with heritage before introducing the aims and objectives of this research project in more detail.
2. Chapter Two: Theory and Context

2.1 Engagement with heritage

By the close of the twentieth century popular notions of history and culture had knitted together as the discourse of ‘heritage’. The romantic idealisation of Britain’s pre-seventeenth century material inheritance, all, “gothic country houses, pseudo-medieval halls (and) thatched roofs…” (Mingay, 1989: 3) by the likes of William Morris and John Ruskin in the nineteenth century, and the Victorian painters’ fascination with the rural idyll, reveal the beginnings of a particular way of viewing the past. This movement treasured a past that was intimately bound up with notions of culture and identity: the heritage discourse in its naissance. Key events such as the passing of the 1882 Ancient Monuments Act made strides towards the reification of these ideas into ‘heritage’ as a concept and professional practice (for a critique of the history of 'heritage' see Harvey, 2001).

In the 1980s this discourse advanced rapidly. Country houses and stately homes, the legacy of privileged classes, were invoked for their social symbolism in reaction to economic decline (critiqued by Wright, 1985). But this reverence for the heritage of the elite competed with a developing interest in the ‘vernacular’ (Harvey, 1996: 306), and in particular the social history of declining industry. Heritage in the post-industrial society broadened out from the allure of the aristocracy, to include the cultural heritage of working class communities in former industrial areas (Dicks, 2003: 122). Out of redundant industrial sites grew museums, viewed by sociologist John Urry (1990, 1995) as tourist attractions, whose potential to fill the void left by industry led to bitter accusations of heritage as a commodification of history: “tourism paraded as an alternative for industrial policy” (Wright, 1995).

Critics saw the emergent ‘heritage industry’ as backward looking, resistant to change, a replacement for British industry, a symptom of and contributor to decline (Hewison,
1987, 1989, 1991, Lumley, 1988, Wright, 1985). Their anxieties drew from concerns about authenticity and historiography and their arguments propagated a view of heritage as a form of commercial display rather than historical education. Geographer David Lowenthal for example, expresses concern about a heritage that celebrates the particularities of locality and ethnicity, nurturing in his view, the biases that academic history has so long dedicated itself to mitigating (1997: 122). He highlights the manner by which the stories presented in commercial heritage displays can be selected and distorted for the ends, political or otherwise, of their authors. This authority, Lowenthal notes, can so easily be mistaken for historical authenticity (ibid: 250).

For postmodern theorist Frederick Jameson (1983), heritage as commercial display is symptomatic of late capitalism: the selling of memories and nostalgia, whereas for historian Raphael Samuel, heritage draws on postmodernism by eschewing grand narratives in favour of personal observation and local knowledge (1994: 196). Within this discourse manifold references to heritage across the spectrum of popular culture are highlighted, a trend viewed on the one hand as a distancing from the past’s ugly realities (Lowenthal, 1985), and on the other celebrated as a democratisation of heritage (Samuel, 1994). The ‘pluralising potentialities’ (Lamont, 1999: 309) of heritage, that welled up warnings of bias for Lowenthal, are in contrast liberatory to Samuel.

Between the nineteenth and late twentieth centuries notions of heritage had accordingly shifted from a fascination with the culture of a distant, untouchable elite, to a breaking down of the barrier between public and private (Dann, 1998: 38) in a move from ‘sceptre and sword’ to ‘hearth and home’ (Samuel, 1994: 161). Perceptions of ‘heritage’ came to embrace the ordinary; all kinds of places, objects and experiences could be heritage. Moving away from heritage as reverence for the elite ‘other,’ the discourse extended to take in personal biography and collective culture: heritage as yours, mine and ours (Urry, 1990). In his criticism, Lowenthal (1997) points to a widespread personal fascination with the past, underlining popular interest in cultural contrasts between individuals and their historical peers or recent ancestors. Impulses
towards such ‘feel good’ history are for Lowenthal, contiguous with the disinterest of the general public in political history at the national level (1997: 12). Sociologist Bella Dicks however, finds more ease with what she describes as this “identity-centred relationship with the past” (2003: 125).

The acceptance of personal, multiple and sometimes ‘dissonant’ heritages (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996) or ‘pluralism,’ (Ashworth et al., 2007) is further shored up by the approach adopted by the Heritage Lottery Fund, formed in 1994, whose schemes encourage those applying to make their own definitions of cultural value (Robertson, 2008: 148). The broadening out of the heritage discourse has embraced classes, genders and ethnicities, “providing an arena in which domestic and ‘everyday’ heritage” (Littler, 2008: 91) can be experienced. Definitions of heritage have expanded to accommodate intangibility: the expression of cultural heritage as a song, dance, dialect, tradition, craft, or culinary technique (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 2004, Kurin, 2004, Munjeri, 2004, Smith and Akagawa, 2009).

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) is particularly concerned to support the ‘safeguarding’ of threatened ‘expressions’ and adopted the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 (Corsane, 2005, Kurin, 2004). The Convention defines intangible cultural heritage as expressions, practices, knowledge and skills that are continually recreated, transmitted between the generations and contribute to a sense of identity. It has been ventured that the Convention lends heritage the capacity to recognise and incorporate other knowledge systems (especially ‘non western’ or ‘subaltern’), advancing its conceptualisation towards greater inclusivity (Corsane, 2005: 6). As Harvey suggests, “it does seem certain that a bigger range and number of people are becoming more involved in a much broader and deeper array of heritage phenomena than ever before” (Harvey, 2001: 336). Communities are engaging with their own heritage.
This chapter traces the developments in museology (2.1.1) and community engagement with heritage (2.2) that are the context for this study. Section 2.3 shifts the focus to the theoretical context of concepts of sense of place and to what is known about the contribution of heritage to this phenomenon. References are made to notions of the intangibility of heritage and current calls within the literature for new approaches to heritage management that provide alternatives to the ‘authorised discourse’ (Smith, 2006) borne out of the Western, positivist science of the Enlightenment (Waterton, 2005). The last section of this chapter places the research question, aims and objectives of the thesis within this context.

### 2.1.1 New museology

The ‘cultural turn’ of postmodernity that has brought with it a democratisation of meaning making and acceptance of plural values, is reflected in the heritage discourse described above (2.1) and also in a museological paradigm shift at times referred to as the second museums revolution or ‘new museology’. The first museums revolution is generally accepted to have occurred at the end of the nineteenth century as the nature of museums work became professional through training courses, journals and associations. Professional practices and standards of conservation, interpretation and education all developed during this period. Key events such as the creation of the Museums Association in the UK in 1889, the American Museums Association in 1906 and first general conference of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) in 1948 are cited when tracing the course of this first revolution (Van Mensch, 1992). During the 1960s however, the recognition of the social and educational role of museums became a concern in parallel with the acceptance of museology as an academic discipline (ibid 1992). ICOM meetings during the late 1960s and early 1970s placed emphasis on the role of the museum in the service of society (Davis, 1999: 52-53). The museums community looked to their practice and considered the purpose of the museum, reflecting on their impact with constructive self-criticism (Davis, 2007b). A number of ideas advanced by this second museums revolution that made specific reference to the role of the museum in disadvantaged or marginalised communities, were cemented by the term ‘new museology’.
New museology is a global phenomenon but its interpretation is fractured along fault lines of language. Its concern is with the role of the museum in assisting development at the local level and ruminations by the museums community in this vein at a number of international museums meetings have been charted by Davis (1999) and Van Mensch (1992, 1995). Museums professionals in Central and South America, drew their own conclusion from new museology, developing the concept of the ‘social museum’ or ‘integrated museum’ and these ideas were endorsed at a UNESCO-ICOM ‘Roundtable’ discussion in Santiago de Chile in May 1972 (Davis, 1999: 53, De Varine, 1995: XIII). The ‘integrated museum’ would make efforts to engage with society, the environment and other organisations in order to contribute to local socioeconomic development (Davis, 2004: 93-94, De Varine, 1995). In France this rhetoric of new museology culminated in the holistic and integrated concept of the ‘ecomuseum’ (discussed in Chapter Seven).

The desire to advance discussions in this tenor at international museums conferences were hampered however, by the seemingly insurmountable obstacle of language. Disappointingly, the limited agility to tackle this obstacle appears to lie with the Anglophone participants. Whilst the goals of new museology are related to social responsibilities and local engagement, the majority of UK authors focus almost solely on what it means for the display and interpretation of collections and have, “largely ignored all that has been written about the nature and purpose of museums in countries where English is not the first language” (Davis, 2007b: 399-400).

In the UK, whilst it is has been recognised that the museums of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had an explicitly educational purpose, for example the collections that eventually entered the public domain as the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford or the British Museum, London (Macdonald, 2006a, Saumarez Smith, 1989), they are now criticised for having taken a singular and taxonomic approach to interpretation. Always having had a clear social purpose, from as early as 1686 British museums have expressed dedication to education, in terms of the promotion of knowledge through objects (Saumarez Smith, 1989) but have nonetheless faced criticism as didactic institutions.
communicating knowledge based on positivist science and essentialism with an anonymous authority. Postmodernism however has demanded that responsibility is claimed for authorship, has questioned the existence of absolutes and problematised ‘truth’; Lyotard has summarised the movement as an incredulity towards metanarratives (1984: xxiv). This alongside developments such as the civil rights movement, the post World War Two reaction to fascism and the compression of time and place that characterises globalisation (Harvey, 1990), has demanded a post-colonial, postmodern approach to museology. In response UK museums have reassessed the purpose and process of what they do.

Museums theorist Peter van Mensch (1992, 1995) in his critique of the second museums revolution, finds a key feature of new museology to be an inability to accept the sort of anonymous institutional voice in exhibition authorship described above. In the UK, Peter Vergo (1989a) examines the new museology movement finding it to be a dissatisfaction with ‘old’ museology’s narrow focus on procedure and method. Peter Davis (2007b: 399) however, underlines the singular concern within Vergo’s edited volume The New Museology (1989b) for the interpretation and display of objects. This characterises the tone of UK museological debate, Sharon Macdonald (2006b: 8) for instance, summarises new museology as a shift in the cogniscence of museums professionals and theorists to a view that: 1) the meanings of objects in museums are situated and contextual; 2) there are continuities between museums and museology to other spaces and practices; and 3) that the way in which exhibitions are read by their visitors or ‘audiences’ is significant.

Macdonald’s discussion foregrounds what she views as ‘patchy’ achievement in addressing the inequalities that have allowed minority cultures to be marginalised or excluded from the narrative of museum display. She describes new museology as a committed shift, “towards understanding the public as diverse, plural and active, rather than as a relatively homogeneous and rather passive mass” (ibid). Further, Davis (1999) describes new museology as a phrase that quickly references what has been a radical reassessment of the roles of museums in society and not just in terms of the plural
meanings made of display. Taking a more global overview, Davis suggests that internationally this movement originated in community museology, turning from the primacy of the object to an, “emphasis on sustainable community development” (Davis, 2007b: 400). Likewise Gail Anderson (2004) sees the movement as a shift of focus from object to society.

The resulting transformation in approaches to presenting the past have been described in terms of shift: from the museum as temple to museum as forum (Cameron, 2004), from the museum as a storehouse to the museum as a contact zone (Clifford, 1997) and from museums about objects to museums for people (Weil, 2004). The emphasis in the policy of UK museums in recent decades upon social inclusion, access and audience development is a direct result of this shift. These changes in museology have been accompanied by debates in archaeology and heritage studies more widely about plural values and how they are recognised and acknowledged (Smith, 2006). The dominant Western heritage management approach has been criticised for its, “impulses in favour of positivist science” (Waterton, 2005: 313) when faced with the wider concept of, for example, cultural landscapes. Such forms of heritage, “are not objects simply to be understood, but exist as living, social processes with ability to generate knowledge through a communities’ knowledge of the past” (ibid: 314). In response to these reassessments in the presentation of the past, community engagement with heritage has been nurtured. What follows overviews the discourse of community heritage, and the critiques of its practice within the literature.

2.2 Community heritage
Discussion above has indicated the contemporary interest in personal biography and ‘vernacular’ social history that shapes heritage as it is found today, and this in part was fuelled by developments in the 1960s, 70s and 80s notably Raphael Samuel’s History Workshop movement originating at Ruskin College, Oxford which promoted ‘history from below’ (see for example, Samuel, 1981). Such interest has also been echoed in the discourse of community archaeology (Carman, 2002). This combined with the new
museological view of heritage display as ‘contact zone’ (Clifford, 1997) has meant an approach that strives more so than ever before for democracy and local representation. In the inter-disciplinary field of heritage studies, this concern is reflected by the growing literature that expresses desire to identify and engage with communities (Smith, 2006: 35).

Elizabeth Crooke whilst qualifying that one should have a, “fluid and flexible idea of what community heritage might be” (2008a: 415), has viewed it in two ways. The first is through the official museum sector which, in the aftermath of the second museums revolution, looks to achieve professional standards and address policy with reference to community (Crooke, 2008b: 7). National museums in the UK, Crooke notes for example, are (at the time of writing) centrally funded and therefore closely tied to government policy. In the last decade this has been informed by notions of social justice that have played out in cultural policy in terms of access and inclusion. The second way in which Crooke views community heritage is through the interest in heritage emerging from communities themselves (2008b: 8). These two views she describes as ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ community heritage and each will here be taken in turn.

2.2.1 Official community heritage

Bella Dicks has suggested that the community museum ideal hinges on two beliefs, the first, that representing community is coterminous with representing place, the second that museums should have active and reciprocal relationships with place (2000: 97). But Dicks questions the effectiveness of such an approach, foregrounding the nature of community and place as a tangled web of place-images or what have been described as place-myths (Shields, 1991: 61). The task set by the new museology to represent the ‘whole’ community is also challenged, she argues, by the plethora of meanings which she describes as the, “multivocality of people in place” (2000: 99).
Indeed, the view that there are many different ways of ascribing heritage value can be juxtaposed with the difficulty presented by the word ‘community’ itself. Rather than one whole community, identities are plural and community cannot be viewed in terms of homogeneity. Cultural identity can be created, sustained, legitimated and also denied by heritage, but it is not singular; cultural identity can be a nested metaphorical Russian doll, it can be collective, individual, private or public, a coexistence or a confusion of contradiction. Benedict Anderson cites ‘imaginary collectivity’ in his critique of community (1991). There may also be communities who are not yet aware of themselves as such, and are therefore unable to “articulate for themselves their needs and expectations” (Gable, 2009: 137). These are ideas explored in Sheila Watson’s edited volume Museums and their Communities (2007b). The multifarious and brambly nature of community, Dicks asserts, causes tension in the presentation of, “community as a representation of multiple vernacular identities”, and she suggests it is simplistic to describe a homogenised view of ‘the people of place x’ in heritage display (2000: 99). In the heritage sector’s attempts to represent each diverse group, Andrea Witcomb (2003) underlines the crux: there will always be someone who feels under represented.

For Witcomb museums at once represent community (and here she cites Clifford’s notion of ‘contact zone’) but as ‘official community heritage’ and linked to government, she invokes Bennett’s argument that they also produce notions of community (2003: 79-80). She identifies heritage and museums specifically as sites of power relations and posits ‘community’ as a notion in resistance to ‘government’ (ibid). In this sense, ‘official community heritage’ can be seen as top down, telling nationalised stories (Smith, 2006: 36) and acting as ‘state space’ (Crooke, 2006). Before examining the dissonance of plural heritages and the claiming of subaltern and forgotten histories at the local level, discussion will remain with notions of ‘official community heritage’ examining next the political agency of heritage and the practice of ‘participation’.

During the last ten years of Labour government in Britain, museums and the heritage sector have been tasked with achieving goals in terms of combating social exclusion. In
order to achieve inclusion, museums and heritage sites have endeavoured to provide access and outreach, breaking down a range of barriers to participation that include money, class, education, disability and ethnicity (Newman, 2005, Newman and McLean, 2004, Pendlebury et al., 2004). Whilst some in the museum and heritage profession appear wholly convinced by the capacity of the sector to achieve these sorts of social justice objectives (Fleming, 2002) others remain critical. Kylie Message questions the appropriateness of museums and heritage sites to tackle social issues particularly those of cohesion and civil renewal (Message, 2009) whilst Pendlebury et al. suggest that, “merely enabling more people to enjoy heritage, or extending how it is defined to recognise the diversity in society, does not in itself challenge power relations and control over the process by which heritage is defined and managed” (Pendlebury et al., 2004: 23 cited in Smith, 2006: 37-38).

In attempts to address issues of control over the process of defining and managing heritage, greater community participation must be pursued. Participation is a process that has been modelled by Sherry Arnstein (1969) as a ladder along which engagement activities may travel until they reach beyond consultation to participation. This ‘ladder of participation’ is illustrated in figure 3. Similarly, Brian Head has critiqued the types of activities and promises that can be made in the discourse of participation and these are illustrated in figure 4 (Head, 2007). Using these models it is clear to see that museums and the heritage sector more widely, have some distance to travel before they can make claims for democracy. As Crooke (2006) suggests, the involvement of diverse groups cannot guarantee ‘inclusion’, what is needed is a break from expert led knowledge to take onboard community opinions. In view of Head and Arnstein’s categories of participation, Crooke appears to suggest that ‘consultation’, ‘involvement’ or ‘placation’ are not enough but that ‘partnership’ and ‘collaboration’ are harder to achieve within the museums and heritage sector.
The UK interpretation of new museology offers an interesting way of understanding the power-sharing ideal that inspires projects of community participation, through the notion of ‘interpretive communities’. Drawn from literary theory, this is the view that searching for an intrinsic meaning in a text (or object) is futile since the meaning itself is the shifting construction of the reader (or visitor) individually and within their ‘interpretive community’ (Fish, 1980). Eileen Hooper-Greenhill (2007) applies these ideas to museum display. Taking this further and drawing on theories from cultural studies, museums and audiences are acknowledged both as producers and consumers of meaning in a circuit of culture (du Gay et al., 1997, Mason, 2005).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public participation goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision making in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise to the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will keep you informed.</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
<td>We will implement what you decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques to consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheets</td>
<td>Public comment</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Citizen advisory committees</td>
<td>Citizens’ juries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Deliberative polling</td>
<td>Consensus-building Participatory decision making</td>
<td>Ballots Delegated decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open houses</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4 Levels of participation and empowerment (International Association for Public Participation, 2005 cited in Head, 2007: 445)*

In steps both to assimilate the view of audiences as the active constructors of myriad meanings, and to be inclusive by engaging with local communities, museums have attempted to go beyond participation towards co-production (see for example Lynch and Alberti, 2010). Sheila Watson (2007a) similarly describes attempts to consult with
communities when developing heritage displays. Watson (2007c: 7-8) builds on Mason’s (2005: 206-207) typologies of ‘interpretive communities’ adding ‘communities defined by location’ to a list that suggests such communities can also be related to ethnicity, specialist knowledge, demographics, identities, museum visiting practices or exclusion from other communities. She describes an experiment at the Great Yarmouth Museum which redesigned its displays after focus group consultation with representatives of such a ‘community defined by location’. In the process the museum found itself compromising authenticity in order to represent a skewed popular consciousness of the area’s local history. In particular the focus groups emphasised a fondly held, but inaccurate belief in the primacy of the local fishing industry (Watson, 2007a). In a bold move here, the museum can be seen to stand by a promise which Brian Head describes as ‘empowering’ the community (figure 4): “We will implement what you decide” (AIPP cited in Head, 2007: 445) and as such is commensurate with Sherry Arnstein’s (1969) seventh rung on the participatory ladder by ‘delegating power’ (figure 3). The example however, raises issues of historical accuracy, collective memory and local identity. It is in the pursuit of the celebration, exploration and validation of such ‘sense of place’ that many communities and subaltern groups are engaging with the presentation of their culture in what Crooke describes as ‘unofficial community heritage.’

2.2.2 Unofficial community heritage

In the 1970s a sense of urgency in relation to heritage conservation became widespread (Pendlebury, 2008: 61-62). In this decade and the early years of the next, local action groups, in a movement characterised as ‘preservation mania’ (Samuel, 1994), were galvanised to save elements of their built historic environment. Preservation groups were particularly interested in the physical remains of spent industry, often housing within them small volunteer-led museums or heritage displays. The increased public appetite for display of ‘vernacular’ cultural heritage and the ascendance of social and industrial heritage can therefore be juxtaposed with a heightened popularity of engagement with heritage at the local level. This self-perpetuates, since the more local people see the ordinary culture of others on display, the more likely they are to wish to display their own (Dicks, 2003: 139, Johnstone, 1998). More recently in the last decade,
the prevalence of such local ‘calls to action’ has been situated within the discourse of globalisation.

Globalisation is a term which references the speeding up of postmodern life through accessible and convenient global travel, instant electronic communications and also the proliferation of multinational corporations that can serve to make one high street look increasingly like any other. In their 2005 volume *Globalisation and Belonging* Savage et al. present a number of views by which the significance of the local might be seen. One such view is that the interest in local culture and desire to articulate and assert this identity is a response to globalisation. In making this case, Savage et al. cite sociologist Manuel Castells, for whom globalisation is a conquering powerhouse of change with the helpless ‘local’ as simply ‘historical residue’ (2005: 5). Castells suggests that in the face of globalisation, “… people all over the world resent the loss of control over their lives, over their environment, over their jobs, over their economies…” (2009: 72). As a result a ‘defensive historical reaction’ (Savage et al., 2005: ibid) can take place, whereby people assert the particularity - Harvey’s ‘militant particularism’ (1996: 306) - of their own local cultural heritage: “the search for meaning takes place... in the reconstruction of defensive identities around communal principles” (Castells, 1996: 11 cited Savage et al., 2005: 5). This accounts for the curiosity in local cultural heritage that can galvanise local people to spend their leisure time in pursuit of its exploration.

Whilst globalisation has brought people closer through ease of communication, this ‘global village’ has the hollow resonance of minimal face to face contact and an experience that communications theorist Joshua Meyrowitz has characterised as ‘no sense of place’ (1987). Aware of the tangibility of this sense of loss, local people appeal to notions of community. As Paul Morris (1996) has suggested in his critique of contemporary notions of tradition, this sense of community comes into focus at the point of its dissolution, so that engaging with heritage is perhaps a form of ‘retrospective unity’ (Dicks, 2000: 98). In this sense place can be a physical reality and an intangible
social construction, ideas which anthropologist Arturo Escobar has explored in his examination of ‘subaltern strategies of localisation’ (2001).

If it is accepted then that engagement with heritage is contiguous with the displacement of local people from notions of their localities (Wallace, 1996) then it is possible to account for a variety of subaltern groups seeking to assert their cultural identity, whether these groups are indigenous or first nations people in international examples (see for example Cheung, 2005, Ndoro and Pwiti, 2001, Smith, 2006: 277), or local groups in the UK context wishing to remind the visitor of ‘forgotten histories’ when faced with, for example, gentrification of their neighbourhoods (Savage et al., 2005). Geographer David Harvey similarly references a search for authenticity that can be evidenced in grassroots movements in ‘militant resistance’ (cited in Cresswell, 2004: 61) to capitalist place-creation (Harvey, 1996: 302). As a combined effect of this capitalist place-making and resistant local searches for authenticity, notions of ‘sense of place’ are continually referenced in a raft of cultural manifestos from local to government level (UK policy in reference to heritage and place has been comprehensively overviewed by Graham et al., 2009). It is salient at this point to examine a clearer articulation of ‘sense of place’ and the next section outlines approaches to this concept within the fields of heritage studies, geography and environmental psychology.

2.3 Sense of place

‘Sense of place’ is a notion permeating every aspect of the humanities. Difficulty with reviewing the theoretical context for such a prevalent concept from a heritage studies perspective is compounded by the inter-disciplinary nature of this field. For this reason it has been necessary to draw parameters around a review of the literature and this section is limited to a review of the empirical investigations of the subject within the field of environmental psychology and the theories of sense of place emerging from geography. The dissertation sits within the inter-disciplinary field of heritage studies however and it is with this literature that any review must begin.
2.3.1 Heritage studies
Discussion above has traced the development of the heritage discourse which in the 1980s focussed upon the mobilisation of heritage in conceptualisations of the ‘nation’ (Hewison, 1987, Walsh, 1992, Wright, 1985). It has also been shown that in recent years increasing reference has been made to ‘the global’ and that yet conversely the notion of ‘place’ continues to resurface. Kevin Walsh (1992) reasserts the ‘local’ in response to the disconnection felt by local people experiencing globalisation. He suggests that museums should be engaging in the discourse of ‘sense of place’ particularly through cognitive mapping exercises of the type promoted by UK organisation Common Ground (1992: 152 - 157). For him the ideal locality is at a scale the people can come to terms with, can feel attachment with and therefore should be encouraged to define for themselves (Walsh, 1992).

Brian Graham, Gregory Ashworth and John Tunbridge were the first to explicitly examine place in relation to heritage, and the edited volume, Senses of Place, Senses of Time (Ashworth and Graham, 2005a) builds on the idea of pluralism (Ashworth et al., 2007) and ‘dissonance’ (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996) to examine the changing nature of place identities over time. This work underlines the constructed nature of heritage and place; the imagined past as a resource from which aspects are picked and chosen to contemporary ends. Developing this view, the book considers ‘place-making’ and the creation of place images by government, the media, local people and tourists.

Focussing on one particular ‘place-making’ scenario, Bella Dicks (2000) examines heritage, place and community with reference to a specific heritage attraction in the Rhondda Valley in South Wales. In meticulous detail, Dicks relates issues of the representation of cultural identity within the context of regeneration in the coalfields of the Rhondda. Her study traces the development of a museum in the last surviving colliery building of what had been an area of thriving industry. She is able to note the
success and failure of heritage in the presentation of place identity, but specifically
refers to the development of a museum enterprise and the accompanying discourse of
commodification which has been described above.

Emma Waterton’s (2005) study of sense of place at Hareshaw Linn, Northumberland
however, takes a site that is not so, “tainted with entrepreneurial character” (Marshall et
al., 2010). With breathtaking mastery, Waterton casts into sharp relief the
epistemological framework around which Western systems of heritage management
have evolved. She underlines the limitations of positivist approaches to understanding
the shifting, organic and contextual process by which heritage meanings of cultural
landscapes are made by local people. David Atkinson (2007, 2008) develops these ideas
by championing the heritage value of quotidian places to local people; the heritage of
the ‘mundane’.

In 2006, Laurajane Smith’s volume The Uses of Heritage developed these ideas to further
challenge notions of heritage as a topic of study and Dicks (2007) has suggested that the
work, “makes a significant contribution to our understanding of heritage as a social and
cultural process”. Smith suggests that the dominant conception of heritage has been
defined by an ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) wherein those with power have
decided what does or does not count as a nation’s heritage. The hegemonic AHD
presents heritage as a tangible entity of common inheritance and innate values that
supports a singular view of the past and is defined through the taste and reasoning of
experts. For Smith, the AHD is a dominant Western knowledge system, “outside of which
dissenting voices struggle to advance alternative conceptions” (Dicks, 2007: 58). Such
alternative conceptions can relate to attachment, identity, belonging and senses of
place.

This discourse dovetails with the publication of an edited volume by leading scholars,
John Pendlebury and Lisanne Gibson which accepts in no uncertain terms the plural
meanings that are constructed around heritage (Gibson and Pendlebury, 2009b). It is noteworthy that in the same year, a report was produced by the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies and the International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies at Newcastle University commissioned by English Heritage entitled, Sense of Place, Social Capital and the Historic Environment (Bradley et al., 2009). This report however, focuses entirely upon heritage in terms of historic environments: places with high concentrations of listed buildings, scheduled monuments, parks and gardens. This is a view of heritage positioned soundly within Smith’s (2006) AHD. Pendlebury and Gibson’s volume on the other hand, returns to Atkinson’s theme and builds on those early seeds of ‘history from below’ to consider the heritage value of, for example, social housing in Newcastle (Pendlebury et al., 2009) or the seaside resort of Blackpool (Walton and Wood, 2009).

In response to the challenge posed by Smith’s (2006) AHD, Pendlebury and Gibson attempt to address the problem of recognising multiple heritage values when making pragmatic decisions about heritage preservation. They conclude in terms of dissonance: by recognising a given set of values in decisions to preserve, inevitably other values and meanings are subordinated. These studies do much to further understandings of place but represent a thin coverage during the last fifteen years. As Smith suggests, “Although critical debates about the nature and role of ‘place’ exist, particularly, within geography and anthropology… similar discussions are infrequent in heritage studies…” (2006: 75). And so it is to the geography literature that discussion now turns.

2.3.2 Geography

One of the key tasks of geography as a discipline is to make sense of ‘place’. This became the central concern of geography during the 1970s and 1980s with seminal works produced by Yi Fu Tuan (1977) and Edward Relph (1976). This section examines the discourse of place within geography, examining definitions: place as meaningful space, place as a way of seeing, place as lived experience, semiotics and genius loci, and
landscape, before finally examining the work of David Harvey and Doreen Massey in defining place in the context of globalisation.

Yi Fu Tuan suggests that when space is invested with meaning, it becomes place (Tuan, 1977). The notion of place as a meaningful location has been developed by John Agnew who organises his approach into three categories or ‘ways of seeing’: location, locale and sense of place (1987). ‘Location’ he sees as the mechanics of space; the grid coordinates, whereas ‘locale’ is the function of place as a physical setting for social relations. ‘Sense of place’ on the other hand refers to the very subjective and emotional attachment that people make to place (1987: 7). This approach draws on French urban sociologist Henri Lefebvre (1991) who suggests space can be absolute (abstract) or meaningful (social). This meaningfulness extends to activity within the space so that Edward Casey (1996, 1997) sees actions conducted within a place invested with meaning because of their setting.

For Casey (1996) life is conducted locally and only through being in place is it possible to truly perceive it. Robert Hay (1998) has examined the relevance of an investment of time in a place, linking sense of place to duration of stay. In this respect Casey and Hay see place as ‘lived experience’ and draw on the philosophical tradition of phenomenology. The philosophical approach from which humanist geography is derived (see for example Buttiner and Seamon, 1980, Seamon, 2000), phenomenology is a view put forth by German philosopher Martin Heidegger. Heidegger saw people inhabiting place not just through their thoughts, but through their physical emotions and experiences (1962). Maurice Merleau-Ponty, a French phenomenological philosopher heavily influenced by Heidegger, as an existentialist, became another key proponent of this approach to place, which is described in the German as ‘dasein’ or ‘being in the world’ (Baldwin, 2003: 27). There are two linked ideas which follow and they are firstly the semiotics of being in place, and secondly the notion of intangibility or spirit.
Nigel Thrift (2004) has considered the way a place can make a person feel emotionally, and he calls for more examination of place and the ‘affective register’. He also refers to the creation and mobilisation of affect; the way a place can be subconsciously read and decoded in order that the body is predisposed for the required or expected action (ibid: 58, 62). Emotional and psychological constructions of place have developed their own strands of geography with Guy Debord and the French Situationist Movement conceiving of ‘psychogeography’ (Coverley, 2006) and with the more recent examination of notions of ‘emotional geography’ (Davidson et al., 2005). The semiotics of place are explored by Mike Crang (1998) who highlights the potential of landscape to be read as a palimpsest of cultural heritage. These ideas have also been articulated in terms of intangibility. This sense of place, or ‘spirit’ has been described by architectural theorist Christian Norberg-Schultz (1980) as ‘genius loci’ which he defines in terms of qualities: topography, light, buildings and culture.

It is in the definition of place however, that heritage studies appears to make a departure from geography, particularly in terms of ‘landscape’. For Laurajane Smith (2006: 78), a scholar of heritage, place as landscape has been examined in two ways: in terms of ‘nature versus culture’ and in terms of ‘multivocality’ (ibid: 78). A natural landscape which also finds significance because of humankind’s interaction with it over time can be defined as a ‘cultural landscape’, but the meanings of such landscapes can be subjective and plural. David Lowenthal (2005) for example has given attention to the tension between constructivist and essentialist approaches to landscape, noting that the epistemological preference can directly affect the approach to heritage management taken. In this case he cites the universalising tendencies of UNESCO, who in an approach informed by essentialism, organise cultural landscapes and their recognition into lists of universal value (2005). In the discourse of multivocality, on the other hand, heritage studies draws on anthropology, notably the work of Margaret Rodman (1992) who again underlines the constructivist view that there are as many meanings made of a local landscape as there are individuals or ‘voices’: place is multilocal and multivocal. Emma Waterton (2005) makes the case for alternatives to essentialist approaches, recognising
the need to understand and nurture the organic quality of cultural landscape as a multifarious and ongoing constructivist meaning-making process.

Geographer Tim Cresswell however, dismisses definitions of place in terms of ‘landscape’ at all, suggesting, “we do not live in landscapes - we look at them” (2004: 11) and thereby identifies what appears to be a major difference between the two otherwise interconnected disciplines of heritage studies and geography. Where the heritage discourse does find synergy with geography however, is through the work of geographer David Harvey. His viewpoint and the ways in which it contrasts with the work of Doreen Massey are germane to the critique of heritage and globalisation given above and it is to their work that discussion now turns.

2.3.3 Global sense of place
For Doreen Massey (1997) globalisation need not create anxiety, and she questions the use of a simplistic catch-all term for the movements of a wide diversity of people with a plethora of motivations. She agrees that these processes of globalisation can cause a ‘retreat’ into local place but stresses her difficulties with the existing accounts for such places. For Massey, local places do not have singular identities, they are not inert and she questions the need for place to be ‘authentically rooted in history’ or have boundaries with which to draw lines of distinction with ‘outside’ (cited in Cresswell, 2004: 72). Any notion of identity or authenticity she argues, is perpetually challenged by mobility and so she suggests new perspectives that reveal place to be receptive, permeable and blended, the product of interconnected flows: routes rather than roots (ibid: 53).

For David Harvey, however, globalisation requires places to be redefined around new communication networks and this leads to a fear of the devaluation of old places through for example, ‘gentrification’ or ‘heritagization’ (1996: 296). Harvey describes a widespread concern to make local places appear special in order to attract mobile
capital. In resistance to this process he identifies ‘militant particularism’ (ibid: 306) and in support of his case for ‘anxiety’ he invokes Tuan’s critique of rootedness (ibid: 302). Harvey suggests that those who are truly rooted do not feel the desire to celebrate sense of place through the creation of museums or heritage displays that are prevalent today (ibid). As such, Harvey appears to suggest that engagement with heritage is coterminous with feelings of rootlessness. Following Heidegger’s notion of ‘dwelling’ whereby ‘being in place’ is authentic, Harvey goes on to suggest that place is the ‘locus of collective memory,’ and a direct link to the past (cited Cresswell, 2004: 61), a past from which cultural identity is drawn.

Harvey’s critique of globalisation and place then, supports the account put forth within the heritage studies canon, combining as it does notions of history, place-making, authentic rootedness and defensive assertions of local distinctiveness. What can be drawn from Massey’s account on the other hand is an acceptance of the changeability of place and its meanings: heritage as a process rather than a product. Such an approach is useful in making sense of the data presented later in this dissertation. A methodology for the collection of these data is presented in the next chapter, but it is useful here to overview other attempts to explore sense of place empirically and these attempts appear largely in the research within environmental and social psychology.

2.3.4 Environmental psychology

So far a case has been made for an understanding of sense of place as fluid and multiple, and this is a view that finds its roots in the cultural turn of postmodernity. By shifting the review now to the literature from environmental psychology, it is possible to reveal, “stark disciplinary and methodological differences” (Graham et al., 2009: 15) in approach to sense of place. These differences hinge on epistemology (the kind of knowledge being produced) and ontology (ways of thinking about social processes). Whilst environmental psychologists build on the ideas about place that are presented by geography, their tendency is towards quantitative data. As a result, such studies are guided by a preference for controlled experiments over explorations of subjective experience and
personal meaning. The interest is therefore in generalisable findings and positivist forms of knowledge (Graham et al., 2009).

The manner by which this field has captured ideas from geography into subsets, categories and indicators has much to offer in terms of an analysis of the data collected and this is explored in Chapters Four, Five and Six. These categories include place identity (Proshansky et al., 1983), place dependency (Korpela, 1989, Stedman, 2003) and place attachment (Guiliani and Feldman, 1993). In order to measure these concepts however, the field tends towards questionnaire surveys that include: agreement against statements which are measured without face to face contact (Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001, 2006); Likart scales (Stedman, 2003); ‘unidimensional scales’ which attempt to avoid preconceived categories (Shamai and Ilatov, 2004); and other scales against which respondents may express the degree to which they agree or not (Shamai, 1991).

These are approaches in contrast with the ‘thick description’ favoured by anthropology or the phenomenology of human geography and their flaws can be seen in two ways. Firstly the use of preconceived questionnaire categories works counter to the teasing out of inductive theory, since the data is bound to a framework restricted by what is already known. Secondly the approach should be tempered by what is understood by semantics: what the researcher intends by the wording of a category is not necessarily what is understood by the individual respondent when reading, and in this sense, the variables are impossible to control. This thesis attempts to chart a middle course between the poles of thick description and phenomenology and the categorisations of environmental psychology, and it is to the rationale of this study that discussion now turns.

2.4 Rationale

This chapter has reviewed the development of the heritage discourse with particular attention to the second museums revolution, the growing interest in and demand for
community participation in heritage and the social justice objectives with which such participation can be tasked. The interest of communities in engaging with their heritage has been seen as ‘unofficial community heritage’ and linked to the discourse of globalisation. The interest of heritage studies with the notion of place has been overviewed and a dearth of literature identified. Rather is has been necessary to turn to the field of geography and the growth of interest in the experience of place and development of a subfield of ‘human geography’ have been described. The synergies with geography and the discourse of heritage have been indicated, particularly with David Harvey’s reference to ‘militant particularism’ as a reaction to globalisation. This chapter has also referenced the epistemological tension between environmental psychology and human geography and the difficulty in empirical exploration of ‘sense of place’. The following is the final section of this chapter and takes the context presented above as the point of departure for the research herein presented.

2.4.1 Addressing the gap

Every society has had a relationship with its past, even those which have chosen to ignore it, and it is through understanding the meaning and nature of what people tell each other about their past; about what they forget, remember, memorialise and/or fake, that heritage studies can engage with academic debates beyond the confines of present-centred cultural, leisure or tourism studies.  

(Harvey, 2001: 320)

In addressing what Smith has described as ‘infrequent’ examinations of place within heritage studies (2006: 75) this thesis adds to the body of knowledge within the field by attempting to tease out the specific contribution that heritage makes to the sense of place phenomenon. In so doing, it takes a view of heritage that goes beyond the materiality of objects and buildings to include the intangibility of heritage expressions and meaning making processes, ideas which are developed in Chapter Five. Building on notions emerging from ‘new museology’ (2.1.1) the thesis also looks to explore new roles for the museum in contemporary heritage management and it does so with
reference to the ‘ecomuseum,’ an idea explored in the detail of Chapter Seven. The thesis also endeavours to expand the understandings of heritage and participation described in section 2.2, by teasing out, and providing empirical data to illustrate, the social benefits of engagement with heritage.

Both heritage studies and geography have seen interest in heritage at the community level as a reaction to globalisation and the North Pennines is used here as a study of the role of heritage for small communities navigating socioeconomic change. Taking the view that there are parallels between ‘genius loci’ and UNESCO’s definition of ‘intangible heritage’ (Kurin, 2004), the thesis looks to explore issues of ‘safeguarding’ sense of place as communities experience the pressure of change. In methodology, this thesis addresses the tensions between human geography, anthropology and environmental psychology mapping a route to data collection that charts these fields. In achieving these goals, broad aims and specific, measurable objectives are required, and at this point the chapter is brought to a conclusion by their presentation. In addressing the ‘gap’ the central research questions, aims and objectives for the thesis have been set out in Chapter One section 1.1.1.
3. Chapter Three: Methodology

This chapter aims to present the reasoning behind methodological choices made during the research. Section 3.2 describes the development of an interview schedule and the piloting of this tool in the field. Data collection and analysis are considered in section 3.3 with focus upon the overall strategy, the sampling rationale and the methods of data-analysis. Finally the chapter examines the validity and triangulation of the data in terms of objectivity, validity and reliability (3.4), before conclusions are drawn. To begin however, the chapter examines the approach to research design, with attention to the collaboration and researcher, the epistemological paradigm within which decisions were made and the development of the fieldwork methods and tools (3.1).

3.1 Approach

What follows is an examination of the approach to research presented within this thesis. This section intends to describe the philosophical and epistemological positions from which the project developed. To begin, the following section recounts decisions made in the overall research design before moving on to examine the epistemological preferences in terms of ‘paradigm’ (3.1.2) and the fieldwork methods and tools (3.1.3).

3.1.1 Design

Undertaken as a collaborative PhD, the design of this research has been the product of meetings with the joint supervisory team from both Newcastle University and the North Pennines AONB Partnership. Notes from initial supervisory meetings that detailed the AONB Partnership’s interests in heritage landscapes and sense of place were developed into the central research questions and the aims and objectives that have been presented in detail in the previous chapter. It was important to make clear the contribution that the research could make to the AONB Partnership’s work from the start and it was agreed that for the AONB Partnership, the findings could influence strategy and inform future actions. The open receptiveness that the AONB Partnership brought to the collaboration influenced the development of an approach to theory
generation that is inductive rather than deductive and used qualitative techniques. Such techniques are subjective and it was important for the researcher to exercise reflexivity during data collection and analysis. It is accepted that choices made in the design of the research are inevitably informed by the interests, beliefs, experiences, knowledge and expertise of the person conducting the research (Creswell, 2003:182, Denscombe, 2007: 68-69, Punch, 1986: 21-22). Consequently it is pertinent to draw the reader’s attention to the interests and experiences of the researcher which have been detailed in Chapter One’s section 1.2.3.

3.1.2 Paradigm

The project has been designed within a specific research paradigm. This paradigm can be explained in terms of epistemology, qualitative ethnography, and the tensions therein. Discussion will examine each of these areas in turn before moving on to discuss the fieldwork methods in section 3.1.3.

Epistemology

Epistemology is the philosophy of enquiry and explanation and is closely knitted to ontology. Ontology refers to the underlying belief systems of the researcher. In other words the choice of methods for discovering new knowledge, and the type of knowledge produced are intimately related to the assumptions, concepts and propositions that orientate the researcher’s thinking (Krauss, 2005: 759). The epistemological orientation of this research follows constructivist ontology. This is the belief that human beings have their own views and ways of experiencing the world and that this must be taken into account during research. As a result, constructivist ontology posits that there is no objective reality, rather there are many realities constructed by the individuals experiencing the phenomenon being studied. The meaning lies in the cognition of individuals rather than any external element (Krauss, 2005: 760). The kind of knowledge produced therefore is purposefully constructed. Accordingly, the epistemology (or methodology) is informed by the assumption that the best way to understand a phenomenon is in its context. This understanding is best achieved through immersion
and the use of flexible data collection tools that can change as familiarity with the context is achieved. Overall, this is a view whereby theories are not seen to be absolutes that may simply be discovered from the world; rather theories are created through human judgement and interpretation which emerge from personal standpoints.

This is an epistemological approach known as ‘interpretivism’. The methodological intention was to gather data about experience from the perspective of the actor. The fieldwork determined to collect testimonies from local people who for the most part are not heritage professionals and to then generate theory inductively through analysis. In this sense the research can be seen through the lens of power relations and draws on ideas within feminist epistemology (Lennon, 2004: 1013). This is an epistemology that sees gendered and other power relations permeating social life and seeks to empower the bearers of knowledge as ‘knowers’ and therefore agents of change. Parallels can be drawn between the discourse of heritage studies that has seen value-judgements made by professional elites rather than local people, and the epistemology of feminism that sees power as excluding subaltern groups from enquiry, denigrating their ‘local’ cognitive styles and modes of knowledge (Anderson, 2000). For feminist researchers, all knowledge is situated and related to the idiosyncrasies of any given researcher’s prejudices and worldview (ibid).

In this sense the epistemology agrees with the philosophy of Emmanuel Kant (Beck, 1996) and anthropological work of Franz Boas (2004) and notions of cultural relativism; it is only possible to understand through the lens of one’s own knowledge and experience. To feminist researchers those holding power can produce theories of subordinated groups that reflect the researcher’s standpoint, present research subjects as inferior, cannot be used by them and only serve to reinforce hierarchies (Anderson, 2000). This research has sought to counter such approaches and it has been the endeavour of this project to give ‘voice’ to the respondents, populating the thesis with their own words and adding the testimonies of local people who are engaging with their heritage to the heritage studies canon. The object of this research has been to gather data about
experience from the perspective of those experiencing the phenomena. Such a posteriori knowledge lends itself to qualitative methods of data collection (Brewerton and Millward, 2001: 42).

**Qualitative ethnography**

Qualitative approaches view knowledge not as something that can simply be ‘discovered’ from the world (Hofer and Pintrich, 2009) with one single valid methodology to its acquisition. Contrary to positivist approaches, those employing qualitative techniques view knowledge as socially constructed (Creswell, 2003: 8). Accordingly, this exploration of ‘sense of place’ is informed by the interpretivist and broadly humanistic approach of phenomenology (for discussion see for example Relph, 1977) and approaches to data collection and analysis could be described as subjective (Layder, 1998). The view is taken that ‘sense of place’ is inherently subjective and it is appropriate therefore to develop qualitative approaches in its exploration. Qualitative methodologies are described as ‘ethnographic’ and tend to incorporate observation and interviewing, aiming to produce rich or ‘thick’ data. In this project’s exploration of sense of place, some observations took place and in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted, with an approach influenced by the main tenets of phenomenology.

After the work of German existential philosophers Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger in the nineteenth century, and the later work of Austrian social scientist Alfred Schutz, phenomenology is the study of ‘being’; the etymology of the word is ‘to study that which appears’ (see also the discussion of humanist geography in Chapter Two, section 2.3.2). Phenomenology is fitting for an exploration of sense of place, stressing as it does the need to understand the ‘socio-cultural lifeworld’ of respondents in order to appreciate the framework through which they experience their realities (Denscombe, 2007: 77). Interviews conducted can be described as the sort of ‘member’s accounts’ characteristic of phenomenology, whereby respondents explain their experiences and reasoning (ibid: 82). The interviews were long, allowing for deviation from the interview schedule’s structure and therefore gave interviewees scope to move
the discussion in the way they felt relevant. Characteristic of phenomenology, the interviews placed special emphasis on the individual’s views and personal experiences in order to understand their thinking.

Claims to phenomenology however must be tempered with the knowledge that parameters of access, resources and time, limited the degree to which immersion in the field was achievable. The research was conducted from a university base in Newcastle Upon Tyne, some distance from the North Pennines, a situation which limited access and also had implications in terms of fuel resources and travel time. Moreover, it was necessary to limit personal risk and therefore travel was only conducted in the spring and summer months, given the area is both remote and often exposed to extreme weather conditions in the autumn and winter. These parameters limited the capacity for exhaustive phenomenological study. Analysis shared some characteristics with phenomenology, for example, reflexivity might be likened to the epistemology’s use of ‘bracketing’ whereby the researcher attempts to set aside preconceived notions (see for example Creswell, 2003, Moustakas, 1994). The use of codes and categories are also similar to the clustering of meanings characteristic of phenomenological analysis and take the analysis close to revealing the essence of what is experienced as ‘sense of place’ and how this is experienced. It is clear however that both data collection and analysis were restricted: collection by distance and the level of immersion possible; and analysis by the number of interviews and the multiple phenomena into which the study sought to inquire. It was pragmatic to analyse with the aid of computer software in approaches informed by ‘grounded theory’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) and in this sense, the study departed from phenomenology. Such limitations present epistemological tensions and it is to these tensions that discussion now turns.

**Epistemological tensions**

Factors such as the views of a funder or sponsor, limitations of resources, access and time, plus the availability of subjects and data, produce epistemological tensions to be resolved by the researcher. The collaborative nature of the research presents tensions
particularly since the AONB Partnership acted as a gatekeeper and suggested the first respondents for interview. The motivations and interests of the AONB Partnership will unavoidably be reflected in the choice of these individuals and to a limited extent are salient to the knowledge claims made by the analysis. However the respondents specifically recommended by the AONB Partnership were those interviewed for the pilot study and after that, such bias was mitigated by the purposive sampling technique employed which is described later in this chapter (3.3.2). Beyond the limitations of practical parameters and potential bias presented by collaboration, epistemological tensions exist mainly around issues of positionality.

Issues of positionality must be considered in terms of situated knowledge, issues of impartiality and representation in analysis, truth and discourse, and the tension between description and interpretation presented by phenomenology. Each of these tensions will now be discussed in turn beginning with the notion of situated knowledge. This is the view that all knowledge is situated and that it is impossible to put the self to one side when conducting research. As a result, all knowledge claims are relative to the researcher’s identity which cannot be left behind when collecting data. This relativism extends to interpretation of the data and whilst a researcher must strive to do justice to the situations of others represented within the data, it must be clear that all writing is from a partial perspective and presents challenges in really ‘telling it like it is’ (Kvale, 1996: 122).

Knowledge claims must be made with an awareness of what critical thinkers Michel Foucault and Noam Chomsky have described in terms of ‘regimes of discourse’ (Wengraf, 2001: 7). In other words, knowledge claims are only based on what a respondent is actually prepared to disclose. An interview is not a window into a respondent’s reality or an unmediated snapshot of their world, rather it is a representation that they are either bound by the available modes of discourse to limit, or are intentionally limiting for the purposes of ‘acceptability’ or willingness to please. Interview responses cannot therefore be taken uncritically and it is in their
interpretation that one further epistemological tension presents. This tension is produced by the primacy given within phenomenological approaches to description without interpretation. Whilst this thesis has endeavoured to ‘give voice’ to the respondents and is heavily populated with their words and descriptions, it would be impossible to address the research questions without the interpretation which was achieved through the constant comparison analysis technique of ‘grounded theory’ (3.3.3).

The interview approach was therefore informed by phenomenology but as discussion in Chapter Two suggested, the methodology has attempted to chart a middle course between the descriptive approach of ethnography, phenomenology and inductive theory generation, and an approach to interpretation through application of codes and categories in analysis (section 2.3.4). Having examined the research design as a collaboration and the situated knowledge of the research (3.1.1) and the research paradigm in terms of epistemology, qualitative ethnography and the tensions therein (3.2.1) discussion now turns to the fieldwork itself and the methods and tools employed.

3.1.3 Fieldwork
In answering the central research questions, data were collected through desk-based documentary research and this included examination of ‘grey literature’ produced by the AONB Partnership and the International Centre for the Uplands at Cumbria alongside an academic literature review. ‘Grey literature’ has been described as, “information produced and distributed on all levels of government, academics, business and industry in electronic and print formats not controlled by commercial publishing…” (cited in Farace, 2007: 1). Whilst newsletters and website material were read and informed the research, analysis focussed upon the AONB’s two five yearly Management Plans for 2004-2009 and 2009- 2014. These documents give rich detail and context to projects that are otherwise only lightly summarised in other marketing material. In addition, where possible, the meetings of heritage groups, activities of heritage volunteers and local heritage exhibitions were observed in the field and this fieldwork schedule with an
example of the field notes can be found in Appendices Four and Five. New ideas were tested and verified through meetings with the collaborative partner and a summative presentation to the AONB Partnership Staff Unit. The greatest investment of fieldwork however was made in the collection of in-depth interviews with individuals engaging with heritage in the North Pennines and considerations in choosing to conduct in-depth interviews are the focus of this section.

Several data collection techniques were considered when planning the research. Some time was given to reviewing the literature describing the focus group technique, however this approach was dismissed after difficulties and limitations were considered. These challenges were presented by for example, the scattered nature of North Pennines residence and the availability of resources such as incentives, refreshments and venues. Moreover, it would be impossible to know how many focus groups were required since the technique demands meetings to be held until the generation of new ideas has been exhausted and discussion only serves to confirm theory (Krueger and Casey, 2000: 66). A quantitative methodology on the other hand, could have provided data pertaining to the dispersal of heritage engagement activities, the range and type of activity and perhaps could have indicated the number of people involved. The research question in this thesis however is exploratory in nature and the theory development inductive, so that it was not possible to know all of the categories of questioning that might be required at the beginning of the study in the way that is demanded of large scale survey questionnaires. Such a quantitative method would provide rigid, shallow data, unyielding to deep interrogation in the light of new theories emerging from iterative investigation. Rather, the central research question required rich, descriptive data and demanded personal and subjective responses. Whilst some of the cognitive mapping activities suggested by the UK based charity Common Ground (Clifford and King, 2010b) were tantalisingly in keeping with this study, their delivery faced limitations similar to those of focus groups. As a result of the considerations described here and throughout the discussion above (3.1.2) in-depth interviewing was chosen as the preferred data collection technique. The approach provides nuanced data and has the flexibility for interrogation of interesting leads with dynamic questioning. At this point
discussion hones in to focus on the development of the interview questions and their piloting.

3.2 Interview schedule and pilot

Before interviews were taken out into the field, a schedule of questions had to be developed and this schedule piloted and adjusted. What follows is a description of the process and considerations in developing this schedule and the issues that were brought to light by the pilot. The subsections which follow describe in-depth interviews (3.2.1), the design of the research tool (3.2.2), and the pilot (3.2.3).

3.2.1 In-depth interviews

In-depth interviews are usually half or semi-scripted with partially prepared questions that leave space for the pursuit of unexpected or interesting veins of enquiry (Wengraf, 2001: 3). Whilst having the appearance of a relaxed conversation, an in-depth interview maintains a very clear purpose (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003: 138). Semi-structured interviewing is concerned with model building and testing (ibid) and this special type of conversational interaction can be seen as an interview which is co-produced between the researcher and the respondent (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000: 47). General questions build the momentum of the conversation, but the interview can be open-ended with more specific questions introduced in response to ideas revealed during the conversation. It follows that there are no pre-established categories against which respondents may agree or disagree (Punch, 1998: 175) but this does not mean that questions are not related to theory for, “to leave background research until after you have started interviewing is to plan for a weak interview” (Wengraf, 2001: 80). Such interviews are structured according to a conceptual framework of posing and answering questions that are provided by the theoretical discourse (ibid: 53), however the interviews conducted in this research project were also designed to generate new ideas, making a light structure appropriate for uncovering what have been described as ‘empirical indicators’ or evidence of new concepts (ibid: 61). The objective of the interview is to understand what the respondent feels is important and how they
construct meanings. Norwegian psychologist, Steinar Kvale, suggested that within the structure of an interview will be elements of: introducing, probing, specifying, direct questioning, indirect questioning, silence and interpretation (1996: 33-35). It is to the development of this structure that focus now shifts.

3.2.2 Designing the tool
The central research questions and related theories were taken as the starting point for developing the interview questions. This approach, starting as it does with theory, has been described as ‘hypothetico-deductivist’ (Wengraf, 2001: 2). This is not however a pre-specified approach and the semi-structured nature of the interviews allows theory to unfold (Punch, 1998: 22). Developing questions using a hypothetico-deductivist model involved examining the central research question, then looking for theory questions that emerge from it, and developing these theory questions into a set of interview questions. Developing theory questions into interview questions then meant translating the ideas from the theory parlance of the research community into the everyday folk-language of the interviewee (Wengraf, 2001; 64, 182), or what has been described as ‘idiolect’ (Akmajian, 2001: 277, Eco, 1978: 272). The interview was constructed following the advice of social scientist Tom Wengraff whereby the central research question (CRQ) is reduced to theory questions (TQ) and specific interview questions or interview interventions (IQ or II) (see figure 5) using what he describes as The CRQ-TQ-IQ (II) Algorithm (2001: 62). The questions were designed using an iterative technique. Each theory produced three to seven interview questions and in generating the questions it was possible to work from both left to right or right to left in the model, either from the preferred interview question backwards to theory, or from theory forwards to the interview questions.

The CRQ-TQ-IQ (II) Algorithm however, produced an unmanageable number of questions which then had to be reduced into something that would allow all salient topics to be discussed within an acceptable time-frame. The interview had to be pared back which was not straightforward since it was important that the interview was well paced and
unhurried, but also that it was not superficial. The questions asked had to be accurate. In order to help establish accuracy, each question was mapped to its corresponding theory, themes and topics using a spreadsheet in Microsoft Excel. Using Excel’s autofilter tool in the spreadsheet, it was then possible to look at each question and its relevance to themes or topics in isolation and this helped in making decisions about which questions were most useful (see Appendix Two). Whilst the interview was gradually tightened, care was taken not to introduce finality at too early a stage and many questions were used in the pilot interviews that were later removed from the schedule, as the next section examines.
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3.2.3 The pilot

The interview schedule that was eventually piloted attempted to move from general to specific through the posing of indirect then more direct questions. The intention was to allow the respondent to ‘warm to the theme’ and to avoid ‘blindsiding’ them with direct questions about a situation that they might not have considered before in the sorts of terms and contexts used by the interviewer. This has been described as the difference
between the easy, tacit knowledge of ‘knowing how’ and difficulty in the articulation of ‘knowing that’ (Wengraf, 2001: 178). This was particularly pertinent in the North Pennines interviews with respondents happy to talk about the processes and products of their engagement with heritage but more challenged by questions about what heritage actually means to them. An unresolved tension in planning the order in which to ask the questions remained throughout the fieldwork, and this was the influence that the context of a question within the interview had on the nature of the response given. So a question about sense of place at the start of the interview was sometimes more challenging to the respondent than if it was placed at the end of the schedule after a good deal of discussion had taken place. To this extent, the interview schedule developed iteratively throughout the fieldwork as different approaches were tried and tested. Plans emerging from the CRQ-TQ-IQ (II) Algorithm produced an interview schedule which clearly grouped questions according to the theme or theory from which they were generated. However there were good reasons for breaking up this logical and theoretical sequence, as a transparent theoretical line of inquiry might influence or ‘contaminate’ the data (ibid: 162). The logical schedule was then translated into something more practical allowing a discussion that traced the theoretical interests of the research with more subtlety, producing a final semi-structured interview schedule that could be taken into the field and piloted.

Following discussion with the AONB Partnership, initial plans were to examine the experiences and issues of particular typologies of respondents for example, ‘collectors’ or ‘botanists’ and the pilot interview schedule was developed into an A5 sized booklet with ‘generic’ questions then specific questions related to these typologies. This was absolutely impractical when taken into the field as it was impossible for respondents to answer such a large number of questions in any depth within a realistic amount of time. For the interviewer, consciousness of time and the unwieldy number of questions detracted from close listening, eye contact and the following up of interesting leads and therefore presented an obstacle to achieving a relaxed conversation. After the pilot then, the schedule was again pared back to just the generic questions thereby allowing generous space to ask specific questions and encourage elaboration. The redrafted
schedule involved open questions that would stimulate conversation against each theme or topic. The schedule still ran onto two sides of A4 and remained unwieldy in the field. It was apparent that the conversations needed less structure in order to be truly deep. The ‘interview schedule’ was eventually condensed into a ‘guide’ with brief prompts to help the interviewer keep the conversation focussed on the required topic (figure 6). This process of both design and technique of interview has been described as ‘tight versus loose’ or the shifting from the product of an deductive research design to the process of an inductive interview (Bateson cited Wengraf, 2001: 2, Miles and Hubermand cited Punch, 1998).

Interview Guide
- Have you always lived here?
- Describe the differences between here and other places.
- If this is a cultural landscape, what are the important elements for you?
- Have you seen any changes to the locality?
- Would you be sorry to leave?
- Describe heritage activities you are involved in.
- Why did you decide to get involved?
- Why do you continue to be involved?
- Why is this work important to you?
- What is the importance to you personally?
- What new skills have you learned?
- Has involvement led to any changes in your life?
- Tell me about the people you have met through heritage activity.
- What do you know of other heritage groups?
- Does heritage contribute to senses of belonging?
- Does heritage contribute to feelings of rootedness? Why? How?
- Describe how your involvement has affected the way you feel about the place?
- If you could have done anything differently in your heritage project what would it have been?
- Who led your project? Who guides it now? (AONB Partnership?)
- What are your hopes for the future?
- Who have you done this heritage work for?
- What do you think a visitor’s sense of place might be?
- Are you interested in interacting with visitors?
- Tell me about sense of place here, the heritage, the cultural landscape: customs; food; dialect; events; characters; music?
- What changes have you seen to the above?
- Are there any threats?

Figure 6 Interview guide
Learning the craft of interviewing was an iterative process throughout the fieldwork. For example, during the pilot fear of ‘contaminating’ the data by revealing too much about the research questions, led to some obtuse responses from interviewees. Whilst it was important to be reflexive and aware of the standpoint from which the research was conducted, a balance was sought between anxiety about contamination and the pursuit of grounded theory whereby theories emerging from analysis are taken back into the field. Practising empathy and developing sensitivity to what is and is not being said, were other elements of the interview craft which had to be developed. It was also necessary to learn close listening in order to identify and follow interesting leads but also develop the assertiveness to return to the interview guide when a discursive tangent appeared unfruitful.

3.3. Data collection and analysis
To this point, discussion has established the practical parameters within which the research was conducted. Ethnographic phenomenological approaches were used, but it was beyond the reach of this project to collect data in what anthropologist Kenneth Pike would describe as an ‘emic’ or insider position as a group member or resident, rather interviews were conducted from an ‘etic’ or outsider standpoint (cited in Duranti, 1997: 172). In-depth interviews are useful for probing ideas, feelings and attitudes and the following subsections describe the approach to interviewing in terms of ‘strategy’, the selection of respondents as ‘sampling’ and the interpretation of findings as ‘analysis’.

3.3.1 Strategy
Interplay of roles and perceptions of power run through the interview exchange. In approaching an interview it was necessary to consider factors that might impact on the atmosphere and success of the exchange. These factors might include the pressures of time upon the respondent and the extent to which they are willing or able to give up part of their day’s schedule. It was important to be sensitive and respectful but also assertive when the balance of power was tipped in relation to age, experience, education, social position and so on (Wengraf, 2001: 43). Moreover, individuals have
different experiences of being interviewed in different contexts and these can be positive, such as brief chats with market researchers on the street, to negative such as inquiries conducted by the police. All of these experiences affect the comfort with which a respondent enters into the research interview. So it was important to be sensitive and make the interview exchange as comfortable as possible. For this reason, interviews were conducted at a place of the respondent’s choosing. The style of the interview was both consciously planned and unconsciously developed for example, lengthy responses were encouraged and it became important to hold back from interrupting. The timing of interventions was a matter of judgement as too were the cues given about the type of answer required for example: “feel free to go into detail in answering my next question” (ibid: 169). The interview guide was successful and the duration of most interviews was well beyond an hour, with the shortest interview lasting forty minutes. The longest interview lasted several hours starting in the late morning and continuing over sandwiches into the early afternoon. This respondent was a rich source of data and the selection of appropriate respondents is the topic of the next subsection.

3.3.2 Sampling
As discussion has already revealed, introductions were made to the first respondents by the AONB Partnership who therefore acted as a gatekeeper (3.2.3). From this point a sampling technique was used that followed the theory of purposive, ‘snowball’ or ‘chain’ sampling (Patton, 1990 cited in Siegle, 2009). Purposive sampling has been popular in types of research where subjects are chosen because of some shared characteristic, in this case, their involvement in heritage related activity (ONS, 2008, Silverman, 2005: 129). By using this kind of sampling, the intention was to identify individuals who were participating in heritage-related activities. The sampling strategy was successful and those twenty seven individuals with whom interviews were conducted were engaged with heritage through a variety of projects such as: village shows, community archaeology, local history publications and exhibitions, natural heritage conservation, traditional music, traditional crafts, heritage trusts and societies, volunteer led museums and the recording of sense of place through oral history and photography (see Appendix Three). Purposive sampling involved each respondent in the identification of further
individuals who could provide relevant accounts in interview (Schutt, 2009: 174). Some opportunistic sampling was used, for example, some interviews were conducted ad hoc during the fieldwork when interesting respondents presented themselves. Otherwise, initial contact was made with respondents by telephone. This conversation was followed up with a meeting at a location of the respondent’s choice where the interview was conducted. The sampling strategy is detailed in figure 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snowball Sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Pennines AONB Partnership introduced NP02, NP03 and NP04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP01 introduced NP15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP15 introduced NP18, NP19 and NP05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP04 introduced NP26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met NP07 through fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP07 introduced NP14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP14 introduced NP06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP07 introduced NP08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP08 introduced NP10 and NP09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP10 introduced NP12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP07 introduced NP13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP16 introduced NP17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONB Partnership introduced NP21 and NP22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP26 introduced NP23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP23 introduced NP24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met NP27 through fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 List detailing how respondents recommended one another using a ‘snowball’ sampling technique.

One difficulty with sampling in this way is in identifying the point at which the data collection is complete. Throughout the data collection a constant comparison technique was used and when new interviews began to reflect the main themes of those previously conducted this was taken as an indication that fieldwork was achieving saturation point and approaching its end. As Denscombe explains, “it is only when the new data seems to confirm the analysis rather than add anything new that the sampling ceases and the sample size is enough” (2007: 96).

3.3.3 Analysis
This chapter has stressed the importance of an inductive approach to this research and as such interviews were transcribed verbatim and in their entirety in order that every possible theme and code could be included in the analysis. Analysis used ‘grounded theory’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, Strauss, 1987, Strauss and Corbin, 1997) which has
been described as probably, “the most widely employed interpretive strategy in the social sciences today” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994: 204) and has been used as a strategy for both fieldwork and analysis with a tendency for researchers to ‘adopt and adapt’ (Denscombe, 2007: 89). In its original form grounded theory requires a researcher to approach data collection and analysis with a ‘blank’ or ‘open’ mind (Denscombe, 2007: 90). The use of grounded theory has to be reconciled with the development of an interview schedule that shows an awareness of previous applicable theories. Glaser and Strauss (1967) concede: “To be sure, one goes out and studies an area with a particular… perspective and with a focus, a general question or problem in mind…” (cited in Denscombe, 2007: 91). The grounded theory approach has been criticised as impractical given the emphasis it puts on the need to ignore everything that has come before and so in practice it tends not to take so rigid a form. Strauss and Corbin’s later version of the theory (1997) suggests that the early questions and areas for observation might be provisionally informed by the literature in order to provide a starting point.

In this sense the analysis finds synergy with the theory of interpretation known as hermeneutics. Whilst traditionally about written texts, contemporary hermeneutics encompasses everything within the interpretive process. This approach embraces the limited and continuing nature of interpretation, acknowledging that whilst theories are shaped by data, they can never adequately reflect the complex realities of people’s lives and the work of the researcher is therefore never finished (Ezzy, 2002: 23). Hermeneutics rejects the Enlightenment’s quest for universal truths, with the philosophers of hermeneutics suggesting, “the lived life is never entirely comprehensible” (Merleau-Ponty cited in ibid: 24). This is a view of research and interpretation as an iterative process which moves from theory to data and back again in what is described as the ‘hermeneutic circle’. Departing from grounded theory to an analysis informed by hermeneutics accommodates the role of theory within the process.

Grounded theory requires that emerging theory is compared to all the previous data so that the research findings can never move too far away from what is evidenced. As such,
the findings better ‘fit’ the real world and are more credible since they never move too far away from what is happening ‘on the ground’. The North Pennines interviews were recorded as MP3 files and transcribed electronically by tabbing on a computer between Windows Media Player Classic and Microsoft Word. This technique allowed for notes and memos to be jotted within the transcribed text. An extract from an interview transcript can be found in Appendix Six. These files were then transferred to QSR N-Vivo 8, which is computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) founded on the constant comparison approach of grounded theory (Lonkila, 1995). Within N-Vivo it was possible to work through each transcribed interview highlighting text and adding to ‘nodes’ or codes. As data were compared, these ‘nodes’ or codes, became ‘parent’ and ‘child’ or rather categories and subcategories. Further memos could be added to the transcriptions raising questions about the emerging codes or drawing attention to interesting data. Using the software helped develop a close familiarity with the data and the built in tools for recording decisions, conceptual and theoretical thinking, and links between memos, documents and nodes helped develop a dynamic audit trail that could meet the criteria of transparency (Bringer et al., 2003: 7). The software also allowed for queries to be run for example in order to search on the recurrence of a particular word or phrase in the transcriptions.

Categories or ‘nodes’ were developed into ‘parent nodes’ and subsets to form ‘trees’ in N-Vivo and nodes were developed iteratively as each interview was coded. Forty nine ‘parent’ nodes were created with associated ‘child’ and ‘grandchild’ nodes. Examples of this coding process for the category (or ‘parent node’) ‘sense of place’ can be seen in Appendix Seven and further coding under the subcategory (or ‘child node’) ‘employment’ is illustrated in Appendix Eight. In total, the data were sorted into around a thousand nodes. In trying to make sense of these categories and the large amount of supporting data, it became necessary to return to the literature. Chapter Two suggested that the research attempted to chart a ‘middle course’ between humanistic and interpretivist approaches emerging from geography and anthropology, and the positivistic approach of environmental psychology, and it was at this point of data collection that new navigational routes were plotted. As discussion in Chapter Four will
show, the indicators, categories and subsets presented by environmental psychology provided a useful path through the breadth and depth of the data. These codes and categories were useful in selecting nodes from the N-Vivo database with which to begin to build answers to questions about heritage, sense of place and ecomuseum potential in the North Pennines. The validity of this analysis is discussed in the last section of this chapter.

3.4 Triangulation and validity

Concepts such as internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity are more traditionally applied to quantitative research. However work has been done to translate these concepts to qualitative research contexts (Guba and Lincoln, 2005: 207-208). Methodologists have debated the value of using a set of standards designed for application to quantitative studies to assess qualitative research. Whilst some argue that efforts to translate the concepts between epistemological paradigms amount only to a relabeling of the quantitative criteria, which could be applied to a qualitative setting as they stand, others suggest that changing the criteria for qualitative research reflects the difference in philosophy between positivist quantitative researchers and constructivist qualitative researchers (Trochim, 2006). Guba and Lincoln’s work suggests that qualitative research should take objectivity as ‘confirmability’, internal validity as ‘credibility’, external validity as ‘transferability’ and reliability as ‘dependability’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Each of these ideas will now be discussed in turn.

3.4.1 Objectivity

Following a tradition established in the social sciences, this research investigates the, “consequences of inner existential choices made by people” (Kirk and Miller, 1986: 10) by exploring individuals and their reasons for taking certain actions. It is driven by the assumption that investigations employ the researcher in an interpretation of data. Objectivity for the qualitative researcher therefore eschews the search for absolute ‘truth’ (Popper, 1959) so that the assumptions underwriting objectivity are that, “there is a world of empirical reality out there but the way we perceive or understand this world
is largely up to us” (Kirk and Miller, 1986: 12). Objectivity is a valuable goal and whilst some see it as a goal sought through the cultivation of the validity and reliability discussed below (ibid), others believe it is to be achieved through ‘confirmability’ (Trochim, 2006). Confirmability is the degree to which the results of the research can be confirmed or corroborated by others. In this thesis, objectivity is achieved through ‘confirmability’ whereby theories are checked and rechecked using constant-comparison within the data, and this process is documented using notes and memos. The research was continually discussed within the research community both at Newcastle University and through presentation of the findings at a number of national and international conferences. These conferences have resulted in publication, three of which are in press entitled:


Hawke, S. 2011 ‘Communities safeguarding sense of place in the North Pennines: routes to social sustainability?’ In Kaminski, J and Sodagar, B ed. *Heritage Impact 2010: The Fifth International Symposium on the Socio Economic Impact of Cultural Heritage*

Hawke, S. 2011.’Local residents exploring heritage in the North Pennines of England: sense of place and social sustainability’ in *The International Journal of Heritage and Sustainable Development*

and two of which were produced in conference proceedings:


These publications refer to the data discussion presented in Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven. Findings were also regularly presented to the collaborative partner who was able to confirm if the findings ‘rang true’ and this process culminated in a presentation of the findings to the AONB Partnership Staff Unit. In this way emergent theories could be exposed to questioning and confirmation and with the reflexivity of the ‘situated knower’ leading to continual auditing for bias, it was possible to strive for qualitative approximations of ‘objectivity’ and ‘confirmability’.

### 3.4.2 Validity

All research demands consideration of the validity and reliability of its tools. Validity can be taken as the ability of an instrument to measure what it was designed to measure. Kumar (2005) has suggested that validity can take two perspectives. The first asks whether the research investigation is providing answers to the research questions for which it was undertaken, and the second asks, if so, whether the research is providing answers using the appropriate methods and procedures (Kumar, 2005: 153). Following Kumar’s view of validity, a case has been made for the appropriateness of the methodological choices made in this study (3.1.2 and 3.3). In particular the appropriateness of the instrument can be assessed by the rigor with which logical links were made between questions and objectives (Kumar, 2005: 154-155) and these were discussed in section 3.2.2. Guba and Lincoln (2005) on the other hand, translate the notion of ‘internal validity’ in quantitative research into ‘credibility’ for qualitative approaches. This means that participants should be able to accept the findings as a believable account. It follows that the constant-comparison method of grounded theory may be taken as an approximation of the credibility that the findings would present to
the research population. This kind of validity involves ‘within-method’ triangulation whereby the findings from one interview are checked against the findings from a number of other interviews conducted with different individuals who have different backgrounds and experiences.

External validity in qualitative research has been seen as the extent to which the findings can be transferred to other settings. This is often achieved by using a number of data collection techniques in order to triangulate the findings between methods: “the observation of the research issue from (at least) two different points” (Flick et al., 2007). However as suggested in the discussion of internal validity described above, this can also occur within-method. Nevertheless, external validity has not been sought in the study. The sampling technique used in this study does not allow for generalisations to be made to the wider parent population or indeed any population beyond this data-set. It is however possible to make theoretical generalisations from the research and this is achieved through the reliability and validity of the methods and their careful documentation, described in section 3.2.2.

This chapter has sought to demonstrate the thorough and careful system through which the data collection tools were developed, sampling conducted and analysis performed and makes a case for the reliability of the research. Data collection and analysis have been carefully documented so if hypothetically, another researcher were to use this material to follow the same steps in the research, they should emerge with similar analysis, allowing margin for situated interpretation. These steps indicate an attempt to support the reliability of the research and as such, theoretical generalisations can be made. This means that the theory can be transferred to other similar settings and populations so that the inferences drawn from the research are suitable for the development of wider theory (Lewis and Ritchie, 2003: 264). This is a point returned to in Chapter Eight, section 8.3.4.
Conclusions
This chapter has outlined and described the interpretivist epistemological paradigm within which this research was conducted and this paradigm was exposed as drawing on feminist epistemology (3.1.2). The methodology is one of qualitative ethnography and in particular has been influenced by the phenomenological tradition emerging from existential philosophy. Epistemological tensions have been highlighted and they derive from the practical limitations of the research. These limitations are specifically the level of ethnographic or phenomenological immersion it was possible to achieve in the field and the positionality of the researcher and its implications for objectivity. The approach to fieldwork has been described with techniques including desk-based searches of both academic and grey literature, observation and in-depth interviews alongside regular reflection with the collaborative partner during supervisory meetings (3.1.3).

The development of the interview schedule and its pilot have been described in detail (3.2) along with the methods of sampling in the field and analysing the data (3.3) and in this way it is intended that the findings achieve validity and reliability (3.4). The within-method approach to triangulation was described in the final section of this chapter and the implications for generalisation of the findings. To this point the dissertation has described the development of the research project, the history and contemporary issues of the locale within which the research has been conducted and given the theoretical context for the research questions. Aims and objectives have been presented and the methodology critiqued. Having established the context, approach and techniques used, the following chapters move on from these foundations to describe substantial data and discuss analysis. Following the thick description advocated by the ethnographic approach of this research, the chapters which follow are necessarily robust, and the reader may discern a shift in pace that these weightier chapters effect.
4. Chapter Four: Sense of Place

During the summer of 2008, interviews were conducted with people who lived in, or worked in the North Pennines AONB. Criteria in selecting the respondents, using a snowball sampling method, was only that they were involved, voluntarily or for leisure, in activities that allowed them to explore an interest in heritage (see the previous chapter’s discussion in section 3.3.2). Data were analysed to examine these accounts for similarities in approaches to the new museological paradigm of ‘ecomuseum’ (discussed in Chapter Seven), for the motivations of respondents in ‘getting involved’ and the benefits of this involvement (discussed in Chapter Six), for the contribution of heritage resources, expressions and processes to this sense of place (Chapter Five) and broadly to examine the character of sense of place in the North Pennines. Discussion in the previous chapter’s section 3.3.3 described the numerous themes emerging from the process of coding the interview transcripts. The resulting N-Vivo database presented a thicket of branching categories and subsets. To illuminate routes through this conceptual undergrowth it became necessary to re-examine the literature presented in Chapter Two and the notions applied to empirical sense of place enquiry from environmental psychology were particularly applicable and useful.

The data revealed complex and varied ways in which sense of place is created in the North Pennines and this chapter examines these accounts in the light of salient research, literature and theory. In terms of this chapter’s structure, sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 examine the accounts with reference to ideas derived from environmental psychology namely: place dependency (4.4), place attachment (4.3) and place identity (4.2). A robust chapter, what follows gives significant empirical detail to support the discussion and the weighty analysis of place identity in section 4.2 endeavours to introduce a framework for exploring sense of place which is returned to in later chapters. To begin, it was interesting to challenge the notion of the ‘North Pennines’ as a holistic landscape unit and the following section (4.1) explores the geographical ‘scale’ of sense of place for those who took part in interviews during the summer of 2008.
4.1 Sense of place and scale

Discussion above (Chapter Two, section 2.3.1) cited Kevin Walsh (1992) for whom the ideal locality is at a scale that people can come to terms with, can feel attachment with and therefore should be encouraged to define for themselves. The charity Common Ground work extensively with communities to explore and safeguard local distinctiveness and suggest that, “Locality needs to be defined from the inside, with a cultural and natural base, less abstraction, more detail” (Clifford and King, 1993: 11). This is a view echoed by environmental psychology. As Bechtel et al. note:

Since, phenomenologically, places are locations of our departure and return with which we entertain emotional bonds and where we are known and know others, it is understandable that places will be encountered on various levels of space appropriation: my place at the table, my house, my neighbourhood, my country, and, moving up to the globe, as seen by an astronaut out on the moon, my planet. Whatever we call ‘place’ (with the obligatory possessive pronoun) is a condensed form or focus of lifeworld.

(Bechtel et al., 2002: 108)

Following the chosen research methodology, it is important not to predetermine the scale of place-sensing in question, but in fact to allow the participants themselves to define the place with which they identify (following the argument of Graham et al., 2009). There is a body of literature to support the existence of place and identity at a national level (Fladmark, 1999, Graham, 1994, Shields, 1991, Wright, 1985) and it is also accepted that place can be sensed from the immediate: the home or street, to the local, regional and beyond. Indeed the data revealed place to operate on a pyramid of scales, with many respondents recognising and identifying with the North Pennines as a region, but others feeling very closely affiliated with their town or village. What follows scrutinises the scale at which sense of place is described by individuals in the North Pennines and begins firstly (in section 4.1.1) with an overview of data pertaining to identification with the North Pennines as a unit, then this is contrasted with data that indicate a fragmented sense of place in the region.
4.1.1 Scales of sense of place

The North Pennines as a geographical concept is reinforced by the boundary of the AONB, which appears to be widely recognised amongst residents of the region. The notion of the AONB as a defining landscape unit jostles however with other ideas such as ‘dale’, ‘moor’ or the administrative units of local authority or county. As discussion above has indicated, place can be experienced at a variety of scales; the home scale, street scale, local scale or regional scale. Educational sociologist Shmuel Shamai (1991) has attempted to systematically analyse sense of place in the pursuit of positivist forms of knowledge and has examined the ‘nested allegiances’ at the scale of country, province or metropolitan area for Jewish students in Toronto, Canada. He suggests that, “The word place is ‘dimensionless’; it can apply to any scale, from an individual home to any part of the globe…” (Shamai, 1991: 347). If sense of place however, is synonymous with feelings, then place, Shamai suggests, must be a piece of the whole environment claimed by those feelings (Gussour cited in ibid: 347).

This section examines the scale at which sense of place is described in the North Pennines. Beginning with a discussion of the identification with the geographical concept of the North Pennines, discussion then examines data that indicate a sense of the North Pennines as a cohesive unit with shared characteristics. Next the fragmented character of sense of place in the North Pennines will be examined. This will be followed by reflection on the perceived implications of this fragmentation for heritage management systems. Finally the attachment of respondents to place on a smaller scale will be discussed.

The North Pennines AONB was designated by the UK Government in 1988 and before this time, it might be suggested anecdotally that the area was less frequently referred to as ‘North Pennines’. However since its inception, the AONB Partnership has worked hard to raise the profile of this conceptualisation of the landscape unit. References to the
AONB as a landscape unit formed a strong subcategory within a ‘scale’ code in the interview analysis. This is reflected by the following respondent who said:

*I mean the... I think by virtue of the outreach from the AONB Partnership at Stanhope... some individuals and organisations within the village are aware of the North Pennines as an entity, but more through the work that those individuals have done and the contribution that certain people have made erm, within the village rather than feeling, you know, ’we’re part of the North Pennines,’ so that would be my experience really...* (NP26).

Such comments indicate the sense in which the ‘North Pennines’ as a region might be seen to have been artificially imposed but also the way in which residents have been persuaded to embrace this conceptualisation of the region. The above comment illustrates a sentiment characteristic of the other responses coded to this category, in that, although the concept of the ‘North Pennines’ is felt to be fairly new, the description is recognised and residents are comfortable with the idea. Indeed it would be fair to note that none of the respondents described the ‘North Pennines’ as an alien idea. The following respondent, a representative from Killhope Lead Mining Museum, understood the wider geographical notion as context to more localised place-sensing:

*We’ve always seen this place as sitting in the context of the North Pennines. Not just in the County Durham context and that’s... I think that’s the important...er we sit right at the west of County Durham. We sit right in the centre of North Pennines, and we’ve seen our interpretation role as being the lead mining heritage of the North Pennines, not the lead mining heritage of Weardale...* (NP16).

Whilst discussion below will show that attachments are perhaps more localised, a strong sense of some form of shared characteristic came through:

*You’re in the same landscape and the factors that formed that landscape and the current communities are much the same whichever county they’re in. The coherence is in the North Pennines, rather than in the County structure* (NP16).
So it might be seen that sense of place does occur at the larger, regional scale that might be described as the ‘North Pennines’:

I... think it’s... it’s the mining heritage that is in common, and the effect that’s had on the landscape that’s in common. Dialect is quite different actually. But the culture is very similar. The historical culture is very similar. I’m not talking about the fringes of the North Pennines, I’m talking about, if you like, about the heartland of the mining economy of the nineteenth century, eighteenth century, nineteenth century mining economy which is I suppose a good part of Teesdale, Allendale, a large part of Alston Moor and Weardale. The centre of the AONB. It does have more in common than it has distinctively different... (NP16).

In many ways then, it might be seen that the description, ‘North Pennines’ does function to amalgamate an assortment of valleys, villages and towns that are connected through cultural characteristics related to industrial practices and land-use, that might indicate a shared sense of place. However, data also provided evidence of perceived fragmentation as the next section discusses.

The data support the view that sense of place can be identified on the scale of a unified and cohesive unit called the ‘North Pennines’ but this must be tempered by data coded within the category of ‘scale’ that reveals the region to be powerfully fragmented. Topographically, population in the region is divided by hills and moors and clustered into valleys. Administratively those same populations were until very recently divided into some eleven different local authorities and three county boundaries (in April 2009 structural changes to local government were implemented creating unitary authorities in areas which previously had two tier systems). As discussion above shows, the introduction of the AONB boundary and the concept of the North Pennines have served to further complicate scales of place-sensing for residents and visitors alike. Whilst it has been seen in the quotes above, that there are cultural characteristics serving to unify sense of place across the AONB or ‘North Pennines’ region, affinities with the cultural heritage of other regions overlap and add to feelings of fragmentation. It could however,
be this very complexity that characterises the ‘uniqueness’ of the region and these ideas are examined below.

Fragmentation in the North Pennines contributes to sense of place. The discussion which follows will examine the nature of this fragmentation, beginning with the impediment of natural topography to the continuity of sense of place. Administrative boundaries, including the boundary of the AONB itself, slice through otherwise distinct ‘pieces of the whole environment’ and quotes will be presented that illustrate this experience. Next this section will examine the cultural references that can be at once holistic and yet patchy. Finally this section will indicate the way in which this very fragmentation is part of the unique experience of sense of place in the North Pennines.

Fragmentation in the North Pennines occurs initially or more viscerally at the level of topography. The rivers Tyne, Wear and Tees cut the region into valleys or dales, patterned by the legacy of enclosure, that stretch beyond into the rising fells. The AONB Partnership point out that these peat and heather fells, the moorland between one valley and another and the uninhabited upland areas managed for sheep and grouse, are the product of a continuation of established land management methods that retain the diverse nature of the North Pennines landscape from the Victorian era (AONB, 2004: 16). This is a diversity that endows the landscape with a distinctive lustre, but affected sense of place for respondents in this study whose responses were coded into the subcategory of ‘fragmentation’ within the node ‘scale’:

… if you think of the geography of the area, you’ve got Tynedale, you’ve got Weardale and you’ve got Teesdale and you’ve got Blanchland with the River Derwent here, and this tiny little narrow valley, and it doesn’t really relate to anywhere (NP26).

The respondent here fails to find a sense of unity across the region, finding that his valley ‘doesn’t really relate to anywhere’. In contrast however, other respondents reported a sense of unity through isolation within the dale:
But on the whole I would say they've got a distinct character that is Weardale and is similar to Teesdale’s. I suppose the two North Pennine Dales, shut off for much of the year, quite often, especially in the nineteenth century when the, you know, Dickens-style winters. Erm... that they erm, turned in on themselves (NP09).

So that whilst the geographical fragmentation is recognised, these respondents were keen to impress that a sense of some ‘commonality’ across the region, prevailed:

Well here you’ve got the Pennines and all the different valleys, the Killhope Ridge sort of thing, the ridge that goes down the different valleys. So in a way they’re isolated but they’ve got very common background, you know the mining background. And living in an isolated place as well, so there are (sic) sort of a common feel to things... (NP10).

There is fragmentation in terms of firstly topography then, and secondly the region is fragmented into administrative boundaries. The numerous and overlapping place boundaries form a sense of confusion that in turn adds to the character of sense of place in the North Pennines for residents but as this respondent suggests, particularly for visitors:

... then you think of like the higher up you go people might think, ‘Oh well that’s the North Pennines because they say Weardale here,’ but actually it starts here – the North Pennines – so it’s quite confusing to people I think – where does the North Pennines actually start and where does it finish? And that is a big confusion with people... (NP02).

Whilst confusing, the overlay of boundaries also becomes an issue for manageability of place:

The fact that for example, Blanchland is in Northumberland but has a Durham postcode, Blanchland belongs to Tynedale in terms of local government but the people here and the place, doesn’t relate to Tynedale at
all really. And it’s constantly being bounced backwards and forwards between Weardale and Tynedale and er, it doesn’t, it doesn’t have a natural connection to anywhere else at all really (NP26).

Difficulties with finding a coordinated management system for safeguarding sense of place in the region are exacerbated as expressed by this representative of the Killhope Lead Mining Museum in reference to the relationship between Nenthead Mines and Killhope:

... what the AONB Partnership lacks still, and I don’t see any great desire there to push it forward, is a tourism strategy for the whole North Pennines. They need one. Because then this kind of development would sit in the strategic framework for the North Pennines. But until that tourism framework for the North Pennines develops there isn’t actually one (muffled) across the whole patch and we continue to be working in separate regions. I think what the North Pennines people (staff from the AONB Partnership) would say is - and rightly - that they’re not a tourism organisation. They’re a landscape conservation organisation. And it could be argued that conservation and sustainable tourism go hand in hand and you need therefore a tourism strategy to underpin your landscape conservation (NP16).

The potential for such difficulties to be overcome using models derived from ecomuseology are discussed in Chapter Seven.

Discussion here then, has shown that sense of place in the North Pennines suffers from fragmentation in terms of topography, confusing place boundaries and administrative boundaries. The third element of fragmentation is that produced through notions of cultural identity. Respondents described a variety of regional cultural characteristics with which they felt affinity. Whilst the data would appear to support the recognition of the ‘North Pennines’ as a wider region, it is also apparent that residents in the North Pennines are more comfortable in describing their sense of place on a smaller scale:
But I also think if you ask most people where they belong, they would not say the North Pennines... they would say their own locality. Whether that was Stanhope, Weardale, particularly Weardale and this area (NP16).

The data would appear to support the view that these smaller units of place such as town (Stanhope) or valley (Weardale) command allegiance yet share their characteristics, as has been indicated above. This next respondent, a field archaeologist by training and born and bred in Weardale, describes with fascinating insight the cultural heritage that unites places on the smaller scale within the North Pennines region and makes them distinctive from other places:

...if you look at population movements in the nineteenth century, there was an awful lot more going on between Teesdale, Weardale and South Tynedale. There’s a lot of population movement between the three areas but less so to the East Durham and further North and South. So I think... to me... it’s probably the geology that’s the reason for that, the jobs are the same so I think when you’re talking about sense of community and sense of place and all that, the North Pennines is a better area say than County Durham because East Durham and West Durham are totally different. The people are different the cultures are different (NP08).

Other responses coded within the ‘fragmentation’ node, revealed a struggle to define a sense of shared characteristic. The following respondent appears to borrow from more established cultural and place identities and defines the cultural heritage of her nearby conurbation of Alston in relation to Cumbria to its west (within which county boundary it sits) and Tyneside and Northumberland to the east:

I think here it’s more connected with the North East. Oh definitely, always has, always have... people go to Newcastle, they don’t go to Carlisle much from here. And they are connected with the North East definitely. The local population – yes. And being in sort of Cumbria, we’re just a little corner aren’t we and really, you don’t really feel part of Cumbria. It is more the North East. Yes. Its just sort of laid back and easy going and friendly (NP14).
For other respondents there was less pressure to conform their sense of cultural heritage to preconceived or dominant ideas of regional cultural identity, with the following respondent working hard to otherwise define the cultural narrative of his home in Alston:

...people lean in different directions on Alston Moor. They lean to the North East, they lean to Hexham, they’ll lean to Penrith and they’ll maybe lean to Carlisle. But very few people lean to Middleton in Teesdale, the road’s shut all winter... But social interaction isn’t very heavy in that direction and we don’t also identify very heavily I think with any county. You know erm we’re on the border of Northumberland, County Durham and Cumbria and honestly people, you know, fairly much just don’t care. Our local newspapers come from all the surrounding, satellite places and you just watch different people and you can say, they’ll be a Penrith - they’ll be a Cumberland and Westmorland (the ‘Cumberland and Westmorland Herald’) person and so on. You’ll see which to pick up. So you could identify people like that (NP11).

The cultural identity of a number of satellite places exerts conflicting pulls on sense of place in the North Pennines for this respondent:

... I tend to think of it as a sort of, rather, in between place: a comfortable, in between place. In terms of... if I’m not careful I’m going to paint a picture of something wishy washy, which is not really what I’m trying to say at all, that it’s neither one thing nor the other. But to me it’s situated sort of just to the east of the Pennines, but more or less half way across the country. You’ve got sort of little bits of east and west... You’ve also got... it’s sort of sandwiched in between the real north eastern things, as you go more towards ‘Geordieland’, but then there’s the Teesside part. But we’re sort of tucked in and it’s almost sort of part of the highway across the Pennines towards the west and... and I think I mean that really in terms of... well OK landscape but also in terms of the people and attitudes (NP19).
Whilst those interviewed revealed sense of place to be fragmented in the North Pennines, confused by topography, place and administrative boundaries, it has a particular sense of cultural identity that is described as ‘in between’. Rather than exerting negative pressures on the sensing of place, the scale and complexity of place as it is sensed by individuals within the region positively affects the way in which the character of the region is viewed:

...we’re an area that’s got a very special... It’s character doesn’t belong to any one place, it belongs to itself... (NP11).

4.1.2 Sense of place and the literature
The literature does not offer consensus on the appropriate approach to take when investigating sense of place. On the one hand, sense of place has been seen as ‘genius loci’ whereby the place is seen to have a ‘spirit’, the sum of its topographical, man-made and experiential features (Stedman, 2003). On the other hand, some have viewed sense of place from a more constructivist position, emphasising the agency of the individual in creating meaning: sense of place as ‘lived experience’ (Graham et al., 2009), a view summarised thus: “Location itself is not enough to create a sense of place. It emerges from involvement between people, and between people and place” (Pretty et al., 2003: 274).

Psychologists have become exercised by the notion of ‘sense of place’ as an element of identity, and as a consequence environmental psychologists have pursued empirical investigation of sense of place through the concept of place-identity (Kaltenborn, 1998, Proshansky et al., 1983, Shamai, 1991, Shamai and Illov, 2004, Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Discussion in Chapter Two has shown that environmental and social psychologists are keen to create subcategories to which specific questions can be attached in order to produce quantitative survey data and positivist forms of knowledge. The psychologists do not reach agreement within the literature about these components of place identity
and as a result, research has used a variety of theories against which to measure empirical data.

Key categories into which the understanding of sense of place have been grouped appear to be: place identity (Proshansky et al. 1983; Lalli 1992), place attachment (Altman and Low, 1992, Moore and Graefe, 1994) and place dependency (Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001, Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006). Jorgensen and Stedman (2006) have looked to attitude theory to explore the notion of sense of place as a multidimensional construct where place identity is seen as an individual’s beliefs (the cognitive domain), place attachment as their emotions (the affective domain) and place dependency as their behaviours (the conative domain). Whilst their empirical investigations take place at sites of recreation, their ideas will be drawn on in sections 4.3 and 4.4 of this chapter’s data analysis. The specifications and requirements of sense of place subcategories are not clearly articulated (Pretty et al., 2003) and the position of attachment and dependency as subsets of identity, or identity and dependency as subsets of attachment (Graham et al., 2009, Kyle et al., 2004) remain ambiguous. For example, Pretty et al. note that Cuba and Hummon (1993) describe emotional ties and affiliation with place as aspects of identity, whereas Altman and Low (1992) use these same factors to define attachment (cited Pretty et al., 2003: 274). Four main stances have been identified:

On the one hand, several authors consider (place identity and place attachment) to be the same concept and either use both synonymously (e.g. Brown and Werner, 1985) or operationalize attachment in terms of identity (Stedman, 2002). One can also be understood as including the other. For example, for Lalli (1992), place attachment is a component of place identity. Other authors have considered place identity and place attachment as dimensions of a supraordered concept, such as sense of place (Hay, 1998a; Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001). Finally, another proposal suggests place attachment as a multidimensional construct that
incorporates factors such as identity, dependence on place and social bonds (Kyle, Graefe, and Manning, 2005).

(Hernández et al., 2007: 311)

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to untangle the conceptual overlaps of social and environmental psychology’s attempts to produce quantitative measures of sense of place, however the ideas put forward from psychology provide useful approaches by which to examine data collected in the North Pennines for new knowledge about the experience of sense of place there. The remainder of this chapter will examine the data in the light of the three key subsets evidenced in the literature: place identity, place attachment and place dependency.

4.2 Place identity

Place identity is widely referred to in the literature and is usually approached as a component of the self identity of the individual. It has been noted that clear theoretically driven approaches to unravelling the processes by which relationships with place affect one’s identity are lacking (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Proshansky et al. (1983) see the components of place identity as: recognition; meaning and its effect upon behaviour; tastes and preferences for particular places; discrepancies between self identity and place; and anxiety and defence (seen as how people learn what to avoid and how they understand when they are in and out of place) (Graham et al., 2009). The work of Proshansky et al. is criticised for its failure to account for the way in which place becomes the cause of this action (Korpela, 1989, Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996).

In their 1996 discussion of research amongst residents of Rotherhithe in London, Clare Twigger-Ross and David Uzzell presented place identity as component of self identity, and this view has been largely accepted (Hernández et al., 2007: 311). Their work will be drawn on in the structure of this chapter particularly their identity process theory which was adapted from the 1986, 1992 and 1993 work of psychologist G M Breakwell. This
‘model’ sees identity growing organically in relation to three main principles of distinctiveness, continuity, and self-esteem:

Three prime principles are evident: the two processes work to produce uniqueness or distinctiveness for a person, continuity across time and situation and a feeling of personal worth or social value.


In later adaptations of the model, self-efficacy is added as a fourth principle (ibid).

The subsets put forward by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell in their investigation of place identity sit comfortably within the framework of this dissertation: *continuity across time* linking to ideas of heritage and sense of place (Chapter Five ‘Heritage and Sense of Place); *self-esteem* and *self-efficacy* providing a useful introduction to data related to ideas of social and cultural capital and pride in relation to sense of place (Chapter Six ‘Sense of Place and Heritage Activity’); and *distinctiveness* referring back to ideas about sense of place and heritage landscape (Chapter Seven, ‘Ecomuseum Potential’). This section will examine the data according to each of these subsets in turn.

4.2.1 Continuity

Twigger-Ross and Uzzell see continuity broken down into two further subdivisions under Breakwell’s model, those of place-referent continuity and place-congruent continuity (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Place-referent continuity describes the way an individual uses the characteristics of a specific place to refer to themselves and their actions in the past in that place: environment provides an aide-mémoire (Korpela, 1989). Place-congruent continuity on the other hand is derived not from *specific* landscapes, but from landscapes that present characteristic yet generic features. These features suit the individual by reminding them of other places they have known at other times in their lives and are therefore ‘congruous’ with their sense of personal narrative. Linking with ideas in sociology about ‘elective belonging’ (Savage et al., 2005), place-congruent
continuity sees an identification with place when it is found to be suitably in keeping with the type of person an individual sees themselves being; place is chosen because it represents an agreeable set of values (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). These ideas are further developed in Chapter Six. Data discussed in Chapter Five, will show that place contributes to identity in the North Pennines by providing place-referent continuity, the surroundings providing a physical reminder of past-selves and actions for people experiencing sense of place there. According to Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996), place can also provide place-congruent continuity, whereby it is not the actual place but rather its characteristic features with which respondents identify. So whilst place-referent continuity will be discussed in Chapter Five, the next section will examine the data for evidence of place-congruent continuity.

Place-congruent continuity sees an identification with place when it is found to be in keeping with one’s preferred idea of self, lifestyle and values and is related less to specific landscapes and more to landscapes that present notional characteristics which reflect these preferences (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Discussion below shows that the respondents in the North Pennines found continuity in the place when it was congruent with their self-image, sense of past-selves, and values and lifestyle. Firstly, respondents talked about their sense of place in reference to their self-concept. These ideas link with notions of ‘elective belonging’ by which people are seen to exercise choice in belonging to a place that fits their self-image (Savage et al., 2005). For example, the following two respondents identified with being a ‘countryside person’ rather than a person who enjoyed living in the city or urban environment:

…erm, I do find people are quite comfortable retiring to here. It’s a smaller place, especially if they don’t want city life (NP27).

…I’m not a… how shall I put it… I’m not a person that loves towns. I like to go there, but I’d rather be in the countryside than in the towns so I’ve had to come here, I thought it was a good idea (NP22).
Similarly for this respondent, place provided continuity by being congruous with their self-image as an environmentally ethical individual:

...we’re slowly evolving into a lifestyle which we find satisfactory... We’re perhaps more at peace with ourselves and the world now... leave a lesser carbon footprint than we have in the past (NP15).

The congruence of place with identity is embraced by respondents coded in a category entitled ‘communication and interpretation’ who are eager both to account for their sense of belonging but also share it with evangelical fervour:

Yeah, I feel as though I’ve got a real interest and emotional investment in the area. I want to work here. You know I want to... and I want to develop other people’s interest in the place, I think as well (NP24).

Discussion that refers to self-identity also inevitably touches on notions of countryside residence as a symbol of affluence:

... one of the largest groups is the well-to-do, retired, loud mouth from Tyneside with four-wheel drives who live separate lives, very, very well modernised houses and er, and I honestly, generally resent, generally resent that group of people, although within it there are people who I really like, where you wouldn’t describe the people that way, you wouldn’t use the word loud mouth, you would say you know, helpful and positive: people who want to be included in the community. And not wanting to use here as a way of lifting their ego. There’s been some awful ones, they do get... they do leave (giggles). They find they can’t tell us what to do. The little, local phrase is quite good, “coming and teaching us how to brek eggs wi a stick” (NP11).

Data coded to the category ‘new residents’ indicated that countryside residence is seen as something coveted by others:

Because everybody wants to be out in the countryside don’t they really you know? (NP21).
More and more people are potentially going to be er... wishing to live in the North Pennines. Because again, communication businesses whatever, er communication, media, internet... you don’t need to be in an office in Newcastle. Erm, and I think, increasingly people may want to live in areas like that away from the cities more so than in other parts of the world and that sort of thing yeah? Erm, to get into an area of tranquility... (NP13).

The data therefore provide evidence that for some respondents, exercising choice in place of residence is linked to congruence between the place and self-image. There were individuals who felt that the North Pennines was congruent with their sense of themselves as a ‘countryside person’, a person who dislikes city-living, or a person who is environmentally responsible; others noted the desirability of countryside residence as a symbol of affluence.

Whilst references were made to the place and its congruence with self-image and the aspirations tied up within it, there were also references to a place congruent with notions of past-selves in other places. Such respondents had chosen to live in the place either consciously because of this, or unconsciously as indicated below:

Erm... and then we er... and it’s funny because we lived in the Peak District - a lead mining area - very similar landscape, but more populated than this area, erm, more villages, more touristy than this area, more developed, but similar landscape so it’s quite funny that that’s... sort of come back to... the same thing (NP24).

The following responded describes how place is congruous with his experiences in the past (a ‘past self’):
Castleside, as I say, when I was a child, was a small village, you knew everybody the same as you do here. So in fifty years things had changed (NP22).

This response was coded to a category entitled ‘nostalgia’. For two particular respondents, this congruence with past-selves was the way in which their children could enjoy a childhood similar to their own in the past:

... he’s got some really good friends here. And one of the things I really like about it is that he’s got a childhood like my childhood. It feels like stepping back in time... (NP24).

The examples above illustrate that finding the North Pennines congruous with notions of self-image and continuity of life-story, does contribute to sense of place for respondents there. Place can support this continuity of identity by having similar characteristics to places of former residence, the settings of other portions of an individual’s life. This notion of congruence also played out in data coded to nodes of ‘nostalgia’ and ‘social values’ which indicated a lament for social values of the past that could be rediscovered in the North Pennines. Place-congruent continuity can be linked not just to the physical characteristics of a place, but to the values that a place represents. Individuals can then refer to these values when accounting for their sense of place in a process that agrees with Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) notion of place-congruent continuity of identity.

The discussion that follows illustrates the number of ways in which place finds compatibility with the values of individual respondents. In particular respondents discussed their sense of place in terms of values such as: sociability; tranquillity; open-mindedness; and concern for the environment. Data referring to the characteristics of local people were coded, and within this category respondents referred to the unusual social contact distinctive to their part of the North Pennines:

But it is... well people find they can’t cope anywhere else because God you know, no one talks to you! (NP11).
You come to a village like this and everybody knows everybody else. I mean there’s a lot of elderly people and they are retired like us, but you communicate more with them, you help each other out... (NP23).

You know that is where you feel that that’s the belonging, because you know in your heart... if you were ill or you needed any assistance, someone would help you. And it’s... I don’t think you get that in other places (NP23).

The quotes above demonstrate how respondents referred to local social values in their descriptions of sense of place. The following respondents describe the compatibility of place with their desire for tranquillity; the first is a cattle farmer in Weardale:

*I could... just sit there and just listen. I do I just love it. I mean you can’t do that down the street, you might have bad neighbours or you might have loads of hooligan kids (laughing) well you know, there’s certain situations, you might have good neighbours you might have a good place where you live, but it’s taking pot luck and you’ve got people’s televisions, noise and everything (NP02).*

*The quietness, the lack of erm... the lack of light-pollution erm, is also attractive. I wouldn’t like to live in a place which was this remote but to be able to hear a motorway. Which can happen if erm... I can think of places on the sides of the Tyne which are... which appear initially to be this remote, but then you can hear the traffic on the A69 as it er thunders along if the wind’s in the wrong direction (NP27).*

Yeah its been a sort of a testing place, if you like the discos and the highlife, Alston’s not the place, but if you like a genuine community and tranquillity and the openness of the hills, that suits a lot of people (NP10).

And it’s remoteness and relative lack of people... Erm I go to the Lakes occasionally but it’s so burdened by the millions that congregate there it’s difficult to get stirred on occasion. You really have to get off track (NP15).
These responses indicate sense of place is related to experiences of sociability and tranquillity in the North Pennines. They develop notions of ‘place-congruent continuity’ by demonstrating the manner in which descriptions of sense of place referenced values in terms of sociability and tranquillity. Furthermore some respondents saw themselves as open-minded, ‘laid-back’ people and within data coded to ‘the nature of local people’ references indicated that the North Pennines was a place compatible with this set of values:

…it’s hmm I don’t know, there’s no edge to anything, people just go to relax and enjoy themselves because nobody’s trying to show off or whatever… (NP10).

This same respondent was keen to express the ‘simple life’ which for others minimised their impact upon the environment:

You can survive here if your life is simple, then that’s fine (NP10).

We’re perhaps more at peace with ourselves and the world now (NP15).

Following the framework put forward by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996), discussion above has examined the data for evidence of continuity, with particular attention to place-congruent types of continuity. Place-congruent continuity has been seen as the way in which place provides a continuity of identity for respondents. It does this through compatibility with notions of past-selves and actions, and can support self-image through presenting a particular lifestyle and set of values. These values were identified within the transcribed interview accounts as sociability, tranquillity, open-mindedness and concern for the environment and quotes were presented to illustrate this discourse. A further three principles were put forward in Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) framework for investigating place identity and these were: self-esteem (4.2.2), self-efficacy (4.2.3) and distinctiveness (4.2.4). Each of these will now be discussed in turn.
4.2.2 Self-esteem

Kalevi Korpela (1989) has indicated that environment can support self-esteem (cited in Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996: 206) and rather than just through a positive evaluation of a place, this can be evidenced through a boost to self-esteem derived from place. An example might be the sense of pride by association achieved through living in a historic town. In the North Pennines, respondents revealed pride indicative of self-esteem in a number of ways and these responses were coded to a category entitled ‘pride’. Some were proud of their industrial archaeology either through pursuing their own interest:

_Erm but there’s, I think you know the archaeology and the, just the industrial heritage is fantastic and that makes them proud. And finding out about the people, the kinds of people and the lifestyles that they had, you know the life they lead and how hard it was for them. Erm but they made a living and they survived. So I think I’m proud of that as well_ (NP04).

or through the development of visitor attractions such as Killhope:

_So I certainly in all the time I’ve been here, I’ve seen a significant shift in public attitudes from sometimes hostility, sometimes indifference to what was going on here to a pride in this place and in reflecting what this area is about_ (NP16).

For residents of the historic village of Blanchland, part of the Lord Crewe, Bishop of Durham’s Estate, they were proud of their historic residence and liked to tell others about it:

_I think you are proud, I mean you do go away and you say to people... when they start saying something ... You like to boast about it_ (NP23).

_Yeah, erm, yeah I think people do take pride in the fact that whenever people come, they say, ‘oh this is a lovely place,’ and people walk around and say you know, that there’s something about Blanchland that they find_
good. You know the atmosphere, the way it looks and so on, and er the sense of community and all the rest of it (NP26).

Pride is evidenced through the care given to place:

I mean people like to keep it nice, you will see, it doesn’t matter who it is but if they walk up the square and they see a piece of litter, they’ll pick it up and put it in the bin. It’s that kind of pride in that… they all like to have hanging baskets out and they all look after their little bits of garden… yeah, I think the majority are proud to live here. And they want to keep it that way you know. I mean… I suppose … I mean it’s a difficult thing because yes, you want it to look nice, you want it to look nice when visitors come and you’re chuffed to bits when they say to you, you know, ‘Oh it’s a lovely place you live in…’ And it makes you feel warm! It makes you feel nice… (NP23).

Finally, one respondent linked his discussion of society membership to senses of pride, reinforcing the data above:

Obviously they’re struggling at the moment… I think people that live in the dale, like the dale. There’s people like Stan Bower from St John’s Chapel who tends a flower bed and the surrounding grass area as you approach St John’s Chapel from the west, on a voluntary basis and it makes such a difference to what the village looks like. I don’t think anybody… he does it because he’s got a pride in the place he lives in. And er, one of our members cuts grass in the churchyard in St John’s Chapel because it needs doing and he’s got a pride in it and there are generations of people who lived in the dale buried in that church yard and out of respect to them he keeps it clean and tidy and I think generally people do have a pride in the traditions and I think that’s some of the reasons why these societies are still going really (NP07).
If the argument of Twigger-Ross and Uzzell is accepted, then self-esteem is developed from a positive perception of the self, group or place with which one identifies, leading to feelings of worth or value. The above data show that there is a desire to maintain a positive perception of the place and therefore of the self. This indicates that place is supporting and inspiring self-esteem for residents. It is therefore possible to see place-identity in the North Pennines comprising continuity of identity (4.2.1) in terms of place-congruent continuity (specifically self-image, values and lifestyle), and self-esteem particularly in terms of pride. Following Twigger-Ross and Uzzell the third principle of place-identity is self-efficacy. How does place support or hinder the lifestyle of respondents?

4.2.3 Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is seen as an individual’s confidence that they are able to manage and carry out necessary tasks to manage various situations (Bandura, 1995: 2). A ‘manageable’ environment, is one in which a person, “feels self-efficacious with respect to their daily functioning in that environment” (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996: 208). The North Pennines failed in many respects to support individuals in their situational demands, with data that indicated poor roads:

Well sometimes it’s frustrating, because the roads are narrow and windy and when you’ve been to work on a Sunday and you want to get home and there’s ten of you in a line of traffic and somebody’s going thirty miles an hour... (mutters and laughs)! Because you’re stuck... (NP17).

poor services such as shops:

...even people like us, we don’t, you know you don’t ‘nip’ into Consett to do your shopping, you plan your shopping and go once a week or something like that... (NP23).

and transport:
I mean I’m involved now in this trouble with the buses being stopped completely, or else not quite... I think there is still a bus, but I think it’s going to stop in September. Because Cumbria won’t pay for bringing it beyond Slaggyford... And the people without cars, it’s a very considerable social problem and everybody is in this position. A lot of the women here, the middle aged women, never learned to drive. Erm, but the older people of course their eyesight deteriorates and they have other problems and even if they could afford a car, they’re not able to do it anymore and they are in a very, very bad position. And social car service and ‘rural wheels’ does not really make up for it (NP06).

Respondents more frequently referred to unmanageability of the North Pennines for the young with comments such as:

*Petrol alone is ten pence a litre dearer, you know your shops are not accessible and the ones that are there are more expensive than most supermarkets. Facilities for children are worse now than what it was for me when I was fifteen or sixteen. There’s nowhere for youngsters to go, and if it is, it’s a bus ride, and there isn’t a bus after six o clock at night* (NP17).

References were also made to lack of employment and affordable accommodation.

However for many respondents as data have shown above, their day to day lives are manageable if they are kept ‘simple’, if they ‘plan’ their shopping and moreover as has been shown, for many respondents, the North Pennines helps rather than hinders their lifestyle, with place supporting sociability (“you help each other out”... “someone would help you...”NP23), tranquillity (“The quietness... the lack of light-pollution is also attractive” NP27), open-mindedness, and concern for the environment. Discussion has explored descriptions of place-identity within the data using the identity principles of continuity, self-esteem and self-efficacy. The next section discusses the way in which place supports the final component of identity: the desire to maintain distinctiveness.
4.2.4 Distinctiveness

The way in which a place is distinctive from others, it’s ‘local distinctiveness’, is subject to discussion in section 5.4 of Chapter Five. This section investigates the way distinctiveness can also be seen as a component of self-identity (following Breakwell’s model discussed in section 4.2). Distinctiveness can be for example, the preference of a person for ‘town’ or ‘country’ as seen in the discussion of the data around the idea of ‘self-image’ above. Taken a stage further, it has been suggested that association with a specific town or indeed a specific area of town allows people to differentiate themselves from others (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996) so that place can work in a similar way to social categories as a component of self-identity that marks one group as different from another. The data have shown above that place can support ‘self-image’ and respondents also made comparisons between their place and other places in terms that distinguished themselves from residents of those places:

...well it was the open space and just the wildness of the place. The towns and villages where I’ve lived before, the landscape’s all manicured, it’s all farmer’s fields and hedges and things like that. Whereas here, I step out in the garden and see hills just for mile upon mile and nothingness and it’s this space and being able to look over and beyond and just, you feel as if you can breathe here (NP10).

Here the respondent compares the North Pennines with other more ‘manicured’ places, differentiating himself from residents of such carefully maintained places, as someone who needs to ‘breathe’. The next respondent marks them self as different to people in cities, the desire to stop and socialise being a ‘different mindset’ from insular urban dwellers:

But as I say it’s a different mindset altogether really. They have a different erm, you can tell people that aren’t local because you walk along the road and everybody speaks to you, “oh are you alright” and somebody that maybe hasn’t been here for five minutes they don’t let on and you
know straight away that they’re not local. You know. Whereas probably they don’t in the city they just… you’re just a number aren’t you? (NP21).

And the sentiment is echoed:

Well there are fewer people. And you come across them much more often. Er. And you’re always meeting the same people doing the same things, in a city erm, you know, if you went into a shop, unless it was the local area shop, you know you wouldn’t know them (NP03).

Erm, well like I say… I think I said to you earlier, living in Newcastle I lived in a little sort of mews horseshoe shaped street with about thirty five houses in it, very small houses, erm and I didn’t know anybody in that street… well apart from the neighbours either side of me. Didn’t really know anybody, saw people coming and going – I suppose part of it was because we’re at work, so we never really mixed, we all had our own lives. Erm, up here, erm there’s the opportunity to get involved with other people and socialise a bit more. You don’t have to and I wouldn’t say I socialise a lot but the opportunity is there to do that and people chat more and people know more about each others’ lives (NP04).

Even in Bishop Auckland. They don’t… they don’t help each other. At all. We had a teacher, she died bless her. Erm, but she said, she said, she said, you know she said, “You could… if you died and laid on your lawn” she says, “You could lie on your lawn a fortnight before anybody would know…” (NP25).

This chapter set out to discuss sense of place in terms of four notions derived from the literature and these were concepts of scale, place identity, place attachment and place dependency. The first section discussed sense of place and scale (4.1). This section (4.2) has examined place identity. The subsets put forward by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) in their investigation of place have been used here to explore place identity and also to introduce the framework for this dissertation: continuity across time (4.2.1) linking to ideas of heritage and sense of place (Chapter Five); self-esteem (4.2.2) and self-efficacy.
(4.2.3) providing a useful introduction to data related to ideas of forms of capital and pride in relation to sense of place (Chapter Six); and distinctiveness referring back to ideas about sense of place and heritage landscape (Chapter Seven). Having discussed the data for what they reveal about place identity, and taking these notions as subsets of the ‘supraordered concept’ of sense of place (Hernández et al., 2007: 311), place attachment (4.3) and place dependency (4.4) will now be discussed in turn.

4.3 Place attachment

Guiliani and Feldman (1993) saw that attachment could be the bond of respondents with topography and buildings, or identification with people or groups associated with that place. Yet they note that the diversity of variables affecting place attachment presents a significant challenge to further progress in the study of sense of place. They suggest it would be, “useful to tighten up on the definition of place attachment...” (cited in Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006: 317). Low and Altman (1992) writing extensively on the notion of place attachment recognised that the emotional quality of place attachment was its most consistent, and that place attachment should be seen as the strong bond between people and places. The emerging field of emotional geography has further explored the notion of affective ties to place (Davidson et al., 2005) both for those experiencing place as tourists or ‘outsiders’ (Urry, 2005) and those with long intimate ‘insider’ ties (Hockey et al., 2005).

Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) in their Rotherhithe study, used an initial questionnaire based on place attachment to find a sample within which to study place identity. In this instance it would seem that place attachment was taken as a precursor to place identity, a view supported by others (Hernández et al., 2007, Kyle et al., 2004). Place attachment for the purposes of this thesis however, will be taken as separate to place identity, and following Jorgensen and Stedman (2006), as a category dealing with emotional relationships to place. This section will firstly examine the data in order to explore the relationship between place attachment and duration of residence, then will examine the data in the light of Bradley Jorgensen and Richard Stedman’s (2006) place attachment
measures which they applied in a study of a lakeshore recreational site. These indicators are: missing the place during absence; relaxing in place; and feeling happy in place and they relate to the categories of analysis when the transcriptions were coded using the NVivo software tool.

4.3.1 Duration of residence

A large body of literature supports the view that place attachment is related to duration of residence (Cross, 2001, Graham et al., 2009, Hay, 1998, Relph, 1976, Riger and Lavrakas, 1981, Tuan, 1977) however it is noted that some empirical work has failed to demonstrate this relationship (Stedman 2002 cited in Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006). Within the category of ‘sense of place’ data coded to ‘duration of residence’ produced a substantial subcategory. In the North Pennines, respondents referred to the length of their stay when discussing their sense of place:

Well yes, I suppose when I think about it I do but it’s the longest I’ve lived anywhere in my life. Erm the house prior to this one I lived in for eight years. That’s the longest I’ve lived anywhere, including life with my parents. And without it being a conscious decision to stay because the place suits me I feel no urge to move on (NP10).

Here, the respondent links the duration of his residence to his attachment, seen as his desire to stay, or lack of desire to live anywhere else. The following respondent made clear the connection between duration of stay and place attachment:

I can’t imagine leaving now, erm, I mean it could happen, obviously in a place as remote as this, you know you need to be relatively fit and healthy, so I guess if I was to become infirm in some way or very elderly, you couldn’t expect to be able to live comfortably out here. So yeah, I think I would be very upset to leave and I guess as time goes on, and you know, you build more memories and enjoyment of the place I think it probably gets harder still (NP04).
Similarly, the following respondent is clearly attached to place through his reluctance to leave, and links this attachment to the rootedness experienced through being in place for a long time and the raising of a family. The raising of family is a particular quality of rootedness that was also identified in Savage et al.’s (2005) research amongst communities in and around Manchester:

*Yeah I think so. I mean probably when I was younger I could’ve maybe moved on but er I think once you’re set somewhere for a long time, especially when you’re family’s up and that sort of thing you know you’ve sort of sprouted your roots there haven’t you?* (NP20).

Newer residents were conscious of the relationship between duration of residence and place attachment, some feeling that it would be inappropriate to claim attachment:

*I think so, I think I feel like I have a certain claim to be able to put down roots, but I think that can only come over time, you can only feel that way over time. And I don’t think we’ve been here long enough to feel like that* (NP04).

But for others the duration of residence was irrelevant and their desire to stay (the emotional tie that might be seen as place attachment) was linked to other variables such as friendships and acceptance:

*I mean for me, I’ve only been here for three years and I feel really rooted here. And my son, he’s twelve, he’s absolutely rooted here. You know you can’t imagine moving away from here. He doesn’t want to go away to university, he wants to stay here with us and travel to university in Newcastle. His friends are here...* (NP24).

This is in agreement with Hernandez et al. who, when reviewing length of stay as a predictor of place attachment note, “…on occasions this variable has been shown to be mediated by others such as the number of relationships within a community…” (Hernández et al., 2007: 311). Here, attachment is evidenced through an emotional connection that is less about duration of residence and more about the desire to
maintain a close connection with place, to remain in a place that feels, “comfortable and safe” (Hernández et al., 2007: 310).

Perhaps conclusions might be drawn from the literature and data that whilst duration of stay positively affects place attachment, it is not a necessary prerequisite to the experiencing of emotional ties to a place and desire to stay. Place attachment can be seen as a preference for the North Pennines above other places and a desire to stay. These ideas are developed in the next section to explore references to homesickness and yearning during periods of absence from the North Pennines.

4.3.2 Missing place during absence
Discussion above (4.2.1, 4.3.1) has seen that some respondents in the North Pennines described sense of place in terms of their feelings and experiences of leaving the area and returning. One of the measures of place attachment used by Jorgensen and Stedman in their study of lakeshore property owners was the extent of agreement (using a Likart scale) with the statement, “I really miss my lake property when I am away from it for too long” (2006: 319). Whilst the methodology employed within this dissertation follows an entirely different epistemology to that of Jorgensen and Stedman, it is interesting to consider whether the respondents in the North Pennines, when encouraged to freely describe their sense of place, were found to discuss attachment in terms of homesickness. In data coded to a category entitled ‘returning to the North Pennines’ references to the sentiment were clear:

*So and we also found ourselves quite homesick for Alston. We’d come back, we’d come back typically, and it’s a long way, about 130 miles we’d get back on a New Years Eve...* (NP11).

The following respondent had retired permanently to his North Pennines property, but had previously used the house as a holiday and weekend retreat. Here he remembers fondly his early attachment to the area in terms of yearning and relief indicative of homesickness:
And er, when I was working, I would very often head out here on a Friday night erm and infact er, it would usually be half past one or two o clock on a Friday afternoon, erm, but it was... just that sense of relief, although I enjoyed my work very much, it was, it was really... you got a, a ... the ‘looking forward to’ aspect as soon as you got onto the outskirts of Tyneside. Looking forward to being in the area... (NP27).

Beyond this, references were made to a preference for the North Pennines above all other places: “…I couldn’t think of anywhere else better to be. I’ve been abroad plenty of places but I still couldn’t think of any better or anywhere more beautiful” (NP21) and the desire to return: “… it’s interesting to see how many people leave the dale, only to come back in their forties and fifties. So I think there’s a very deep love of the dale itself” (NP09).

4.3.3 Relaxing in place

When measuring place attachment, Jorgensen and Stedman also asked respondents to rate their agreement or disagreement with the statement, “I feel relaxed when I am at my lake property” (2006). The following respondent made explicit reference to relaxation when accounting for their sense of place:

Erm, it’s just very relaxing and very beautiful... (NP13).

This respondent elaborates:

I love it here and the peace that you... you just go out and hear everything
... It’s therapeutic that’s what I call it when I’m out walking, its therapeutic
(NP02).

Without using the language of relaxation, the following respondents referred to pleasure in activities, such as walking and enjoying nature, that are analogous with relaxation:

The peace, the tranquillity. All the natural history things. Flowers and birds and the people...
We do walk quite a lot. It’s nice just to go out of the door and walk. Which is the thing I would miss... (NP14).

Concepts such as ‘relaxation’ and ‘happiness’ are tangled in the data with one easily read as indicative of the other and they presented relatively minor subcategories in the NVivo analysis. It is relevant however to explore the subcategories within the data coded to ‘sense of place’ to explore the nuances of this experience in the North Pennines, and references to the literature help structure this enquiry. The last section within this discussion of place attachment, seeks to investigate evidence within the data, of sense of place described in terms of happiness.

4.3.4 Happiness in place
The final statements against which Jorgensen and Stedman (2006) asked respondents to rate their agreement was: “I feel happiest when I am at my lake property” and, “My lake property is my favourite place to be.” The phrases ‘happy’ and ‘favourite’ did not occur amongst the North Pennines data, however comments were made that could be equated to happiness, for example expressing emotions such as ‘love’:

Just everything here, I love everything here. I love the open space, you go out of your door and everything’s there...

And all the hay meadow flowers are coming up and that and you... I just...
You know where the picnic tables are down by the woodland I could just take my dogs... for a walk and just sit there and just listen. I do I just love it (NP02).

‘My favourite place to be’ might be seen as equal to a preference above other places, a sentiment frequently expressed throughout the data:

It’s quiet and again, tranquil’s not the right word... but it gives you that feeling... you know, it’s just nice to be here (NP22).

These senses of happiness and preference are also indicated by an expression of feeling comfort in place:
... being comfortable. So it doesn’t matter who you talk to or where you are in the village, you’re comfortable. You don’t have a sense of, “Should I be here, should I talk to them, they might wonder what my opinions are, I’d better be careful.” Erm, so being able to talk to anybody, there isn’t anyone that I wouldn’t feel comfortable talking to (NP27).

Discussion has examined the data using indicators of place attachment derived from the literature. Section 4.3 has seen that place attachment in the North Pennines is evident and recognised as emerging in part from length of residence (4.3.1); although the data show that place attachment is also nurtured by other variables such as social ties. Place attachment was also expressed through feelings of homesickness and desire to return during periods of absence (4.3.2), although respondents tended to couch such sentiments in terms of preference for this place above others. This trend was also evident in data which supported Jorgensen and Stedman’s (2006) measure of ‘relaxation in place’ (4.3.3) and ‘happiness in place’ (4.3.4) whereby the environment was found to be more peaceful and tranquil than other places and able to inspire love and feelings of comfort.

To this point, this chapter has discussed two of the three sub-sets of sense of place emerging from the literature, those of place identity and place attachment. Viewing the data through the lens of analytical categories emerging from previous research has allowed a discursive route to be navigated through the bramble of categories and subcategories which emerged through inductive data analysis. This discussion has presented a window into the nature of sense of place in the North Pennines in terms of the features of environment and residence which are treasured by residents, workers and property owners there. Notions of place attachment should be tempered by the data discussion presented in section 4.1 concerning scale since, “it is now widely accepted that ‘place attachment’ can form at a variety of geographic and spatial scales” (Nanzer, 2004 cited in Graham et al., 2009). The final sub-concept derived from the sense of place literature is that of ‘place dependence’ and this chapter will conclude with
a discussion of the data in the light of Jorgensen and Stedman’s (2006) place dependency indicators.

4.4 Place dependency

If place identity is equated to beliefs and Jorgensen and Stedman’s attitude theory derived ‘cognitive domain,’ and emotional ties are accounted for by place attachment and the affective domain, place dependency is linked to the ‘conative domain’ and behaviours related to place (2006). Seen as a measure of how well a place serves the needs of an individual (Stokols and Shumaker, 1981), place dependency links to self-efficacy (as discussed in section 4.2 above) (Korpela, 1989) as, “the ways in which an individual will form stronger attachments to place when that place enables them to achieve their personal lifestyle goals” (Graham et al., 2009). In their 2006 publication, Jorgensen and Stedman measure place dependency using scales of agreement with the statement, “My lake property is the best place for doing the things I enjoy most” (or “for things I enjoy doing, no other place can compare”). Respondents were also asked in this study if other places were better for engaging in enjoyable activities. Following the work of Jorgensen and Stedman (2006), this section will examine place dependency in two areas: place facilitating lifestyle, and place as preferred for enjoyed activities.

4.4.1 Place facilitating lifestyle

Discussion in section 4.2 has examined the data in detail for evidence of self-efficacy and found that the North Pennines was not an easy place to live in terms of roads, services, and opportunities for the young such as employment and affordable housing. In this sense, the environment hindered the manageability of day to day life. This reveals a quandary which the literature does not resolve and that is whether manageability refers to everyday life, or achievement of chosen lifestyle. The data indicated that for many respondents, the North Pennines facilitated the manageability of their chosen lifestyle. This was seen through data that saw respondents referring to place when marking themselves as distinctive from others. For example, place supported notions of sociability (“you help each other out”... “someone would help you” [NP23]) and
tranquillity (“The quietness, the lack of erm... the lack of light-pollution erm, is also attractive” [NP27]).

As discussion about the values coterminous with place above (4.2.1) has suggested, the North Pennines can support lifestyle choices for respondents, because of a general spirit of open-mindedness that seems to prevail there:

There’s the, there’s the sort of yuppie incomer group that I would get put into, who would drink in a particular pub and drink early doors at the Cumberland at the bottom. And they all meet up on a Friday night. And that’s pretty middle class, pretty broad base. But there are local people in there as well, its not exclusive and people are talking to one another you couldn’t really work out who was an incomer you just talk to, you know, like minded folk. If you want to talk about film, they want to talk about music or politics or whatever... you can do it (NP11).

Discussion has seen (4.2) that the North Pennines was a place that helped respondents achieve their lifestyle in terms of being a ‘country’ or ‘outdoor’ person. This helped individuals to distinguish themselves from others through place distinctiveness as subset of place identity:

...I’m not a person that loves towns...I’d rather be in the countryside than in the towns... (NP22).

Some described the North Pennines as helping them to achieve a ‘simple’ lifestyle:

...if your life is simple then you’ve got everything. You know you’ve got the... all the amenities of the town and you’ve only got to walk for ten minutes and you’re out in the countryside and you’ll not see another soul for hours on end (NP10).

‘Pace of life’ as a subcategory of data coded to ‘sense of place’ in analysis identified the slower pace of life that North Pennines residence allowed respondents to achieve:
Everything goes at a much more leisurely pace here (NP03).

Erm... difficult to put it into words... it’s a much slower pace of life up there (NP07).

...everybody takes a lot more time. Erm sometimes, people who’ve moved in from the city, don’t appreciate that you know, people in the country areas think things over more slowly... whereas they think that you don’t want change, well, you maybe don’t want change that quickly (NP03).

For some, as discussion has shown in 4.2, North Pennines residence helped them achieve goals in relation to environmental ethics:

But I think we’re slowly evolving into a lifestyle which we find satisfactory and we hope we’re making a contribution. We’re perhaps more at peace with ourselves and the world now (NP15).

Finally, the comment below summarises the attraction of the North Pennines in terms of achieving lifestyle goals. The respondent explains that people find the North Pennines particularly manageable for its beauty coupled with its proximity to towns but helpfully summarises the dichotomy of place attachment which emerges from the North Pennines data, that whilst for some lifestyle is very manageable, for others, particularly the young, lifestyle is not just unmanageable, but financially impossible:

I would say there are some who move in specifically you know to live in a nice area and to work close by in the town. And then the ones who choose to retire here. And there are some who live here through inertia, they’re not er, they’re not moving anywhere, and erm lots of the local young people, choose to move out. That’s generally what happens, they need to move out, the opportunities are not within the dale (NP03).

4.4.2 Place as preferred for enjoyed activities
Jorgensen and Stedman (2006) asked their respondents to rate their agreement with statements that indicated the locale was their preferred place for taking part in
enjoyable activities and or was a ‘favourite’ place to be. Respondents in the North Pennines were asked open questions about their sense of place and references were made to enjoyed activities and experiences which were coded to a category entitled ‘recreation’, indicating place attachment:

Yes well, obviously the landscape attracted me because I’ve always been an outdoor person. I’ve always gone fell walking and also my main hobby is mining history so I obviously visited this place you know, and found it very attractive because it’s very quiet, peaceful, there’s not a lot of visitors, but of course that’s a disadvantage in some ways, you know, for anybody in business. But really it was just generally, I just liked the nice, quiet unspoilt landscape. I’m very keen on botany and birds and all that so it was absolutely ideal (NP14).

The North Pennines helped this respondent to take part in activities she enjoyed such as observing wildlife and flowers, fell walking and pursuing an interest in mining history. The next respondent is ostensibly interested in the North Pennines for its industrial archaeology however is keen to describe the way in which the region facilitates his love of general ‘outward bound’ activities.

... my interest in the Pennines is it hasn’t necessarily been originally the industrial heritage, it was the landscape, enjoying the outward bounds scene (NP13).

Such sentiments are equally expressed by the gentleman making the comment below who also makes the connection indicated by Jorgensen and Stedman’s (2006) place attachment measures with the region being his ‘favourite’ or preferred place for undertaking such activities:

I’ve always been interested in walking and outdoor activities. Er I had a long... for a long period from the early seventies to the nineties, you could ski in Upper Teesdale. And it was one of the, it was the first ski club in England from what I gather. Erm it was very primitive. It was very beautiful to go up there and er so that, that attachment, together with
summer walking meant going onto the high peaks of Cross Fell and er Great Dun Fell and High Cup Nick the er, the sheer beauty of the Pennines surpasses any other area in the country as far as I’m concerned. And its remoteness and relative lack of people... Erm I go to the Lakes occasionally but it’s so burdened by the millions that congregate there it’s difficult to get stirred on occasion. You really have to get off track. Where in the Pennines you’re a welcome visitor. If you happen to come across a farmer or a shepherd, which is very rare er, you won’t be exactly greeted with open arms, but there’ll be no hostility and there’ll be an expectation to stop and have a little chat (NP15).

Conclusions

This chapter has discussed the scale at which place is experienced for respondents in the North Pennines and the features of place that they refer to when describing their sense of place. Section 4.1 saw that place can be experienced at a pyramid of scales from the wider North Pennines region to the valley, town or village. This range of scale echoes a fragmentation of sense of place characteristic of the North Pennines, with data showing references to fragmentation in terms of topography, place boundaries, administrative boundaries, the AONB boundary itself and also the place based cultural heritage with which respondents identify. When describing sense of place, Chapter Five will see data demonstrating that respondents referred to the natural landscape, social bonds, ancestral heritage and senses of nostalgia and childhood.

Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 took subcategories of sense of place from the literature and used them to organise a discussion of the nuances of sense of place in the North Pennines that it is possible to identify through the data analysis. Place identity was discussed in section 4.2 using the components of identity introduced by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) as a framework for presenting the data. It was indicated that the North Pennines provides a place-referent continuity of identity, and discussion in Chapter Five will show place as the specific site of past selves and actions, with environment providing a physical ‘aide-mémoire’ in several ways for example, through familiarity in terms of
routine, landscape and community; through memories of childhood and family; and through feelings about leaving and returning. Section 4.2 saw place-congruent continuity of identity provided by the North Pennines for newer residents through harmony between the characteristics of the North Pennines and other settings of past-selves and actions. Place-congruent continuity was achieved through compatibility with self-image, congruence with experiences of other places in the past; and agreement with preferred values and lifestyle.

Place was also found to provide self-esteem as a component of identity, through feelings of pride in: archaeology and other heritage of the area; the North Pennines’ aesthetic appeal; community, and appeal for visitors; and the desire to physically maintain communal areas through voluntary effort. Place aids self-efficacy by supporting lifestyle choices. This can be juxtaposed with other variables of place identity and sense of place such as place-congruent continuity and place dependency discussed here, in order to provide a fuller description of sense of place in the North Pennines. Finally section 4.2 saw that place can support a person’s sense of distinctiveness by comparing favourably with other places (when a respondent indicates a preference for the country over urban lifestyle because they are an ‘outdoors person’ for instance).

Section 4.3 applied categories of analysis drawn from studies of places for their leisure and recreation values. Place attachment in the North Pennines was examined in terms of duration of residence, homesickness, desire to return during long periods of absence, and preference for the North Pennines above other areas. Relaxation and happiness were also discussed following the place attachment predictors put forward by Jorgensen and Stedman (2006), and the data were seen to show preferences for the North Pennines because of the region’s peace and tranquillity when compared to other places and its ability to inspire emotions of love and feelings of comfort.
This chapter concluded with discussion of place dependency (section 4.4). Similar to place-congruent continuity and self-efficacy (variables of place identity), place dependency refers more to behaviours (the conative domain) than to beliefs (cognitive) and discussion focussed on the ease with which respondents were able to conduct their day to day lives and achieve lifestyle goals in the North Pennines. Section 4.4 saw that there were difficulties with roads, services and the unmanageability of place for young people in the North Pennines, but that in terms of lifestyle, respondents found they could achieve their desired level of sociability, tranquillity, open-mindedness and distinctiveness and also live simple, environmentally ethical lives. Place allowed respondents to pursue their enjoyed activities and was preferred above others for its natural beauty. In this chapter the data have revealed the wide variety of factors and features contributing to sense of place in the North Pennines. References have been made to senses of ancestral belonging, interest in archaeology, senses of nostalgia, and love of natural heritage. The next chapter will examine these elements in more detail to explore specifically the relationships between heritage and sense of place in the North Pennines and begin to build an answer to the central research question, ‘how does heritage contribute to sense of place in the North Pennines?’
Chapter Four examined sense of place in the North Pennines using the categories, subsets and indicators provided within the literature of environmental psychology. The data were examined in terms of scale, place identity, place attachment and place dependency. Moving on from what has been a broad and descriptive chapter, this chapter discusses specifically the contribution of heritage to sense of place. It does so by presenting sense of place in the North Pennines as a three-dimensional model linking people, place and time. Section 5.1 examines the heritage studies literature and Laurajane Smith’s (2006) case for an alternative heritage discourse that has opened up interesting paths for exploring the relationship between heritage and sense of place. Section 5.2 narrows the focus to the intersection of people and time within this three-dimensional model. Data are presented that describe sense of place in terms of community and temporality, notions that can be independent of the specific material elements of place. References are made to theories within sociology of ‘memory talk’; the construction of imaginative communities in townscapes of memory through references to long absent buildings and sites (Degnen, 2005). Within this category of analysis, references were made to: social bonds, being known within the community, feelings of security and trust, ancestral connections and nostalgia.

Section 5.3 explores the intersection of people, place and time within the three-dimensional model. It examines descriptions of the interaction of people with places over time. In particular this section recalls the framework presented by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) to examine place identity and the continuity of identity that can be achieved with reference to a specific place (‘place-referent continuity’). Finally section 5.4 discusses notions of local distinctiveness as defined by the UK based organisation Common Ground and presents a number of ways in which respondents described the North Pennines as different from other places. Data are presented that make reference to: nature, industry, culture, social relations, traditions and place myths.
5.1 The contribution of heritage to sense of place

Chapter Two overviewed the theoretical context in which this study is situated summarising the ideas produced by museology (2.1.1), heritage studies (2.3.1), human geography (2.3.2) and environmental psychology (2.3.4). Chapter Four used a framework of categories and subsets developed from the environmental psychology literature to organise a discussion of the nuanced perspective on sense of place in the North Pennines that the data present. Adding texture to the theoretical context, this chapter draws on ideas from the fields of sociology and gerontology in an exploration of the specific ways in which heritage contributes to sense of place. The section that follows revisits and develops the theory and literature presented in Chapter Two, before suggesting a model to represent the ideas therein.

5.1.1 Heritage studies literature

It is no surprise that interest within the heritage studies literature is with the contribution of ‘sense of place’ to the heritage discourse, rather than that of heritage to ‘sense of place’. The close relationship between heritage and place is often implicit in the literature, rarely examined or contested. Whilst in recent years work has emerged exploring the relationship between museums and representations of place (Davis and Huang, 2009, Dicks, 2007, Watson, 2007a), in some readings, references to ‘place’ and ‘heritage’ interchange as though analogous.

Perhaps it is necessary to unpack what is meant by the term ‘heritage’ before it is possible to explore the contribution of heritage to sense of place. For the last three decades, heritage has been the field of heated debate. As Chapter Two suggested, for some, particularly in the 1980s, heritage signified a popularist, nostalgic use of history, ‘dumbed down’, without the rigour of ‘real’ history. Such critics saw the past commodified and used for present day ends when presented with notions of heritage (section 2.1). In more recent years, the literature has examined the process of cultural production at heritage sites (Bagnall, 2003, Dicks, 2003, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998, 2000) resulting in the recognition that ‘heritage’ might stand for more than just the
material, the fabric, the site, rather that heritage is the process of production of meaning, consumption and representation characterised within cultural studies as a circuit (du Gay et al., 1997). Consumption was paid particular attention and it was suggested that visitors to heritage sites interpreted those texts in a socially interactive process related to public discourses of the past (gleaned from the media and state education) and personal biography (reminiscence and identity) (Dicks, 2000, Bagnall, 2003), creating a plurality of meanings (Ashworth et al., 2007, Gibson, 2009).

Such processes occur not just at heritage sites opening as visitor attractions, but in ordinary places, the ‘mundane’ or ‘everyday’ (Schofield, 2009: 93), with which people create meaning through commonplace interaction (Waterton, 2005). Heritage then, can refer to physical sites or places, but can also be seen as a process of meaning making, an idea illustrated by Laurajane Smith in her book The Uses of Heritage (2006). She identifies the inadequacies of traditional approaches to heritage management, which she describes as the ‘authorised heritage discourse,’ to recognise heritage when it manifests as an expression or process (Smith, 2006).

Smith (2006, Smith and Waterton, 2009) expands on notions of heritage. It is sometimes tangible, in the form of objects and sites, but often heritage is intangible: a song, dance, language, craft, festival or spoken word story (see also Kurin, 2004, Matsura, 2004, Munjeri, 2004, Smith and Akagawa, 2009). In the UK, Smith and Waterton (2009) argue that primacy is given to values embodied within physical objects or buildings. Related notions of inheritance and stewardship work to privilege ‘expert’ understandings of heritage. These are notions derived from the aesthetic approach to building conservation born of the nineteenth century and the conservation movement characterised by William Morris and John Ruskin. They summarise: “the values through which we interpret heritage have become confused with the object itself” (Smith and Waterton, 2009: 291). In developing this argument, heritage can be seen as more than materiality but as a process of remembering, recounting, and identifying in order to make meaning of the past in the present. Such notions suggest a democratisation of
heritage, demanding recognition for ordinary types of heritage and the everyday and plural ways of valuing it, issues discussed in the 2009 volume *Valuing Historic Environments* (Gibson and Pendlebury, 2009b).

Such an understanding has allowed the heritage discourse to acknowledge the value of places once thought banal, even if those ‘experts’ in the heritage sector might consider the suggestion of their recognition or preservation, “audacious and counter-intuitive” (Walton and Wood, 2009: 135). In the UK, the charity Common Ground has developed these ideas over the large part of the last three decades. Common Ground emphasises the expertise of local people in identifying the forms of heritage that hold value for them. Using a number of techniques to engage communities in identifying and celebrating local distinctiveness, Common Ground suggest: “Local distinctiveness is essentially about places and our relationship with them. It is as much about the commonplace as about the rare, about the everyday as much as the endangered, and about the ordinary as much as the spectacular” (Clifford and King, 1993: 7). Similarly Smith (2006: 137-275) draws attention to community action in Castleford, West Yorkshire, where little ‘fabric’ of conventional heritage value remains, but where the process of heritage is active through an annual heritage festival. Combining reminiscence, story-telling and education about the town’s past, the festival serves to maintain, create and recreate, “interpersonal relations that are knitted together to foster community identity” (ibid: 239).

Whilst the heritage studies literature comes to an acceptance of pluralism or ‘multivocality’ (Rodman, 1992), there is an acknowledgement that traditional heritage management systems – the authorised heritage discourse (Smith, 2006)- developed around the positivistic approaches to knowledge of the Enlightenment, have little capacity for safeguarding these latter, more nebulous conceptions of heritage. Gibson explains that whilst the notion that values are constructed has become, “the dominant theoretical approach across the humanities and social sciences” (Gibson and Pendlebury, 2009a: 1) heritage management systems have been slower to evolve, many having been
developed around the understanding that objects and places have an intrinsic value decided upon by experts (ibid).

An alternative heritage discourse thus emerges whereby heritage can be material, an expression or a process. Within this discourse, heritage may be designated and ascribed meanings by experts in a top-down process, but equal value is also demanded for the ‘bottom-up,’ ‘grass-roots,’ every day meanings ascribed to it (see for example, Howard, 2009). This chapter ultimately argues for a holistic understanding of heritage that is not categorised into types (such as movable, immovable, tangible or intangible heritage) (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 2004: 57, Smith and Waterton, 2009: 291). However in order to explain this argument it is useful to understand what an alternative heritage discourse might embrace. Figure 8 models this alternative heritage discourse, whereby heritage can contribute to sense of place through the materiality of historic and natural features, the expression of traditions such as craft, dialect, culinary techniques, dance or music, and the process of the engagement of ordinary people with such heritage resources whereby meanings are made and remade, for example through remembering, reminiscing, educating and interpreting. Smith supports the notion of heritage as a cultural process explaining, “What makes certain activities ‘heritage’ are those activities that actively engage with thinking about and acting out not only ‘where we have come from’ in terms of the past, but also ‘where we are going’ (2006: 84). Understandings of heritage have expanded to become more holistic, relative and democratised and scholars of heritage studies continue to challenge the dominant systems of acknowledging and managing heritage resources. It is with this understanding of heritage that the contribution of heritage to sense of place in the North Pennines is examined. The next section puts this understanding within the context of the wider literature.
Alternative Heritage Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material (tangible heritage)</th>
<th>Expression (intangible heritage)</th>
<th>Process (intangible heritage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Buildings</td>
<td>o Traditional techniques such as crafts and culinary methods</td>
<td>o Remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sites</td>
<td>o Traditional music and dance</td>
<td>o Reminiscing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Nature</td>
<td>o Dialect</td>
<td>o Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Objects</td>
<td>o Traditional festivals</td>
<td>o Researching and interpreting heritage (for example local history or genealogy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Regional characteristics
- Spiritual beliefs and practices
- Traditional modes of dress
- Remembering
- Reminiscing
- Storytelling
- Educating
- Collecting
- Visiting heritage sites and displays
- Watching traditional performances
- Taking part in festivals
- Preparing exhibitions

**Figure 8 The alternative heritage discourse**

5.1.2 Wider literature

In geography the idea that ‘quotidian’ landscapes can be sites of memory and therefore that heritage is a process of everyday meaning making, has recently been probed (Atkinson, 2007). By studying the relationship between residents and their ‘heritage pastiche’ dockland housing estate in Hull, David Atkinson (ibid) noted not only that residents were comforted by the kitsch, fabricated symbols of seafaring with which their surroundings were littered, but this appeal to notions of heritage was part of their sense of place. Indeed when the only building within the estate of any genuine historic fabric was threatened, residents formed an action group to save it. Here they planned to create a heritage display and a whole process of meaning-making began, as people came forward with memories of the dockland which inspired the development of an archive. Atkinson notes, “This signals how easily a derelict building... can be invested with significance as a focus of heritage...” (2007: 534) implying that ‘heritage’ can be more than a historic building by focussing on the process of identification, interpretation and memory talk rather than built fabric. This is a view in support of the alternative heritage
discourse suggested above. Moreover, Atkinson’s (2007) study provides an example of how an everyday place can be imbued with heritage value by ordinary people: the building was not unique, nor spectacular, just a site of decaying Victorian fabric, ubiquitous in the wider surroundings of Hull.

The notion of heritage as a form of social interaction has been further explored in the field of sociology. Again recent research in this field has shown that everyday places are the sites of reference for continual, ordinary memory talk: reminiscences and references to the past that help place individuals in the present (Degnen, 2005) and also stake a claim to their belonging or ‘insideness’ (Rowles, 1983, Rowles and Watkins, 2003). This is a process of identity work to develop ‘insideness’ and belonging, through reference to the past. It is a process which finds agreement with the alternative heritage discourse described above (see figure 8) that embraces heritage as material, expression or process.

To be ‘inside’ is to identify with something distinctly different to those ‘outside’. The contribution of heritage to senses of place can often be seen in this sort of ‘identity-work’ (Smith, 2006), by which an individual or group marks themselves as different from others by asserting a belonging to a place with distinctive features or characteristics. Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) suggest that place contributes to identity, in part, by providing reference points from which to distinguish oneself from others. As Chapter Two section 2.3.3 indicated, this drive for distinctiveness has been increasingly exercised under the competitive economic pressures of globalisation. Once, a strong place identity might have been attributed to limited mobility and the tendency towards residence in a single place from birth until death. But within a single generation (from the 1940s to the 1970s), travel has become both desirable and achievable (Relph, 2008). In a world where place distinctiveness is threatened by the flood of globalisation, identifying and asserting the particularity of place has presented a retreat from the flood or a tool for anchorage (Crang, 1998: 102, Dicks, 2000: 51, Harvey, 1990: 302, Smith, 2006: 75). This dissertation seeks to argue that some form of ‘insideness’ is at the core of links between heritage and sense of place, at the point of intersection between notions of place, people and time.
The next section introduces the notion that these dialectics come together in a three-dimensional model following the work of Edward Relph (1976) and Catherine Degnen (2005).

5.1.3 Three-dimensional model

Edward Relph (1976) sees place, activity and meaning coming together in an approach to place. For Relph, place links to activity and this relates to Chapter Four’s discussion, particularly the preference of the North Pennines for enjoyable activities (place dependency) or the way in which the North Pennines helped or hindered the ease of daily life (self-efficacy). Relph (ibid) also links place to meaning, so that an individual might read or decode a place to draw conclusions, for example the identification of a ‘safe’ place or a ‘wilderness’ place (for discussion see Stedman 2003). Finally Relph (1976) links meaning back to activity. This is the way in which an activity or behaviour in a place gives it its meaning. This could be the performance of a ritual or other expression of cultural heritage, but in the North Pennines, this idea relates just as easily to the ‘openness’ or codes of friendliness that characterised sense of place discourse there (see for example, Chapter Four sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.4). So what emerges from Relph’s discussion of place identity is the notion of place as a triad of intersecting notions: place, activity and meaning, a triad that can be further developed in order to explore the contribution of heritage to sense of place.

The previous section critiqued Smith’s (2006) ‘authorised heritage discourse’ with its focus on tangible heritage resources and expert-led systems of knowledge. An alternative heritage discourse was introduced in which the conceptualisation of heritage embraces the intangibility of heritage as a cultural expression or as a process of meaning making (figure 8). Using Relph’s (1976) approach to place, in which place intersects with meaning and activity, it is possible to map these three ideas back to the alternative heritage discourse. Figure 8 presented the alternative heritage discourse in terms of material, expression and process and it is possible to argue that these three ideas link directly to Relph’s notions of place (material), activity (expression) and meaning.
(process). What Relph’s model does not make explicit however is the role of time or temporality. The contribution of heritage to sense of place is the underpinning of activity with the durability and lustre of temporality: the notion of tradition. Heritage is also the way in which people work together to make sense of their identity over time: the process of meaning making. The authorised heritage discourse makes clear that heritage can also be embodied as an object or physical place. Taking this idea forward, it is possible to visualise sense of place as a relationship between people (processes and expressions), place (physicality) with a third dimension: the depth of time (temporality) (figure 9). These intersecting ideas also present another way of viewing the limitations of the authorised heritage discourse and ‘official community heritage’ (2.2.1).

The dominant understanding of heritage allows only for the recognition of heritage when it references materiality. Within figure 9 this means that the intersection of time with place falls within the authorised heritage discourse, and this might be demonstrated through the listing by English Heritage of historic buildings, their register of historic gardens and the UNESCO designation of cultural landscapes. The intersection of people and place might also be seen falling within the authorised heritage discourse, with for example, the preservation of the famous buildings and homes of famous people by the National Trust. Where the authorised heritage discourse is limited however, is in its capacity to recognise the intersection of people and time, for example the acknowledgement of processes of meaning making such as the Castleford Heritage Festival (see previous section 5.1.1) reminiscence, or the expression of cultural heritage in a regional dialect. Smith and Waterton (2009: 289) point out that England has yet to ratify or accept UNESCO’s *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* which would open out the heritage discourse better placing it to acknowledge heritage as a cultural process. The next section explores the conceptualisation of heritage as a process that falls without the authorised heritage discourse at the intersection in figure 9 of notions of people and time. It does so by discussing the landscapes of memory in which local people place one another.
Figure 9 Sense of place as a three-dimensional model of people, place and time
5.1.4 Place and social memory

The idea of three-dimensionality has been explored by sociologist Catherine Degnen (2005) who cites Ryden:

A sense of place results gradually and unconsciously from inhabiting a landscape over time, becoming familiar with its physical properties, accruing a history within its confines... when space takes on three dimensions, when it acquires depth, it becomes place.


Degnen (ibid) describes how talking about memories is a process through which local people make meanings of their places. Environmental psychologists John Dixon and Kevin Durheim (2000) have explored the importance of talk and language in their discussion of place identity, noting that these are cognitive processes that demand a discursive approach to sense of place. Through talking about place and memories, sense of place is delivered from the ‘vaults’ of the mind to the foreground of human dialogue and language becomes the channel through which sense of place takes shape (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000). In an ethnographic study of residents of Dodworth, South Yorkshire, Degnen (2005) similarly explored the use of what she describes as ‘memory talk’ in the everyday interactions she observed. This confluence of theory shores up arguments for an alternative heritage discourse that recognises heritage as a process, in this case of talking about place and history. As Smith notes, heritage is, “not so much a ‘thing’, but... a cultural and social process, which engages with acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present” (2006:2). Shifts in the study of both place and memory have evidenced increased interest in theories of identity and also, “the inherently temporal aspects of both remembering and the experience of place” (Degnen, 2005: 729).

In a conceptual shift running parallel to arguments for an alternative heritage discourse, both Atkinson (2007, 2008) and Degnen (ibid) agree that memory is not just related to formal commemorative sites and practices, but that ordinary material environments can
have emotional meaning though memory (Hockey et al., 2005). Memory, like heritage and indeed as a ‘process’ within the alternative heritage discourse, is related to everyday mundane interactions, part and parcel of ordinary ‘webs of relations’. For Degnen, memory as a heritage process was key to identity work in Dodworth, as talk, “shuttled between present and past, individual and collective...” (2005: 730) so that people ceaselessly placed each other through, “shared memories of where what had been and by what events they had experienced together”(ibid: 733). In this reading, physical relics of the past were less necessary as memory talk reconstructed, “where what had been...”

This interpretation supports an argument for memory as a heritage process whereby meaning is made of the temporality of place. Place can be seen as Atkinson eloquently puts it, “as a topology of memories: as a sedimented, folded, undulating terrain of associations and memories – and as one continually reconfigured by new eruptions of memory...” (Atkinson, 2007: 523). Here, sense of place is seen through Tim Ingold’s ‘dwelling perspective’ (2000) whereby generations of previous occupants have left a place with a rich patina of meaning and associations. This view agrees with Pierre Nora’s ‘lieux de mémoire’ (1989: 7), where ordinary places, or even places absent of any physical features from the past, are sites of interaction and memory talk (Degnen, 2005: 735) and the adoption of a local disposition. The temporal aspect of place is the depth of knowledge and feeling that accumulates over time so that Degnen sees social memory as a three-dimensional perspective of place, absence (memories of places changed beyond recognition) and relationality (the way relationships between people are worked into places both present and erased) (2005: 738).

These perspectives inspire and support an illustration of the contribution of heritage to sense of place as a model of the three intersecting concepts of place, people and time introduced above and in figure 9. In this model time provides the three-dimensional depth of the people-place interaction, an interaction that is a memory of the past, happening in the present, and making sense of the future. Discussion above (5.1.3) indicated the limitations of the authorised heritage discourse to acknowledge heritage
when it occurs as a process at the intersection of people or communities with notions of temporality. Whilst the latter two sections of the chapter discuss the relationship between people, place and time in terms of ‘place-referent continuity’ (5.3) and notions of local distinctiveness (5.4), the section which follows examines the process of heritage through which people make sense of their history and culture; the relationship between people and time (figure 9).

5.2 People and time

Not all elements cited as contributing to sense of place in the North Pennines data were physical and tangible. According to Tuan, place can be seen as, “time made visible” but also as a, “memorial to times past” (1977: 179). So whilst discussion of senses of place or belonging in the North Pennines referred to nature and the natural landscape, data were also coded to categories such as: social bonds (for example knowing people and being known); heritage and ancestral connections; and growing up and nostalgia. Each of these ideas expands on understandings of the interaction of people and communities with ideas of history and temporality. These ideas sit at the intersection of people and time within the three-dimensional model (figure 9), the intersection that falls outside of the authorised heritage discourse, and each will now be discussed in turn.

5.2.1 Social bonds

Data referring to sense of place and social bonds or interaction can be grouped into a cluster of subsets: being known and knowing others; and trust including acceptance and comfort, and community spirit. Each subset demonstrates the contribution of heritage to sense of place through frequent references to temporality, so that for example, individuals are known over their whole lives and their fathers and mothers are known before them. Such longevity of knowledge leads to senses of trust and acceptance which in turn contribute to a community spirit characteristic of sense of place in the North Pennines. Each of these subsets will now be discussed in turn in order to illustrate the contribution to sense of place that heritage makes as a process of meaning making.
Data coded to categories of ‘belonging’, ‘networks’ and ‘community’ included subcategories of references to the pleasure and reassurance derived from being known amongst local residents and knowing others:

Oh yeah, you go down the front street, drive up the front street and you’re waving, you’re waving, you’re waving, you’re waving...

And yeah I’ve started to feel OK, I feel quite happy going into pubs and I’ll go into Langdon Beck anyway, because you always sort of know someone in the end (NP11).

Samuel (1994: 8,15) describes the way in which the past infuses daily life so that history and memory are indivisible. Part of this notion of knowing and being known in the North Pennines, is the idea of history, that not only is an individual known, but likewise their parents and wider family.

Well probably people more than anything else. People know you and your history and the same with other locals, you know them you know their history and you can go back over a lot of years sometimes you know...

And I mean you know, if you’ve gone to school with somebody you know and that sort of thing isn’t it? You know and you’ve known them most of your life (NP21).

An oral historian and photographer captures this sentiment poignantly:

...it’s like a three D network that you’re joined into, these’re real people (I’m) not just interested in, “oh I’ve got another picture of old Alston” you know “oh I’ve got 500 now.” It’s not like that. It’s about how people look like one another as they come through time and you feel their character and you remember what it was like to be with them. And you know what it’s like to be with their children and grandchildren now, so it’s part of belonging. It’s integral, it’s one thing, you know it’s one complex thing (NP11).
Such data illustrate the sense in which connections between people have a temporal depth, casting back over generations and therefore contributing to sense of place for those involved. This kind of being known has been theorised within the study of ageing as part of a system of ‘autobiographical insideness’ (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000: 457, Rowles, 1983: 302), where to be an ‘insider’ means one’s biography is shared: “you know them and you can go back over a lot of years” (NP21).

This temporality of social contact might be seen to add to feelings of security and trust:

_TO a certain extent... you know who you can rely on, I mean and all (as well), you know? At least that’s what I think. I don’t know how you see it, but that’s how I see it_ (NP21).

_Well certainly I think a sense of trust is a big one and the fact that doors are always open and until very recently that’s always been the case. There are thefts you know and there is crime and more so I suppose recently. I mean until then you know, you got kids messing around, but nothing serious. But my mum and dad never had the door locked_ (NP08).

Trust is recognised as a part of the glue that holds communities together in terms of social capital (1993, Putnam, 1995) and its existence in the North Pennines is evidenced in data that reference neighbours willing to help one another, sure in the knowledge of reciprocity:

_Because the people... I mean you know there’s the fractions (sic)... you always have, you know, differences, but I honestly think, if you had a problem here, there would be somebody that would be willing to help you. Whether it was medical, you need a doctor, you need your shopping doing, you need your garden doing, you need somebody to come up and fix a plug... it’s just the place to be. It’s just the place to be. I don’t think there’s anything that you couldn’t go to someone in this village and... you know they wouldn’t refuse, they wouldn’t refuse to come and help you in any way. And that’s the belonging sense. You know that is where you feel_
that that’s the belonging, because you know in your heart... if you were ill or you needed any assistance, someone would help you. And it’s... I don’t think you get that in other places (NP23).

In this way many respondents felt accepted, the third subset of social bonds indicated above. Respondents felt accepted in spite of quarrels and differences of opinions:

*It’s very nice you know, you know nearly all the people and okay you might fight with half of them but it... you know that’s just how it is. There’s a lot less fighting now than it used to be* (NP11).

The sum of these aspects of social bonding through familiarity that has a depth of temporality -being known, trust and acceptance- produce a sense of community, the last subset of the notion of social bonds identified above and evidenced through the data:

*In a little place like Alston it’s er... This is the thing that really takes people if they’re here on holiday or when they first move here, it’s a community. Once you get to know people, you go to the shops and it’s more of a social occasion, because you’re you know, talking to people all the way* (NP10).

*Well it’s the people really, they’re very... once you know them they’re very... I mean they don’t come out all smiley, but once you know them, they’re friends for life. I think, I think there is this sort of real community spirit...* (NP15).

It is interesting here to note that whilst this last quote indicates a sense of belonging or insideness emerging from social relations that have the durability of temporal depth, it also hints at what Relph has described as a dark side of insideness, whereby groups might become parochial (Relph, 2008: v), inward looking and apparently hostile to strangers or ‘incomers’, a phrase commonly used in the North Pennines:

*I think when I came here, at a very, very approximate guess, two thirds of the people were ‘Nentheeders’ but I think much less than that now. There’s an awful predominance of incomers, where there were certain (commonly found) surnames... These things are apparent even to an*
incomer like me who isn’t deep into it. But that is disappearing of course, with the erm, erm dispersal of people and the travel, not tourism at all but people working away... (NP06).

So whilst distinctive places are important in localities that are metamorphosing under pressures of globalisation, it is worth noting that changes that might bring opportunity and broader horizons are often positive. Relph noted, “Increased travel and mobility, combined with electronic interconnectedness that are now taken for granted, have broken down the barriers of that rooted sense of place” (Relph, 2008) and since economic opportunities have expanded and outlooks have broadened, these changes are not always for the worse. To sum up, social bonds in the North Pennines contributed to sense of place as close interpersonal relationships emerged from generations of familiarity and biographical knowledge. Relationships imbued with such a depth of temporality led to trusting, accepting groups of people who came together with a stronger sense of community. Heritage contributes to sense of place through this kind of durable familiarity.

5.2.2 Heritage and ancestral connections

...involvement with place is founded on the easy grasping of time spans of centuries, particularly by the persistence of tradition and through ancestor worship.

(Relph, 1976: 32)

Heritage can contribute to sense of place through close interpersonal familiarity spanning generations, so that within social bonds a solid temporal thread is exposed, as individuals know and are known within the community in the context of the history of their forebears and their interaction with others. In the North Pennines temporal depth was important not just between people in the present, but also with people long passed. Ancestral forms of belonging were pertinent to individuals as they described their sense of place:
Erm... long family tradition... Well my family goes back to about 1700 here. I mean there are a lot of families here that go back much further than that. My family were probably cattle rustlers from Carlisle. Finally they moved up into this area eventually so the family’s been here from about three hundred years (NP03).

I was born and bred in Weardale and I was actually born in the same house that my great, great, great-grandfather was living in the eighteenth century (NP08).

Yes yes. Yes I’ve got to say I’ve got a long history of the family being in this area and I feel, well as I also say, I feel rooted here (NP03).

I think there is still a much bigger proportion of people who have spent their lifetimes, and their ancestors lived in the North Pennines area than you get in any other parts of the country (NP07).

Heritage can therefore be seen to entangle itself in and amongst references to social relations in descriptions of sense of place. This is revealed when awareness of the family history of oneself and others is expressed. It will be seen later in this chapter that landscape acts as a palimpsest for respondents in the North Pennines and whilst descriptions of sense of place referred to community in the present, there are indications that heritage contributed to sense of place through an awareness of the interaction of humans with place over a long history:

...you’ve got a real sense of... you’ve still got, I think, I real connection with the history of this landscape its.. erm... if you know about it I suppose. If you don’t know about it perhaps you wouldn’t have. But I do know about it and I’m interested in it and I’m interested in researching it so you know, the landscape is very much a man made landscape and you’ve got that, I’ve got that feeling of, you know, of following on in the footsteps of all these other people who lived here, and made this place (NP24).

Exploring heritage can be seen as an active expression of sense of place which in itself is inextricably bound up with a sense of people or culture and of the past. Not explored in
this section but elsewhere within the thesis, are the data that refer to change: the natural landscape is an anchor in a place experiencing social change (5.3.2); the born and bred as a ‘dying group’ (6.2); and genealogy as a means for new residents to find rootedness and their own sense of place in a new place (6.2.1). The tangibility of this change can be communicated through expression of nostalgia, and nostalgia following social bonds and ancestral connections is a third category by which the data referring to community and temporality are grouped.

5.2.3 Nostalgia
Temporality or a sense of the past, contributed to sense of place for respondents who harked back to their childhoods and referenced nostalgia in their descriptions. The data reveal a strange calling or pull to return to the area after time away, with references made to childhood. In the same vein a sense of nostalgia that seems to be particularly evoked in the North Pennines was treasured. Notions of globalisation and the appeal to place discussed in Chapter Two (section 2.3) are relevant here. It has been noted that emotional connections to place come to the fore during times of change (Stokowski and Antholine 1995: 2 cited in Walsh et al., 2008: 210). Respondents described returning to the area in the search for a nostalgic idea of the past. Yet in the shifting socioeconomic climate of the North Pennines described in Chapter One (section 1.4.3) it is possible to discern a lament for lost social values of the past.

... he lived down near Maidenhead for most of his life but he retired back here because he... I don’t know... maybe had a call to come back (NP03).

The ‘call’ to move to the North Pennines or return there is connected to notions of the past with reference in the data to the halcyon days of childhood:

No, I’m from Sunderland originally and then Leeds, Canada and most of my career in Teesside... We’ve er, we’ve both been associated with Teesdale erm, on a fairly permanent basis for the last fifteen or twenty years. And my imagination was fired by coming to Teesdale as a ten year
old to Middleton in Teesdale to a holiday camp. And I’ve returned ever since on a fairly regular basis... (NP15).

I think when I was small and lived in the terraced street at Houghton-le-Spring there was that kind of community so I’ve come back to really knowing everybody you know, and everybody helping each other... (NP23).

Research indicates that dwelling on childhood memories can improve happiness and self-esteem (Bryant et al., 2005, Wildschut et al., 2006) and this supports the case made in Chapter Four (4.2.2) to show that place can support self-esteem as a subset of identity. Following this harking back to childhood, data seem to expose a perception of North Pennines communities as custodians of a heritage of traditional values that are lost to fast-paced urban life. Ashworth and Graham noted in their critique of heritage and sense of place, the past is sometimes used to validate the present by, “conveying the idea of timeless values” (2005b: 9) and the cultural heritage of the North Pennines worked in this way for the following respondent:

I spent a lot of my childhood on the farm and wanted my children to able to have the same experience that I had... And indeed the children really did enjoy coming to the cottage right up until the time that they left home it was always a popular place to go. They could run free, they could help with the hay-time, they could go for walks and they could do the sorts of things that I used to enjoy and did enjoy...

They keep an eye when we’re not there, they cut the grass for me... and I cannot reward them for doing it... however hard; they won’t accept payment and so you’ve got to try and do something in kind. I think it... it’s like it was when I was young (NP07).

... one of the things I really like about it is that he’s got a childhood like my childhood. It feels like stepping back in time. You know he’s got a childhood where... there’s all this stuff now about children, parents, you know, wrapping their children up in cotton wool and children not being
able to be... to wander and play out. Euan and his friends can go down to the river and wander around in fields here and he has a mobile phone, I can keep tabs on him to some extent but you know he can be out ‘til eight o clock at night and I don’t have to really worry (NP24).

Which is what I like about it, things have changed less... (NP07).

The sense that the place acts as a reminder of the past through nostalgia is certainly perceived to be an attraction for visitors to the region:

Well that’s what I think, because it’s one of the places that still looks the same as it did. You know, seventy, eighty year ago, it hasn’t changed. And I think this brings people back, where they go to other places, like Slaley and Newhouses, places like that and it changes but this is... their youth, you know they’re going back because they remember it and it’s still the same (NP23).

It might be said that nostalgia however, is only ever revealed when cast under the spotlight of change. As a key organisation campaigning for safeguarding sense of place, Common Ground, argue: “Local, really local, significance is rehearsed in a subtle dance of detail and patina: we understand a place in close up, through stories retold, meanings shared, accumulations of fragments and identities. Our appreciation of it is often only tested when unsympathetic change threatens, or has already materialised” (Clifford and King, 2010b).

Data coded to a category entitled ‘change’ indicate a sharp sensitivity to the changes that respondents perceive around them (described in Chapter One, section 1.4.3). Places now absent exist in the landscape of memory as demonstrated in a snippet of memory talk that echoes Degnen’s (2005) Dodworth research:

At Rookhope, you know it’s hard to imagine if you drive through it now, I don’t know whether you know the village at all. It’s got a tiny corner shop which doubles as the post office and it used to have three shops when I
was younger, no four shops. There was a little sweet shop right down the bottom, and the sweet shop near the top and then there was the one that’s still there and then there was a Co-op (co-operative grocery shop) as well so there was a choice of four places to go for sweets when we were kids! Yeah, there’s only the one left... (NP08).

Lament for the past in a climate of change is a motif repeating throughout discussion of sense of place:

I think I miss the way things were... I don’t know, I don’t know... things change... things change it’s as simple as that. Erm it was nice you know if there was a stranger you knew he was a stranger in the village. Simple as that (NP20).

This section has explored the notion of heritage as a process that is not necessarily connected to physical places. This is a view of heritage that falls without the authorised heritage discourse that can only legitimise heritage in its material form. The alternative heritage discourse has been presented as a Venn diagram in which notions of place, people and time intersect (figure 9). This section has explored the processes that are located at the intersection of people and time and that are without reference to any specific tangible elements of place. The descriptions of sense of place from the North Pennines dataset that have been presented in this section have referenced the temporal depth of: interpersonal familiarity in relation to the social bonds; ancestral heritage; and senses of nostalgia and childhood, as examples of the contribution of intangible forms of heritage to sense of place. The next section of this chapter moves on to discuss the contribution of heritage to sense of place when heritage is taken as a holistic concept combining tangible and intangible elements to include heritage material, expressions and processes. This can be illustrated as the intersection of people, place and time in the Venn diagram in section 5.1.3 (figure 9), and also as the alternative heritage discourse presented in figure 8, section 5.1.1.
5.3 People and place and time
Heritage contributes to sense of place through a three-dimensional model that gives the relationship between people and place the depth of temporality. This chapter has illustrated that time and people work together through heritage processes to create sense of place. This sense of place grows out of interpersonal relationships that span generations, awareness of ancestral lineage casting back into the past and the manner in which a place and its society can function as a reminder of the past through nostalgia and reminiscences of childhood. These are processes that take place within the context of a place but do not necessarily take immediate reference from any material, physical fabric of place. Discussion will now turn to the way in which the tangible elements of place intersect with notions of people and their senses of themselves as they move through time.

5.3.1 Continuity
The previous chapter used an identity process model to examine discussion of sense of place within the North Pennines dataset (section 4.2). This model identified elements of identity that are supported by place, namely distinctiveness, self-efficacy, self-esteem and continuity. Continuity, it was noted, could be subcategorised into the manner in which place supported life-story (place-reference continuity) and the way in which place support self-image (place-congruent continuity). This section returns to notions of continuity in order to tease out the relationship between people, place and time. According to Relph, “The result of... a growing attachment, imbued as it is with a sense of continuity, is the feeling that this place has endured and will persist as a distinctive entity even though the world around may change” (1976: 32). It follows that the physical or material fabric of place can serve as a reminder for people as time passes and other referents change.

Graham Rowles in a study of older members of a North American community, argues that individuals transform spaces into places through repeated interaction over a lifetime which develops a sense of place (Rowles, 1983, Rowles and Watkins, 2003: 78).
They do this, he suggests, through having tangible objects or places that serve as reminders of their personal history. This also occurs through the repetition of physical interactions with place over time to develop subconscious familiarity of place through habit and an autobiographical form of insideness. As Chapter Four has explored, spaces become places through a process of emotional bonding, what Jorgensen and Stedmen (2006) have described as ‘affective ties’ to place (see also Altman and Low, 1992). Furthermore Rowles and Watkins suggest that spaces become places when they can produce a sense of home, where a place is a secure centre from, “which we venture forth and to which we often long to return” (2003: 81). This is a suggestion supported by discussion in the previous chapter which noted the way in which respondents missed the North Pennines when they were away (section 4.3.2).

Chapter Four described the two subsets of continuity provided by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996). Place-referent continuity describes the way an individual uses the characteristics of a specific place to refer to themselves and their actions in the past in that place: environment provides an aide-mémoire (Korpela, 1989). As discussed in Chapter Four, place-congruent continuity on the other hand is derived not from specific landscapes, but from landscapes that present suitably characteristic yet generic features that are in keeping with self-image and life-story. Evidence of place-congruent continuity has been examined in the previous chapter (section 4.2) and in this section the discussion opens out to examine evidence of place-referent continuity. In this way, discussion will develop the idea that a temporal thread runs through the relationship between people and place evidenced in the processes, expressions and fabric of heritage.

5.3.2 Place referent continuity

...there is still a much bigger proportion of people who have spent their lifetimes here... than you get in any other parts of the country (NP07).
There’s a diminishing group of people who you would call native to this area, that means they’ve lived here all of their lives, their parents lived here, their grandparents lived here (NP03).

The model put forward by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) provides a useful framework for examining the data collected in the North Pennines. Interviews provide evidence that sense of place in the North Pennines can provide place-referent continuity for those interviewed. The quotes above suggest in particular that some respondents had lived in the area for their entire lives. The data indicating evidence of place-referent continuity can be organised into three groups: familiarity with place; memories in place; and leaving and returning. These groupings will now be discussed in turn.

Respondents referenced familiarity with place:

Well yes, I suppose when I think about it I do but it’s the longest I’ve lived anywhere in my life... I feel no urge to move on (NP10).

Hay (1998) suggests place attachment is related to length of stay and therefore familiarity, and this is explored in Chapter Four (section 4.3), however the references to familiarity can also be organised, according to the coding of the North Pennines data, into the subcategories of: familiar landscape and routine which link to Rowles’ (1983) notions of ‘insideness’ and place-making through habitual interaction; and knowing everyone. Respondents referred to a familiarity with the landscape when describing their positive emotional connection with place. For this dry stone waller, his sense of attachment is directly related to his familiarity with the landscape:

I don’t know... I don’t know you just get attached to somewhere. I mean I suppose in the whole time I’ve been walling, there isn’t a single place in the dale I haven’t been in. I’ve been in every little hillside and I don’t think there’s many people that can say that, that live in the dale. If anyone (NP20).
The unchanging nature of landscape means that for some respondents, familiarity with it served to anchor identity through place:

*I think so. The people change. The landscape doesn’t tend to, not as quickly anyway. So I go up there and a lot of the people that I know in the village have died or moved out... there’s still a few people that I recognise... but you know when you go on the fells, it’s just timeless. And I know going back, way back it wasn’t heather moors and all the rest... But you know, as long as I’ve known it, it’s been like that. And it probably will be you know, for as long as I’m here* (NP08).

This response illustrates Relph’s suggestion that, “…the persistence of the character of places is apparently related to a continuity both in our experience of change and in the very nature of change that serves to reinforce a sense of association and attachment to those places” (Relph, 1976: 31).

Familiarity with place can also be linked to routine:

*You just know when everything, as it gets to this time of year, April and into May, say in May everything starts drying up I get my flowers out there, my flower tubs out there, start painting things on the front - same time of year, we do it every year- brighten things up, colour there, my hammock outside, my glass of wine on a night time (laughing)... but you know that the spring and the summer’s coming and you can sit on this front here, on the hammock and see the little yellow wagtails, the grey wagtails, different birds, all bathing, in the stream down there, you know the stream that runs through the front of the house it’s lovely* (NP02).

This data support the notion of ‘insideness’ (Rowles, 1983, Rowles and Watkins, 2003) which discussion above has indicated is linked to familiarity though repetitive, habitual interaction. Rowles suggests that insideness can be physical (knowing a place through habit) and also social: “stemming from integration within the social fabric of the community” (1983: 302). As discussion in section 5.2.1 has already discussed, when
discussing familiarity with place, respondents referred to knowing others and being known.

Place referent continuity also linked to memories. Respondents discussed memories of both childhood:

*Upper Weardale. It’s the landscape up there that does it for me. If I ever just feel like I want to get away from it all I would head up onto Bollihope Common or the top between Rookhope and Westgate just on the fells. I think as a child, we used to go out and walk on the fells loads and that’s sort of home to me* (NP08).

and family:

*I think once you’re set somewhere for a long time, especially when your family’s up... you’ve sort of sprouted your roots...* (NP20).

When describing sense of place, respondents also referred to feelings about leaving and stories about returning, themes that seem salient to place-referent continuity for what they reveal about landscape as an aide-mémoire to past-actions (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996).

Feelings about leaving the area were discussed in some of the interviews. Respondents talked about how they would feel if they had to leave in order to help articulate their sense of place:

*...I think I would be very upset to leave and I guess as time goes on, and... you build more memories and enjoyment of the place I think it probably gets harder still* (NP04).

Discussion of nostalgia, above (section 5.2.3) has also indicated the tendency amongst local people to return to the area in later life:
And it’s interesting to see how many people leave the dale, only to come back in their forties and fifties. So I think there’s a very deep love of the dale itself (NP09).

This anecdotal evidence of the tendency to return might be connected to Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s (1996) suggestion that place-referent continuity is a subset of place identity. Elements of the landscape carry meaning for the self-identity of those returning to the North Pennines:

A friend of mine, she’s gone to Norfolk to live, she hates it because it’s just flat. Now she misses the hills. When she comes home, all they do is walk up and down the hills and I mean, you know her son actually has known nothing else, but he still likes to come back because it’s, it’s the hills and the valleys (NP24).

Place can contribute to identity in the North Pennines, by providing place-referent continuity, with the surroundings a physical reminder of past-selves and actions for people experiencing sense of place there. Kalevi Korpela (1989) has examined the way in which place can act in this way as a mnemonic tool to help individuals regulate their self-identity and there are parallels with Twigger-Ross and Uzzell’s notions of place-referent continuity (1996). This is achieved through familiarity: familiar landscape; familiar routines related to the place; and familiar people (the sense of being known and knowing others). These are notions described as social and autobiographical insideness (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000, Rowles, 1983, Rowles and Watkins, 2003). Place-referent continuity manifests in the way that sense of place for a number of respondents was intimately bound up with notions of childhood and family. Finally the data indicate that place is used as a reference point for the continuity of identity through evidence of a reluctance leave and a desire to return. Chapter Four examined notions of distinctiveness as a subset of place-identity (section 4.2.4) and distinctiveness is a theme to which this chapter now returns, the next section examining the features of particularity that were referenced in the North Pennines interviews.
5.4 Distinctiveness

Heritage has been seen to contribute to sense of place through the relationship between people, place and time illustrated as three-dimensional model (figure 9). Heritage can be a tangible part of the built or natural fabric of a place through the values ascribed to it. However heritage can also be an intangible expression, for example of dialect or tradition. Discussion has also seen that heritage can be a process of making meaning through memory talk, reminiscence, genealogy or education. This alternative heritage discourse champions the meanings ascribed by ordinary people to everyday places as heritage texts. This section examines how cultural heritage helps distinguish one place from another in an increasingly homogenising, globalised world, as Relph points out, “Place, however else it might be interpreted, is unquestionably about difference...” (Relph, 1976: vi). Chapter Four examined the way in which place can support an individual’s sense of distinctiveness as part of their self-identity. Whilst a place might carry with it certain cultural characteristics that can help an individual or group mark themselves out from others, the manner in which a place itself is distinctive from other places is often described as ‘local distinctiveness’.

5.4.1 Common Ground

In the UK the charitable organisation Common Ground has worked for twenty six years to promote the safeguarding of sense of place in the form of what it describes as ‘local distinctiveness’ which is defined thus:

“Distinctiveness is about partularity, it is rehearsed in the buildings and land shapes, the brooks and birds, trees and cheeses, places of worship and pieces of literature. It is about continuing history and nature jostling with each other, layers and fragments – old and new. The ephemeral and invisible are important too: customs, dialects, celebrations, names, recipes, spoken history, myths, legends and symbols.”

(Clifford and King, 2010a)
Common Ground is internationally recognised for its interest in the linking of nature with culture through art and the environment. In a sentiment echoed by that of the ecomuseum paradigm (examined in more detail in Chapter Seven), the organisation focuses upon the positive investment people can make in their own localities. Drawing striking comparisons with the ecomuseum paradigm, Common Ground champions democratic involvement as a process that can improve the quality of the way ordinary people live in everyday places. The organisation has developed techniques to engage groups of residents in exploring this ‘local distinctiveness’ through cognitive mapping exercises such as illustrating parish maps (Clifford and King, 2010b) in order to identify the features and characteristics of the locality that make it different from others. North Pennines respondents described their sense of place with reference to a number of features of local distinctiveness, many of which are easily seen as heritage when examined through the lens of the alternative heritage discourse described above (figure 8).

5.4.2 Local distinctiveness: ‘Heritage’ factors contributing to sense of place
This chapter has suggested that heritage contributes to sense of place by providing the third dimension of temporality to the people-place dialectic (figure 9). It has also described an alternative heritage discourse that conceptualises heritage as more than the physicality of place. This is a discourse with the capacity to embrace heritage as the intangible processes of making meaning of places or the expression of place identity though traditions (figure 8). The alternative heritage discourse and the conceptualisation of sense of place as a three-dimensional relationship of people, place and time (figure 9) agrees broadly with Common Ground’s definition of ‘local distinctiveness’. Within this definition, sense of place, and its temporal depth can be identified through the combination of: buildings, land-shapes, wildlife, nature, local produce, spiritual and artistic expressions, customs, dialects, festivals, culinary techniques, stories and myths. Common Ground see heritage as integral to local distinctiveness, as a jostling of old and new. Discussion in section 5.2 examined the interrelation of people and time in the sensing of place and in section 5.3 attention was given to the manner in which the physical environment can act as a referent for personal history. The final section of this
chapter will examine the intersection of people, place and time through notions of local distinctiveness that were indicated in the interview data.

In the North Pennines respondents indicated a number of features that would agree with the Common Ground definition of local distinctiveness as ‘continuing history jostling with nature’. It was clear that for many respondents, the North Pennines was experienced as a very distinctive place to live:

*I think it’s... especially this area, it’s sort of unique really, Alston Moor. You know and I suppose its er... a bit like Weardale and all, you know it’s sort of a unique area I think. I don’t think there’s anywhere quite like it really.*

*I think everybody at the bottom of them, I think they’ll agree that it’s unique and it’s... you know the views and everything (NP12).*

...I very much feel that it er, it’s... this area has significant landscape and it’s quite, it’s not unique but its fairly unique, largely because of the erm... the grouse shooting and the... the preservation of the moorland at a particular, in a particular state to the grouse, means that you’ve had very little development during the whole of the last century... (NP27).

In accounts of sense of place in the North Pennines, it was possible to code data to categories of: nature; the legacy of industry; cultural heritage; tradition; and creativity, myth and memory. Each of these areas will now be discussed in turn.

In descriptions of the special and distinctive features of the North Pennines, respondents referred to nature. They described the landscape characterised by wide, open, wilderness spaces that marked the North Pennines as special:

*But I feel... I love the landscape, I love the, you know, I love the sort of, these massive hills and the openness... (NP24).*
Wildlife and scenery marked the North Pennines as different, sometimes superior to other places:

> And then you get people like us who like it because of the scenery, because of the wildlife, and because of the heritage... (NP07).

> And when I walk about and I see you know a pit shaft up the lane or I see deer going across the road past the pit shaft... all these are all experiences that I take in (NP26).

> But the trouble is we live in it, we don’t appreciate the scenery. I mean there’s not many places in the country where you can go five miles out of Alston and if it’s a fine day you’ll look across and see the Solway which is fifty miles away. There’s not many places in the country you can do that (NP12).

In particular respondents remarked on the geology of the region,

> So here the narrow river valley is a geographical factor which is part of the cultural landscape because it’s imposed certain things upon the way, the fact that its got a mining history, it’s got a monastic history it’s got a particular stone and form to the place... (NP26).

References were also made to flora:

> I’m in the Upper Teesdale Botany Group you see which is... I mean Teesdale is a very important place for er you know rare flowers and things.

> The peace, the tranquillity. All the natural history things. Flowers and birds and the people (NP14).

Respondents saw the North Pennines as unspoilt, “Well I think people see it as a beautiful place, they see it as an unspoilt place” (NP26) and also as discussion has shown above (5.2) as unchanged:
...you’ve had very little development during the whole of the last century, in fact since the lead mining era, things have hardly changed at all and I do like that, that’s erm significant in this area and its something that is attractive (NP27).

The landscape had cultural elements that were unchanged – “And people still call the fields by their names they had in the 1800s which is great” (NP04) – and continuity was also provided by the built environment:

*Well that’s what I think, because it’s one of the places that still looks the same as it did. You know, seventy, eighty year ago, it hasn’t changed* (NP23).

This combination of wilderness and open spaces characterised the North Pennines as an isolating place for respondents through, “its remoteness and relative lack of people”(NP15):

*I would say one of the characteristics would be is that people who live here feel fairly cut off, although, you know obviously nowhere near in the sense that they may have done years ago but it’s things which are expressed* (NP26).

*I suppose the two North Pennine dales, shut off for much of the year, quite often, especially in the nineteenth century when the, you know, Dickens-style winters. Erm... that they erm, turned in on themselves...* 

*Every village is dispersed along this main road. With the exception of little Rookhope. And you can see how they’d become, in former times when times were hard, or reasonable transport -before people were car owners- there’s a great... there’s a tendency to be inward looking and separate because that was geographically the fact* (NP09).

*It’s relatively isolated and so there’s a stronger sense of identity amongst Teesdale people than probably in many parts of the country now. Erm that’s er... so, the geographic circumstances and the*
employment of the centuries of mining for lead and various other minerals... (NP15).

...the differences and the way that the places seem much more distant than just the few miles that they in reality are (NP18).

Chapter One described the industrial heritage of lead mining in the region (1.3.2 and 1.3.5). Mining and the tradition of the mining industry were recalled when respondents described the local distinctiveness of the North Pennines:

Well in this area, most people had something to do with lead mining. They were either lead miners or they were in the ancillary trades around lead mining. Erm, they might have been blacksmiths or something like that, toolmakers. Erm and I mean if they worked in a shop, then it was serving people who were working in the lead mines. So it was all to do with lead mining. There was a farming population as well. But mainly it was lead miners, and further down the valley it was quarrying (NP03).

This respondent for example, recollected the tradition of miner-farmers, lead miners who cultivated small holdings:

I don’t think.... a lot of people you know... it’s about who you know. And there’s a lot of... the miners, the miners were miner-farmers weren’t they? And their families were miners and farmers and there’s a lot of that still goes on, you know that people do half a dozen things – there’s you know, there’s a chap who part of the time he helps with the coal lorries, part of the time he helps with the farming, so people can still make a living in some ways in those old ways. Erm and I think there’s a lot of very traditional, you know there’s a lot of families here that have been here for a long time or are very local..., so there’s a lot of really old families that are still in this area (NP24).

There was a lament for the demise of traditional industry:
You know and now I mean anyone that’s er what, thirty, definitely thirty and younger, don’t know like how the dale was made and that like you know? I mean some of them will know, but you know, it was mines, mining and quarrying that made Weardale erm… it’s as simple as that. It’s lost it’s lost forever! (NP20).

Well, er, Frosterley in particular grew up around quarrying, very, very much, it’s the centre of er, everything that went on at that particular time in that particular era. That was sort of you know, just before I was born and… because the village hall itself was built by the local quarrymen. They did it physically themselves, even gave a penny of their wages a week to build it which in those days was a lot of money. So if somebody came and said, well, where, what is the heritage of your village without a doubt it’s quarrying, without a doubt yes (NP25).

This shared experience of working life has led to cultural characteristics, as seen in Chapter Four section 4.1.1:

I... think it’s... it’s the mining heritage that is in common, and the effect that’s had on the landscape that’s in common... But the culture is very similar. The historical culture is very similar... It does have more in common than it has distinctively different (NP16).

References to local distinctiveness in terms of shared culture were coded to a category that was eventually described as ‘local disposition’: “Well as I say, they are quietly generous, they don’t make a song and dance. There is a perception which I think is now dying out... the relic of the old lead mining and quarrying activities, that Weardale looked after its own” (NP09). Respondents referred to cultural characteristics of local distinctiveness such as the tenacious nature of the local population, the large proportion of ‘born and bred’ residents, the tradition of Methodism, the gentler pace of life and the depth of time evidenced in the environment that could be read as a palimpsest. So a tenacious population were described:
Because Alston’s survived the… you know the depression when people were emigrating. A third of the population of Alston left between 1921 and 1931 so the population went down from three thousand to two thousand. And it’s sort of stayed at that two thousand level that it was at about 1930. Erm, but still, people hung on. They wanted to be here and you know in the seventies there were the economic things and then the hippies and then the commuting era which… it’ll be interesting to see how things work out for the cost of fuel, whether people will leave Alston or whatever… (NP10).

This is a population who, perhaps as a result, were disproportionately born and bred, with one respondent commenting that there are, “a much bigger proportion (of born and bred people)... than you get in any other parts of the country” (NP07) and another noting the longevity of family names through time:

There’s an awful predominance of incomers, where there were certain surnames like Piet, Swindle, er, Richardson (laughs) which were a very big erm, proportion of the names here. And you find them over the North Pennines. But Emerson for example doesn’t exist here and it’s as common as can be in Weardale (NP06).

Residents were proud of the region’s history as a hotbed of Methodism, as the curator of the Weardale Museum explained, the collection related to Methodism was treasured:

...because it’s probably the biggest centre for Methodism in the North East, what we hold here. So that’s regionally important but erm it’s important to the people who’ve lived here for a long time in wanting to preserve something of their heritage (NP02).

For others distinctiveness in the North Pennines was related to pace of life:

Whereas here, erm, everybody takes a lot more time. Erm sometimes, people who’ve moved in from the city, don’t appreciate that you know, people in the country areas think things over more slowly ... whereas
they think that you don’t want change, well, you maybe don’t want change that quickly... (NP03).

Distinctiveness was also related to a sense that the environment had been written over by successive generations leading to strong sense of history and the continuum of time, with one respondent commenting “…you’ve still got, I think, a real connection with the history of this landscape” (NP24) and another noting, “in the North Pennines, the whole landscape is shaped really from its industrial and farming past” (NP07).

Respondents recognised an ‘in between’ culture; a mixture of north eastern and western cultural characteristics that led to a sometimes fragmented sense of cultural identity (ideas explored in Chapter Four, section 4.1.1), but the history of lead mining gave a feeling of commonality to people and places in the North Pennines:

I mean there are, yeah there are differences, the differences of landscape and settlement and so on, but I think relatively subtle and then commonality is significant. The Methodist heritage, the erm... the mining heritage linked together. Traditions of self-improvement and traditions of small holdings and these traditions of dual economy between mining and farming. The very strong feeling of independence and self sufficiency and erm... having to look out for yourself, and do things for yourself. That sort of independence if you like. That is to some extent based on the way mining was operating (and) is common across the area and I think links it together (NP16).

Earlier discussion (Chapter Four 4.2.4, 4.4.1) saw the North Pennines marked out as different because of the particularly friendly nature of its residents: “Its just sort of laid back and easy going and friendly” (NP04). Local distinctiveness was also related to traditions, such as the garden display of 'bonny bits' of fluorspar smuggled from underground by miners, or the rural tradition of making clothing, woollen goods and
quilts. In particular respondents commented on traditional methods of environmental management:

*I know people you know, don’t like the shooting and hunting, but I don’t think they realise it is part of a community life here, it’s something that’s tradition. I mean that is your heritage that’s gone back for years and years. People don’t realise how much is relied on them...* (NP23).

The landscape was clearly seen as one that was managed, and managed traditionally:

*I know they shoot the pheasants and the grouse and things but they do keep, you know, the wildlife going as well. Because they are managed. They would be overgrown with heather and you know there would be just no fodder, no food. I mean we used to have deer round here. We saw a couple the other morning, just you know heading off and there are a couple of deer in the field. Yeah, they’re just wild. There’s quite a few around here that you can spot, in a morning. So I mean as I say, the farmers work towards that and the gamekeepers work towards that kind of thing...* (NP23).

And this sense of tradition served as a link to the past with which respondents seemed quite proud:

*So it’s those sorts of things that appeal and the fact that the farming methods are still more traditional than they are... you know there are still small fields, dry stone walls, there’s still hay meadows, there’s still no arable farming apart from up in the top end of the dale where the ground’s good enough... cereals don’t grow well enough to compete, so people rely on sheep and to a lesser extent cows. That’s another (change) we’ve seen since the foot and mouth (disease) outbreak and the decline in cows in the dale although there are a few more coming back now, but it’s been mainly sheep, since the 1980s. The sheep are down on the bottoms in the winter and on the fell side in the summer*
and the lower fields are hay meadows. It’s still the same method of farming that’s gone on (NP07).

Some dialect survived to mark the North Pennines as distinctive:

Well if you were describing someone, as ‘licious as steyarn pig trou’ is basically saying you’re as agile as a stone pig trough. Right. Which means you’re not very agile at all! (laughs). But there’s just loads of things like that you could say. Now when I... I wasn’t aware I had a strong dialect until I actually went to work, because when you grow up in a farming community, you go to school in a farming community... (NP17).

References also included the artistic nature of the community around Alston, descended from the hippy settlements of the 1970s and 1980s that engendered open mindedness amongst residents. Local mythology was described, and in an example that draws parallels with Sheila Watson’s (2007a) experience of heritage focus groups in Great Yarmouth (Chapter 2, section 2.2) a fallacy clung to with pride by many respondents was referenced in descriptions of Alston, as the highest market town in England (it has not held this status for some time, and Nenthead as the ‘highest village’ does in fact sit lower than other villages in England for example, Flash in Derbyshire). This respondent described sense of place in terms of collective memory:

Whereas there’s still a lot of memory in Nenthead. I warm to them quite a lot you know, there’s a phrase ‘Nentish’ mind. ‘Nentish’ means a bit small minded, and erm, turning your back on people. “Nentish aye aye” “Divn’t come calling Nent” -don’t start criticising us- “just ‘cause we live on sausage and cabbage” ... (NP11).

Discussion has demonstrated that using the definition of local distinctiveness devised by the organisation Common Ground, references were made in the North Pennines data to a number of characteristics that marked the region out from other places, related to nature, culture, history and society and entwined with each characteristic was the sense
of a continuum of history or the ‘jostling’ of past and present, the dimension of time intersecting with people and place in a three-dimensional model.

**Conclusions**

This chapter has seen the contribution of heritage to sense of place described as a threedimensional model linking people, place and time. Section 5.1 saw how the heritage studies literature has failed to examine and tease out the relationship between heritage and sense of place, but that Smith’s (2006) case for an alternative heritage discourse has opened up interesting paths for exploring this relationship. The alternative heritage discourse was seen to comprise physical environment but also expressions of cultural identity and processes of meaning making. Discussion of the wider literature revealed the interest of geography in the heritage meanings of everyday places and the processes by which ordinary people make those meanings was examined through the sociological concept of memory talk. The three-dimensional perspective introduced by the latter was developed to create a model by which to explore the contribution of heritage to sense of place.

Section 5.2 explored the conceptualisation of heritage as a process, at the intersection of people and time within this three-dimensional model, through social bonds, knowing people and being known, security and trust in place, interest in ancestral connections and feelings of nostalgia triggered by place characteristics. In this way it was seen that place can be a context for a sense of place that does not always take materiality as a reference point. Section 5.3 explored how the physicality of place can be used as a reference point, exploring the intersection of people, place and time within the three-dimensional model. Here the environment is used as an aide-mémoire for the continuity of a personal biography.

Finally section 5.4 explored the notion of local distinctiveness as defined by Common Ground. Interview data were examined to identify features of local distinctiveness
referred to by respondents and heritage was seen to contribute to sense of place through the jostling of notions of past and present found in nature, industry, culture, social relations, traditions and place myths. The sampling rationale for this research aimed to identify individuals who were engaged with exploring this sense of place and local distinctiveness through involvement, often for leisure, in various types of ‘heritage activities’. The next chapter will examine these activities in order to explore the motivations of those involved and the benefits of this involvement for individuals personally and for their sense of place.
6. Chapter Six: Heritage Activity and Sense of Place

Discussion in Chapters Four and Five has endeavoured to expose sense of place as it is described by those interviewed in the North Pennines. The unfolding perspective is of a sense of place experienced at a variety of scales (Chapter Four section 4.1). Place in the North Pennines supports identity through place-congruent continuity whereby the place presents qualities in keeping with an individual’s self-image (4.2.1 and 5.3.1). Features have been identified that help respondents to feel distinctive from other people in other places (4.2). It was possible to identify within the data an attachment to place that related to the happiness and relaxation associated with it and duration of residence there (4.3). Some respondents described dependency, with place facilitating their preferred activities and lifestyle (4.4). Chapter Five suggested ways of conceptualising the contribution of heritage to this experience of sense of place and it did so in terms of memory talk, durable social bonds, ancestry and notions of nostalgia (5.2). These were seen as the connection between people and time. Section 5.3 however examined how people, place and time relate to one another in terms of place-referent continuity whereby a place acts as a mnemonic tool in the recollection of life-story helping residents to experience physical, social and autobiographical insideness (sections 5.2.1, 5.3.1 and 5.3.2). The chapter concluded by identifying the features of North Pennines life that produce its distinctive character.

The charity, Common Ground (Clifford and King, 1993) advocate the identification of features of place distinctiveness by local people. Recognising what is distinctive about a place and understanding what is special is a prerequisite to any attempt to safeguard sense of place. As Freedman Tilden pointed out, protection must be built on exploration and understanding: “Through interpretation, understanding; through understanding, appreciation; through appreciation, protection” (cited in Davis, 1996: 101). This chapter examines the involvement of local people in attempts to explore and safeguard the valued elements, both tangible and intangible that contribute to their sense of place. The chapter examines what happens when local people are involved in this sort of
engagement with heritage. Section 6.2 will explore the character of this involvement in heritage activity: who gets involved and why.

The chapter then moves on to examine engagement with heritage in the North Pennines in terms of capital. Capital has been defined as, “a resource invested to create new resources” (Flora et al., 2004: 18). In the rural context, a number of different theories of capital have been applied and Flora et al. (2004) use seven in their critique of the rural situation in the United States of America. These are cultural, social, human, political, natural, financial and built forms of capital. Cultural capital they view in terms of knowledge: “Cultural capital determines what constitutes ‘knowledge,’ how knowledge is to be achieved, and how knowledge is validated” (Flora et al., 2004: 25). Critical thinker Pierre Bourdieu (1997) posits that cultural capital can be embodied (though refined habits and ways of thinking or ‘habitus’), institutionalised (for example through universities and accredited qualifications) and objectified (demonstrating one’s knowledge through the objects one possesses such as fine artworks). Social capital on the other hand relates to networks: “the networks, norms of reciprocity, and mutual trust that exist among and within groups and communities” (Flora et al., 2004: 19).

Human capital refers to the skills and abilities of each individual within a community, whilst political capital is the, “ability of a group to influence the distribution of resources within a social unit, including helping to determine what resources are available and who is eligible to receive them” (ibid). The “landscape, air, water, soil and biodiversity of both plants and animals” are conceptualised as natural capital, whereas financial capital relates to available money for investment, and built capital is the investment of that money in buildings (Flora et al., 2004: 18, 19). The specific forms of capital explored in this chapter are examined in more detail in section 6.1.1.

Focussing on social and human capital, section 6.3 will examine the engagement with heritage by local people, in the light of theories of bonding social capital, and section 6.4
considers some of the outcomes of this participatory activity in terms of bridging and linking forms of social capital. Forms of human capital developed through learning and the growth of individual confidence are examined in section 6.4.2. In the following section, notions of capital are expanded upon before they are applied to the data which are discussed in section 6.2 and throughout the rest of this chapter.

6.1 Forms of capital

Chapter One noted the experience of socioeconomic flux that presents threats to a particular way of life and sense of place in the North Pennines (section 1.4.3). Perhaps the awareness of change galvanises those experiencing it to explore their local particularity through engagement with heritage (ideas discussed in Chapter One section 2.3.3). This section explores the experience of engaging with heritage as it was described in the North Pennines interviews and in doing this it draws on theories of capital.

6.1.1 Participation and forms of capital

Claims have been made for the value of cultural participation by policy makers and strategic bodies interested in achieving goals such as regeneration, civic engagement, social cohesion, urban renewal and citizenship (Graham et al., 2009, Message, 2009) and these ideas are largely developed from theories of capital. The forms of capital conceptualised by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, (1984, 1997) are used to explain the non-economic currency guiding the social world in relation to social position and mobility. Forms of capital relevant to the participation discourse are: social, cultural, human and identity forms of capital. Each will now be briefly summarised in turn.

In the 1990s political scientist Robert Putnam (1995) published his research and theory in relation to social capital, research drawing such a breadth of data that his ideas became fuel for widespread debate. Between 1996 and 1999, around 1000 articles were produced examining social capital (Baum cited in Harper, 2001: 7). Social capital is the notion that social networks have value and Putnam examined approximations of the
theory in practice, for example he looked at membership of associative groups such as parent teacher associations or women’s institutes. Social capital theorises that membership to groups implies values are shared, thereby allowing trust and reciprocal relationships to flourish (Anon, 2007) and creating stronger more efficacious communities. Though not an end in itself (Coleman, 1990: 302), one of the claims for the benefits of social capital is that as a process, it develops group identity, increases solidarity and helps transform an ‘i’ into a ‘we’ mentality (Anon, 2007). Putnam (2000) claimed that social capital could take two forms: bonding and bridging, the former working as a sort of glue to hold members of a particular group (perhaps a family or shared ethnicity) together, the latter working like a lubricant, allowing people to socialise between groups and develop social mobility. Woolcock added ‘linking’ social capital to this list, whereby individuals lever in resources through networks that include those with power, who are authorities or decision makers (Harriss, 2002: 100, Woolcock, 2001).

Cultural capital on the other hand, is the notion that an individual has particular levels of knowledge, skills and education that can provide advantages within the social class system. An individual’s particular ‘taste’ resulting from upbringing, experience and opportunity is described by Bourdieu as ‘habitus’ (2005: 43). Habitus allows an individual to distinguish themselves from others in terms of class (Bennett et al., 2005). Cultural capital may take an ‘embodied’ form in relation to one’s character and tastes. It may also take an ‘objectified’ form through consumption practices, such as visiting art galleries or going to the theatre; and cultural capital can take an ‘institutionalised’ form whereby academic qualifications indicate the cultural capital with which an individual is possessed (Bourdieu, 1997, Jeannotte, 2003: 38, 1984). Whilst appearing deterministic, Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital allows for its strategic acquisition through social capital, whereby an individual can access the cultural capital of others within their social network. It has been suggested that those who are busily participating in cultural consumption (such as visiting galleries or going to the theatre) are also more likely to be involved in associative activities (such as parent teacher association membership or other kinds of volunteering) (Jeannotte, 2003). Cultural capital may also determine the quality of social capital as it creates a ‘mentality’ (through habitus: taste and values).
amongst individuals or groups that can help or hinder desired outcomes such as social cohesion or sustainability. Cultural and social capital then, can be seen to work in a virtuous circle or ‘feedback loop’ (Mercer, 2002: 50).

Developing these ideas further, human capital has been described as, “the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals which facilitate the creation of personal, social and economic well-being” (OECD cited by Jeannotte, 2003: 37) and, “…a combination of an individual’s own innate talents and abilities and the skills and learning they acquire through education and training” (OECD, 2007). Often used in economic discourse, human capital is seen as a lucrative focus of investment which can deliver economic returns, but has also been shown to produce non-economic outcomes such as improvements in health and increased civic participation (Jeannotte, 2003: 37).

Research in 2007 amongst community heritage activists in Italy indicated the projects, “resulted in significant change to the lives of the people closely involved with them – they had indeed accrued human capital as a result” (Corsane et al., 2007b: 235). This chapter will examine the North Pennines data for evidence that knowledge, skills and competencies were developed through heritage activities and whether personal, social and economic results were facilitated.

Identity capital is the theoretical conceptualisation of the link between human capital and cultural capital. This form of capital sees individuals investing in ‘who they are’ in order to survive in a, “highly changeable and personally politicized society where skills, tastes and rules are constantly shifting” (Côté, 1996). The notion of identity capital indicates a set of skills required for an individual to form and sustain an identity within the pragmatic demands of their social life or occupation. It requires cognitive skills and personality attributes that are not imparted by human or cultural capital, rather these are the skills that allow an individual to cope such as self-monitoring and adjusting their identity in order to suit particular situations presented by modern life (Côté, 1996). This chapter will ask if the North Pennines data support the view that identity capital is developed by engaging with heritage through involvement in heritage activity. But
before such questions are answered, the following section discusses data referencing the respondents’ motivations in engaging with heritage by asking, who gets involved in heritage activity and why?

6.2 Who gets involved in heritage activity and why?

Sharon Jeanotte (2003) argues that those who are already participating in cultural consumption, those holding cultural capital, are more likely to be interested in giving up their time to volunteer or take part in associative activity. Added to this, Bennett et al. find that the culturally omnivorous middle class, defined by its ‘pluralistic versatility’ (2009: 177), is more likely to exert choice in where to live and where to identify with, through ‘elective belonging’ (Savage et al., 2005). For Savage et al., some social groups (such as the middle classes; often described as the service and professional classes) are privileged with the agency and mobility to ‘elect’ to belong in places that for one reason or another are deemed congruous with a desired lifestyle. Linking to ideas from environmental psychology, presented in Chapter Four (4.2.1) for Savage et al., belonging is defined, “when a chosen place of residence is congruent with one’s life story” (2005: 54). Mike Savage (2009) has gone on to suggest that those who are ‘elective belongers’ are also more interested in exploring and articulating their particular sense of place than born and bred ‘dwellers’. In the North Pennines, respondents reported volunteering commitments to a number of heritage institutions, agencies, associations or organisations and many, if not new residents themselves, reported that the overwhelming interest in their heritage activity appeared to come from new residents (in migrants or ‘elective belongers’). Perhaps these elective belongers who are more prepared to get involved in associative activity or volunteering (Jeannotte, 2003) and more likely to participate in cultural activity (Bennett et al., 2009), are getting involved in heritage activity as a process through which they can develop belonging. Through heritage activity, newcomers can build social capital (‘fitting in’), learn about heritage and account for their choice to belong. This section will examine the reasons given for taking part in heritage activity, followed by a discussion of the types of people who appear to be involved in order to examine Savage’s (2009) theory.
6.2.1 Motivations

Respondents reported a number of reasons for becoming involved in heritage activity. Heritage activity as a collective exploration of sense of place and in some cases an interpretation of that sense of place for the outside world, might be seen as a process that bonds participants through reminiscence and the sort of ‘everyday memory talk’ (Degnen, 2005) described in Chapter Five. This section will examine the data relating to motivations in heritage activity as follows: developing collective identity, presenting sense of place to others and reproducing sense of place through memory talk.

Some respondents were able to account for their engagement with heritage in terms of collective identity. Collective identity does not supersede or replace individual identity but it does allow for generalisation about notions of belonging in social contexts (Ashworth and Graham, 2005b: 3) and the ‘group based dimensions’ of place have been recognised (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000). The respondent below is the vicar of a North Pennines village who is involved in researching local history for the parish newsletter, chairs a community development organisation that runs the annual village show, and had recently invited professionals to run an oral history training event for residents. He was asked why his heritage activity was important:

*Erm, well I think it’s to do with humanity and it’s to do with community and I feel that as human beings I feel that it’s almost part of our spiritual side really and I don’t mean a religious side, I mean our spiritual side. That it’s something that is part of what makes us who and what we are. And that it should be nurtured and once it’s gone it’s gone and so even while we’re still (asking), “why ought we to be doing this?” you know, we should be doing it because when we eventually get to the answer we’ll think, “oh I wish I’d done it while I was thinking about it” (laughs). Er so I think its important you know from that point of view and then I think it’s important because all these things are part of being a community really.*
And not just a sense of place but you know the sense of community within the place really (NP26).

His response is interesting in a number of ways. Firstly he clearly sees an exploration of heritage as contributing to identity with, “It’s what makes us who and what we are” and that this sort of activity goes beyond the individual, helping to define a collective identity (“it’s part of being a community really”). Heritage encourages groups to think about their ‘cultural roots’ in order to make statements about themselves and their identities (Dicks, 2003: 140) and if this is accepted, heritage can be seen as a process through which particular cultural collective identities are produced. Secondly the respondent reiterates the argument presented in Chapter Five for heritage and sense of place as a three-dimensional notion comprising people, place and time, when he surmises heritage activity is about: “not just a sense of place but you know the sense of community within the place.”

He went on:

*Er, so that’s important but I also feel that I do think because of the things I was just saying, it is important for these people in this place... I do feel it’s important for these people in this place* (NP26).

What emerges from this comment and from other interviews, is a sense that individuals or groups are galvanised by tangible local social or physical change to become involved in heritage activity and by asserting that heritage is, “important for these people in this place” the above respondent indicates that the turn to heritage as a resource for production of collective identity is particularly pertinent for North Pennines residents.

The representation and production of cultural distinctiveness (‘local distinctiveness’ ‘cultural heritage’ or ‘cultural particularism’) has been seen in sections 2.2.2, 2.3 and particularly in 2.3.3, as a response to, and product of globalisation (Dicks, 2003, Robertson, 1992). This is a process that sees multifarious identity claims made by groups who want to present themselves as close-knit and culturally distinctive. The comments above might be taken as an instance of this process. Perhaps residents in the North
Pennines are stirred to become active in relation to heritage by the changes that are happening at a local level (described in Chapter One, section 1.4.3). Shrinking opportunities for employment (AONB, 2009b: 5) have led to migration and an ageing population (Ward, 2006: 129). Rising house prices accelerate the socioeconomic transition:

Another thing is and all of course, house prices. You know I mean, there’s a lot of people have moved up from the south up here, you know and older people and er... the young uns (sic) can’t afford to buy houses so that’s another reason why they have to move away... (NP21).

Residents turn to heritage either as born and bred ‘dwellers’ (Ingold, 2000) looking to exert some control of identity in times of change, or as new, middle class, ‘elective beloners’ (Savage et al., 2005) doing all they can to prevent any degradation of their historical ‘investment’ (Dicks, 2003: 140). The notion of ‘elective belonging’ versus ‘dwelling perspective’ presented by Savage (2009), will be explored later in this chapter. It is worth mentioning that Dicks sees an appreciation of cultural distinctiveness (described as ‘cultural particularism’) finding value when local ways of life are under threat by the homogenising forces of globalisation (2003: 29), ideas which are explored in Chapter 2 sections 2.2.2, 2.3 and particularly in 2.3.3. She suggests that this value emerges from a consciousness of change, writing, “it seems that a major criteria for reverence (of particular cultures) is (their) being in a state of near or total eclipse” (ibid ).

Perhaps then, threatened ways of life exercise communities to explore and articulate their cultural heritage. In the North Pennines, changes in population and employment might portent a changing way of life (indicated in the comments below) and perhaps this is fuelling interest in heritage activity:

Yes, there have been massive changes here, massive changes. All the mines have closed and a lot of the quarries have closed, there’s only one quarry left, but erm, farming’s changed so much you know. It would be easier to tell you what hasn’t changed.

...when I lived at Rookhope I mean it must have been about... 400 people lived there then and I knew every single person... I don’t know everyone
in Frosterley now, no way. Nowhere near. I don’t know everyone on this estate. So that’s how much it’s changed (NP20).

As local change and wider pressures of globalisation (described in Chapter Two sections 2.2.2, 2.3 and 2.3.3) see North Pennines residents turning to heritage in a process of recognising and claiming a cultural identity, “those with access to exhibitionary resources (from media to museums) can circulate and market these through cultural display” (Dicks, 2003: 29). Four interview respondents had been involved in creating local history exhibitions (figure 10), and the following individual, a senior teacher heavily involved in the local community described her experience:

The only way I’ve sort of got involved is because people got to know (me) through having these exhibitions and you know... I mean originally, initially it was a money making effort, but eventually it... it... particularly, it got to be more of an educational thing than a money making effort (NP25).

Figure 10 Annual local history exhibition in Frosterley, August 2008
Whilst for her, creating a local history exhibition began as a fundraising enterprise, it developed more popularity amongst the community and visitors to the village than she had anticipated, so that the annual event became more of an ‘educational thing’. In other words, the exhibition allowed local identities to be, “discovered, claimed and publicly affirmed” (Dicks, 2003: 29). This final respondent describes the origins of a community action group which, at the time of interviewing, he chaired. Again, local people were galvanised to present their heritage to visitors when the extent of the threat posed by change was brought home to them:

_Basically the... erm... it was partly because of a, of a erm newspaper article which was about erm, which was titled ‘Britain’s Dying Villages’ which came out in about ’85 and they picked on Allenheads as a village which er, where the pub had closed, there was a small shop and post office and nothing else and erm, a lot of derelict buildings around the place, a large number of derelict buildings around the place, which the landowner, Allendale Estates were doing nothing about, they were just letting them... letting them fall down because it was of no... no interest to them, no benefit to them to do them up because they didn’t have people to rent or sell them to. Erm, and this article, this article sort of erm, got people talking in the village and erm, the attitude was, “Well ours isn’t a dying village, let’s get an action group together and tidy it up...” So we had a few weekend work parties and tidied up the flower beds and tidied up some of the central village area and then one or two activists got involved and said, come let’s take it on from there. We’ll raise money, we’ll buy these old ruined buildings from Allendale Estates, we’ll do them up, we’ll make a heritage centre, we’ll create jobs, we’ll create a café, we’ll build a play park for the kids, we’ll... and so on..._ (NP27).

In each of these examples, local people are agents, producing heritage for consumption, selecting the stories, media and creating the interpretation, with a specific purpose in preserving cultural values or reinforcing specific place identities (Groote and Haartsen, 2008: 181) by, for example, creating ‘heritage centres’. Here the value of heritage is
found in, “a popular feeling for the past and for place identity, manifested in people’s reluctance to see the signs of ‘their’ history obliterated in a speeded up world of constant change” (Dicks, 2003: 139). Perhaps then a desire to exert control over identity and how it is seen by others in times of change is motivating people in the North Pennines to become involved in heritage activity (Goulding et al., 2009). The process of producing exhibitions to represent heritage or sense of place to others, also involved a reproduction or reaffirmation of identity through interactions between residents at these exhibitions, and this notion is explored in the section which follows.

Chapter Five discussed the ways in which memory and sense of place are interconnected (Degnen, 2005: 729, Nora, 1989). Degnen has argued for a move away from a focus on social memory as intentional commemorative practice, in order to examine how place, relationships and recounting experience have a deeper value in understanding social memory (2005: 730). In this argument identity and belonging are reinforced through discussion that refers to individuals past and present and memories of people in relation to one another and to places past and present (see Chapter Five). Memory talk for Degnen is the way places are background to webs of social relations, for instance where people live or used to live. This view supports the proposition of this thesis and of human geography more generally: that place is a social construction. It also however develops theory to answer what David Harvey suggests is the only interesting question left to ask, “by what social process is place constructed?” (Cresswell, 2004: 29, Harvey, 1996: 261).

In the North Pennines, respondents involved in presenting sense of place or collective identity to others through local history exhibitions, explained how these exhibitions became a tool for memory talk, sparking discussions that helped individuals place themselves within these ‘webs of relations’ thereby producing and reproducing notions of belonging, identity and sense of place. This individual described the importance to her of interaction at the annual local history exhibition (figure 11) she organised:
Yes, yeah, erm but it’s interesting to listen to people who, oh, you know, I try to put names on as much as possible, and people say, “That’s so and so” “No I don’t think it is” “Are you sure, I think it’s so and so.” And just a friendly argument, if there’s a person with no name on, you know, who is it? And it, that to me, once it’s up and that’s the interesting part about it, listening to what people say (NP25).

Figure 11 ‘Memory talk’ at Frosterley annual local history exhibition, August 2008

The appeal of this sort of memory talk, framed by shared experiences and place was described by another exhibition organiser from a local history society (figure 12):

It’s funny, photographs always interest people. Well you saw in the exhibition there was a bit of er documentary information in the cases and photographs. And obviously it’s instant information when you go round and you look and you don’t have to study a photograph you can pass on or look at it closely and I did have the captions, whereas a document, you’ve got to read it. But I did have the captions to try and entice people to read. Erm... let’s see, Garrigil, it has an annual gala and er... I didn’t go this year... but last year there was a marquee and people
were invited to bring their old photographs along and that was popular, bringing your old photographs entices people... (NP20).

![Figure 12 Alston Historical Society annual exhibition, Alston, August 2008](image)

So for those with a long-term connection with a place, these exhibitions help to reproduce sense of place and belonging through memory talk. However, many of those involved in heritage activity were newer residents. Savage et al. (2005) suggest that the post-war literature on sense of place has until recently tended to privilege the ‘born and bred’ as bearers or agents of sense of place and belonging, but that in recent years a body of evidence has gathered to indicate that this might not be the case. Those involved in heritage in the North Pennines are involved in a discourse of sense of place and belonging. The next section explores whether these individuals are born and bred residents or if according to the North Pennines accounts, Savage et al.’s ‘elective belonging’ argument holds true.

6.2.2 Who gets involved

Post war sociology privileged belonging to born and bred residents of place. Mike Savage, Brian Longhurst and Gaynor Bagnall (2005: 205) sought to ‘debunk’ the idea that any distinction between the born and bred and newer residents of a place
(‘cosmopolitans’) is of major contemporary significance. Their research, conducted in areas surrounding Manchester, found that few ‘locals’ in those areas were ‘born and bred’ and where such locals did still exist, they often thought of themselves as marginal (on the edges of belonging, sharing only some of the traits and values of the majority) (Savage et al., 2005: 205). Whilst there are few comparisons between these places which are found in the latter stages of gentrification, and the North Pennines which is only beginning to experience the effects of socioeconomic change, perhaps claims can be made of North Pennines newcomers, (‘in-migrants,’ ‘cosmopolitans’ or ‘elective belongers,’ who exercise a choice in where to live), that they are highly motivated to explore and articulate place identity (Savage et al., 2005: 207, Savage, 2009).

Savage’s (2009) later work indicates three modes of belonging: elective belonging, whereby new residents choose a place that seems congruous with a desired lifestyle and class identity; dwelling in place, whereby born and bred residents of a place articulate a more aesthetic attachment to place, and are less concerned with taking ownership and command of it; and nostalgics, dwellers who are aware of their juxtaposition with elective belongers and the limitations of their place and who are consequently trapped in nostalgia (Savage, 2009). The majority of respondents in the North Pennines appeared to be best described by the elective belonging mode, although some were dwellers, and Savage has yet to expand on the requirements of the nostalgic subset. Overwhelmingly for all groups, respondents reported the involvement of older people (ill-defined in the interviews but often retired) in heritage activity. This section will examine the categories of people involved in heritage activity as older people, elective belongers and dwellers, and it is with dwellers that this discussion begins.

The respondent below is born and bred in the North Pennines. In a conversation that touched on the out migration that had seen most of her friends from school leave the area in pursuit of better work opportunities, she speculated on the failure of local people to engage with their heritage:
Some (born and bred residents) I just don’t think care. And I think that’s the same everywhere, I don’t think that’s just the North Pennines. But you’ll probably find it’s the more… I’ll try to put this nicely (laughs)... the more intelligent people who actually do the thinking and you know the, “where have we come from” and, “why are we here” and all this kind of thing. And probably the (born and bred) people... just accept the fact that they’re here and that’s enough (NP08).

Her response resonates with Savage’s recent hypothesis, emerging from research into cultural consumption and class in the UK (Bennett et al., 2009, Savage, 2009), that the educated middle classes are more inclined to omnivorous participation in culture and are more likely to exercise mobility and make choices about where they live; articulating eloquent narratives about belonging and place identity (Savage, 2009). In agreement with this hypothesis, a common motif of the North Pennines responses was the reluctance of ‘dwellers’ to take part in heritage activity:

...some of them (newer residents or visitor), in actual fact are more interested in what you’re doing than the ones who live here (NP25).

You know they sort of think the offcomers are all a bit nosey and digging all this stuff up you know all the old customs and things like that, and you think, you often think that the locals would rather just let them float away. I don’t know really... (NP14).

So whilst respondents reported tepid interest in heritage from born and bred residents, there was a keen interest and willingness to get involved in exploring heritage, both tangible and intangible, from newer residents. The following discussion examines this data in the light of these newer residents and ‘elective belonging’.

Purposive sampling resulted in interviews with respondents who were involved in heritage activity in the North Pennines, a number of whom were not born and bred in the area:
But we... when I moved here I just became steeped in the history and once you found out more it led to another question to find out more... (NP10).

As discussed above, in an analysis of data pertaining to the nation’s cultural involvement, Savage has recently suggested that, “People who are privileged on the cultural map can give eloquent stories about their sense of place” and those privileged tend to be the more geographically mobile middle classes (2009). The following respondent had moved to Weardale within the last five years, and her comments indicate a strong interest in learning about the area, in order to articulate a story about sense of place:

...you’ve got a real sense of... you’ve still got, I think, a real connection with the history of this landscape it’s... erm... if you know about it I suppose. If you don’t know about it perhaps you wouldn’t have. But I do know about it and I’m interested in it and I’m interested in researching it so you know, the landscape is very much a man made landscape and you’ve got that, I’ve got that feeling of, you know, of following on in the footsteps of all these other people who lived here, and made this place (NP24).

This echoes David Harvey’s view that a rooted community has less need for museums and heritage displays, rather it is those without roots who make deliberate and conscious efforts to evoke sense of place (1996: 302). Savage et al. (2005) in their study of communities in and around Manchester, found that newer residents or ‘elective belingers’ are motivated to satisfactorily account for their sense of belonging. The desire to articulate this account is further explored in the comments of this member of a local history society:

...say you get occasionally local people interested in their family trees. Surprisingly few, it’s always people from outside. It’s as if people are... you know like a kite that isn’t tethered to the ground sort of thing, they want to come and make that connection and think, “Oh phew” you know, “I’m still hanging on to my roots...” Whereas people don’t need that if they already live here. If they are where they’ve been for a generation (NP10).
This kind of searching for an ‘authentic’ past demonstrates that the phenomenological notion ‘being in place’ (see Chapter Two, section 2.3.2) cannot be taken for granted (Cresswell, 2004: 60). The kind of autobiographical insideness described in Chapter Five section 5.2 is desirable to newcomers who look for ancestral bonds. In the same vein, this newer resident to the North Pennines described having gone to some lengths to find ‘roots’ in the area:

*I looked into the family history and I found that I had a great, great granddad who came from just up the road, Slaley. He married a lady over in Allendale, and they lived in Allendale for many years and his son was a stone mason and then the son, John Charlton he took everybody, he packed them onto a cart and took them into Newcastle and they lived in Newcastle from about 1890 I think, and that’s how the family comes to be in Newcastle. So yeah, I think really those links are too far back to feel like you have a stake in the place. You know an ancient stake in the place. But it still does make us feel like I have some kind of investment in the area* (NP04).

Discussion has seen that a number of respondents in the North Pennines can be described as ‘elective belongers’ or newer residents who are involved in the development of an articulation of sense of place through heritage activity. It was possible to code data within a category of ‘heritage activity’ to a subcategory of ‘younger people’. Within this category, respondents reported a difficulty in recruiting the young and that their heritage groups and activities were best supported by older people. Whilst the North Pennines is an ageing population, with few young residents, perhaps this is unsurprising. Moreover many of the in-migrants or individuals ‘electing’ to belong in the area are retired people. Several theories offer accounts for the demographic peculiarities of associative heritage activity and they are discussed here through an examination of ageing membership and interest at a particular time of life.
When writing about social capital, Putnam suggested that in the United States of America, associative activity was more popular amongst the generation of post World War II ‘baby boomers’, born between the years 1946 and 1964 than their ‘generation x’ successors (Putnam, 2000), and this respondent said, “It is mostly the older people that turn up for everything really” (NP10).

*There weren’t very many younger people. If I look at the heritage groups, you know, like the friends of Killhope and the Weardale Field Studies Society, the membership do tend to be older* (NP08).

For some retired people, volunteering fulfils a need for some form of ‘busywork’ (Orr, 2006):

*I suppose newly retired people are looking for things to do but you find that their time gets filled up really quickly and I’ve known some retired people who have a more active social life, you know, they’re busier than I am!* (NP08).

Respondents in the North Pennines characterised the membership of heritage groups as older, retired people and reported difficulty in attracting younger people. The reasons for this were commented on, with some speculating that life is busier for working people today, and noting the rise of home entertainment and decline in face to face contact:

*... I’ve always thought it’s probably more to do with younger people having more to do with families...*

*... the work situation is different nowadays isn’t it? People have to work quite hard, those that do have jobs, you know, and they’re quite taken up with it aren’t they?* (NP14).

*... I think it’s also the fact that those older people and the way they were brought up, you know they didn’t have Sky TV, they didn’t have computers they didn’t have you know, Gameboys and you know X Boxes*
and all this kind of thing. They probably are used to doing more things in groups and going out to things rather than staying in (NP08).

Perhaps they don’t think they’re needed anymore and perhaps the need isn’t there, they don’t see the need anymore to organise talks and things because there are alternative ways of getting information now (NP27).

Robert Stebbins (2007) writing within the field of leisure studies, has argued that when an amateur or hobbyist wishes to extend their interest through involvement with a site, institution or organisation as a volunteer, they might be described as ‘career volunteers’ in the pursuit of serious leisure (Orr, 2006). For some older people in the North Pennines, their involvement in heritage was an extension of an interest and might be characterised as the pursuit of committed or serious leisure:

So age has a thing to do with it as well. People who are looking for an interest, you know, something else to do… (NP10).

There are people who… are drawn towards erm heritage as a topic. I think through general interest in reading and you know that kind of interest in reading… (NP03).

Perhaps there is more of an interest in developing identity through an exploration of heritage and associative cultural activity later in life. In Rowles’ (1983) study of the elderly members of a community in the Appalachian region of the United States of America, he concluded that attachment to place amongst the elderly was intimately related to a sense of self. His ideas have been further developed by Goulding et al. (2009) who suggest that, “in order to generate and sustain a self-concept in old age, a process of life review takes place, which involve(s) reminiscence”. The enthusiasm of older people for heritage related activities might be related to reminiscence and therefore to this sort of development of identity capital in later life.

Such identity work is relevant to older, retired people experiencing changes in lifestyle and Proshansky et al. (1983) have already recognised that identity can change
throughout the lifecycle. Older people renegotiate their identity through adapting to the changing set of circumstances that retirement presents. It has been suggested that taking up an identity position—which might be seen through the selection of voluntary groups with which to become involved, or the exploration of a particular sense of place through heritage; aligning oneself with others of a ‘heritage sensibility’—has advantages for individuals who are then able to develop control over their place within social contexts (Goulding et al., 2009), developing identity capital (Côté, 1996). A body of work exists that links this sort of control with health benefits that increase with ageing, particularly with reference to the benefits for the elderly in residential care when exercising small everyday choices (Coleman and Iso-Ahola, 1993, Rodin and Langer, 1977, Schulza and Hanusa, 1978). The predominance of retired people in heritage activity also raises issues about the types of skills in use and the social position or class of those involved linking back to notions of elective belonging.

From this discussion some conclusion may be drawn about those interviewed who were involved in heritage activity in the North Pennines. A number were not born and bred residents and might be described as ‘elective belongs’ protecting their heritage investment and articulating their sense of place. Moreover many were older, retired residents who in the pursuit of serious leisure are exercising control in redefining their identities. The following section will examine the function of heritage as an associative activity that can build social capital.

6.3 Bonding social capital
It has been suggested that social capital is related to sense of place through notions of place attachment, and self-esteem particularly through shared pride (Graham et al., 2009). As discussed above (6.1.1), social capital is a multidimensional concept which is difficult to measure. Instead, approximations of social capital are measured, such as membership of associative groups. Blaxter et al. (2001) developed a framework for measuring social capital that included: i) participation, social engagement and commitment; ii) control and self-efficacy; iii) perception of community level structures or
characteristics; iv) social interaction, social networks and support; and v) trust, reciprocity and social cohesion. Blaxter et al.’s (2001) measures draw some immediate parallels with sense of place and heritage activity and their report went on to suggest that satisfaction with living in an area was also associated with high levels of social capital (cited in Harper and Kelly, 2003). This dissertation acknowledges that a variety of approaches are required in order to provide a comprehensive picture of social capital in the North Pennines, but proposes that the interview data provide some evidence that heritage activity helps support and build social capital. These data will now be examined with particular attention to: existing social capital; maintenance of social capital; and building social capital.

6.3.1 Existing social capital

When explaining how they came to be involved in heritage activity, some respondents referred to a mobilization of existing social capital, whereby they joined a group as a favour to a friend or heard about membership recruitment by word of mouth:

It was word of mouth. It’s been ongoing for twenty five oh gosh or is it thirty years. It’s just the way you get to know people (NP10).

Sometimes it’s just an interest in helping a group of friends that you already know and belong to and you want to help out with, so that the interest may not be particularly you know, strong on the heritage side (NP03).

The manner in which the purposive sampling technique presented respondents along the Weardale valley further illustrates the network that was activated by this sampling method (figure 13). Heritage activists were very aware of one another within valley, but not across the region. Here Blaxter et al.’s measures of iv) social networks and support and v) reciprocity are evidenced, as individuals get involved through existing social networks or as a reciprocal favour to friends.
6.3.2 Maintaining social capital

Some respondents indicated that heritage activity was another way in which social capital was sustained, as might be seen in the comments of this individual involved in organising an annual local history exhibition:

*And sort of erm, it’s a time when people get together and now it’s got to the stage where you think. Well... I was thinking at the weekend, “Oh, Mr and Mrs Glayburn haven’t come from Bishop Auckland, I must give...*
them a ring to see if they’re alright.” Because they’ve come every year for years. And you look for people that you only see say once a year, that come, you know, deliberately at that time of year (NP25).

The annual event helps strengthen ties, tightening loose stitches in the fabric of the network, and it was clear that a motivation to maintain this sense of a close knit community had exercised some respondents to get involved:

...you volunteer because you want to belong, but you volunteer because you want to help. I mean because we like the community, we want to see it keep going (NP23).

Further evidence is provided here then, for Blaxter et al.’s fifth measure of social capital, in a strengthening of social cohesion.

6.3.3 Building social capital
Heritage activity has been seen to contribute to a strengthening of existing social capital. For some respondents however, they had become involved in heritage activity as a way not just to strengthen their existing network, but to build on it. Heritage activity can act as a channel through which new residents fit in, make friendships, and create a new network. Heritage activity for them agrees with Baxter et al.’s first social capital measure of ‘participation and social engagement’:

Yeah, we’ve got very good relations with the, you know, even the people that’s lived here all their lives. We’ve fitted in extremely well. And maybe because we have volunteered... (NP23).

You just have to do what you want to do and you know, contribute what you want to contribute and I think erm, I think that’s helped enormously in er, making us feel part of the community (NP24).

Oh yeah, definitely I mean that’s definitely one of the reasons to do things really, is actually to meet people (NP14).
For longer-term residents, heritage activity brings people together and develops trust, evidencing participation, social engagement, commitment, interaction and support and trust (Baxter et al.’s first, fourth and fifth social capital measures). The respondent below explains that for her, one of the pleasures of organising a local history exhibition is the ability to reunite people:

*I tend to look for people, if I know, if I decide I’m planning something, I know who I can go to, who I would like to see and speak to. Erm, when I did the first one about the Co-ops (co-operative grocery shops), erm, because there was Frosterley, Stanhope er Westgate, St John’s Chapel, Wearhead, and they all had, their own different managers, past managers. So I just rang them up and said you know, “Can I come and talk to you about when you worked in the Store?” and what the nice thing was, erm, when it opened, the night before it opened, I got them all together, I’ve got a photograph and all the past workers together and, oh it was lovely because they were all there, and, you know, it’s like school reunion. It er, yeah it was really nice (NP25).*

For another respondent involved in recording photographs and oral history, the development of a community of trust was notable (figure 14):

*My actual support comes from local people, who say, “(he’s) alright, he’s doing a decent job, he likes it here” you know? “I’ll lend him my pictures, you can lend him yours” (NP11).*

Social capital is generated through heritage activity. Groups recruit through existing networks and some volunteers do so as a reciprocal gesture to friends. Such activity also helps to maintain social capital, strengthening bonds of friendship and community, and works to build social capital, helping newcomers to ‘fit in’.
6.4 Social and human capital

As discussed above (6.1.1) the theory of capital has been applied in several areas. This section will build on the discussion of bonding social capital above (6.3) to investigate whether the data indicated evidence of bridging and linking capital. The agency of heritage activity in the development of human capital will then be examined, through an inquiry into the opportunities for learning presented by such involvement, and the development of confidence and self-esteem.

6.4.1 Bridging and linking

Social capital can work to bond together those who have similarities, but it can also bridge differences between social groups or can work to create links with those who hold authority or power (6.1.1). For some, heritage activity was a great leveller; this
respondent, involved as a hobbyist in traditional bee-keeping, found the activity formed a bridge, helping individuals to socialise across class boundaries:

*The nice thing about beekeeping is you meet a whole spectrum of people, you know from professionals to farm labourers* (NP07).

Whilst the practice of beekeeping might be less place-related than other heritage activities investigated through this research, it is an expression of intangible cultural heritage and one kept alive by this group of enthusiasts. Moreover, whilst those within a given heritage-group were bonded by their common interest, heritage activity also appears to work to bridge the differences between heritage groups, to create a wider heritage network:

*See it’s a sort of network, you’re coming across the same people who know the same people...* (NP07).

*If the society had a project, I would know who to ask. Erm... again I think because it’s not... we just know each other you... even if you hadn’t a clue where to start, you would know somebody who did know sort of thing* (NP10).

For some this bridging network was more formalised: the Weardale Museum for example is part of a network of volunteer museums, whilst Nenthead Mines, Killhope Lead Mining Museum and the Weardale Museum are all part of a North Pennines Visitor Attractions Group. For others the bridged network acted like a chain, linked by shared members:

*I mean you’ll find the same people are friends of Beamish (The Living Museum of the North), you know, they’re in the North Pennines Heritage Trust, they’re friends of Killhope so it’s a common interest and they tend to overlap to a large extent. Killhope’s a bit more, got fewer people than Beamish, but nevertheless because of the newsletter, people have joined* (NP07).
...because the same people are in the same groups, well the knowledge just goes around. Sort of in the Botany Group... I actually found out about the Botany Group by helping with an archaeological survey in Weardale you see. So that’s how it works, it just goes round (NP14).

Heritage groups then are bridged by support groups and shared individuals, accessing new knowledge, expertise and members through this form of social capital. The next section investigates whether social capital can generate links between local people engaged with heritage in the North Pennines and their local authorities and decision makers.

Respondents in the North Pennines reported ability to access resources and expertise through networks. Whilst one respondent listed the experts with whom she had built relationships, from the National Trust to the National Park to local archaeologists (NP14), another reported being friendly with outreach officers from local museums (NP11), the Friends of Killhope had training in archiving from Durham Archives (NP07) and the Weardale Museum had advice from the local Bowes Museum and the Museums Libraries and Archives Council:

*We have a curatorial advisor at Bowes Museum: Jane Whitaker. She’s the Senior Keeper there and she provides advice to me, she comes over occasionally and helps you to do your erm... accreditation. She helped us with that last year. Erm. We’re a member of the North East Museums Libraries and Archives Council so we get help from them and there’s a special volunteer section that often meets on a Saturday. Well I say often, three times, four times a year. To go over issues that are to do with volunteer museums...* (NP03).

... we learn the ins and outs of the workings of the district councils to some extent, lots of things like that... I mean I’ve become acquainted with some of the Eden District Officers who know me as being a Haggs Bank person and encounter me again in some other activity... (NP06).
Heritage activity then provides the opportunity for individuals to meet those in positions of power and develop linking forms of social capital. In the North Pennines, social capital is generated by heritage activity. Interview data also evidenced that alongside identity and social capital, human capital was also being created and this is the focus of the discussion which follows.

6.4.2 Learning and confidence

Sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu suggests that cultural capital can be institutionalised through academic qualifications or objectified through a confidence and ease in the consumption of cultural products (1997). Conceptualisations of capital were also produced by economists in the 1960s who began to see that a conscious investment in the individual through the acquisition of learning and skills was a form of human capital, capable of raising earnings and improving health (Becker, 1964: 15). Human capital has also been characterised as the, “knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes that allow people to contribute to their personal and social wellbeing…” (Keeley, 2007: 3).

This section firstly asks whether respondents in the North Pennines found they had developed new skills, learning, qualifications or appreciation through their involvement in heritage activity, before examining whether respondents reported an increase in confidence and self-esteem.

Respondents reported that heritage was a great motivation for learning: one respondent explained how an inability to find a book on the history of Alston led to a self-directed research project that resulted in a self-published book (NP10); others talked about developing skills in order to progress their heritage project, for example extending an understanding of information and communication technology as this respondent explains:

...I realised that there’s people from all over the world that are descended from the people who were round here. And if they were able to access the information, maybe they would have photographs or
memories that they might want to contribute as well. So that’s why I
started the website... I decided I would learn how to put my own website
together, because although Colin, my partner, is a computer
programmer and he runs his own website, he runs one for a running club
in Durham, er I didn’t want to have to be depending on him to upload
photos and all of that stuff, you know I didn’t want him wasting his time
doing that so I set about learning, and I’ve sort of learnt (NP04).

Self-directed learning characterised many of the accounts, from learning about income
tax returns and treasury skills for members of the Blanchland Community Development
Organisation (NP23, NP22), learning word processing skills for those producing the
Blanchland Parish Newsletter (NP26), to inventing an archive system at the Alston
Historical Society (NP10) or learning to photograph wildflowers as part of the AONB
Partnership’s ‘Haytime’ hay meadow restoration scheme (NP02). This gentleman, a
photographer by trade, gave an animated account of his interest in heritage and
explained how his hobby fuelled his skills-development:

    Started collecting, or being given to copy, a lot of old photographs of
    Alston, sometimes they’d come in a big bunch, and that went alongside
    the standard modern photographic business, and erm, it developed quite
    slowly erm as I learnt how to digitise things as well. And then I learnt
    how to put information behind pictures and then I learnt how to collect
    oral reminiscence which boosted the images or was just interesting
    anyway... (NP11).

Mistakes were learning experiences for respondents who reflected on the value of past
projects, whether it be failed funding applications for the Blanchland Community
Development Organisation (NP23) or using an overwhelming amount of technology for
an individual involved in digitising photographs and oral history (NP11). Experience
allowed respondents to better understand the commitment involved in a given project
and how to manage it, as this description of preparing a parish newsletter filled with
local history stories illustrates:
...the mistake was, I took it all on and what I should’ve done is get some people around us, and I said to J------, when he was going to take it on, I said the most important thing is: make sure you keep people involved in doing other jobs. Erm, and I think that’s helped him a bit because erm Graham up there now does the erm, he does the printing and then we all meet about once a month just to do the folding and stapling and stuff and erm, Graham does a regular article and I do a regular article. So that helps out with filling the thing up you know? So I think, I think that helps a bit but yeah, it is too much for one person really (NP04).

Respondents enjoyed the opportunity presented by their involvement in heritage activity to engage in kinaesthetic ‘learning by doing’ as this gentleman involved in creating local history stories for the parish newsletter reported:

...I tend to be very much task orientated in that I’ll only... it’s a need to know basis do you know what I mean? So if I’ve got to do something I’ll learn how to do it and I’m quite happy with that. I’m not somebody who’s got to know how it all works and be a... I mean one of the problems with the computer is unless you’re doing various things every day, you know you say, “well how do you do this?” and somebody shows you but you don’t need to do it for a month. And of course by the time that comes round you think “ah! I can’t remember how you do this”. But if it’s a task that I’ve got to do regularly, well that’s fine, I learn how to do it and I do it. And that’s as far as it goes for me (NP26).

Interestingly, the wisdom developed from the experience of learning by doing and learning from mistakes was transferred between heritage groups through bridging social capital often embodied in an individual. This person explains the ease with which she raised funding and produced an interpretive leaflet for the Haggs Bank conservation area on Alston Moor:

You know because, because we’d done sort of fundraising and things with this (pointing to a Cumbria Amenity Trust Mining History newsletter) I found that Haggs Bank thing very easy to do. You know,
because I had a good idea about it. And of course, North Pennines Heritage Trust, not that I’m involved in the fundraising there but I mean you know I hear and so it does increase your knowledge doesn’t it? Each thing you do increases your knowledge and you know, because of my contacts in the Botany Group which is a lot of local farmers, in the Botany Group that means you can talk about, you know what’s happening don’t you? So each group does sort of add to your knowledge and it... it does help. The Haggs Bank thing, you know, I didn’t really find that difficult (NP14).

Respondents in the North Pennines then, indicated that heritage fuelled an interest that went on to inspire self-directed learning. They enjoyed learning in a practical way and reflected on mistakes in order to strengthen future heritage-related endeavours. New skills were also developed such as web design and digitisation of photographs and oral histories (NP04, NP11), creating interpretive material (NP11), giving talks and classes (NP10), archiving (NP07, NP14, NP10), learning word processing and secretarial skills (NP14, NP26) developing an understanding of building rents and property law (NP27) and also specialist skills in professional museum management (NP03). Only one respondent talked about gaining academic qualifications through an interest in heritage (what Bourdieu would describe as institutionalised cultural capital) but her case does demonstrate the possibility open to other heritage activists. From an information assistant at Killhope Lead Mining Museum and treasurer of the Weardale Field Studies Society, this individual explained how her interest in heritage progressed:

From there I did a Diploma in Archaeology and Local History at Durham University. From there I excelled in a thesis and actually won a national essay prize for the archaeology side of things rather than the local history and from that I was accepted to do a Masters degree at Durham, without having done a Bachelors first. So that was great. So that was archaeological survey... (NP08).

Learning is therefore associated with heritage activity at a variety of scales, and for the respondent above, increased confidence is demonstrated through achievement of
academic qualification. Further indications that heritage activity can increase the confidence of an individual involved are examined in the next section.

Involvement in heritage activity provided an opportunity for some individuals to test their ability to take responsibility, and by taking responsibility they increased their confidence. As a result, respondents experienced pride in their achievement and reported a sense of satisfaction. Discussion here takes each of these outcomes in turn: taking responsibility; developing confidence; experiencing pride; and feeling satisfied and rewarded. In data coded within the ‘heritage activity’ category to a subcategory of ‘responsibility’ references indicated the volunteer contribution involved taking charge. At the Weardale Museum, volunteers were involved in training new recruits and sharing information from professional training courses with the volunteer team (NP03). The Friends of Killhope took responsibility for purchasing a collection of minerals and all of the display cabinets for the exhibition ‘Pennine Jewels’. For some, describing their heritage activity involved emphasis on the role and responsibility they accepted as part of the project, as this organiser of a local history exhibition demonstrates:

> When I did Nenthead pictures and stories exhibition, I did the interviews, I took the photographs I borrowed the old photographs and copied them, I interpreted them, I, with a friend built the internal environment, we made a little cinema room I did the work with the schools, erm creating mobiles about life above and below ground in Nenthead ordered… everything, ordered all the equipment, I went and then maintained it on a regular basis and so on (NP11).

In such accounts, it is possible to discern an undercurrent of pride in the respondent’s description:

> Applying for the grant and really, laying out the leaflet I mean… I more or less did that myself (NP14).

In taking such responsibility, respondents described nascent self-confidence: members of the Blanchland Community Development Organisation refused to be off-put by a
failed grant application having experienced success in the past, and were less afraid to stand up in meetings and have their voices heard; an individual who had pursued academic archaeology qualifications took her work with heritage volunteers further by becoming a teacher; an individual involved in researching local history gained the confidence to have his work published:

...and I plucked up courage, there was another little publication in between, about a mining disaster actually near Tynedale, that I told you about, and I funded that myself. And I sort of had the publication for it which was quite cute and fun. But the History of Alston Moor was a bigger enterprise altogether and there’s a publisher in Carlisle, Bookcase Publications for local history and I took it to him, and he published the first print-run, which sold six hundred copies in six months! That’s fantastic! But once he’d sold the six hundred, he knew that the next batch was going to sell much more slowly, which wasn’t so much of a financial prospect. So from a business point of view, he wasn’t really interested in another print run but I took the plunge and I’ve had another two editions printed since then (NP10).

Heritage activists coached one another, providing support to nurture confidence as this organiser of a local history exhibition explained:

But if I have... I think if I actually said to one or two people, “Look find out about so and so for us...” Marjory across the road for instance, she’s got more into it than she used to, although she deals with raffles, tombolas erm, whatever, that sort of thing. You know, teas and making stuff. She actually is getting more into erm, finding things out more erm, than she ever used to. She’ll come with erm, you know, oh I’ve been talking to so and so, and did you know this that and the other. And she’ll hand it over and she’ll say this is what I found out. Whereas once upon a time, she wouldn’t you know (NP25).

Here the value of heritage activity for building confidence is neatly summarised:
I should have been more confident at the beginning in my own abilities but how could I have been, I’ve never really done anything like that before (NP11).

Alongside an emerging confidence, accounts of heritage activity in the North Pennines also made reference to pride in achievement. For some this was in achieving professional standards as volunteers:

Well there’s an enormous sense of achievement and pride in reaching a standard, certainly as far as I’m concerned. This museum is an accredited museum and in order to be able to reach that sort of standard that’s quite a big thing for a very small organisation. Because there’s quite a lot of work attached to accreditation (NP03).

And when we started the archive and we invited David Butler from Durham Archive to come and talk to us about how to go about it and then our paperwork is correct and it’s got revision numbers on and everything’s listed etcetera, etcetera, so when they came to see if we could become a museum officially and they looked at the archive as part of that and it came up with flying colours! And they said a lot of established museums could learn from us. So that’s been quite a useful experience (NP07).

For the North Pennines Heritage Trust there was pride in an audit report which provided ‘independent verification’: “when I read that I thought, what a hell of a CV it was. You know it was really... quite important. So we can now say, ‘it’s not us saying this, we have independent verification of who we are and what we are’” (NP13). This pride in independent recognition was important for a respondent involved in the AONB Partnership’s ‘Haytime’ hay meadow restoration project:

...it’s the recognition from them, it’s like erm, winning a million pounds on the lottery, sort of thing. You think, “oh wow they think our hay meadow flowers are fantastic” that’s brilliant and you know they’re
excited and it excites you doesn’t it? And you think “oh God you know, my granddad was right” (laughs)...

I wish he was here and he could see that, I do, and I mean he was a character, and for him to have been here. I know he’ll be proud, that’s what I know. I love, I’m thinking, are you watching, can you see this? (NP02).

These accounts, taken together indicate that heritage activity can be deeply rewarding for participants, a sentiment expressed in these final two quotes. The first respondent works to develop heritage projects for special needs groups and described a project related to railways:

With the railways we didn’t have to do any research at all to get people to talk about it. Almost instantly people were popping up saying... quite astonishing how many people have been associated with the railways or their parents, relatives, grandparents: quite rewarding (NP15).

Whilst finally this respondent explained his pleasure in recording oral history:

...I said, “come on in and listen to yourselves. This is the tape we made, this is you talking” you know? And I’m sitting in the same seat I am here and behind me is the computer there, and these speakers, these two very large old ladies just collapse on me, “just have you heard what we sound like!” you know, “eeeee!” “Eeee, don’t we sound Geordie” and they did. And that’s sort of, that’s payday for me you know, that’s payday. All of that you know (NP11).

Conclusions
The chapter has sought to demonstrate the conclusions that might be drawn from data collected in the North Pennines in relation to forms of capital and the key concepts were presented in an introductory literature review (section 6.1). Section 6.2 investigated Côté’s notion of identity capital in the North Pennines. Respondents indicated that they
were motivated to become involved in heritage activity through a desire to explore collective identity and present this identity to others in a process that involved dialogue and memory talk (6.2.1). Section 6.2.2 saw that of those involved in heritage activity in the North Pennines many are not born and bred residents and might be described as ‘elective belongers’ protecting their heritage investment and articulating their sense of place. Moreover many are older, retired residents who in the pursuit of serious leisure are exercising control in redefining their identities.

Section 6.3 examined how heritage activity can reinforce bonding forms of social capital. It was found that social capital is at play in heritage activity. Groups recruit through existing networks and some volunteers do so as a reciprocal gesture to friends. Such activity also helps to maintain social capital, strengthening bonds of friendship and community and works to build social capital, helping newcomers to ‘fit in’. In section 6.4 social and human capital were examined. The differences between heritage groups were seen as bridged by support groups and shared individuals, allowing access to new knowledge, expertise and members through this form of social capital (6.4.1). Respondents in the North Pennines also reported ability to access resources and expertise through linking forms of social capital that joined them to experts, authorities and power-holders (6.4.1). Section 6.4.2 examined the North Pennines accounts and found evidence that human capital is created through heritage activity. Heritage activity was found to motivate learning which was self-directed in nature. Participants learned practically, from experience, and knowledge was shared via key individuals who served to bridge different heritage groups. There was evidence that heritage activity raised confidence and self-esteem (6.4.2) as respondents described taking responsibility, feelings of pride and satisfaction in tasks completed.

To conclude, this chapter has demonstrated that heritage activity develops social, human and identity capital, with groups able to access resources, aware of one another through bridging forms of capital and able to learn new skills and present their identity to others. Social and human capital can contribute to social sustainability. They do so
through stronger networks, improved individual capabilities, stronger senses of group and individual identity and the leveraging in of resources from those who hold power and influence.

Chapter Two identified within the heritage studies literature references to ‘unofficial’ community heritage activity that can empower local people to define the scale of the locality with which they feel attachment (Walsh, 1992). With reference to globalisation and tangible changes at the local level (such as those in the North Pennines described in Chapter One, section 1.4.3), the chapter described Harvey’s (1996) identification of the appeal to local distinctiveness that is in resistance to hegemonic global forces. Participatory models were described, for instance, Arnstein’s (1969) ‘ladder of participation’ against which attempts to empower communities to engage with their heritage could be measured.

Chapter Five outlined the inadequacies of the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (Smith, 2006) to acknowledge heritage as a process of meaning making or expression of cultural heritage. An alternative heritage discourse was described (figure 8), with the capacity to embrace alternate knowledge systems and the plural and local ways in which heritage meanings are made. The following chapter draws these ideas together to present a heritage paradigm often exercised when communities are marginalised or their futures threatened. This is a heritage paradigm that nurtures the social, human and identity capital that can contribute to social sustainability, privileges meaning making at the local level, strives for voluntary effort and genuine local participation and embraces heritage in its tangible, intangible, movable and immovable forms. The next chapter explores the solutions to safeguarding sense of place in the North Pennines that this paradigm has the potential to present.
7. Chapter Seven: Ecomuseum Potential in the North Pennines

Taking sense of place as an approach, this thesis has examined through in-depth interview data, what constitutes sense of place for people involved in heritage activity in the North Pennines, the results of which analysis were presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five showed that heritage contributes to sense of place through the notion of temporality and continuity through time. Focussing on the experience of people engaging with heritage, the previous chapter found there was a keen interest in heritage from older people and in-migrants, that people were involved in order to develop a sense of collective identity and reproduce that both for visitors through various forms of exposition and within the community through processes of ‘memory talk’. Taken together, the preceding three chapters suggest a plethora of ways in which people in the North Pennines experience sense of place. The contribution of heritage to this sense of place goes beyond the historic fabric of built places or the physicality of nature. Chapter Five introduced an alternative way of conceptualising heritage that embraces materiality but also intangibility. Expressions of cultural heritage through traditions are included within this heritage discourse alongside notions of heritage as a process of meaning making, for example, through ‘memory talk’. This chapter examines an integrated and holistic approach to safeguarding heritage that is in harmony with the alternative heritage discourse examined in Chapter Five, recognising and valuing the sort of grass roots interest that Chapter Six described, and taking the concept of sense of place, introduced in Chapter Four as its organising philosophy. This ‘sense of place’ approach is known as ‘ecomuseology’ and it is the focus of discussion throughout this, the penultimate chapter of the dissertation.

7.1 People making place

Chapters Two (2.3.2) and Three (3.1.2) described the baseline assumptions from which this thesis has unfolded and they are that sense of place is socially constructed and that heritage can be imbued with a plurality of meanings. This thesis also accepts that heritage manifests as more than materiality, that it can also be expressed through tradition or take the form of the meaning making process itself (5.1). These ideas
foreshadow an alternative approach to heritage management that embraces plurality and intangibility and recognises the ways in which place is socially constructed. It is an approach informed by notions of ‘sense of place’ as the following section discusses.

### 7.1.1 Sense of place as an approach

Approaching an investigation of heritage through the notion of ‘sense of place’ allows for a view of heritage that integrates landscape and culture, the past and the present, the movable and immovable, tangible and intangible in any analysis (Waterton, 2005, Smith, 2006). Despite frequent references to sense of place in the heritage studies literature, the contribution of heritage to wider sense of place needs closer examination and more precise articulation. Changes in the North Pennines economy and shifting community dynamics in relation to population mobility and increased commuting are all issues to which an integrated approach to safeguarding sense of place could contribute by nurturing local identity. Sense of place manifests through ‘ordinary’ features such as hay meadows or dry stone walls, through the intangible heritage of dialect or music and through the process of talking about sense of place as a community, described above as ‘memory talk’ (Degnen, 2005). By identifying these ‘cultural touchstones’ (Davis, 1999: 40) solutions to safeguarding the particularity or distinctiveness of the North Pennines can be developed to the benefit of economic and social sustainability. The next section examines the value attributed to these ‘cultural touchstones’ (ibid) which existing policy and practice are limited in acknowledging (Smith and Waterton, 2009).

### 7.1.2 Plural ways of valuing heritage

The ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (Smith, 2006) recognise heritage value through protection. This protection happens at a number of levels, from the lists and registers of English Heritage and UNESCO, local nature reserves and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty to World Heritage Sites (Davis, 2009). But this meaning is constructed by ‘experts’ not the local people or visitors that experience them (ibid). This dissertation contributes to an emerging heritage discourse which suggests an alternative to ‘top down’ means of valuing heritage is required. The field of heritage studies is coming to an
understanding that material things do not have an inherent importance (Gibson and Pendlebury, 2009a). Rather, as discussion in Chapter Four suggested, the value of place, buildings or objects is socially constructed, and Chapter Six (6.2.1) identified that these objects and places are used to give tangibility to the values that a community wishes to communicate to the outside world (Smith, 2006: 77). Heritage studies has begun to discuss a diversity of landscapes and environments, not all of which have been officially designated as heritage, all however valued by groups and individuals (Gibson and Pendlebury, 2009a).

Heritage as material, expression or process, “virtually by definition, exists in the present and is ‘present-centred,’” (Howard, 2009:52). The value of heritage is constructed in contemporary contexts. But the heritage elite are experts whose profession is informed by notions of essentialism and intrinsic values and within their authorised heritage discourse, experts have limited ability to acknowledge the varied and contemporary ways of ascribing heritage value. As a consequence this discourse is increasingly questioned in a growing trend towards democratic participation in the heritage sector (ibid 53). When presenting this research at a North Pennines AONB Staff Unit research seminar in March 2010, lively debate ensued about ways of valuing heritage in the North Pennines. In reference to data presented in Chapter Six, Partnership staff recognised the interest in heritage shown by in-migrants, but questioned the more conventional or obvious sorts of heritage which appealed to newer residents. It was a familiar picture, they discussed, that in the North Pennines, newcomers were seen as resistant to physical changes, keen to protect the investment in a particular type of heritage landscape that they had made by moving to the area and sometimes causing tension within communities as a result. The focus on the inherent value of the physical historic fabric of a place, makes the ‘outsider’ appreciation of heritage similar in approach to the ways in which the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (Smith, 2006) selects the heritage worthy of recognition through protection.
The previous chapter suggested that born and bred residents were less concerned about holding onto their heritage, and of intangible expressions this respondent suggested, “you often think that the locals would rather just let them float away” (NP14). Perhaps, the AONB Partnership Staff Unit suggested, born and bred residents in the North Pennines are more comfortable with change because their sense of place, ‘cultural heritage’ or ‘identity’ has the security of an ‘insideness’ (Rowles, 1983) identified in Chapters Four and Five, that sometimes defies the need for physical ‘anchors’. Whilst it has been posited that the born and bred are unenthusiastic about articulating their sense of belonging, as one member of the Staff Unit commented, “I would challenge you to suggest to a hill farmer that he has no sense of place.” The AONB Staff Unit’s discussion touched on the way ‘insiders’ in the North Pennines were more accepting of changes to the physical environment (for instance to buildings) and this, it was suggested, is perhaps because born and bred residents in the North Pennines live their heritage through their daily interactions with both people and place without so strong a need for physical representations of it. Maybe it is not that the ‘born and bred’ are unable to articulate a ‘sense of place’ as suggested in Chapter Six, but that they have no need to; it is expressed in the day to day routine of their lives. Indeed interview responses made reference to a nebulous form of collective identity born of isolation and a hardy survival instinct which could be described as a particular ‘disposition’.

References were made to people who, “turned in on themselves” with a, “great tendency to be inward looking” (NP09) with one respondent suggesting, “it’s relatively isolated so there’s a stronger sense of identity” (NP15). Heritage viewed in this way is impossible for the traditional, essentialist paradigm to acknowledge.

The alternative heritage discourse presented in Chapter Five requires a heritage management paradigm that can allow for the more ambiguous conceptualisations of heritage that contribute to sense of place. What is needed is a paradigm less focussed on preservation and more able to acknowledge the way in which sense of place in the North Pennines through its very intangibility is an organic process subject to change and evolution. As another Staff Unit member suggested, perhaps valuing heritage through
conventional policy and understandings is simply ‘gardening on a landscape scale’. Peter Howard describes an authorised heritage discourse that:

...desperate to retain hedgerows, cottages, even attempting tree preservation orders... constantly misses the most important element. Architectural conservators similarly find themselves conserving the frame when the function has gone, sometimes even preferring frame to function. Local people so often prefer the memorialisation of events to the conservation of objects... This is the group which so often is left out of the old kind of heritage debate which sees heritage as largely a tourist enterprise... The completely different kinds of heritage, based on events and people that are valued by locals or insiders are only now beginning to be fully recognised...

(Howard, 2002: 68)

Within the heritage studies literature then, there is a growing call for new ways of democratising decisions about the elements of heritage that are important. Howard argues that such a democratisation, “will probably involve us with activities as much as objects” suggesting that ideas about conservation require expansion, “to devise ways of introducing other agenda – the local, the insider... and this will include encouraging insider groups to make decisions for themselves and safeguard their own heritage” (2009: 61). This dissertation has presented data to show that some residents in the North Pennines as locals and insiders are safeguarding their heritage in the way Howard suggests. As discussion will show, a heritage management paradigm exists that underpins such grass-roots approaches and can offer solutions to some of the issues of embracing multiple values that are herein posed.

7.1.3 Communities engaged with heritage

Chapter Six found that communities were engaging with their heritage in order to safeguard it in response to social and economic changes, and Chapter Two has discussed that this is part of a wider trend symptomatic of globalisation, that sees individuals and
communities looking to communicate their cultural distinctiveness in an increasingly homogenised world (2.3.3). Data were presented that indicated those involved in heritage activity were producing, representing, consuming and reproducing heritage through expressions, for example local history exhibitions, and processes such as ‘memory talk’. Newer residents were particularly interested in conducting research into local heritage and communicating it to others, developing articulate narratives about sense of place. Such data are in keeping with a view that place identity can be related to congruence with life-story. This is a process that can be juxtaposed with concepts of ‘elective belonging’ (Savage et al., 2005). Older people liked to get involved (section 6.2.2), perhaps in order to redefine their identity in a process of life-reviewing reminiscence or through ‘career volunteering’ (Orr, 2006). Chapter Six raised questions about how heritage or sense of place is valued by born and bred residents and what the future for community-led heritage activity might be beyond the current period of intense associative activity fuelled by the ‘baby-boom’ generation. Heritage activity was seen as a positive pursuit that could lead to gains in terms of human and social capital.

This chapter examines a heritage management paradigm that seeks to empower those involved in grassroots heritage activity, but that also has the flexibility of approach to tease out and recognise the plural ways of valuing sense of place that do not have agency within existing policy and practice (Smith’s [2006] ‘authorised heritage discourse’). This paradigm approaches heritage from the context of sense of place described above (7.1.1), has the capacity to recognise alternative ways of valuing heritage (7.1.2) demanding decision making at the grass roots level and the participation of local people (7.1.3). It is an approach that takes the involvement of local people and their ways of valuing heritage in the social and economic context of place, recognising the dialogue between resident and visitor, insider and outsider, as part and parcel of heritage as a process. At the same time, this is an approach that accepts the economic value of place-branding (discussed in Chapter Two section 2.1) and recognises the regenerative potential of engagement with heritage as an activity that develops the skills, learning and confidence of participants (Chapter Six section 6.4.2). It is a holistic and integrated approach to safeguarding heritage in its social and political context,
through the notion of ‘sense of place’ and it is this approach, known as ‘ecomuseology,’ to which the main body of this chapter now turns.

7.1.4 Ecomuseum

The ecomuseum paradigm was born of a desire to challenge preconceptions about meaning, control and authority and is frequently linked to ‘new museology’ (in its original international form rather than the narrower UK understanding described in Chapter Two section 2.1.1). The discourse of ‘new museology’ has seen a shift from the notion of the museum as a self-contained institution that is the domain of experts and elites, to a more inclusive approach. Likewise the ecomuseum strives to draw the community into its practice (Corsane, 2006b) and exercise its agency to advance community sustainability. In origin, ecomuseology was born out of a widespread dissatisfaction with the ability of traditional museums to deal in this way with contemporary social, cultural, political and environmental issues and contexts. Davis has suggested that a number of innovative museum projects paved the way towards realisation of the ecomuseum paradigm: from the rallying patriotism of the German ‘heimatmuseum’; to the ethnographic experience of the open air museum; folk-life and industrial museums; to the Smithsonian’s ‘neighbourhood museum’ experiment at Anacostia, Washington D.C. (1999: 45-51). Ecomuseology drew from these ideas to mobilise the notion of an ‘integrated museum’ (which emerged from the UNESCO and ICOM ‘Round Table of Santiago’ meeting in 1972). It did so by adopting many of the propositions presented by the notion of an ‘integrated’ socially inclusive cultural institution into its philosophy and practice (Davis, 2004: 93).

Ecomuseology emerged from the new museology discourse in 1970s France. The culture minister disliked what he thought to be the old-fashioned connotations of the word ‘museum’, and contrived with the inspiration of museologist Hugues de Varine, to describe the new integrated museum ideal as ‘ecomuseum’ (Davis, 1999: 58). He used the term at international museums meetings in the early 1970s and the ideas were developed by both Hugues de Varine and his colleague Georges Henri Rivière most significantly through the formation of the ecomuseum of the urban community of Le
Creusot-Montceau. A former industrial region, the ecomuseum at Le Creusot-Montceau set out to revitalise the community by generating both local pride and tourism revenue (Davis, 1999: 66). Today there are more than four hundred ecomuseums across the globe (Davis, 2007a: 198) and whilst they demonstrate enormous diversity, all ecomuseums take a defined geographical territory as their organising concept and are intent upon community participation (Davis, 2004: 93).

Museologists have been at pains to succinctly articulate a definition of the ecomuseum and Davis suggests that early definitions were broad, even ‘guarded’ (ibid: 95-96). The ecomuseum most palpably departs from the traditional museum concept by dismantling its walls to embrace a holistic territory. The ecomuseum is a place rather than a building and its heritage resources are the distinctive features of that locality rather than museum objects. These resources are tangible and intangible, fixed and portable, what Davis has described as a community’s ‘cultural touchstones’ (1999: 40). He cites Sheila Stephenson who suggests, “the ecomuseum is concerned with collections management – the collection being everything in the designated area... flora, fauna, topography, weather, buildings, land use practices, songs, attitudes, tools... “ (cited in Davis, 2004: 96). De Varine too noted that everything within the Le Creusot-Montceau ecomuseum territory was part of its ‘collection’ (cited in Davis, 1999, Stefano and Corsane, 2008).

A number of useful models have been provided that help to visualise the ecomuseum paradigm (Davis, 1999, Corsane, 2006b: 112-118). It has been suggested that where a traditional museum is the sum of its building, collections, expert staff and visitors, an ecomuseum is the sum of a territory, its heritage, the population and their memory (Rivard, 1984; 1988 cited in Davis, 1999). The paradigm has been illustrated as string of beads, each ‘cultural touchstone’ within the territory represented as an equally important important gem on the metaphorical ecomuseum thread (figure 15). Davis explains:

“Here, the pearls are the elements of landscape, nature, community, sites, song, traditions and so on. This ‘necklace’ model helps us to understand that by combining the attributes of regions -their cultural sites and associated histories and themes, vernacular
architecture, traditions, dialect, memories- the ecomuseum brings together those elements that make places special” (Davis, 1999: 240).

Figure 15 The ‘Necklace Model’ for the ecomuseum (Davis, 1999: 240)

In recent years Davis has pared the ecomuseum definition back by stating that after long consideration, the most practical explanation seems to be that an ecomuseum, “is a community-led heritage or museum project that supports sustainable development” (Davis, 2007a: 199). Notwithstanding these definitions however, the interpretation of the ecomuseum paradigm in practice has proved fluid, diverse and inconsistent. For this reason, efforts in recent years have been made to assess how far ecomuseums achieve the original philosophy. Attributes have been listed (Davis, 1999: 228) namely that an ecomuseum is indicated by a heritage management system that:
adopts a territory that is not necessarily defined by conventional boundaries
adopts a ‘fragmented-site’ policy which is linked to in situ conservation and interpretation
abandons conventional views of site ownership; conserving and interpreting sites via liaison and cooperation
empowers local communities, involving local people in museum activities and in the presentation and development of their cultural identity
has potential for interdisciplinarity and holistic interpretation.

This list has been further developed to help heritage projects and ecomuseums assess their performance against the ideal (Borrelli et al., 2008, Corsane et al., 2007b, Corsane et al., 2007a), and the fundamental tenets of the ecomuseum philosophy have been reduced to twenty one principles (figure 16) that can serve as indicators of ecomuseology in practice (Corsane, 2006a, Corsane, 2006b):

1. An ecomuseum is initiated and steered by local communities.
2. It should allow for public participation in all decision-making processes and activities in a democratic manner.
3. It should stimulate joint ownership and management, with input from local communities, academic advisors, local businesses, local authorities, and government structures.
4. In an ecomuseum, an emphasis is usually placed on the processes of heritage management, rather than on heritage products for consumption.
5. An ecomuseum is likely to encourage collaboration with local craftspeople, artists, writers, actors and musicians.
6. It often depends on substantial active voluntary efforts by local stakeholders.
7. It focuses on local identity and a sense of place.
8. It often encompasses a ‘geographical’ territory, which can be determined by different shared characteristics.
9. It covers both spatial and temporal aspects. In relation to the temporal, it looks at continuity and change over time. Therefore, its approach is diachronic rather than synchronic.
10. The ecomuseum often takes the form of a ‘fragmented museum’, consisting of a network with a hub and antennae of different buildings and sites.

11. It promotes preservation, conservation and safeguarding of heritage resources in situ.

12. In the ecomuseum ideal, equal attention is often given to immovable and movable tangible material culture, and to intangible heritage resources.

13. The ecomuseum stimulates sustainable development and use of resources.

14. It allows for change and development for a better future.

15. It encourages an ongoing programme of documentation of past and present life and people’s interactions with all environmental factors (including physical, economic, social, cultural and political).

16. It promotes research at a number of levels—from the research and understanding of local ‘specialists’ to research by academics.

17. It promotes multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches to research.

18. The ecomuseum ideal encourages a holistic approach to the interpretation of culture/nature relationships.

19. It often attempts to illustrate connections between: technology/individual, nature/culture, and past/present.

20. The ecomuseum can provide for an intersection between heritage and responsible tourism.

21. It can bring benefits to local communities, for example a sense of pride, regeneration, and/or economic income.

*Figure 16 Twenty one principles of ecomuseology (Corsane, 2006a, Corsane, 2006b)*

The ecomuseum is a heritage paradigm that gives voice to everyday ways of valuing heritage. It takes a diachronic approach with the flexibility to allow for the way heritage is treasured in the past, present and future by both residents and newcomers or visitors. Ecomuseum recognises the relationship between people, time and place described as a three-dimensional model in Chapter Five and seen elsewhere as, “community, heritage and place” (Stefano and Corsane, 2008). Its holistic approach to heritage management has the scope to accommodate every nuance of sense of place described in the previous chapters. Ecomuseology is an approach that values the dialogue between visitors and residents, spreads the interpretive responsibility and economic benefits of tourism around the territory whilst abiding to ethics of environmental, economic and social
sustainability. By recognising the pride and self-esteem that it is possible to foster through engagement with heritage activity (Corsane et al., 2007b), the ecomuseum paradigm finds further harmony with issues put forth in the preceding chapters. The following section examines this synergy in closer detail with reference to interview data and objectives found within the North Pennines AONB Management Plan for 2009-2014. Appendix Nine details these objectives and Appendix Ten plots them against the twenty one principles presented above. A bar chart illustrates in Appendix Eleven the principles which find the most agreement with the AONB Partnership’s objectives. Before moving on to look at issues of community engagement with heritage, the first part of this discussion is organised by ideas related to sense of place, namely: the alternative heritage discourse and plural ways of valuing heritage.

7.2 Sense of place and the alternative heritage discourse
The fourth chapter of this dissertation examined data to explore what constitutes sense of place for people living in the North Pennines. The chapter acknowledged the complexity of the notion of sense of place and recognised it as a social construct: place is given meaning through the interaction of people with it. As such, sense of place has been recognised as a ‘chameleon concept’ (Davis, 1999: 238), but perhaps approaching heritage through a notion that accepts inherent changeability and plurality of meaning and value offers alternatives to the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (discussed Chapter Five section 5.1.1). For Smith (2006: 11):

...there is a hegemonic ‘authorized heritage discourse’, which is reliant on the power/knowledge claims of technical and aesthetic experts, and institutionalized in state cultural agencies and amenity societies. This discourse takes its cue from the grand narratives of nation and class on the one hand, and technical expertise and aesthetic judgement on the other. The ‘authorized heritage discourse’ privileges monumentality and grand scale, innate artefact/site significance tied to time depth, scientific/aesthetic expert judgement, social consensus and nation building.
An alternative heritage discourse that uses sense of place as an organising concept has the capacity to be receptive to the grass-roots narratives of local people and the values with which they imbue ordinary places. Sense of place as an approach allows for a plethora of heritage material, expressions and processes to be recognised: all elements of place, both tangible and intangible. Davis has argued that ecomuseums are special because they take sense of place as an approach, intending to capture it as a way to exercise local distinctiveness and pride (Davis, 1999:239). So whilst the field of heritage studies makes increasingly vociferous calls for an alternative to top down, elitist, western, patriarchal ways of acknowledging heritage (Gibson and Pendlebury, 2009b, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998, Kurin, 1997, Smith, 2006, Smith and Akagawa, 2009), a suitable approach, that of ecomuseology, which has been adopted at currently some four hundred sites worldwide (Anon, 2010), has been steadily gathering momentum for the last forty years.

The ecomuseum paradigm is an alternative approach to heritage with the capacity to acknowledge varied ways of ascribing cultural value to the materiality and intangibility that form local distinctiveness. This is a paradigm at ease with notions of pluralism or ‘the cultural turn’ that this dissertation has suggested poses problems for existing heritage ‘authority’. Focussing down to the North Pennines situation, six ecomuseum principles have salience in addressing these issues and they are: Principle 2 (democratic participation); Principle 4 (focus on process); Principle 7 (focus on identity and sense of place) with Principle 12 (equal attention to both tangible and intangible heritage); and Principle 9 (diachronic approach) with Principle 15 (ongoing programme of documentation). Discussion will now examine these principles in more detail to discuss how they can help address issues of plural ways of valuing heritage in the North Pennines.
7.2.1 Principle 2

An ecomuseum should allow for public participation in all decision-making processes and activities in a democratic manner.

In the space of a few short months in the summer of 2008 it was possible to make rapid contact with almost thirty individuals who were engaged with heritage and in some sense wished to have a stake in decisions made about its acknowledgement, presentation, preservation and conservation in the North Pennines. Local people are experiencing an impulse to participate in the safeguarding of their heritage. A member of the Allenheads Village Trust, involved in the regeneration of the village in part through the development of a heritage centre, explained why he chose to get involved:

I felt that the Trust needed the support of individuals, and if I wanted to influence the way the Trust went, then I had to get involved, and at the time I did want to influence the way that the Trust was going... So I felt that the Trust had an important part to play... (NP27).

Here is an individual with a strong desire to have his voice heard in debates about safeguarding place and heritage. The value of a dialogue with local people is recognised by one of the key heritage institutions in the region, Killhope, The North of England Lead Mining Museum:

I mean it is crucial isn’t it, that voices are seen to be listened to? So there’s a contract on both sides in volunteering isn’t there? Of making your volunteers feel valued and that they get something back out of it...
(a volunteer) has a very positive contribution to make (NP16).

Ecomuseums thrive on the positive contribution of volunteers, striving for democracy and public participation in decision making. The Kalyna Country Ecomuseum in Alberta, Canada for example, is managed by a consortium of local people (Davis, 2009) and the Écomusée Saint Dégan in France was created by local people and is run by them on an entirely voluntary basis (Corsane et al., 2008: 57). Democracy is a fundamental tenet of ecomuseology and the idea runs like a thread through many of the twenty one principles. In this sense it is useful to refer back to Arnstein’s ‘Ladder of Participation’
which presents a model against which attempts to empower citizens in democratic processes can be measured (Chapter Two, section 2.2.1). The aspiration of a true ecomuseum is to reach the top rungs of Arnstein’s (1969) ladder, those of ‘Citizen Power’ and the examples above suggest that strides towards partnership, delegated power and control have been made (figure 17).

The North Pennines AONB Partnership have set out their aims and objectives for the next five years in a Management Plan (Appendix Nine) and it has been possible to map these objectives against the ecomuseum principles, the outcomes of which are presented in Appendices Seven and Eight of this dissertation. The AONB objectives are related to management strands namely: landscape and geodiversity; land management and biodiversity; the historic environment; enjoying and understanding the North Pennines; economy and business; community and culture; and increasing knowledge of the AONB. The most notable synergies with Principle 2 of the twenty one principles of
ecomuseology, are within the objectives related to the AONB Management Plan strands of ‘Historic Environment’ (HE), ‘Enjoying and Understanding the North Pennines’ (EU), and ‘Community and Culture’ (CC). In terms of the historic environment, the AONB Partnership aims to increase participation of local people in research, conservation and interpretation (objective HE5). To achieve enjoyment and understanding of the North Pennines, the AONB Partnership aims to involve three Local Access Forums to collaborate in decisions relating to the countryside (objective EU8), whilst objectives related to community and culture advance the support and encouragement of local communities in conserving and celebrating place (objective CC2), interpreting place (objective CC3) and participating in sustainable tourism (objective CC4).

Moreover, the AONB Management Plan’s objective CC7 is perfectly ‘ecomuseum’ in its aspiration: “To ensure that local communities, networks and individuals can give expression to what their landscape and their ‘place’ means to them.” There is a demand and will for public engagement in decision making and heritage management activities in the North Pennines, and in this sense, nascent ecomuseum approaches are being adopted to the benefit of local people and the acknowledgement and safeguarding of what they consider to be their heritage. The ecomuseum demands democratic participation and is also democratic in its approach to ways of understanding heritage as a process of meaning making occurring amongst local people, an approach emphasised by the principle guiding the discussion which follows.

7.2.2 Principle 4

_In an ecomuseum, an emphasis is usually placed on the processes of heritage management, rather than the heritage products for consumption._

Chapter Five presented a model (section 5.1.1, figure 8) that saw heritage manifested in materiality, but also in expressions such as music, dance, culinary techniques, dialect or traditional crafts and in processes such as mapping family trees, researching, story telling, and reminiscence. In the same chapter the notion of ‘memory talk’ was
introduced as a heritage process through which memory and the past are part of the everyday chatter that works to reinforce the identity of individuals within the community of a place. Smith (2006: 237-275) noted the agency of residents of the West Yorkshire town of Castleford in producing and reproducing ways of valuing heritage when little material evidence of it remains in their built environment, and they do so through an educational week-long festival (O'Toole, 2007). Smith suggests that this intangible process of heritage education slips through the net of the authorised heritage discourse (ibid: 237).

A similar story was evidenced in the North Pennines. Heritage was a process in which individuals located themselves and others within the ‘webs of relations’ (Degnen, 2005) formed of people both past and present. A respondent involved in developing local history exhibitions for example noted: “It’s funny, photographs always interest people... bringing your old photographs entices people...” (NP10). Another respondent involved in researching local history, commented on the process of coaching other community members to develop their sensibility in relation to heritage:

...one or two people that erm, a girl called Susan said, “Oh I’ve got some photographs, I’ll...” you know, borrow them so her and her husband came and put them up (in the heritage display) and this, that and the other and she’s sort of... not on the same scale, but she started to collect bits of things together... after I’d started to do more for the exhibition... (NP25).

Similarly this respondent remarked upon the vibrant process of developing a local educational project around the heritage of the railways:

...and we worked with all the schools in the area and they erm... they adopted their local station and it was amazing how much knowledge they could er... er deliver from their parents, grandparents... (NP15).
Ecomuseology has the capacity to acknowledge the value of what is occurring in the cultural process of heritage indicated by the above quotes. It has been modelled for example, with the process of collective memory at its core (figure 18).

![Figure 18 Graphic representation of the ecomuseum (after Rivard, 1984 in Davis, 1999: 72)](image)

Ecomuseums are particularly effective in the acknowledgement of heritage as a cultural process. The Soga Ecomuseum in China for example makes a key feature of its ‘Memory Project’ whereby collective memories of the Qing Miao people are documented through, “oral recording in their own language; the Miao have no written language of their own” (Corsane et al., 2008: 53). This facility is one of the ecomuseum’s strengths as an alternative heritage management paradigm and is encapsulated within its fourth principle by placing emphasis on the process of meaning making dialogue rather than the product. Giving value to and emphasis upon the process of heritage, the fourth principle of ecomuseology embraces what Smith has described as the ‘performativity of ‘doing’ and ‘being’ (Smith, 2006: 238). By elevating the importance of the cultural processes of heritage, it is possible to value the power of heritage activities that are,
“fundamentally about providing and creating opportunities for acts of remembering and commemoration, and above all social networking” (ibid). Perhaps it is to be expected that the AONB Management plan is light on objectives that have synergy with this ambitious and progressive view of heritage. However there are indications of a shared philosophy particularly within objectives 3 and 7 of the ‘Communities and Culture’ strand of the Management Plan which support local communities to interpret their sense of place and give expression to what place means to them. The widening of the definition of heritage to include intangibles such as processes and expressions is the focus of the next two principles in the discussion that follows.

7.2.3 Principles 7 and 12

_The ecomuseum focuses on identity and a sense of place; In the ecomuseum ideal, equal attention is often given to immovable and movable tangible material culture, and to intangible heritage resources._

Section 7.1.1 described sense of place as an approach that recognises and values the ordinary features of a place, features which are ‘cultural touchstones’ (Davis, 1999: 40) for local people. Section 7.1.4 discussed the way in which all of the elements of a local place that are valued by its residents and contribute to its distinctiveness can be viewed as part of the ecomuseum’s ‘collection’. The North Pennines AONB Partnership presently works to address threats to the cultural landscape, including a loss of traditional craft and agricultural skills. At risk here are associated losses of features akin to ‘cultural touchstones’: the ordinary yet distinctive characteristics such as patterns of dry stone walling and traditional wild flower hay meadows (AONB, 2004: 25). Specific action has been taken to address these issues through AONB managed projects such as the _Hay Time_ hay meadow restoration project and dry stone walling apprenticeships (Corsane et al., 2009). The twelfth principle of ecomuseology suggests that it is an approach recognising heritage in its intangible forms such as traditional crafts, techniques and skills whilst Principle 7 indicates that an ecomuseum focuses on all of the elements that contribute to identity and sense of place, in a definition which therefore can embrace ordinary features such as hay meadows and dry stone walls. This example reveals the
harmony ecomuseology finds with the situation in the North Pennines and the potential it holds for acknowledging and safeguarding heritage there (Corsane et al., 2009).

Objective LB3 of the AONB Partnership’s Management Plan however, aims to, “secure, by 2014, appropriate conservation designations and/or land management schemes for remaining undesignated or ‘non-scheme’ hay meadows...” and indicates that safeguarding sense of place remains bound to the conservation values of the ‘authorised heritage discourse’. In this sense ecomuseological approaches have potential in helping to give voice to the values ascribed by local people to the ordinary or everyday features of their place. In the Asahi-machi Ecomuseum in Japan, for example, the ecomuseum was used to lever local voices into the authorised discourse; the ecomuseum plan was adopted as part of the town’s development strategy (Davis, 2009). Whilst it is fair to say that the Hay Time and dry stone wailing apprenticeship schemes are ‘top-down’ initiatives, conceived of and managed by the North Pennines AONB, they also involved local people in passing on skills, sharing knowledge and volunteering (the Hay Time project for example, has involved twenty five volunteers in gathering seeds and growing plug plants). The dry stone walling and hay meadow restoration initiatives are part, however, of a wider context of activities that explore and safeguard sense of place, one of which, discussed in the next paragraph, is conceptualised at a grass-roots level.

A community-led initiative finding success in the North Pennines is the Know Your North Pennines training programme, which is available for those in a visitor-facing role to learn more about the area in order to communicate it to others. As one of the programme’s creators explained:

...the idea behind the programme is not just to give people who deal with the general public greater knowledge and understanding of their area, it’s for them to be able to transmit that greater knowledge and enthusiasm, with enthusiasm to visitors... its primary function is to reinforce that sense of place of the North Pennines as a whole, rather than the constituent
parts of it. And the constituent parts are there but it’s to show that there is commonality of culture and food and architecture and history and geology and ecology across the whole area. That’s one of the reasons why the North Pennines AONB support that programme because it ties into their agenda and is entirely about sense of place (NP16).

*Know Your North Pennines* takes a ‘sense of place’ approach, is initiated by local people and aims to help them communicate their identity to visitors. It is an approach that embraces heritage in its movable and immovable, tangible and intangible forms, the, “commonality of culture and food and architecture and history and geology...” The approach is supported by the North Pennines AONB Management Plan which, in objective CC3 sets out to encourage and support local communities to interpret the special qualities of the area. This objective and the *Know Your North Pennines* scheme find harmony with ecomuseological principles relating to identity and intangibility but also to principles related to local decision making and democracy, particularly Principle 1 that, “an ecomuseum is initiated and steered by local communities”, issues to which the later parts of this chapter will turn. Ecomuseums are characterised by a degree of dialogue between visitors and residents. In the Kalyna Country Ecomuseum in Alberta, for example, the focus is primarily on outsiders and on boosting the economy (Davis, 2009), whereas for the Hirano-cho Ecomuseum in Japan, a purposefully ambiguous map of the ecomuseum territory works by stealth to encourage visitors to ask directions and as a result communicate with local people (Davis, 2004: 99). Communicating sense of place occurs within contemporary contexts however, in which the cultural heritage of a place continues to grow and change organically. The salience of ecomuseology in addressing issues of shifting value is the issue to which discussion now turns.

7.2.4 Principles 9 and 15

An ecomuseum covers both spatial and temporal aspects; its approach is diachronic rather than synchronic; it encourages an ongoing programme of documentation of past and present life and people's interactions with all environmental factors (including physical, economic, social, cultural and political).
Interview data supported the suggestion that the North Pennines is undergoing a period of social and economic change. Respondents commented on changes to employment (NP20, NP22 and NP23) with its knock on effect for the general atmosphere, hustle and bustle and traffic of North Pennines life (NP06, NP03) and the effects of in-migration on the social landscape (NP20 and NP03). For some, involvement in heritage activity was in response to such changes and heritage was seen not as a moment in time, but as something affecting lives today and views of the future:

...it’s that link, for me it’s that feeling of... you know, the link to the past and how the past is affecting our lives still... I think that making that personal, getting kids to appreciate their, their place in history and the fact that history isn’t just something that’s in books but that it’s something that’s, that’s just in the past that you read about, but that we’re creating history for tomorrow. And you know if you, if you actually go and talk to... I get, I sort of talk to children about: when you go home, ask your parents or your grandparents or something... (NP24).

Another respondent involved in developing local history exhibitions, saw them as an observatory of change and a way for the community to come to terms with it:

...one of the interesting things, when it’s up, and you’re listening to people walking round and looking at things, is, er... talking about what’s on the photographs. Talking about what they were doing, “can you remember when...” and of course this time it was things that used to be in the village, that aren’t any more, erm, football, cricket, tennis, er, a cycling club, operatic society, erm, the youth club and Sunday school did pantomimes, erm, all that sort of thing that... there is nothing like that anymore (NP25).

Ecomuseums allow for such change and help local communities navigate identity through it. By taking a view that heritage is not fixed at one moment in time (synchronic) but that what is valued as heritage is ever-changing (diachronic) ecomuseums helps communities redefine their cultural identity or sense of place through times of flux, in a way that the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ fails to allow. The philosophy also
encourages documentation of change, placing emphasis on cultural heritage in the present as much as in the past and this is in keeping with community based activity already taking place in the North Pennines as this gentleman involved in photography explains:

*I’m actually filming things as they happen now, I’m filming current history. These are images largely of farming processes, the sheep show, the sheep dog trials which is a separate business, a separate event... And odd things, just things about the countryside which I kind of happen to collect, you know, just oddities that I save up and use later on, er road building, it’s not old fashioned at all but they re-tarred the road outside here and it was just so visually amazing, they did it in the winter and it was, there was hot tar coming down in the rain and it was steaming, and flashing lights. I’ve done little things like floods, our house gets flooded occasionally and down below, took some film of that and then I went out and filmed other little bits of floods later on, so this is just recording small bits of what’s going on... collecting modern images (NP11).

Documentation was also taking place through the recording of oral history:

*so we’ve started this process and one of the things we’re interested in is doing an oral history archive as well so that’s at the very early stages really. And we’re aware that you know, even at the time that we’ve been beginning this process some of the old timers have died, and you know, taken their stories with them (NP26).

Respondents from Alston Historical Society and the Friends of Killhope described the development of their archives and the desire for others to access them with ease. Another respondent was a member of the North East Vernacular Architects group and recorded, researched and published information on buildings in the North Pennines. The way in which these community groups are acting upon impulses to safeguard the heritage that contributes to their sense of place finds parallels with the grass-roots activity from which ecomuseums are born. When a local historical association in the Piemonte region of Northern Italy for example, were galvanised to save their last
remaining rope-works, the Ecomuseo della Canapa was born (Corsane et al., 2007a, Corsane et al., 2007b, Davis, 2007a). The local authority or ‘Municipality’ were supportive, recognising what the project could do to support local distinctiveness and cultural tourism (Davis, 2007a: 200) and the site became a hub for local pride and the generation of social capital (Corsane et al., 2007b).

There are links between what is happening ‘on the ground’ in the North Pennines, ecomuseum philosophy and the objectives put forth in the AONB Management Plan. It is clear to see that the AONB Partnership take an approach that is concerned with spatiality (and a continuing review of the AONB boundary is aimed for through objective LG10) moreover objectives 8 and 10 under the ‘land management and biodiversity’ strand show a concern for the future through a preparedness for the effects of climate change. Harmony between ecomuseology and the Management Plan is most effectively found however, in the AONB Partnership’s emphasis upon sustainability, both social, for example through a retention and expansion of village services (objective CC1), and environmental. In terms of documentation, the Management Plan aims to record geological sites (LG4), and encourage community participation in historic environment research (HE5) along with aims related to the development of learning programmes (CC5, IK5). Were ecomuseological principles adopted to guide heritage management objectives in the North Pennines, they could unlock the potential within the existing Management Plan to give voice to the values ascribed by local people to the ordinary or everyday features of their place, past, present and future through for example, ongoing documentation.

7.3 Community engagement with heritage
Chapter Five and section 7.2 above suggested that present systems of heritage authority, Smith’s (2006) ‘authorised heritage discourse’, are unable to acknowledge heritage values that are less tangible, ever-changing and formed through contemporary contexts: heritage as process or expression. Howard’s (2009) call for heritage management systems that give voice to the values ascribed to heritage by local people or ‘insiders’
was used to support the case for local people to safeguard their own heritage (Howard, 2009: 61). Some residents in the North Pennines are actively engaged with their heritage as volunteers and Chapter Six described some of the motivations of those involved in heritage activity and what the benefits of getting involved appeared to be in terms of social, identity and human capital. Several ecomuseum principles have salience in addressing the interest of local people in the North Pennines in safeguarding their heritage and the need for a system that acknowledges everyday ways of making heritage meanings, and they are: principle 6 (substantial voluntary efforts); principle 3 (joint ownership and management) with principle 17 (multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches) with principle 16 (research at a number of levels); principle 14 (change and development for a better future) and principle 21 (local pride, regeneration or economic income). Each of these principles will now be discussed in turn with reference to the interview data and AONB Partnership’s current Management Plan.

7.3.1 Principle 6

An ecomuseum often depends on substantial active voluntary efforts by local stakeholders.

In the North Pennines volunteers are engaged with heritage in a number of ways for example through membership of heritage groups such as: the Allenheads Village Trust; Friends of the Weardale Museum; Friends of Killhope Museum; Frosterley Local History Exhibition; North Pennines Heritage Trust; Tyne Valley Railway; The Hub Museum, Alston; Alston Historical Society; and the Weardale Field Studies Society. The extent of this activity and the existence of volunteer led museums and heritage centres at Weardale, Allenheads and Alston are characteristic of ecomuseology. There are moments of ambition evidenced through the creation of the volunteer-led museum ‘The Hub’ at Alston which was developed as a one-off project to celebrate the millennium but has become a permanent exhibition, or the archives developed by the Friends of Killhope, the Alston Historical Society and in the early stages at Blanchland. There are also moments of inspirational communal effort, as volunteers taking part in a local history exhibition at Frosterley coach one another to research and develop exhibition
content (also described in Chapter Six, section 6.4.2), “I have actually said to one or two people, ‘Look, find out about so and so for us…’ Marjorie across the road for instance, she’s got more into it than she used to… she’s actually getting more into  erm, finding things out more, than she ever used to” (NP25). Volunteers play a significant role in ecomuseum projects, the Écomusée Saint Dégan in France is run by local volunteers (Corsane et al., 2008), the Kalyna Country Ecomuseum in Alberta is managed by a consortium of local people (Davis, 2009) and the Ecomuseo della Canapa (Hemp Ecomuseum) in Italy is a success through united local voluntary efforts (Davis, 2007a).

In the North Pennines however, many respondents talked about difficult issues in relation to volunteering. For the Weardale Museum, some volunteers only committed a few days each year necessitating burdensome retraining (NP03). Some volunteers, who were widely involved, committed substantial amounts of time to their volunteering (NP07 and NP14) and this was a problem:

... you are under pressure all the time you know, to do more and more really. Erm, but I am more careful now. I wouldn’t take anything else on, and I keep thinking “well, I should drop something” but I don’t know what to drop! (laughs) Because everything I’m involved in you know, I’m interested in. But of course as you get older, you don’t move as fast. So you’re not quite so full of energy (NP14).

And others were concerned that volunteering meant offering skills that might otherwise command payment:

The trouble is, I mean I, I need to be working, this is the way I earn my living and erm, I used to... for years I was practically working full time as a volunteer... for, you know, at one point in my life... I’m older, I’ve got a limited amount of time erm, to do things and, I’ve got to earn a living. I’ve spent five years at university, I need to be using that and I can’t... I can’t just... I can’t be doing voluntary stuff (NP24).
Perhaps for these reasons and others, most of the interview respondents referenced issues relating to sustainability. The Friends of Killhope, the Weardale Museum and Allenheads Village Trust all had difficulties in recruiting new volunteers and Trustees for their committees (NP16, NP08, NP06, NP27, NP03, NP14, NP10) and some suggested that younger generations had “other outlets” (NP07) for associative activity. This was seen as a threat to expressive forms of heritage, such as local village shows (NP07). One respondent commented on the small core of active people within the community:

... see it’s a very, very small community this, and one of the difficulties of that is there’s a very small and again, given the age of the residents, there’s a very small pool of active people who you can call upon to fulfil certain functions or duties or roles (NP26).

Maintaining the community’s interest in volunteer projects was also an issue noted by respondents:

That is the problem, when things start you have a large volunteer group but as the years go on, it dwindles down. It’s like Friends of Killhope, that’s absolutely dwindled (NP14).

Within the ecomuseology discourse, concerns have been raised about the sustainability of community enthusiasm for the ecomuseum amongst the generations succeeding the originators of the project (Howard, 2002). The interest of local people in safeguarding their heritage in the North Pennines, certainly shares characteristics with the ecomuseum ideal, but for an ecomuseological approach to be taken in the North Pennines, one that demands substantial voluntary efforts, then issues of raising the interest of younger generations, balancing the commitment of time required, making volunteering as rewarding as it would be with remuneration and ensuring sustainability of volunteer enthusiasm will need to be addressed.

The AONB Management Plan emphasises a voluntary commitment under objective EU8 which calls for the establishment of three Local Access Forums, and then largely through its ‘communities and cultures’ strand which looks to encourage community groups to
engage in the conservation and celebration of the AONB (CC2), to encourage local people to help interpret the local area (CC3), and to encourage the community to support sustainable tourism (CC4). Moreover, two major heritage bodies in the North Pennines, The North Pennines Heritage Trust and Killhope: The North of England Lead Mining Museum were each recruiting volunteer coordinators as part of respective volunteer schemes at the time of data collection in the field. Taken together the aims of the AONB Partnership and the actions of a major heritage organisation and a major heritage institution in the North Pennines, suggest that ecomuseological principles have potential to guide and coordinate an approach to community engagement, engagement which might then give voice to the way in which local people value their heritage.

7.3.2 Principle 3, Principle 17 and Principle 16

An ecomuseum should stimulate joint ownership and management with input from local communities, academic advisors, local businesses, local authorities and government structures; it promotes multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches to research. It promotes research at a number of levels – from the research and understanding of local ‘specialists’ to research by academics.

Joint management and community input characterise the North Pennines AONB. Its boundary spans the administrative boundaries of three County Councils: Northumberland, Durham and Cumbria. This combined with Management Plan goals in relation to: landscape and geodiversity; land management and biodiversity; the historic environment; enjoying and understanding the North Pennines; economy and business; community and culture; and increasing knowledge of the AONB, means that the designation, by it’s very nature, works through joint ownership, management and input; the Staff Unit is itself funded through a partnership of twenty two statutory agencies, local authorities and voluntary or community organisations. Interview data presented a number of examples of the ways that communities engaged with heritage were able to work with authorities and government in networks that Chapter Six saw in terms of linking social capital (sections 6.3 and 6.4). Working in partnership was important for community groups as this respondent explained:
...you want to surround yourself with people with different skills and different backgrounds, all of which hopefully will be helpful to the project (NP11).

Many respondents described the ways in which they worked with organisations, institutions, agencies and authorities. Allenheads Trust worked with Allenheads Estate (NP27); Durham County Council fund Killhope (NP16); The Hub Museum at Alston liaised with the Weardale Railway to maximise visitor potential (NP12); Blanchland Community Development Organisation, the Haggs Bank Conservation Group and many others work with the AONB Staff Unit (NP22, NP23, NP05, NP26); the Know Your North Pennines scheme creates an informal network of small to medium enterprises (SMEs) (NP03 and NP16); Killhope shared a philosophy with the AONB Partnership which led to a good working relationship:

...we work quite closely with the AONB unit and have done for a number of years actually and we have a good working relationship. It’s not a formal working relationship. It’s based on personalities, as these things always are. Rather than on structures. But yes, I’m the chair of the Historic Environment Working Group at the AONB, have been for some time. I was one of the people who put together the bid for Geopark Status for the AONB, with various other people. And I was initially one of the two geopark representatives with Chris Woodley-Stewart (Director of the North Pennines AONB Partnership), on the network... So ... we have a history of working together... (NP16).

An example of the kind of partnership work that takes place between community groups and ‘authorities’ was given by the following respondent, a member of The Friends of Killhope, The North of England Lead Mining Museum:

Well... we organise a day school as part of the two week geo-festival, we organise the day school and this year we started that. Ever since it started we’ve had a minerals weekend you know on Saturday and Sunday where we have a display of minerals... and we work closely with the British Geological Survey, a national organisation, a government organisation,
they come and er put an exhibition on for us. Newcastle University for the last two years, sorry Durham University for the last two years have come and put a display in as well, so we do work with other groups to further the information about the collection and lead mining etcetera (NP07).

Interview data indicated that partnership working was seen positively. The benefits meant a sharing of responsibility as this respondent indicates through the following example:

One of the projects we’re working on is between the... on this road, as you’re coming up towards the quarry there are two large lime kilns on the left hand side as you cross the second bridge, and erm... we’re trying to get those consolidated at the moment so that once they’re consolidated we can fence them off and put a walk way round and it’ll be somewhere else for people to visit when they’re in the area. But we don’t want to own them. We just... we’re happy to manage the site in so far as you know looking after the interpretation boards and making sure that it’s safe and doing a health and safety check once a month... but er... but we don’t want to expand it to taking them over... (NP27).

Here then are similarities with ecomuseum objectives relating to joint ownership and management with input from local communities and specialist advisors. The quote above demonstrates the potential of inter-disciplinary work to give local people the scope to interpret their own heritage without having to take full responsibility for the more specialist aspects of conserving heritage resources. Partnership and inter-disciplinary work is apparent in the North Pennines. Local businesses feed into the work of the AONB Partnership through their involvement in the Know Your North Pennines scheme, in objectives related to sustainable communities (Management Plan objective CC1) and through the AONB’s schemes to promote ‘green tourism’ (EBS). Local authorities contribute to the Partnership that funds the Staff Unit, whose finances are processed through Durham County Council. The need draw from a range of specialism is also evidenced through the Management Plan’s wide objectives ranging from
biodiversity, conservation, the historic environment, sustainable tourism, public rights of way, developing rural skills, and engaging schools.

Similarly the AONB Partnership strives for research in both multi and inter-disciplinary ways and from academics alongside local ‘specialists’ in an approach that yet again has synergy with ecomuseology. Section 7.2.4 of this chapter examined the ongoing documentation of North Pennines life by its residents in terms of oral history and the preparation of local history exhibitions (see the last section 7.3.1 and quote from NP25), and the promotion of community participation in historic environment research within the AONB Management Plan (objective HE5). Through the AONB Partnership’s work, residents research their heritage through community archaeology (Flint, 2009), young people are engaged through the Heritage Lottery Funded work of the ‘Living North Pennines’ project (Clarke, 2009), which has also involved community groups in learning how to record oral history (NP26). The AONB has research objectives related to enhancing the county Historic Environment Record (HE1) and encouraging schools to use the North Pennines as an outdoor classroom (EU5).

The Plan has a specific ‘Increasing Knowledge’ strand which includes objectives for: developing baseline data and future research areas to improve knowledge and understanding of the area’s qualities and condition (IK1); increasing knowledge and understanding of species and habitats (IK3); researching tourism to inform policy and investment (IK4); and researching the impact for children of outdoor learning (IK5). The result of a collaborative research project with the AONB Partnership, this dissertation in itself is evidence of the inter-disciplinary approach to research that the AONB is prepared to take, and the project has also led to a multi-disciplinary approach through a research seminar with other Newcastle University researchers from the fields of archaeology and rural development, a seminar which is likely to become a regular feature of the Partnership’s staff development programme. At this seminar AONB staff said that they felt their research programme was presently guided by reaction to issues and concerns and that they are keen to see a move towards research that is guided by
proactive policy and strategy; this thesis posits that the adoption of ecomuseological principles could help guide such a move.

With similarities to ecomuseum then, the AONB Partnership approaches research in inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary ways and in ways that allow for the understandings of both local people and academics. Management in itself through partnership is also in harmony with ecomuseology’s principle of joint approaches. However only one Management Plan objective makes specific reference to grassroots research and this, along with making the connections between community heritage groups more structured, is an area that could benefit from the AONB Staff Unit’s familiarisation with the ecomuseum philosophy.

Discussion has then shown that the ecomuseum paradigm has potential for embracing the already substantial voluntary engagement with heritage amongst local people in the North Pennines, and that the AONB Partnership’s management structure along with its interest in inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary approaches to research, embracing research by both academics and local ‘specialists,’ leads to a management of the cultural landscape that is characteristic of ecomuseology. Section 7.2.4 also noted the diachronic emphasis of the ecomuseum approach and the next section examines change and development in the North Pennines in light of this approach.

**7.3.3 Principle 14**

*The ecomuseum allows for change and development for a better future.*

Chapter One described the small and sometimes fragile communities that exist in the North Pennines in a time of flux (section 1.4.3). Their cultural landscape once characterised by the thriving industry of mineral extraction is now supported by an economy based on agriculture and tourism (Convery and Dutson, 2006a: 213-214). Of the former, there is a widespread perception that hill farming is in decline, or on the
verge of collapse, whilst for the latter, visitors place high value on this particular kind of landscape, environment and sense of rural community (Soane and Nicholson, 2005: 2-3). Chapter One described the shrinking opportunities for employment (AONB, 2009b) that have led to migration and an ageing population (Ward, 2006:129) threatening a particular way of life; a situation exacerbated by the area’s appeal to wealthier commuters and retirees who are willing to pay a premium for property in the AONB.

Interview respondents noted these changes, some suggesting that in-migration was good because it meant the refurbishment of derelict properties: “they’ve... done the places up and all like you know? You know they might stop derelict otherwise” (NP20), and that more of it was to be expected: “More and more people are potentially going to be er... wishing to live in the North Pennines” (NP13). Respondents also noted the high value now placed on their particular kind of landscape through the increasing reliance of the economy on tourism: “there’s nothing virtually around here apart from the little bits there is of tourism... and obviously working in a hotel or working in a tea-rooms...” (NP23). What also emerged however, and was highlighted in discussion at an AONB Partnership research seminar (touched upon earlier in section 7.1.2), was the resistance of newcomers to physical changes in the environment as this born and bred resident suggested:

...I think it can be (a threat) to a certain extent I think that they (in-migrants) want erm the place, the dale to look beautiful for the way it is now. Erm, but they don’t want industry in the dale where it’s industry that made the dale beautiful in the first place. You know? (NP20).

Discussion at the AONB Partnership seminar indicated that whilst in-migrants could be resistant to change, born and bred residents were more flexible, perhaps because they had the cultural memory (the social, physical and autobiographical ‘insideness’ described in Chapter Five) to cope with changes to the physical landscape, and this sometimes caused tensions in the community. Again the issue of plural values and the role of outsider groups in defining heritage is raised. Once these outsider groups ascribe value through the systems of acknowledgement and protection espoused by the ‘authorised
heritage discourse’, policy does not have the flexibility to allow for less clearly defined insider ways of defining heritage. Authorised ways of valuing heritage mean that physical elements of the landscape are ‘frozen in aspic’ and changes in the ways of valuing and defining heritage as ordinary places, expressions or processes, even if they are enthusiastically endorsed by residents, cannot be recognised.

Given that the designation of the AONB itself can be viewed as part of Smith’s (2006) ‘authorised heritage discourse’, The North Pennines Management Plan is throughout concerned with protecting that for which AONB status was designated. In this sense, objectives relating to change and development in the future make reference in some form to: enhancing and maintaining landscape quality; maintaining natural beauty and tranquillity; maintaining historic structures; encouraging visitors to contribute to conservation; sustainability of tourism and transport; and overall development in keeping with the landscape setting and special qualities. The vision is one of a developing sustainable tourism economy with the encouragement of green tourism businesses, marketing and promotion, and the development of art and craft enterprises. Alongside the tourism economy, through objectives relating to countryside and conservation skills training, broadband installation and training for young people, the AONB Partnership also look to develop human capital. Taken as a whole then it is possible to see that the North Pennines AONB Management Plan, whilst tied to the authorised heritage discourse, is compatible with the principles of ecomuseology, allowing for change and development always with a view to sustainability of communities and of the environment.

An ecomuseum cannot be directly compared with an AONB, since ecomuseology is not recognised heritage management system in the England. For that reason, it is not possible to anticipate how existing legal systems for protecting heritage in England would relate to tenets of ecomuseology as they are expressed in the twenty one principles. However the AONB Staff Unit have a strong concern for the future development and management of change in the North Pennines, albeit within the
parameters of existing conservation legislation, and in this sense the Management Plan finds harmony with ecomuseology. The concern for development and change is revealed in the AONB Partnership’s interest in benefiting its local communities and the next section discusses this concern and its relationship to the twenty-first ecomuseum principle.

7.3.4 Principle 21

_The ecomuseum can bring benefits to local communities, for example, a sense of pride, regeneration and / or economic income._

Chapter Six examined the benefits of engagement with heritage for local people in terms of identity, social and human forms of capital. Ecomuseum provides an organising philosophy for the promotion of a place which can then affect pride and self-esteem amongst the community, attract investment in an area and thereby drive the economy. The effects of an ecomuseological approach which promotes the special qualities of a place and sustainable tourism, thereby revitalising the economy and infrastructure, would certainly benefit those living and working in the North Pennines. As this respondent suggested, “I think our biggest worry is lack of public transport, lack of facilities and lack of sustainable, decent, waged jobs” (NP17). Interview data suggest there are three ways in which the ecomuseum philosophy could develop the current situation in the North Pennines for local communities and these are: attracting in-migrants; attracting visitors; and involving the community in interpreting their place. Each will now be discussed in turn.

Interview respondents noted the appeal of the North Pennines for those wishing to relocate and recognised the benefits of in-migration. The restoration of derelict properties was a common theme (NP20, NP16, NP27, NP13, NP05) and the renovation work on buildings and the land fuelled by in-migration was seen as having positive effects for the economy:
But what I will say, if they hadn’t moved into the dale, there wouldn’t be the work for such as myself (a dry stone waller). Because you seem to find that maybe people that’s moved into the dale have got more money and they’ve done a lot more work and done the places up and all like you know? (NP20).

Some of these renovated buildings have become holiday lets for tourists and as one respondent speculated: “people will stay and that’s of tremendous economic benefit” (NP13).

Tourism was felt to be economically important for respondents:

It’s very difficult to keep a happy balance because residents you find, when it’s lots and lots of visitors they find it very hard, to park (cars) and things like that. So that’s another thing, it’s trying to get a happy balance. But without the visitors the village will die (NP23).

For another respondent, the visits generated by the Coast to Coast Cycle Route (‘C2C’ opened in 1994) are notable:

...particularly since they... put the C2C cycle route through. That made a big difference. Erm a big difference to the viability of businesses in the village. People came to the village as they cycled through and they brought their families back to visit places that they’d found interesting... (NP27).

Of visitors in general this respondent said:

I think we do have the capacity to take a lot more. I certainly think we have enough to keep people here at least a week at a time, to cover just about everything that anybody wants to do, whether its culture, walking, you know, adventure. I think we just... there’s enough (NP17).

An enthusiasm for more visitors was also matched by eagerness to interpret sense of place for visitors:
If the people like to think that they’re talking to someone that does have a connection with the place, does have a bit of family history. I think for them it helps them a little bit to understand a bit better because you can speak from personal experiences you know, you can talk about the lead mines and all the rest of it, but a lot of my dad’s family history is just so typical of lots of lead miner’s family’s histories up and down the North Pennines (NP17).

Earlier discussion has shown that community participation in interpretation, research and conservation are all areas to which the North Pennines AONB Management Plan has set out to address, alongside achieving the sustainability of rural communities through support for the retention and expansion of village services (objective CC1). The value and potential of tourism for the region is also highlighted through objectives relating to the attraction of new and diverse audiences (EU6), marketing and promotion, development of tourism packages to incorporate local business and products (EB2,4,6,7 and 10) and the engagement of the community in promoting environmental sustainability within the tourism industry in the region (CC4).

The concern within the Management Plan for the economic viability of the North Pennines way of life, through tourism, and the associated business development linked to regeneration, also finds harmony with an ecomuseogical approach. Moreover, like an ecomuseum, the strategy of the AONB Management Plan seeks to develop a sense of pride, through promoting the desirability of the region for visitors and also educating and employing young people in the cultural landscape (CC8). Section 7.3 has examined the voluntary efforts of local people in the North Pennines and saw that ecomuseum philosophy has potential in uniting these diverse activities (7.3.1). It was noted that AONB Partnership’s management structure along with its interest in multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches to research, embracing research by both academics and local ‘specialists,’ leads to a management of the cultural landscape that is very ecomuseological in character (7.3.2). Synergy with ecomuseum was also found in the strong concern within the AONB Management Plan for future development and
management of change (7.3.3). Ecomuseum philosophy can also provide an organising structure to interpreting the cultural landscape \textit{in situ} through its holistic and fragmented site approach and it is this holistic approach put forth by the philosophy to which this chapter now turns.

7.4 Holistic, integrated and \textit{in-situ} approach

This dissertation has advocated a heritage management approach focussing on ‘sense of place’, an approach that embraces the notion of cultural landscape, incorporating natural and cultural heritage, the movable and immovable physical heritage and the intangible: customs, dialect, song and dance. In the ecomuseum philosophy the geographical territory of an ecomuseum is decided upon in relation to shared characteristics. There is harmony here with the landscape unit identified by both the government in the designation of the North Pennines AONB, for its outstanding natural qualities, and by UNESCO through the designation of Geopark status for its unique earth heritage. Linked to this characteristic, the cultural heritage of a mineral extraction industry for lead and fluorspar also unites the region in shared history, and it is a shared history currently interpreted at four sites in the North Pennines: Nenthead Heritage Centre, Killhope: The North of England Lead Mining Museum, the Weardale Museum at Ireshopeburn and Allenheads Heritage Centre (see Chapter One sections 1.3 and 1.4).

Discussion up to this point has drawn very many parallels between the approach taken by the North Pennines AONB Partnership and the ecomuseum paradigm, and debating these ideas at an AONB Research Seminar in March 2010 indicated that many of the staff were comfortable with the tenets of ecomuseology and identified for themselves the similarities. In only one area did the staff identify dissimilarity. This was in relation to the fragmented site approach described in Principle 10 of Corsane’s et al.’s (2006b, 2006a) list. In particular staff noted that the organisation of the territory differed from the use of a ‘hub’ and various satellite or antennae sites linked by way-marked routes which are characteristic of ecomuseums (Davis, 1999: 68). Overall however, there was a general enthusiasm for the idea and this, the last section of the penultimate chapter of this
dissertation, examines the holistic, in situ, fragmented site approach of ecomuseology and its applicability in the context of the shared characteristics of the North Pennines.

7.4.1 Principle 8

An ecomuseum often encompasses a ‘geographical’ territory, which can be determined by different shared characteristics.

The North Pennines AONB Partnership recognises shared characteristics and seeks to promote them within the AONB Management Plan through objectives related to tourism and the promotion of the area’s special qualities. Discussion at the research seminar referred to above, highlighted that at the moment the AONB boundary cannot include an area in the south east corner of the region because of the existence of a cement works that adversely affects these ‘special qualities’. It is likely that the locality of the cement works would however, be included in an ecomuseum boundary and the potential for other changes remain a possibility particularly within Management Plan objective LG10 which suggests reviews of the AONB geographical boundary to make it more coherent.

Interview respondents felt that there was coherence in the North Pennines AONB boundary, rather than in the County structure of Northumberland, Durham and Cumbria, and this was a social and cultural coherence embodied by informal ‘insider’ networks as this respondent explained in reference to the culture of farming:

... the farming community has kept its dialect, they say ‘yaw’ and not ‘you’. I mean, I’m not a farmer here, I don’t know it all but I think you would find it among the farmers. And the farmers I think are much better aware of what is happening in the next county, because our local paper stops at the county boundary, we’re unaware of what is happening in Teesdale, but the farmers aren’t (NP06).
Discussion in Chapter 4 (4.1.1) also highlighted the scales at which sense of place was experienced, finding that the North Pennines was generally felt to be an amalgamating concept of shared characteristic: “a lot of people identify with the North Pennines more because of... what’s here” (NP02).

Interview respondents noted the potential for heritage groups to be united across the North Pennines as the following example demonstrates:

...there was an erm... a resident of the town... He just thought he’d like to record the vernacular architecture of Alston... I thought, this is a great idea... and I phoned up other people and oh there was Allendale, Stanhope and Middleton and there was interest in all... So we got people from all four main dales together... there’s the potential there to organise a North Pennines Architecture Group (NP10).

Other respondents noted the potential for heritage institutions and organisations to be united across the region as the Chairman of the North Pennines Heritage Trust commented of the Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre, “it’s bringing together those initiatives with Killhope into some form of unified, let’s call it the... North Pennines Brand yeah? And again this is potentially an ongoing discussion between ourselves and the AONB and other partners you know?” (NP13). The bringing together of these initiatives is a possibility to which discussion now turns.

7.4.2 Principles 10 and 11

The ecomuseum often takes the form of a ‘fragmented museum’, consisting of a network with a hub and antennae of different buildings and sites; it promotes preservation, conservation and safeguarding of heritage resources in situ.

Chapter One described the main sites at which heritage displays interpret sense of place in the North Pennines (section 1.4). The possibility of linking the four key sites at Allenheads, Killhope, Nenthead and Ireshopburn has been discussed elsewhere in detail
(Davis, 1999: 56-63, Davis, 2003) with reference to a discussion document produced by the three counties in 1987 born of a suggestion later put neatly that, “the location of the three adjacent lead mining sites of Allenheads (Northumberland), Killhope (Durham) and Nenthead (Cumbria) in different administrative areas creates potential for conflict or cooperation, and a strategy was needed to ensure it was the latter” (Davis, 2003: 61). It is fair to say that some twenty three years later, the need for cooperation in order to present a holistic North Pennines story for visitors remains; this is discussed in more detail in the next section. The philosophy of ecomuseology has great potential here, in organising the three sites, along with the volunteer led Weardale Museum at Ireshopeburn, to work in a more cooperative way, with one centre acting as a hub for orientation to the North Pennines cultural landscape and others as antennae sites.

Recent projects developed by the AONB Partnership could also become antennae, complementing the interpretation of industrial heritage with a wider exposition of sense of place: visitors might follow way-marked routes to species rich hay meadows, or geological sites for example. The fragmented site approach certainly appealed to some interview respondents. The Chairman of the Allenheads Village Trust talked about his interest in consolidating lime kilns for tourists to visit; these would be suitable ecomuseum antennas. In reference to the AONB Partnership’s published guides he felt, “there should certainly be something produced on the lead mining, for instance ‘lead mining in the North Pennines, these are our centres of attraction’...” (NP27). He was also interested in orientation explaining about a visit from an AONB Partnership officer, “I’m hoping to talk to her about... some money... to set up an information point which would be computer based” (NP27). Orientation concerned a respondent engaged with heritage in the village of Blanchland who wanted to develop a vacant shop into a heritage centre saying,

... you could look on Blanchland almost as being a kind of gateway to the lead mining history and heritage... I could see it as being a centre which pointed the way to other things like pointing the way to Killhope or pointing the way to... it’s Nenthead isn’t it where the other lead mine
museum is? Or the Westgate place, the museum: Weardale Museum…

(NP04).

Davis suggests that for the ecomuseum visitor, the ‘antennae’ are frequently linked by way-marked footpaths or scenic drives (Davis, 1999:68). As the Chairman of the North Pennines Heritage Trust said of Killhope and Nenthead:

...what’s the physical difference between the two sites? It’s three miles. So I guarantee, a hundred years ago, people were walking between those two sites. Where’s that track over the fell? Let’s recreate that, way mark the track. People could pay at Killhope, come in our backdoor. It is all about creating a unique visitor attraction and experience (NP13).

Through it’s published walks such as the ‘Hay Time’, hay meadow walks, plant identification guide, cycle routes such as ‘Wheels to the Wild’ and published guides to the subregional areas, the historic environment, nature watching, local events, festivals, agricultural shows and fairs, most recently amalgamated into a North Pennines ‘Pocket Guide’, the AONB Partnership, like an ecomuseum, also offers visitors the opportunity to follow trails in order to explore sense of place. Supported by Management Plan objectives in relation to Public Rights of Way (EU7), the development of tourism packages that link visitors with natural beauty, local businesses and local products (EB7) and the involvement of local people in interpretation (CC3), the ‘pocket guide’ could be developed following ecomuseum principles in order to lead visitors to the sorts of antennae sites described above. Such a guide encourages visitors to discover both tangible (e.g. industrial archaeology, geology and flora) and intangible (e.g. farmers markets, fairs and festivals) elements of the cultural landscape that create sense of place. The approach can be further extended to incorporate movable tangible heritage as the next section explains.

Several interview respondents referred to objects of heritage value which are held within the community. A dry stone waller was proud of his collection of broken clay pipes, dating back through the centuries, found abandoned within the walls he repaired.
(NP20), a respondent involved in recording oral history showed off her similarly antique bibles and hymn books and children’s clothes, given to her for safekeeping by members of the community saying, “I don’t really know what to do with them but obviously I’m keeping them because I always think, don’t throw anything like this away” (NP04). The process of planning local history exhibitions meant that for one respondent her collection was overwhelming: “it’s just as well we’ve got five bedrooms because right up at the top it’s... the stuff I’ve got is phenomenal” (NP25). To celebrate the launch of a book by Amy Emms (1991), The Story of Durham Quilting, High House Chapel at Ireshopburn borrowed quilts from the community for a special evening and one of the organisers explained: “...these quilts that came out of the cupboards and drawers when we did this exhibition I’m quite sure went back to the late eighteenth century... Well I think even the Weardale people who knew the area and were born and bred, were surprised at the number that came out...” (NP09). Collections are held throughout the community and under ecomuseum principles could continue to be cared for in situ. Following ecomuseological philosophy, the AONB Partnership along with County Museums Services could record these in situ collections, offer advice on care and conservation and organise events, similar to the High House Chapel evening, where collections could be shared. This would involve a development of the AONB Management Plan a little further away from the current emphasis on natural heritage, related to the purpose of designation, in order to bolster the ‘Community and Culture’ strand of its objectives.

7.4.3 Principles 18 and 19  

The ecomuseum idea encourages a holistic approach to the interpretation of culture/nature relationships; It often attempts to illustrate connections between technology/individual, nature/culture, past/present.

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are designated by government as precious landscapes whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard them. They serve a dual purpose then which combines nature with culture, a combination reified by UNESCO as a ‘cultural landscape’. In this
sense the AONB Partnership take a holistic approach to the relationship between nature and culture. What this chapter has attempted to demonstrate is that this holistic approach could be developed to the benefit of visitors and the sustainability of the four sites of Killhope Museum, Nenthead Heritage Centre, Allenheads Heritage Centre, and the Weardale Museum. Here the relationship between nature and the effects of human cultural activity on the landscape can be explored, linking, for example the earth heritage of the UNESCO Geopark designation to the cultural heritage of lead mining, and the long history of population migration to the ebb and flow of technology and capitalism. Presently sites of heritage interpretation compete with one another. This respondent from Alston Historical Society was keen to develop a museum, but was afraid to compete with the local ‘Hub’ museum, even though this museum focuses on railways and motor vehicles: “there is scope for a museum in Alston, but it would have to be run by volunteers because it wouldn’t be a paying concern... er, you’d in effect be competing with The Hub so we wouldn’t want to do that” (NP10). A holistic approach within an ecomuseum paradigm would allow each site to tell its own discrete part of the North Pennines story thereby avoiding competition, overlap, and community tensions where possible.

During the period of fieldwork, Killhope Museum had submitted a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund for substantial development to the Museum and as part of this application, the funders had insisted that an agreement be made for the two major industrial heritage sites of Killhope and Nenthead to work together. The Chairman of the North Pennines Heritage Trust when interviewed was clearly excited by the prospect of the development and the new relationship, envisioning shared marketing and ticketing, a ‘trading and pooling’ of visitors believing:

... there seems to be a groundswell developing, that yes, it has to be done, it’s not an option not to do it, yeah? Er to make all these opportunities sustainable. And the heritage becomes a coherent story, not just a piece there, and a piece there and people are trying to work the jigsaw out, there’s pieces missing you know? (NP13).
Making the ‘opportunities sustainable’ is key to the fragile tourism economy of the North Pennines and this is a substantial theme running through the AONB Management Plan, indeed the greatest proportion of objectives were mapped back to ecomuseum principles in relation to sustainability and responsible tourism as the next section will show.

7.4.4 Principle 13 and Principle 20

*The ecomuseum stimulates sustainable development and use of resources; it can provide for the intersection between heritage and responsible tourism.*

Sections 7.2.1, 7.3.2, 7.3.3 and 7.3.4 examined similarities between the North Pennines AONB Management Plan and ecomuseum principles in relation to volunteer effort, local participation in decision making, acceptance of change, and regeneration. By following ecomuseum principles and nurturing an interest, enthusiasm and involvement amongst local people, encouraging their engagement in interpretation, conservation and decision making, heritage management approaches can be made more sustainable through community ownership and support. Section 7.3.1 however, identified issues related to the recruitment and retention of volunteers.

Where volunteer projects are successful, they need the support of a wider ‘ecomuseum’ network and contact with experts to make them sustainable as evidenced from these somewhat contrasting comments from respondents involved with The Hub Museum at Alston. The first, an elderly gentleman, still involved with the museum said: “Oh we were all friends that set it off at the beginning. It was supposed to be just for about six weeks for the millennium and it’s gone on and it’s getting better and better you see…” (NP12). Whereas this rather more ambitious respondent, no longer involved with the museum said:

*...when the project moved from being a local railway preservation society, one month project, into trying to become a steady state, open for the*
summers only museum, it needed to start to fulfil a lot more rigorous things... (NP11).

An ecomuseum network would involve access to expertise, which could then lead to accepted standards in relation to health and safety, intellectual property law and copyright, all of which issues had caused dispute between volunteers of The Hub Museum. An ecomuseum network would also help to make developments sustainable by spreading the benefits of tourism.

Whilst some interview respondents suggested that tourism was sometimes unpopular (NP27) and seen as, “a threat rather than an opportunity” (NP16), there was an overriding sense that the benefits were apparent to most: “I was sceptical but so many depend on it” (NP10) and that, “the businesses need the tourism, it gets very quiet in the winter, they have to concentrate on... just trying to survive in the village” (NP23). In particular, representatives of the North Pennines Heritage Trust (NPHT) and Killhope, The North of England Lead Mining Museum called for a more integrated approach to promoting the region to visitors and this new enthusiasm was accelerated by Killhope’s Heritage Lottery Fund proposal, as this member of the NPHT explained,

Yes well Killhope are applying for a Lottery grant to have a new centre built and one of the conditions is that they have to work with us! Well in the past we haven’t worked with Killhope at all. You see, Killhope opened first and Killhope is just a small, single mine site. And then we got started. And the Nenthead site was one of the largest sites in the country at the time, you know it’s an important site. And they weren’t very pleased. You know, because we’re just down the road. But we’ve never done as well as them. We never get as many visitors... But I mean in the first place when we opened, we were supposed to work the three together, us and Allenheads. Well Allenheads more or less went under but we are supposed to be trying now and we’re quite willing (NP05).
Killhope sitting within the county of Durham carved a niche for itself particularly for its educational work, winning the Guardian Family Friendly Award in 2004, but just a short time later, Nenthead, in Cumbria, began to develop its own education service, employing a Heritage Lottery Funded Education Officer and setting itself up in direct competition. As a result, Killhope’s Museum Manager called for a,

... strategic framework for the North Pennines... until that tourism framework for the North Pennines develops (and) there isn’t actually one across the whole patch... we continue to be working in separate regions (NP16).

Whilst he acknowledged that the AONB Partnership are not a tourism organisation he suggested, “it could be argued that conservation and sustainable tourism go hand in hand and you need therefore a tourism strategy to underpin your landscape conservation.”

Indeed this is recognised by the AONB Partnership through objectives relating to the development of tourism packages that support infrastructure, products, services, signage and marketing (EB4, EB6 and EB7) however, were the AONB Partnership to commit to the ecomuseum paradigm, its principles would guide a management plan that demanded a holistic approach, with cooperation rather than unsustainable competition between sites. As Davis has suggested, “with a little foresight the projects in the North Pennines could begin to work together to create a more sustainable experience for locals and visitors and begin to approach the model of the ecomuseum” (Davis, 2003: 64). In terms of the presentation of a comprehensive story about sense of place in the North Pennines, ecomuseum philosophy therefore has enormous potential.

Conclusions
Introducing the notion of ecomuseology, this chapter described the paradigm as one which takes an approach to heritage management informed by the notions of sense of place explored in Chapter Four. Able to embrace notions of changing, plural ways of
valuing heritage and able to acknowledge heritage as process, expression or material, ecomuseum supports arguments put forward in Chapter Five for an alternative heritage discourse, one that sees heritage contributing to sense of place through the relationship between people, time and place (or community, heritage and place). Moreover ecomuseology was seen to champion the involvement of local people in exploring their heritage, recognising the senses of pride, self-esteem, skills development and general community benefits that were revealed through data presented in Chapter Six.

Section 7.2 developed this notion of a democratic heritage management system, exploring the way in which ecomuseology supports notions of shifting heritage values and integrates approaches to heritage within a wider concept of sense of place to acknowledge the tangible and intangible and the acceptance of change and ongoing documentation of it. Section 7.3 built on data presented in Chapter Six, demonstrating the manner in which ecomuseological approaches champion the voice of ‘insiders’ through voluntary efforts, joint ownership and management, multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches and research at a number of levels to support development for a better future, local pride, regeneration and economic income. Section 7.4 concluded this chapter by revealing the potential of ecomuseology were it to inform the AONB strategy as implemented through its Management Plan, for a fragmented site approach, conserving heritage in situ, and coordinating a sustainable approach to the presentation of the characteristics of the North Pennines for visitors through its holistic and integrated philosophy.

This dissertation has revealed the complex and nuanced nature of sense of place in the North Pennines. Heritage contributes to this sense of place by giving the three-dimensionality of temporal depth. Heritage does this not just through historic environments and objects, but through expressions of cultural identity and processes of meaning making. This chapter has demonstrated the way in which ecomuseology provides a heritage management framework within which such plural ways of understanding heritage and sense of place can be embraced. It has teased out the
synergies between the tenets of ecomuseology and the North Pennines AONB Management Plan to indicate the potential within this alternative heritage paradigm to better safeguard sense of place for the benefit of social and economic sustainability. The following chapter is the last and serves to conclude the dissertation.
8. Chapter Eight: Conclusions

The previous section identified synergies between approaches to safeguarding sense of place set out in the North Pennines AONB Management Plan and the principles of ecomuseology. The descriptions of sense of place given by North Pennines interview respondents were described in Chapter Four, and the relationship of heritage to this sense of place described in Chapter Five. Chapter Six examined existing attempts to safeguard sense of place and the ways in which this process aided social sustainability by developing forms of capital. All three chapters foreshadowed the inadequacy of the existing heritage management paradigm to recognise and safeguard the multifarious ways in which heritage contributes to plural experiences of sense of place. These issues dovetailed into the advancement of new approaches to heritage, adopting ideas from ecomuseology presented in the previous chapter. This chapter concludes the thesis.

8.1 Reassessment of aims and objectives

In concluding the thesis it is germane to return to the aims and objectives and assess the extent to which they have been achieved. The following sections firstly summarise the findings of the thesis, linking data to theory, before revisiting these aims and objectives.

8.1.1 Summary

This thesis set out to examine how heritage contributes to sense of place in the North Pennines. Concepts, meanings and explanations were derived inductively from the in-depth interview perspectives of the research participants and discussed in the light of existing research and theory. The research also aimed to explore the applicability of the principles of ecomuseology in the region in order to sustain sense of place there. This was carried out, in the large part, through analysis of in-depth interviews, but also by using participant observation, studies of academic and grey literature (such as the North Pennines AONB Management Plan) and discussion with heritage professionals in the region. The research findings have illustrated that the experience of sense of place in the North Pennines is closely related to forms of heritage. Sense of place refers to tangible
heritage, particularly the physicality of landscape, but also makes many and varied references to heritage in less tangible forms. These can include the expression of heritage as a particular ‘disposition’ related to a cultural heritage affected by geographical remoteness and isolation, to the process of meaning making itself; the casual reminiscence of everyday memory talk. Heritage was seen to contribute to sense of place in the North Pennines by providing a source of self-esteem, distinctiveness and senses of continuity of identity over time. Taken as a whole, this thesis has demonstrated that the contribution of heritage to sense of place takes many forms. Heritage can be physical and material, but it can also be a process or an expression (illustrated in Chapter Five, section 5.1.1, figure 8). The relationship between heritage and sense of place has been illustrated as a three-dimensional model whereby people relate to place in a dialectic that has temporal depth (Chapter Five, section 5.1.3, figure 9).

The research took place in the context of socioeconomic change in the North Pennines and interviews indicated that consciousness of the experience of transition had a galvanising effect, generating an impulse amongst local people to pursue an interest in safeguarding heritage and thereby sense of place. Through this engagement with heritage, individuals could build bonding forms of social capital. Such forms of capital were demonstrated in the way newcomers engaged with heritage as a way of integrating into the community. Engagement with heritage, as volunteers or for leisure, also exercised and strengthened bonding forms of social capital. Furthermore, it was apparent that an effective network existed between heritage projects that bridged the differences between the groups involved. Heritage projects also linked people with those who held decision-making power or authority such as local councillors. Through involvement with heritage, individuals developed control over their identity, transferable skills and self-confidence.

Finally, this thesis has identified synergy between many of the elements of sense of place in the North Pennines described above and the ecomuseological approach to
heritage management. In order to synthesise the most effective elements of the existing community engagement with heritage in the North Pennines and also address issues of sustainability in the region, the thesis concludes that the principles of ecomuseology have much to offer heritage managers there. Ecomuseum principles offer a comprehensive set of aims that can guide heritage management policy and procedure. These can be applied to safeguard sense of place by sustaining cultural heritage and encouraging sustainable tourism. Importantly they also sustain the communities, who act as local meaning-making agents, leading and taking a core role in the identification and interpretation of heritage. This is an approach that spreads tourism and economic benefit more evenly by encouraging low level and sustainable tourism. Indeed, the key idea of this thesis is that appreciation and subsequent protection of heritage is built on community centred ways of valuing heritage. It is when community members realise and respond to the values and meanings of their heritage that actions from the grassroots have longevity. This thesis has shown that the process of recognising and responding to the value of heritage can build and strengthen the forms of capital that are integral to social sustainability.

8.1.2 The relationship of the data with theoretical concepts
The findings of this thesis have built upon notions of social capital and associative activity put forward by Putnam (2000) and have supported the suggestions made by Corsane et al. (2007b) that heritage activity develops forms of social capital. Moreover, data analysis has served to develop Côté’s (1996) notion of identity capital, supporting suggestions made by Goulding et al. (2009) that engagement with heritage can allow for control of identity, particularly in an individual’s later years. Findings also fit within du Gay et al.’s (1997) notion of the ‘circuit of culture’, participants working to produce, represent and consume heritage. The context of socioeconomic change within which this activity was conducted supports Robertson’s (1992) theory of ‘glocalisation’ and Dicks’ (2004) assertion that in an increasingly homogenised world, local people tend to assert their ‘cultural particularism’. Relph (1976) has suggested that when place is threatened by change, the interest in acknowledging its distinctiveness is stimulated, and this resonates with data presented within this dissertation, respondents referring to the
socioeconomic change experienced within the region in their explanations of their interest in heritage. Data also supported Savage et al’s (2005) ‘debunking’ of the notion that born and bred people are privileged in terms of belonging, demonstrating that for respondents new to North Pennines residence, interest and engagement with heritage helped them to develop a ‘satisfactory account’ of their sense of place and that in fact, their experience of sense of place was more readily communicated than those ‘born and bred’ in the region. Data supported the proposition of the cultural turn experienced by the humanities and social sciences, that meanings and values are not essential or absolute, but plural and individual. The thesis thereby agrees with the recent work of Pendlebury and Gibson (2009b), Kirschenblatt-Gimblett (1998), Howard (2009), Waterton (2005) Ashworth and Tunbridge (1996) and Ashworth et al. (2007), that heritage values are plural and in terms of sense of place, there are many interpretations: heritage and place are ‘multilocal and multivocal’ (Rodman, 1992). Following Smith (2006), the dissertation ultimately calls for an alternative heritage discourse with the capacity to acknowledge and respond to such pluralism and identifies solutions within the ecomuseum paradigm.

This final chapter concludes by suggesting the scope for further empirical investigation in order to establish the possible refinement and development of theory that this thesis suggests. First however, the chapter maps the aims and objectives of the research onto the structure of the thesis, illustrating the chapters in which the aims and objectives were addressed. Outcomes and results are overviewed in 8.2. The chapter then reflects upon the methodological approach taken in this study in section 8.3, analysing its appropriateness and effectiveness, and identifying some alternative approaches. Finally, suggestions are made for the implementation of the findings and a number of potential avenues for further research are developed.
8.1.3 Mapping aims and objectives

The aims and objectives of this research were set out in Chapter Two (section 2.4.2) of this dissertation. The following clearly illustrates in which chapter the objectives in relation to each aim were achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does heritage contribute to sense of place in the North Pennines?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Define sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Scope elements of cultural heritage that provide a sense of place in the North Pennines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Investigate the ways in which people explore and safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Critically reflect on the elements of cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Define ecomuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Appraise the benefits of ecomuseology for the sustainability of heritage and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Examine the applicability of ecomuseum principles against issues identified from data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2. Outcomes / results

8.2.1 Sense of place in the North Pennines: Aim 1.1 and 1.4
The first aim of this thesis was to define sense of place and scope elements of cultural heritage that provide sense of place in the North Pennines, and the fourth aim was to critically reflect on these elements: **1.1 Define sense of place; 1.4 Critically reflect on the elements of cultural heritage that provide reference points for sense of place in the North Pennines.** Chapters One, Two and Four reviewed literature pertaining to sense of place and Chapter Four described the sub-categorisation of sense of place within the environmental psychology literature into subsets related to beliefs (identity), emotions (attachment) and behaviour (dependency). Chapter Four went on to use these subsets in an analysis of interview data. Sense of place in the North Pennines was described in terms of the scale at which place is experienced, from valley to town to village (4.1) and also the fragmentation of sense of place in relation to topography, boundaries and the place-based cultural heritage with which respondents identified. Chapter Four examined, within the interviews, the way in which sense of place related to identity (4.2) in terms of for example: place-congruence by which the North Pennines was compatible with the self-image of respondents; self-esteem and the pride respondents reported experiencing in response to heritage and community; and the way in which the special characteristics of place allowed respondents to experience a sense of distinctiveness. Chapter Four also discussed data supporting the respondents’ experience of place attachment and the emotional connection with place that allowed them to feel relaxed and happy (4.3). Data supported too the way in which respondents indicated dependency on a place that facilitated their preferred behaviours (4.4). Chapter Five examined the way in which heritage contributes to sense of place by contributing a third dimension of time to the people-place dialectic.

8.2.2 Heritage and sense of place: Aims 1.2 and 1.3
Chapter Five moved on to address the second and third aims of the thesis and discussed the way in which heritage contributed to sense of place for those interviewed in the
North Pennines: **1.2 Scope elements of cultural heritage that provide a sense of place in the North Pennines; 1.3 Investigate the ways in which people explore and safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines.** The chapter identified the limitations of the discussion of sense of place within heritage studies, noting that the cannon fails to tease out the specifics of the relationship between heritage and sense of place. It was suggested that recognition of the failings of traditional heritage management approaches described as the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (Smith, 2006) and the subsequent call for an alternative heritage discourse, has opened the way for an exploration of this relationship. The contribution of heritage to sense of place as a three-dimensional model was introduced, whereby the relationship between people and place has a temporal depth. Heritage takes a plethora of guises and Chapter Five suggested these could be material (a site, object or landscape), a process (of meaning making, through for example ‘memory talk’), or an expression (the intangible cultural heritage of dance, dialect or food for example) (5.1.1).

The relationship between people and time that occurs within a place to create a ‘sense of place’ were discussed with reference to the heritage from which they draw (5.2). In the North Pennines interviews, sense of place referred to social bonds, social insideness (knowing people and being known), senses of security and trust, knowledge of ancestral connections, experience of nostalgia triggered by ‘old-fashioned values,’ and even a particular ‘local disposition’ (5.4) demonstrating that sense of place can take very intangible components of cultural heritage as its reference points. The relationship between people and time however also made clear references to the materiality of place and section 5.3 revealed that environment could be used as a reference point for ‘autobiographical insideness’, sites serving to remind respondents of themselves and their actions in the past.

Chapter Five also examined the notion of ‘local distinctiveness’ in its addressing of aims 1.2 and 1.3 and in section 5.4 the references respondents made to features that made their sense of place different to others in other places were described as nature
(wilderness and tranquillity), industry (lead mining and the miner-farmer landscape), culture, particular social relations (openness), traditions (for example the display of miners’ stolen fluorspar in gardens as ‘bonny bits’) and place myths (Alston as the highest market town in England for example).

8.2.3 Heritage activity and sense of place: Aims 1.3 and 1.5
Aims 1.3 and 1.5 were largely addressed in Chapter Six where discussion turned to heritage activity in the North Pennines: **1.3 Investigate the ways in which people explore and safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines; 1.5 Critically reflect on the ways in which people explore and safeguard sense of place in the North Pennines**. The chapter addressed aim 1.5 using theories of capital which were summarised in section 6.1. The way in which people explored and safeguarded sense of place were then examined using theories of identity capital and the chapter found in section 6.2 that respondents wanted to explore their collective identity and present it to others. Here heritage took the form of a process of dialogue and ‘memory talk’. The chapter also introduced notions of ‘elective belonging’ (6.2.2) and noted that interviews often described the enthusiasm of new residents to explore and safeguard sense of place, perhaps to assert and articulate their right to belong. Older people were also described as keen to engage with heritage and Chapter Six suggested that this could be explained using theories of ‘serious leisure,’ older people taking roles and responsibilities within heritage groups, indulging in reminiscence and gaining control of the definition of their identities.

It was also possible to reflect on the engagement with heritage of interview respondents in the North Pennines in terms of social capital (6.3) and whilst using and reinforcing bonding forms of capital, heritage activity also built it, helping newer residents to fit in. Section 6.4 suggested that bridging social capital joined the network of heritage groups together helping them to share knowledge and skills. Finally the chapter reflected on activities that explored and safeguarded sense of place in order to describe the human capital that those interviewed talked of, in terms of developing skills and knowledge and
raising confidence and self-esteem. Chapter Four identified that place can support an individual’s identity by supporting self-efficacy (4.2.3). Chapter Six demonstrated that engaging with heritage can help individuals and communities to be more able to manage situations and carry out necessary tasks effectively, through forms of human and social capital. It is possible to therefore conclude that heritage contributes to sense of place by enabling greater self-efficacy and therefore stronger place identity.

8.2.4 Ecomuseum potential: Aims 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

Aims 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 were addressed in the penultimate chapter of the thesis: 2.1 Define ecomuseum; 2.2 Appraise the benefits of ecomuseology for the sustainability of heritage and communities; and 2.3 Examine the applicability of ecomuseum principles against issues identified from data collection. Here the notion of ecomuseum was defined and its benefits and applicability were assessed with reference to the North Pennines AONB Management Plan. The chapter argued in section 7.1 that the ecomuseum takes an approach to heritage management that is informed by notions of sense of place and that the paradigm presents an alternative heritage discourse with the flexibility to embrace plural and changing heritage values. Ecomuseology acknowledges heritage in its material form but also as an expression of cultural distinctiveness or process of negotiating values through memory talk or exhibition. Due to its holistic and integrated approach, Chapter Seven also found ecomuseology able to effectively recognise the contribution of heritage to sense of place through the relationship between heritage, place and people put forth in Chapter Five. The principles of ecomuseology were described and it was possible to see an ecomuseum approach championing the involvement of local people in heritage through participation in its identification and interpretation. The senses of pride, self-esteem, and the potential to develop skills presented by engagement with heritage were therefore well recognised and valued by the ecomuseum paradigm.

Section 7.2 described the democratic philosophy of ecomuseology and described its capacity to absorb changing heritage values, acknowledge intangibility and embrace
change through a process of ongoing documentation. Such philosophy was seen to be in keeping with interview data that described the ways in which local people engaged with their heritage, and the synergy with and limitations of the AONB Management Plan were highlighted. Section 7.3 focussed upon the ability of the ecomuseum paradigm to give ‘voice’ to ‘insiders’ through principles related to voluntary effort, joint ownership and management, multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches. Whilst there was significant synergy between the principles of ecomuseology and the current AONB Management plan in terms of environmental sustainability, Chapter Seven indicated that ecomuseology held more potential in terms of supporting social sustainability. This potential was evidenced through principles relating to development for a better future and regeneration. Finally Chapter Seven demonstrated the potential of ecomuseology for informing AONB management strategy by indicating synergy (the fragmented site approach, tenets of conservation in situ and sustainable tourism) and potential in terms of its holistic and integrated philosophy (7.4).

In the section to follow (8.3), the methodology of this research is revisited. The section firstly reflects on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methodological approach, before evaluating the research design and the decision to collect data using an in-depth interview technique. The alternative approaches available and the suitability of the interview-schedule as a tool are re-examined. The next section concludes with an examination of the validity and transferability of the findings.

8.3. Reflections on methodology

8.3.1 Appropriateness and effectiveness

Research design and choosing to interview
This thesis sought to answer the central questions: how does heritage contribute to sense of place in the North Pennines and can ecomuseology offer solutions for the sustainability of efforts to safeguard sense of place there? In answering these questions, the methodological approach was appropriate and effective. The principal method of
data collection was the in-depth interview. Interviews were conducted with a sample of those engaged with heritage in the North Pennines, in order to explore the first research question: ‘how does heritage contribute to sense of place?’ The purposive sampling technique used was entirely appropriate in an investigation of those engaging with heritage in the region, allowing the research participants to self-identify and thereby presenting the individuals whose reflections on their experiences would provide the richest sources of data. Interview findings were supported by participant observation where possible at local fairs and events, exhibitions, visitor centres, museums, consultation meetings and annual AONB Forum meetings. Three pilot interviews were conducted and after revisions were made to the interview schedule, the fieldwork was carried out, consistently adhering to key questions set out in the interview guide.

Interview data were analysed through close listening, transcription, note and memo taking and coding using a constant comparison approach aided with QSR NVivo 8 computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS). The use of coding and constant comparison was systematic and very comprehensive (indeed the desire to develop findings inductively meant that in every case the entire interview was transcribed and coded). Typologies were confirmed by multiple assessments as each interview was compared with previous codes. The interviews were lengthy and provided rich data for analysis, and as such, the approach was very effective. Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven demonstrate that interpretation of the findings was well-supported by the evidence and it has been the endeavour of this project to provide the reader opportunity to hear the ‘voice’ of respondents throughout the discussion of analysis.

The second research question (can ecomuseology offer solutions for the sustainability of efforts to safeguard sense of place?) was answered in part with data derived from in-depth interviews, but also through reference to grey literature from the North Pennines AONB Partnership, through observation of AONB Partnership annual public forums and with regular discussion of the research and its emerging hypothesis in supervisory meetings with the AONB Partnership’s Deputy Director, who acted as collaborative
supervisor to this research project. The approach was appropriate in exploring the potential of ecomuseology in the North Pennines and the use of interview, desk-top survey and supervisory discussion of findings was an effective combination in answering the question.

Choosing to interview

Chapters Two, Four and Five reviewed literature in relation to sense of place and noted the variety of approaches that have been adopted in the empirical exploration of the phenomenon. Chapter Two concluded that a number of factors need to be taken into account in an investigation of sense of place. Whilst sense of place has been measured - most notably within the field of environmental psychology - through quantitative surveys adopting multiple choice or Likart scale tools, such techniques are deductive in nature and require hypothesis and pre-prepared categories of analysis. Multiple choice questionnaires involving scales are also inconsistent since they necessarily depend on the respondent’s interpretation of the categories available.

The contribution of heritage to sense of place and the experience of those engaging with heritage are aspects much better explored through the inductive techniques favoured by sociology and human geography. The decision to use the in-depth interview as a data-collection technique to investigate how heritage contributes to sense of place in the North Pennines and thereby develop theory rather than test a preconceived hypothesis is therefore appropriate. So, whilst other data collection techniques were considered and may have been equally appropriate (as discussed in the next section 8.2), the central research questions’ emphasis on the experience of sense of place, combined with the practical parameters of the study, fully justify the technique employed.

8.3.2 Alternative approaches

Following the research of Convery and Dutson (2006b, 2006a), the focus group method was the preferred data collection technique in the early stages of the research design.
However, well before the development of the research tool was underway, discussion with the Deputy AONB Director suggested that bringing together such groups, finding a venue in which to host the meetings and funding the travel and refreshments of participants would be impractical. The scattered geographical spread of residence in the North Pennines does not lend itself easily to the drawing together of focus groups, particularly when it is not possible to support and entice participants with expenses and incentives. A case study approach, examining two comparative ‘sense of place’ activities, was also considered and such an approach might well yield insights into the interaction, interests and sustainability of ‘grass-roots’ heritage projects. However, again, given the limitations of distance, the expense of travel and the often slow progress of such projects, the immersion required to make this approach effective was not achievable within the practical and temporal parameters of the study.

Engaging respondents in discussion of ‘sense of place’ was not straightforward and a variety of prompt questions were explored throughout the fieldwork. As discussed in Chapter Six and elsewhere in the thesis, long-term or ‘born and bred’ residents in particular were reticent about describing their sense of place. Towards the end of this project it has been possible to discuss the research at a number of international conferences and discussion there with other heritage researchers has allowed alternative approaches to be considered in the elicitation of ‘sense of place’. The approach of the organisation ‘Common Ground’ engages participants in identifying the elements contributing to their sense of place through the illustration of place A to Z charts, or parish maps for example. Whilst unusual and no doubt effective, this approach is better utilised with a group and the limitations of drawing a number of people together in the North Pennines have already been addressed.

An alternative approach was presented by the ‘photo-elicitation interview’ (Clark-Ibáñez, 2004), which allows discussion to form around images of place. Indeed the approach of museum educators using object handling for reminiscence might also be developed into a useful tool to elicit ‘sense of place’ discussion. It has also been
suggested that by conducting an interview with a long-term resident whilst they give a
tour of their place, thereby contextualising the conversation, it might be possible to
encourage more vivid descriptions of sense of place. This approach has been used to
However, whilst the use of an image, object or physical place to stimulate discussion
holds great appeal, decisions would nonetheless need to be made in the selection of
such material in advance of interviews and as such the limitations of this approach are
not dissimilar to those of the pre-selected categories of a survey questionnaire. An
approach which encouraged the respondent to conduct a tour of their place also has
tantalising potential, but in pragmatic terms this is an approach that would require
significant risk assessment in order to ensure the safety of the researcher in meeting
strangers in remote locations. Given these limitations, the approach adopted was
entirely suitable and appropriate.

8.3.3 Suitability of data collection tools
This thesis took as its starting point issues raised from literature review and in discussion
with staff of the North Pennines AONB Partnership’s Staff Unit. Discussion with a key
member of staff at the Partnership led to the development of early research aims and
the central research questions. Following Wengraff (2001), these research questions
were developed into theory questions and in turn interview questions in what is
described as a ‘hypothetico deductivist model’. Whilst it has been acknowledged that
this research takes an inductive approach to the generation of new knowledge, it is also
accepted that research projects tend to be inductive and deductive at different stages.
The development of the research tool, based on the literature, was a deductive stage in
the cycle of this research project whilst the constant-comparison approach to analysis
allowed for inferences to be drawn more inductively.

The hypothesis driven approach to the development of interview questions allowed a
data collection tool to be created in the form of a semi-structured in-depth interview
guide which was subsequently piloted with three respondents. A semi-structured
approach was adopted in order to help prompt discussion around the specific themes of sense of place, engagement with heritage and ecomuseum characteristics. The pilot served to indicate the limitations of attempting to ask both general questions in relation to sense of place and specific questions in relation to individual heritage projects. As a result, the schedule of questions was significantly reduced before further interviews were conducted, thereby allowing more freedom to explore interesting veins of inquiry as they occurred.

Discussion of the limitations of alternative approaches described above (8.2) has shown that whilst other data collection tools hold significant potential and appeal, within the parameters of this study, the in-depth interview was the most appropriate. Interviews conducted were genuinely in-depth and as such, the tool was effective in stimulating discussion and revealing new knowledge about the contribution of heritage to sense of place and the motivations and experiences of engaging with heritage for people in the North Pennines.

8.3.4 Validity, triangulation, generalisation and transferability

Validity and triangulation

Triangulation is broadly defined as, “the combination of methods in the study of the same phenomenon” (Denzin cited in Jick, 1979: 602) and is based in the assumption that several perspectives on the same subject allow for greater accuracy. In the social sciences particularly, the view is held that collecting different types of data to find out about the same phenomenon allows inferences drawn from the data to have greater validity. However, validity can also be achieved ‘within-method’ and for qualitative studies this can mean by studying ‘multiple comparison groups’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The approach adopted in this study achieved its triangulation in this ‘within method’ style. The difference between types of approach has been summarised thus: “In short, ‘within-method’ triangulation essentially involves cross-checking for internal consistency or reliability whilst ‘between-method’ triangulation tests the degree of
External validity has not been sought in the study and as such any generalisation to the wider parent population or any population beyond the data-set can not and has not been made. The chosen method has achieved a detailed, thorough, and enlightening study of the experiences of respondents in a particular context and was therefore successful. The findings contribute to a body of knowledge, and the advancement of theory they provide is useful for those studying similar populations in similar contexts, ideas which are explored in the discussion that follows.

**Generalisation and transferability**

Generalisation is widely recognised as taking three forms. Given the qualitative approach and sampling technique adopted, representational and inferential generalisations cannot be made. In other words, empirical claims cannot be made of the findings for the wider ‘parent’ population or for other settings and contexts. As such the research does not offer external validity. It is possible however to make theoretical generalisations from this research, and the thorough, reflexive and well documented data collection and analysis can offer the reader confidence that the phenomenon described are significant and would be identified were another researcher to have followed precisely the same approach. With findings that are in this way reliable, theoretical generalisations can be made and the development of theory can be transferred to other similar settings and population. In summary inferences drawn from this study have wider applicability through ‘theoretical generalisation’ whereby: “Conclusions are drawn from features or constructs developed in a ‘local’ or single study which are then utilised in developing wider theory” (Lewis and Ritchie, 2003: 264).

To sum up, the chosen methodology was appropriate and effective in developing theory. This thesis set out to examine sense of place, engagement with heritage and ecomuseum potential in the North Pennines. Largely through in-depth interviews but also through participant observation, discussion of findings with heritage professionals in the region and survey of academic and grey literature, the thesis has illustrated:
1. that heritage contributes to sense of place in physical or materials forms, but also through expressions of cultural heritage and the process of meaning making which permeates all activities that involve communities in an engagement with their heritage. The plurality of heritage values, particularly ‘insider’ values are ill-supported by traditional heritage management approaches.

2. that engagement with heritage can help newcomers and older people negotiate their identity, that engagement can be galvanised by the experience of change and that engagement uses and builds forms of capital (social, human and identity capital)

3. that ecomuseology offers an alternative heritage paradigm with the capacity to acknowledge both the plurality of values and the power of engagement with heritage to build sustainability. The paradigm finds synergy within the AONB Management Plan and holds significant potential to guide future plans.

What follows is the final section of the dissertation and it considers how the findings of the research might be used by heritage professionals and where the opportunities lie for further academic investigation.

8.4 Implementation

This thesis has argued for recognition of the ways in which local people value heritage. It has called for alternative heritage management paradigms that allow for plural and changing heritage values, which manifest as processes of meaning making and expressions of cultural distinctiveness alongside material sites, objects and buildings. The thesis has demonstrated the value of engaging with heritage in terms of personal and community identity and also in terms of networks (social capital) and self-efficacy (human capital), each of which may be seen as cornerstones of social sustainability. In terms of implementation, the thesis has set out the principles of an alternative heritage paradigm that supports grassroots identification and interpretation of heritage and recognises the power of community-led approaches in terms of social, environmental and heritage sustainability. Whilst Chapter Seven has indicated where many synergies already occur between the principles of ecomuseology and the North Pennines AONB
Management Plan, it also serves to recommend aspects of heritage management such as for example, local voluntary effort, that the AONB Partnership might look to investigate in order to maximise the sustainability of both heritage and communities in the changing socioeconomic circumstances of the region.

More generally, the thesis contributes to an increasingly vociferous call for the acknowledgment of varied heritage values and its findings also encourage heritage managers more widely to consider their approach to safeguarding sense of place. Further implementation would involve a re-examination of the policy of traditional heritage management bodies and its adaptation to better embrace heritage in its intangible forms as process or expression. Ultimately this demands an acknowledgement of the limitations of the dominant forms of attributing heritage value through the lists so favoured by English Heritage and internationally by UNESCO. In terms of procedure this means working more closely with local people to encourage them to identify and subsequently treasure their local distinctiveness.

8.5 Developing and refining the theory: scope for further research
This research has advanced theory in a number of areas. The contribution of heritage to notions of ‘elective belonging’ and the interest of in-migrants in heritage extends existing theory, as does the suggestion that engagement with heritage as ‘serious leisure’ or as ‘career volunteers’ combines with the reminiscence of life-review to develop control over identity for older people. The thesis has also identified reluctance amongst born and bred people to engage with heritage or describe sense of place. In order to establish this development of theory, similar research could be undertaken in areas experiencing similar circumstances, other Northern Upland regions of the UK for example. In order to further investigate the ideas presented here, some of the alternative approaches discussed in section 8.2 above might be employed. Burning questions remain unanswered: to what extent are insider values attached to material heritage such as buildings and in whose interests are such heritage protected; what are
the differences between born and bred and in-migrant heritage values; how far can engagement with heritage support social sustainability through forms of social, human and identity capital; and can engagement with heritage support well-being in later life by offering individuals agency in the presentation of their identity?

Some of these questions might be answerable through interviews, using purposive sampling for example to identify born and bred respondents, or those who do not engage with heritage. The ideas presented in this thesis would also be further tested and developed through the use of focus groups in the North Pennines. In terms of social sustainability and well-being in later life, a longitudinal study is required and were such a research project supported, the potential evidence it might provide would serve to underpin this dissertation’s ultimate call for heritage management practices that begin and develop at the community level in order to truly safeguard sense of place.
Appendices

Appendix One: Map of UK Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (image courtesy of the North Pennines AONB Partnership)
Appendix Two: Filtering questions against themes and topics in Microsoft Excel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the...</td>
<td>What...</td>
<td>Are there age...</td>
<td>Are there age...</td>
<td>Irreducible...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People involved in...</td>
<td>People involved in...</td>
<td>People involved in...</td>
<td>People involved in...</td>
<td>Intangible...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out about...</td>
<td>To find out about...</td>
<td>To find out about...</td>
<td>To find out about...</td>
<td>Tangible...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Democratic...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Capital...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Economic...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Environment...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Place</th>
<th>Sense of Place</th>
<th>Sense of Place</th>
<th>Sense of Place</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a...</td>
<td>How is this...</td>
<td>Have you...</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People involved...</td>
<td>People involved...</td>
<td>People involved...</td>
<td>Who to ask</td>
<td>Who to ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out about...</td>
<td>To find out about...</td>
<td>To find out...</td>
<td>What to find out</td>
<td>What to find out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Intangible...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tangible...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Democratic...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Capital...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sense of place...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cultural...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sustainable...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Three: Interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.10.07</td>
<td>NP01</td>
<td>Working to explore cultural heritage themes with community and special needs groups as a volunteer and fundraiser. New resident.</td>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.04.08</td>
<td>NP02</td>
<td>Restore traditional hay meadow flowers as a farmer participating in the AONB Haytime scheme. Born and bred in Weardale.</td>
<td>Wolsingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.08</td>
<td>NP03</td>
<td>Voluntary curator of a volunteer-led museum. Born and bred in Weardale.</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.08</td>
<td>NP04</td>
<td>Recording local oral history and uploading to own website. Researching local history stories for the parish newsletter. New resident.</td>
<td>Rookhope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.09.08</td>
<td>NP05</td>
<td>Female dry- stone waller. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.09.08</td>
<td>NP06</td>
<td>Member of the Haggs Bank Conservation Group. New resident, long duration of stay.</td>
<td>Nenthead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.07.08</td>
<td>NP07</td>
<td>Member of the North East Vernacular Architecture Society, Friend of Killhope Lead Mining Museum and Beekeeper. Second home owner.</td>
<td>Weardale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.07.08</td>
<td>NP08</td>
<td>Member of the Weardale Field Studies Society and Friend of Killhope Lead Mining Museum. Born and bred in Weardale.</td>
<td>Tow Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.08.08</td>
<td>NP09</td>
<td>Member of the Weardale Field Studies Society with long history of support for heritage projects in the North Pennines. Beekeeper. New resident, long duration of stay.</td>
<td>Stanhope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.09.08</td>
<td>NP10</td>
<td>Member of the Alston Historical Society, amateur archivist and author of two self-published guides to local history. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Alston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.05.08</td>
<td>NP11</td>
<td>Collecting oral history and historic photographs. Created local history exhibitions. Former volunteer with volunteer led museum project. Born and bred, recently returned to the area.</td>
<td>Alston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.09.08</td>
<td>NP12</td>
<td>Founding member of volunteer-led museum project. Born and bred in the area.</td>
<td>Alston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.07.08</td>
<td>NP13</td>
<td>Chair of the North Pennines Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.07.08</td>
<td>NP14</td>
<td>Member of the North Pennines Heritage Trust, Friend of Killhope Lead Mining Museum, member of the Haggs Bank Conservation Group and volunteer with the ‘Hay Time’ scheme as a seed collector. New resident.</td>
<td>Garrigil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.09.08</td>
<td>NP15</td>
<td>Working to explore cultural heritage themes with community and special needs groups as a volunteer and fundraiser. New resident.</td>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.09.08</td>
<td>NP16</td>
<td>Museum curator, instrumental in the foundation of the institution. New resident, long duration of stay.</td>
<td>Killhope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.09.08</td>
<td>NP17</td>
<td>Information assistant, Killhope Lead Mining Museum. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Killhope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.09.08</td>
<td>NP18</td>
<td>Local newspaper reporter covering local heritage project. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.09.08</td>
<td>NP19</td>
<td>Local vicar’s wife, volunteering as part of heritage project. New resident with long duration of stay.</td>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.09.08</td>
<td>NP20</td>
<td>Dry stone waller volunteering to take part in apprenticeship scheme. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Nenthead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.09.08</td>
<td>NP20</td>
<td>Dry stone waller volunteering to take part in apprenticeship scheme. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Frosterley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.08.08</td>
<td>NP22</td>
<td>Local development group member taking part in oral history training provided by the AONB Partnership and running the local village show. Resident of historic village.</td>
<td>Blanchland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.08.07</td>
<td>NP23</td>
<td>Local development group member taking part in oral history training provided by the AONB Partnership and running the local village show. Resident of historic village. New resident.</td>
<td>Blanchland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.07.08</td>
<td>NP24</td>
<td>Local heritage volunteer. Freelance musician and arts educator interested in traditional music. New resident.</td>
<td>St John’s Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.09.08</td>
<td>NP25</td>
<td>Curator of annual local history exhibition. Born and bred resident.</td>
<td>Frosterley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07.08</td>
<td>NP26</td>
<td>Local vicar, researching local history stories for the parish newsletter and initiating local history and oral history training for village residents. New resident.</td>
<td>Blanchland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.07.08</td>
<td>NP27</td>
<td>Chair of local village trust. Active in heritage interpretation and conservation. New resident.</td>
<td>Allenheads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Four: Field work schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.06.07</td>
<td>AONB Partnership’s Annual Forum</td>
<td>Allendale Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.07.07</td>
<td>Upland Centre Reciprocal visits into Cumbria Fells and Dales with North Pennines delegates</td>
<td>Cumbria Fells and Dales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.11.07</td>
<td>Wild about the North Pennines – AONB Partnership’s nature tourism event</td>
<td>Mickleton Village Hall, Teesdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.12.07</td>
<td>AONB Historic Environment Conservation Area Consultation</td>
<td>Blanchland Sports Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.08</td>
<td>Weardale Museum</td>
<td>High House Chapel, Westgate, Weardale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.08</td>
<td>Folk music performance</td>
<td>Allendale Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.08</td>
<td>Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre</td>
<td>Nenthead Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07.08</td>
<td>Blanchland Tea Rooms heritage displays</td>
<td>Blanchland Tea Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08.08</td>
<td>Local History Exhibition</td>
<td>Frosterley, Weardale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08.08</td>
<td>Local History Exhibition</td>
<td>Alston, Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08.08</td>
<td>Weardale Scarecrow Festival</td>
<td>Weardale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.09.08</td>
<td>Craftworks – exploring local heritage themes with special needs group</td>
<td>Barnard Castle, Teesdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.09.08</td>
<td>The Hub Museum</td>
<td>Alston, Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.03.10</td>
<td>Café and local craft shops</td>
<td>Durham Dales Centre, Weardale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Five: Example field notes

Frosterley Local History Exhibition,

St Michael and All the Angels Church, Frosterley.

23.08.08

Today I took a drive through Weardale and began by locating and visiting the Frosterley Local History exhibition, following up on a telephone conversation I had last week with its organiser.

On this visit I was a complete participant, enjoying the exhibition as any other visitor might. The exhibition felt intimate and I did not take notes whilst inside the space (not wishing to draw attention to myself) although I did try to get lots of photographs to help me to remember, and made some jottings when I got back to the car.

On my approach to the exhibition, I was struck by the number of cars lining the road. It was impossible to park my car close to the exhibition and I took this as a clear indicator of the exhibition’s popularity – I don’t know how significant it is that people are driving to the exhibition and whether this means they are or are not local residents. I arrived at around 12.45pm and I stayed for perhaps an hour, reading the panels, looking at the objects and observing visitor interactions.

When I arrived at the exhibition there were perhaps twelve people in three or four groups exploring the panels and displays. There were two or maybe three children but the majority of the visitors seemed to be of retirement age. There were also a number of older people who seemed in some way linked to the organisation or administration of the exhibition. It was a bit unsettling to arrive since there was no clear entrance way, no one to meet or greet visitors, and no clear indication of whether a payment was required for entry. I did hesitate around the door for a while, but people seemed generally very relaxed. I don’t know whether there was a tacit expectation that
visitors had perhaps done this before and would know what to expect, and this is plausible given that the exhibition has run annually for a number of years.

The first display to which my eye was drawn focussed on the heritage of cricket within the village of Frosterley and communicated well the main theme of the exhibition which related to sports and leisure past and present. There were charming elements to the display that signposted it as a community effort, the use of an old-fashioned shop-display mannequin to demonstrate a cricket kit is one such example. The display detailed the highs and lows of Stanhope Cricket Club, and objects displayed included team photographs through the ages, a bat and ball, a cap and assorted newspaper articles amongst others. The interpretation text was word processed and printed onto two sheets of A4 paper and interestingly the four paragraphs were signed by the exhibition’s organiser, who I hope to interview next week. I wonder why she felt it necessary to put her name against the interpretive text, as this does not fit with exhibition conventions. The addition of her name further underlines the intimacy of the exhibition experience and it would be interesting to know how many of the people visiting actually know the organiser personally. A grey-haired couple, perhaps in their 60s or 70s were discussing the photographs of cricket players, chatting about who they knew and reminiscing about a person who seemed to have been a memorable character from the club.

The displays were against the walls of the church and towards the front of the church and in the wider areas were temporary free standing display boards. Moving on from the cricket display was an arrangement of girl-guiding objects including a banner (1st Frosterley Girl Guides) hats, badges, leaflets and photographs. A freestanding display detailed the sports and leisure clubs associated with Wolsingham Steelworks. The accompanying text explained that the steelworks had employed many men over many years and was a major contributor to the Weardale economy. Two newspaper cuttings were displayed to illustrate this point and the remainder of the display celebrated the success of the Works Choir through photographs dating back to the 1950s and further newspaper cuttings. The same display panel focused upon other nostalgic elements of Frosterley’s past, similarly illustrated with newspaper cuttings. The text had a friendly tone, “Can you remember in the 1980s the excitement in Weardale when the BBC filmed a series called, ‘Flesh and Blood’? This was a series of episodes about a family who
owned a cement works.” Other memorable moments from Weardale’s past included the Vaux Breweries Cycle Race, illustrated in photographs.

Cycling is a theme explored in greater detail in two large freestanding display panels at the front of the church where a cluster of three ladies were gathered, again all of retirement age, discussing their own knowledge of the ‘Stanhope Wheelers’, ‘Crook Wheelers’ and ‘Weardale Road Club’, checking their own understanding against the information detailed in the display and confirming their interpretation between themselves.

I moved on to another panel, the theme again focusing upon cricket (the thematic flow around the displays is disjointed), and listened to two ladies discussing the black and white images on display. They were trying to place individuals in photographs and having a lighthearted disagreement as they tried to put names to faces.

A further display detailed the heritage of the sport of football within Frosterley, again illustrated by black and white images and newspaper cuttings. I was particularly interested in the layering of information, a row of bulging ringbinders available for visitors to leaf through at their leisure on the front pew of the church. I didn’t see any visitors take this opportunity to look through the folders. They seemed to consume the exhibition in pairs or groups, with plenty of gentle discussion, reporting back to one another what they had learnt. I overheard one couple checking their understanding about the closure of Wolsingham Steelworks between one another and sharing what they also knew about the topic from their older family and friends.

This is an exhibition in the context of the community functions of a village church, a point illustrated by a 10p book sale sitting alongside the archives in ringbinders.

More recent colour images brought the story of leisure and sports in Frosterley up to date with glossy colour photographs illustrating the history of the Frosterley Village Hall Leek Club which began in 1976 and ended in 2007, holding an annual competition on the last weekend in September every year. I fell into conversation with a gentleman looking at this display who was generally lamenting the failure to interest people in these sorts of community leisure activities today. We also discussed the dating of the
photographs and he was able to suggest when he though they might have been taken based on the people whose images were captured. Some interpretive text typed and printed onto heavy paper had been placed on the table with several photograph albums relating to the leek club. The text explained the origins of leek growing competitions in Frosterley, explaining the four main public houses within which the tradition was encouraged. It occurred to me that this is an intangible expression of cultural heritage only very recently lost to the community of Frosterley and I wondered whether the very obvious desire to treasure the memory of the club expressed through this part of the local history exhibition might relate to any efforts to safeguard the tradition.

The next display I came to described the popularity of sponsored walks in Frosterley. Encouraged by one local family, the Nelsons, sponsored walks were popular for twenty years. The Nelson family were also connected to the success of the leek club and I wondered how important one pivotal character within a community can be for safeguarding expressions of cultural heritage. I wanted to take a photograph to remind me of this thought and as I did so, I was called to by a lady at the very exit to the exhibition who wondered if I had permission to take pictures. She was an older lady, retired and perhaps in her 70s. I went to her and we had an interesting chat about her crochet stall which she had set out to catch the attention of visitors as they came to the end of the exhibition. She explained that she was a good friend of the exhibition organiser and that in earlier years, stall-holders selling local crafts had played a more significant role in the annual event. She told me a little about her crochet work, that she buys secondhand woollen clothes from charity shops and unravels them to provide a cheap source of yarn. She also described some technical features of crochet work that she suspected are particular to the North Pennines. She acknowledged the loss of crochet as a commonplace home craft and seemed embarrassed to accept that her skills were now coveted and that her products could command a high price. Having exhausted the conversation, I took one last look around the exhibition, which now seemed busier than earlier with more children and adults of working age, and I left for Alston and the Weardale Scarecrow Festival.
Appendix Six: Interview transcript extract

Extract from transcription of interview with NP26, 11.07.08

This is a short extract from an interview with duration of almost two hours.

.... If I can move on to asking you about sort of the parish newsletter and things that you've been involved in ...the sort of active heritage activities you've been involved in... can you tell me just a bit about those.

Right. Well starting in a sense with the second first one of the things I feel strongly about is like, take this question of heritage and I feel that to use the abbey church as an example there are people who can tell you, can quote verbatim you know, when it was founded, who by, and they can tell you all sorts of things about the building and you know, this window’s from that date and that arch is from such and such a date. And I don’t think that’s what heritage is really. I think that it’s an aspect of the heritage of the village but for people to quote that at length and then actually know very little about the people who are living in the village at the moment, is a complete distortion really. And so for me it’s like, you know, we were talking about archaeology before, you know an archaeologist will say well lets say I’ve got I don’t know, something up there on the shelf and unless I can put that into context the archaeologist will say to you, it’s worthless, you know, it’s totally useless. And so I feel that talking about the buildings in the village, out of context of the people is a waste of time really and... Having said that you know, I love old buildings and there is something about going into an old house or an old church or whatever where I think there’s a definite...well I certainly feel an atmosphere really. And I think that’s great. But if, unless, there’s sort of some living relationship with it, it’s not worth a lot really. So I feel that, the stuff, say that er E----- is trying to make into an archive now, is really important in terms of making connections between the past, the present and the future. I mean I was trying to say to someone in the village a couple of weeks ago about people in the future being interested in their ordinary, everyday life. And that when we look back and we go somewhere, more and more we’re beginning to
appreciate that you know what somebody was doing in the kitchen at a great house we
find as interesting and validly so as what the king did when he visited once...sort of thing.
Erm and so I feel all these issues are really important in terms of a sense of place and as
I say you know, having this line really and giving people ... so that’s what gives people a
personal connection really and a sense of belonging.

I was interested in the story of the parish newsletter how you’d got involved, and how
the heritage side of it had evolved. Can you just tell me a bit more about that for the
recording?

Oh yeah! Sure yeah. Well when I first... I think years ago, as is, I guess, typical of most
places like this the local parish magazine was produced by the vicar. That tended to be
the standard way of going about it. And I don’t know why; that petered out at some
stage. It’s not all that long ago. But it petered out. And when I came it was being
produced by a retired local government officer and that gave it a certain style both, I
suppose from his background and also his own personality that’s the way he did things.
So it was, to use a phrase, it was very much like a public service broadcasting really and
he’d give lists of events and that came from the local authority you know, what was
going on. And that was the style. And it was also done on very old equipment which had
been er, bought second hand from a school or something when it was being thrown out
and so the actual presentation of it was poor as well. And I’m not trying to run down
what they were doing at that stage, this is just the way it was really. So it was er... faint
and so on, or it varied, you know: it would be faint here, and thick there. And it was put
on to a drum you know and so on. And it was... well one way or another it wasn’t
fantastic really. He stopped doing and er, a person called E------ started doing it and she’s
got a background as a journalist so she started doing it but she ended up doing it on her
own and then she felt that she couldn’t continue with that and we didn’t have one for
about two months and then, because I’d decided that I was going to get involved in local
stuff, I felt you know, this was something I could do, certainly didn’t think the collating of
material and the writing of material was something I could do. I’m not particularly
somebody who’s happy with technology. I could use the computer at quite a basic level
but I thought, if there was somebody else who could help me with that... so I started
doing it and erm, I didn’t take a deliberate decision or a conscious decision “well I’m
going to change it” I think my approach to whatever I’d done is essentially to be myself really. And so I started doing it as me you know, so the stuff I put in and the way I wrote things was using myself as a resource really. And so it just changed. And then I felt that one of the things I wanted to do was to use material that I found in odd places about stories about the local area. And so I started periodically doing a piece on an incident from the past, usually the nineteenth century and this was an area of interest for E--------. She was very interested in local history and so we got together and she did a couple. And then we felt it would support, rather than just find items to titillate the readers, that we’d erm...we wanted actually to start a proper archive of local history and that we would start looking for material, collating material, researching material, and actually preserving it and so we had things, like for example, the Hunstanworth Village School – Hunstanworth is a village just two miles from here, very much relating to here and the school had closed down and the last school headmaster, had gone off with the school diary which is essentially like a log book of the school really. And it closed a good while ago, must be fifty years ago I should think, anyway as a result of starting this process this log book was obtained from this man’s widow and is now lodged at Beamish and so we’ve got that as a resource that we can access. So that was one instance. So we’ve started this process and one of the things we’re interested in is doing an oral history archive as well so that’s at the very early stages really. And we’re aware that you know even at the time that we’ve been beginning this process some of the old timers have died. And you know, taken their stories with them.
Appendix Eight: Example of N Vivo analysis for ‘employment’ subcategory within ‘sense of place’ node.

Glossary of terms

BAP – Biodiversity Action Plan [http://www.ukbap.org.uk/]

NATURA 2000 – A Europe-wide network of sites tasked with the preservation of natural heritage [http://www.natura.org/about.html]

EUROPARC - members in 36 countries – international cooperation in protected landscape management [http://www.europarc.org/home/]

Local Access Forums – three groups of local representatives meet twice each year

Landscape and geodiversity

Objectives

LG1 To ensure that new development within the AONB or its setting does not have a significant adverse impact on the purpose of AONB designation.

LG2 To ensure that road improvement/safety schemes are compatible with rural character.

LG3 To enhance landscape quality and character on farmland.

LG4 To ensure that important geological sites and features are recorded, conserved and not lost to development.

LG5 To end the illegal and unregulated collection of minerals and mining artefacts.

LG6 To improve the appearance of active and disused quarries, and manage or restore them in a way that complements and enhances the character of the local landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity.

LG7 To ensure that trees and woodland (new and existing) contribute more positively to natural beauty and climate change mitigation and adaptation.

LG8 To understand and plan for the likely landscape impacts of climate change.

LG9 To accommodate small-scale renewable energy technology without a significant adverse impact on the purpose of designation.

LG10 To use national AONB boundary reviews to address anomalies in the AONB boundary
Land management and biodiversity

Objectives

LB1 To ensure that burning management of heather and grasslands is sympathetic to all aspects of biodiversity conservation.

LB2 To ensure that land drainage of meadows and moorlands does not reduce the quality of the habitats and species and other characteristics of the AONB.

LB3 To secure, by 2014, appropriate conservation designations and/or land management schemes for remaining undesignated or ‘non-scheme’ hay meadows, other species rich grasslands, springs and flushes, and also those moorland fringe pastures and allotments which support important numbers of breeding wading birds.

LB4 To improve the conservation value of the AONB’s Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites.

LB5 To improve and enhance farms and other land, including at a landscape scale where possible.

LB6 To support the conservation of hay meadows, peatlands, waders, black grouse and calamarian grasslands through the expansion of current initiatives for their conservation and the establishment of new initiatives for these and other UK BAP habitats and species throughout the life of this Plan.

LB7 To ensure that no new moorland tracks are built without appropriate permission and that any new tracks have no significant adverse impact on hydrology, natural beauty, tranquillity and the interest features of NATURA 2000 sites.

LB8 To reduce and manage the number/range of invasive and non-native species in the AONB, where these impact on other conservation interests.

LB9 To end the illegal persecution of birds of prey.

LB10 To understand and plan for the potential impacts of climate change on BAP habitats and species.

LB11 To implement a large scale ecological restoration project that seeks to have natural processes as the primary land management objective.

The historic environment

Objectives

HE1 To enhance the county Historic Environment Records, and thus enable more informed landscape management.
HE2 To conserve, through specific projects, relict landscapes and landscape features.

HE3 To contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the AONBs historic environment through the sensitive maintenance of historic structures.

HE4 To improve the management of Conservation Areas.

HE5 To increase community participation in historic environment research, conservation and interpretation.

HE6 To secure resources to support the conservation and enhancement of the North Pennines’ historic environment throughout the life of the Plan.

HE7 To understand and act on the likely impacts of climate change on the historic environment and produce an adaptation plan to address them.

Enjoying and understanding the North Pennines

Objectives

EU1 Ensure that the area’s special qualities are effectively communicated to visitors and local people and that visitors:

• have information on outdoor recreation activities such as walking, riding and cycling
• have information on how their visit can contribute to conservation and have minimal environmental footprint
• know when they are in the AONB and European Geopark

EU2 To encourage visitors to contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty.

EU3 To ensure interpretive structures are of a high quality, are well maintained and reflect the character of the AONB.

EU4 To increase awareness, understanding and enjoyment of the area’s geodiversity and retain the AONB's UNESCO European and Global Geopark status.

EU5 To encourage more schools to use the North Pennines as an outdoor classroom.

EU6 To encourage new and more diverse audiences to understand the special qualities of the area.

EU7 To ensure that the Public Rights of Way network is appropriately managed, having regard to the importance of the North Pennines as a popular recreational and visitor destination.
EU8 To ensure that the three Local Access Forums are facilitated to play a collaborative role in decisions relating to access to the North Pennines countryside.

EU9 To ensure that the legal use of Public Rights of Way by mechanically propelled vehicles is appropriately managed to avoid significant adverse impact on a route's surface and on the tranquillity of the AONB.

Economy and business

Objectives

EB1 To secure the EUROPARC Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas during the lifetime of the plan.

EB2 To market and promote the North Pennines, its special qualities and its potential as a green tourism destination.

EB3 To increase opportunities for visitors and local people to maximise their use of sustainable transport

EB4 To establish new (and support existing) high quality tourism development, infrastructure, products, services, signage, and marketing in (and about) the AONB which reflects the area’s high quality environment and landscape and is in keeping with its setting and/or the area’s special qualities.

EB5 To encourage an annual increase in the membership of validated green accreditation and quality tourism schemes in the North Pennines and a greater level of working together between green tourism businesses.

EB6 To support the development of new and existing ambassadors for the North Pennines who also use the area’s special qualities in their marketing literature, websites and offers.

EB7 To support the development of packages which link visitors with natural beauty, local businesses and local products.

EB8 To support and develop skills training in farming, woodland and game management, nature and heritage conservation in the AONB.

EB9 To secure broadband coverage for the whole of the AONB without having a significant adverse impact on natural beauty.

EB10 To support arts and crafts businesses to inspire others, contribute to community life and tourism.

EB11 To support and encourage development, production and use of local food and other products, especially those linked to natural beauty.
Community and culture

Objectives

CC1 To support the retention and expansion of village services.

CC2 To support and encourage community groups to actively engage in conserving and celebrating the AONB.

CC3 To encourage and support local communities to help interpret the special qualities of the area.

CC4 To encourage a greater community participation and better understanding of the benefits of a sustainable tourism industry.

CC5 To establish annual programmes of lifelong learning that are based on the area’s special qualities.

CC6 Support and develop programmes linked to local and national cultural figures that have celebrated and been inspired by the North Pennines.

CC7 To ensure that local communities, networks and individuals can give expression to what their landscape and their ‘place’ means to them.

CC8 To develop new opportunities for young people to find training or employment in the area related to the purpose of AONB designation.

Increasing knowledge of the AONB

Objectives

IK1 To develop baseline data and future research areas to improve knowledge of the area’s special qualities and condition.

IK2 To understand and plan for the potential impacts of climate change on the area’s natural beauty.

IK3 To increase knowledge and understanding of geodiversity and BAP species and habitats

IK4 To undertake research into tourism in the AONB to inform policy and investment and the development of work under the EUROPARC Charter for Sustainable Tourism.

IK5 To understand the impacts on children’s well-being associated with outdoor learning in the North Pennines.
## Twenty One Ecomuseum Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twenty One Ecomuseum Principles</th>
<th>2009 – 2014 Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum is initiated and steered by local communities</td>
<td>EU8, CC3, CC7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum should allow for public participation in all decision-making processes and activities in a democratic manner</td>
<td>HE5, EU4, EU8, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum should stimulate joint ownership and management with input from local communities, academic advisors, local businesses, local authorities and government structures</td>
<td>LB5, LB6, LB10, HE1, HE4, EU1, EU5, EU7, EU8, EB2, EB5, EB6, CC3, CC4, CC7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an ecomuseum, an emphasis is usually placed on the processes of heritage management, rather than the heritage products for consumption</td>
<td>HE4, EB8, CC3, CC7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum is likely to encourage collaboration with local craftspeople, artists, writers, actors and musicians</td>
<td>LB1, LB2, LB5, EU5, EB7, EB8, EB10, CC5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum often depends on substantial active voluntary efforts by local stakeholders</td>
<td>LB9, EU5, EU8, EB2, EB3, EB5, EB6, EB7, EB8, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum focuses on local identity and a sense of place</td>
<td>LG1, LB5, LB8, HE2, HE4, EU1, EU4, EU5, EU9, EB4, EB7, EB8, CC1, CC5, CC6, CC7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum often encompasses a ‘geographical’ territory, which can be determined by different shared characteristics</td>
<td>LG10, LB5, LB6, EU4, EB4, EB7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum covers both spatial and temporal aspects. In relation to temporal, it looks at continuity and change over time. Therefore, it’s approach is diachronic rather than synchronic (in the context of time rather than stand-alone)</td>
<td>LG10, LB8, LB10, HE2, HE7, EU2, EU4, CC1, CC3, CC4, CC6, CC8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ecomuseum often takes the form of a ‘fragmented museum’</td>
<td>EU7, EB7, CC3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**consisting of a network with a hub and antennae of different buildings and sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An ecomuseum promotes preservation, conservation and safeguarding of heritage resources in situ</th>
<th>LG3, LG4, LB1, LB2, LB3, LB4, LB5, LB6, LB7, LB8, HE2, HE3, HE4, HE5, HE6, EB1, EU2, EB8, CC3, IK3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the ecomuseum ideal, equal attention is often given to immovable and movable tangible material culture, and to intangible heritage resources</td>
<td>LG5, LB1, LB2, LB3, LB5, LB6, LB7, LB9, LB10, HE1, HE2, HE3, HE4, HE5, HE6, EU1, EU2, EU9, EB7, EB8, EB10, CC1, CC5, CC6, CC7, IK3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ecomuseum stimulates sustainable development and use of resources</td>
<td>LG1, LG2, LG3, LG4, LG5, LG6, LG7, LG8, LG9, LB1, LB2, LB3, LB4, LB5, LB6, LB7, LB8, LB9, LB10, HE2, HE3, HE4, EU2, EU7, EU9, EB1, EB2, EB3, EB4, EB5, EB8, CC3, CC4, CC8, IK4, IK5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ecomuseum allows for change and development of a better future</td>
<td>LG2, LG3, LG8, LG9, LB1, LB2, LB5, LB7, LB10, HE3, HE4, HE6, HE7, EU2, EU9, EB1, EB2, EB3, EB4, EB5, EB6, EB8, EB9, EB10, CC1, CC4, CC5, CC8, IK2, IK4, IK5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum encourages an ongoing programme of documentation of past and present life and people’s interactions with all environmental factors (including physical, economic, social, cultural and political)</td>
<td>LG4, LB3, LB6, HE1, HE5, EU1, EU4, EU5, CC3, CC5, CC6, CC7, IK3, IK5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ecomuseum promotes research at a number of levels – from the research and understanding of local ‘specialists’ to research by academics</td>
<td>LB6, HE1, HE5, EU5, CC2, CC3, CC5, CC6, CC7, IK1, IK3, IK4, IK5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ecomuseum promotes multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches to research</td>
<td>LB6, LB10, HE4, HE5, EB1, EU1, EU5, EU9, EB2, EB7, EB8, CC3, CC5, CC7, IK1, IK3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ecomuseum ideal encourages a holistic approach to the interpretation of culture / nature relationships</td>
<td>LB1, LB2, LB5, LB6, HE2, HE3, EU1, EU2, EU4, EB7, CC6, CC7, IK3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ecomuseum often attempts to illustrate connections between: technology / individual; nature / culture; and past /</td>
<td>EU1, EU4, EB7, EB8, CC4, CC5, CC6, CC7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ecomuseum can provide for an intersection between heritage and responsible tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG3, LG4, LB1, LB5, EU1, EU2, EU6, EU7, EU9, EB1, EB2, EB4, EB5, EB7, CC3, CC4, IK4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ecomuseum can bring benefits to local communities, for example, a sense of pride, regeneration and/or economic income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB5, HE2, HE3, HE5, EU1, EU5, EU6, EU9, EB1, EB2, EB4, EB5, EB6, EB7, EB9, EB10, CC1, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5, CC6, CC7, CC8, IK4, IK5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Eleven: Graph to show agreement between AONB Management Plan objectives and the 21 principles of ecomuseology

This graph refers to the 21 principles of ecomuseology which are detailed in Chapter Seven, figure 16. It shows the number of objectives outlined in the North Pennines AONB Partnership's Management Plan for 2009-14 that find agreement with these principles. The North Pennines AONB objectives are presented in Appendix Nine.
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