

REFIT Data Collection and Methodology Summary

The aim of this document is to detail the data collection methodology of Phase one of the REFIT (Resituating Europe's First Towns) Project. This initial phase of research seeks to evaluate stakeholder awareness and understanding of historical and contemporary land use and land management in the context of four case study cultural landscapes: Bagendon and Salmonsbury in the Cotswolds, UK, Bibracte in Burgundy, France and Ulaca in Avila, Spain. A brief introduction to the project, which builds on the information on the project's website (www.refitproject.com), is outlined before the methodology is explored in full.

1. Introduction

Since the latter half of the 20th century, there has been increasing focus on the importance of active management of the world's natural (ecosystems services) and cultural capital. Recognition that these human and natural assets are innately entangled and cannot be separated when considering the 'quality' and 'sustainability' of life has led to a major shift in the way influential international bodies, national governments, environment and heritage agencies are conceiving and classifying sites and landscapes. For example, the United Nations helped bring to prominence the term 'cultural landscape' through the World Heritage Convention in 1992, which has come to shape how many governments, organisations and policy makers define most of the earth's surface – everywhere there is interaction between humans and their environment (Fowler 2003).

Cultural landscapes are now integrated into the classification process of the UNESCO World Heritage List (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>). The term has also influenced other developments such as the United Nations Millennium Ecosystems Assessment (MEA, 2005) and European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000), which, in turn, have shaped various national policies and begun to guide strategies in the development of more integrated and sustainable landscape management frameworks (e.g. NE 2009; 2010; Lock and Cole 2011; RGSF 2013). While a great deal of 'progress' has been made, at least at a theoretical level, what is missing is the investment in human capital – dialogue, collaboration, outreach, training, knowledge exchange – to ensure that the quality of human production, based on the utilisation of natural and cultural capital, is enhanced in a manner that reinforces rather than further endangers ecosystems and heritage assets, i.e. cultural landscapes. To achieve this, greater work is needed from all sectors – environment, heritage, economy – in terms of understanding the current perceptions and management strategies of local stakeholders within specific cultural landscapes.

Recognition of the value of stakeholders' perceptions and specific knowledge-sets is spreading to all realms of landscape-related management – urban planning, environment, heritage, agricultural strategy (e.g. Boatman et al. 2013, Butler and Berglund 2014, Dunford 2016, Waterton 2005). However, the present focus is largely on the top-down enforcement of national and international bodies' management strategies, rather than on collaboration and knowledge exchange. Change in the manner cultural landscape management schemes are designed and administered is therefore essential as only with an understanding of the situations, conflicts, current approaches and aspirations of individual users towards landscapes will it be possible to develop, communicate and deliver more sustainable management strategies that will have practical application for the future

(McManamon and Hatton 2000: 8-10). It was with this remit in mind that the REFIT Project was developed.

The REFIT case study landscapes are united by the presence of a pan-European phenomenon, Late Iron Age oppida - some of the most significant, yet poorly understood, monuments in European history (c.200BC–AD60 see Collis 1984, Fichtl 2005, Fernández-Götz 2014, Moore 2012). Oppida are essentially large, ditched complexes, both enclosed and unenclosed, which encompassed multiple activities, from residential areas to farming, and are often described as prehistoric Europe's 'proto-towns'. Due to their large size, some of which extend over hundreds of hectares, oppida landscapes are particularly challenging to manage. The REFIT project maximises existing expertise on oppida through cooperation between three project partners: Durham University (UK), Bibracte EPCC (France) and Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain) but recognises that focusing on the archaeological narrative alone does not address the interplay between multiple pasts and present land use that exists over these large swathes of Europe. Nor does it reflect how those using and inhabiting these landscapes are equally important to the landscapes' stories as their 'natural/built/historical' features. As such, the project is part of a growing cohort of interdisciplinary work that is beginning to actively challenge the underrepresentation of cultural landscapes and their diverse stakeholders within the development of new sustainable landscape management strategies (e.g. Dougill et al. 2006, Fairclough and Rippon 2002, Reed 2008, Decker et al. 2012). Building on the ethos of stakeholder collaboration within the context of a cultural landscape approach, this new generation of research aim is to unite at the 'point at which a top-down approach to management is met with a bottom-up understanding of heritage' and the environment (Waterton, 2005: 312).

Landscapes, their values and meanings are constantly in a state of flux as communities move through them freely, without the need to 'break' chronological barriers (Ingold 1993:159). Thus, through engaging with the range of stakeholders - from farmers and wildlife experts to local residents, small-medium enterprises (SMEs) and leisure users - at REFIT's 4 case study landscapes, the project will explore how each of these cultural landscapes is currently used, understood and managed. Working directly with our associate partners – Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (UK); Réseau des Grands Sites de France (France); Parc naturel régional du Morvan (France), Regional Government of Avila (Spain) and Cotswold Archaeology (UK) – the project aims to develop a broader understanding of the perceptions, current management approaches and needs of stakeholders whilst integrating them into archaeological research and future management strategies. With longevity as a focus, the ultimate aim of the REFIT project is to integrate the perceptions and needs of different stakeholders into the research and presentation of these cultural landscapes, including their history as well as modern-day use, and to share these different types of knowledge with wider audiences. Having achieved this at a local level, the lessons learned from the case studies will be used to develop a more widely applicable set of 'best practice' for the sustainable management of other cultural landscapes across Europe, which recognise that the agricultural, economic, ecological, heritage, wildlife and social 'values' of landscapes are best viewed as interdependent, rather than isolated, components.

2. Methodology

Phase one of the REFIT project employed a multi-method approach to achieve the aims of stakeholder collaboration in the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. The two UK cultural landscapes, Bagendon and Salmonsbury, were used as a pilot to test and refine the methods before they were adopted for the French and Spanish case studies.

The methods and preliminary results of the UK pilot provided the focus of REFIT's first workshop, held at Bibracte, France, between 21-23 March 2016. Bringing together not only the project investigators, key partners and a number of stakeholders, but also independent consultants and members of national and international organisations from across the fields of heritage, environment and farming, the workshop allowed for further dialogue on the project's methods and guided best practice. The methodological development process recognised the importance of asking difficult questions raised elsewhere in cultural resource management studies, such as how can issues of identity, ownership and belonging be integrated into management decisions when it comes to the guidelines, assessment processes and definitions used in both national and international designation strategies? How can environmental and heritage management move towards the inclusion of things that are not things at all, but intangible values stemming from identity and a sense of place if the mechanisms for allowing such opportunities are not put in place? How can the management process move beyond a consideration of how people use the landscape towards understanding why and in what way they value it (Waterton 2005: 318)?

To address these issues, techniques from a cross-disciplinary range of cultural landscape/heritage perceptions research were discussed at the workshop, enabling the project to build a methodology through which to draw out the views of different sectors of each stakeholder community (e.g. Crang 2006, Tully 2007, Hernández-Morcillo et al. 2013, Duxbury et al. 2015). Discussion also acknowledged the problems of quantitative research methods in terms of simplifying data through seemingly deterministic conclusions (Morgan et al 1993: 16), and the potential for highly subjective, researcher-led interpretations of meaning-based qualitative methodologies. As such, a combination of the two approaches was employed to produce the best possible 'balance' of social research (Philip 1998: 273). This was coupled with self-awareness and self-reflexivity on the part of the researchers and through the aim of standardising the pilot methodology when transferred to the remaining 2 case study sites and partner nations.

For more details of the workshop please see the REFIT blog <http://www.refitproject.com/single-post/2016/04/02/Our-first-international-workshop>

For clips from the workshop please see Bibracte's YouTube Channel <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLPrSUALTWubhJVHUnIFnIITF-igOX0CGB>.

2.1. Project Structure

The methodological approach through which the REFIT Project aimed to achieve Phase one of its aims, building the stakeholder networks and collecting the data necessary to evaluate understanding and awareness of land use and management, consisted of 4 key components:

1. *Literature Review*

Review of European benchmarking and landscape-based policy/management, landscape/agri-environment-related stakeholder engagement/perceptions work, ecosystems services and cultural services literature.

2. *Stakeholder identification and cross-sectoral assessment*

Stakeholder analysis through cross-sectoral stakeholder consultation, building on existing local contacts, to identify potential risks, interests and influences connected to key stakeholders and a broadly representative group of individuals and organisations with whom to work during the next steps (Grimble & Wellard 1997, Prell et al. 2009, Reed et al. 2009).

Stakeholders who took part in the work included: landowners (some of whom are farmers); tenant farmers (who rent from landowners); local residents and local Council representatives, local politicians, employees and volunteers for Governments and NGO wildlife/environmental organisations; members of local archaeological and historical societies; archaeologists and heritage professionals; local tourism professionals, students of archaeology and wildlife; metal detectorists; rambles; local business people etc. These groups and individuals were contacted through various channels. Many landowners, archaeologists/heritage professionals, residents and wildlife professionals were already known to the REFIT team from previous archaeological research in the 4 case study areas. Others were contacted via telephone or email, as a result of recommendations from other participants and organisations, and invited to share their perceptions.

3. *Interviews and Focus groups*

Targeted interviews and focus groups are essential to develop in-depth perceptions work and allow participants to expand on their experiences beyond the capacity of a survey (Smith 2001: 28-29). While accepting the potential bias between interviewee/focus group attendee and interviewer (Fontana et al. 2008: 115 - 116), face-to-face questioning, activities and discussion are inevitably the best means of gathering perceptions (Bedford and Burgess 2001) and exploring competing landscape narratives (other examples include: Tully and Hanna 2013, Lillehammer 2009, Waterton 2005, Daehnke 2007).

In order to get as inclusive a range of data as possible, interviews and focus groups took place in people's homes, as well as in community spaces and the offices of public organisations – wherever stakeholders felt most comfortable. Flexibility was essential to encouraging a diverse mix of participants who crossed the spectrum of demographic, personal, economic, environmental and cultural interests vested in the landscapes.

A two-part approach was taken during interviews and focus groups to elucidate different aspects of stakeholders' associations with the cultural landscapes: 1 - perceptions mapping; 2 - direct questioning (semi-structured interviews).

Part 1 - Perceptions Mapping

Drawing on collaborative cultural mapping approaches (e.g. Seiber 2006, Duxbury et al. 2015), participants were given a satellite image of the approximate area of each cultural landscape which contained the focal archaeological monuments (the oppida). They were then asked to draw the boundary of their definition of the cultural landscape(s) and to annotate this with values/activities/opinions. No guidance was given on how the project defined the landscape and it was emphasised that there were no right or wrong answers in terms of scale or annotations. The approach was adopted as it enabled the identification of personal bonds with the landscape more easily than a question and answer style approach would alone (cf. Lillehammer 2009: 263-264). These relatively recent GIS and sociologically-based approaches to perceptions also challenge the traditional, top-down, politically/academically defined boundaries (Harley 1989) which continue to shape much supposedly public-focused mapping/landscape work (e.g. Fairclough 2005) and instead encourage individuals and communities to determine their own locational parameters (Craig et al. 2002).

In terms of representing this data and communicating perceptions to a wider audience, different stakeholders' annotations can be analysed for both quantitative and qualitative results. In addition, boundaries can be overlaid using GIS, creating 'hotspot' maps which show the range and relative density of stakeholders' interpretations of their cultural landscape (e.g. Fitzjohn 2009). The visual and spatial nature of these participatory mapping tasks are powerful for the immediacy they offer in terms of summarising multiple individuals' views and large amounts of data in a single image, making them a useful preface to more in-depth textual analyses.

With regard to the REFIT project, the reflective nature of the mapping task also set the tone and focused participants on the specificities of their cultural landscape in readiness for the questions that followed by making it clear that they were the experts and that all opinions were valid. This helped establish a relaxed setting as individuals understood that they were not going to be 'quizzed' but instead asked to reflect on their relationship with the cultural landscape in question as they had defined it.

Part 2 – Direction Questioning (semi-structured interviews)

The targeted questions moved the research forward to explore in more detail levels of knowledge and individual connections to each landscape through two main areas of investigation: (1) personal perceptions of the value and future direction of the cultural landscape(s), (2) understanding of current cultural landscape management strategies.

All the interviews and focus groups were recorded on a Dictaphone with participants' consent, with audio files being deleted once transcripts were typed up and anonymised. Key words and themes were identified initially during analysis by manual scanning of the transcripts. This activity was supported by NVivo 10 software for qualitative data analysis to enhance the speed of analysis and management of a large amount of data. While the nature of focus groups meant that they provoked debate and discussion to a greater extent than one-on-one interviews, the questions were designed to encourage solo participants to reflect on areas of agreement and conflict within their experiences, thus helping ensure that the data was comparable across the two formats of questioning.

The questions were as follows:

- In what capacity are you connected to the landscape of BAGENDON/ GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)/BIBRACTE/ULACA?
- Do you remember your first impressions of the landscape?
- How do you view the landscape today, compared to your first impressions?
- What do you think is most important about the landscape?
- What do you consider the value of the landscape to be?
- How do you use/make use of the landscape?
- What is your most memorable experience of being in the landscape?
- Have you heard the term oppidum? Do you know what an oppidum is?
- Have you heard the term cultural landscape? What do you think it means/might mean?
- How do you think the landscape is currently managed?
- How do you think the landscape should be managed sustainably – what strategies would you promote?
- Do you think there are other stakeholder groups who see and experience the landscape and the issues of cultural landscape management in a similar way to you?
- What does sustainable landscape management mean to you?
- Do you think stewardship schemes are important and why? (NOTE: The idea of stewardship (land management schemes) will be different in different contexts and those who are not farmers/involved in landscape management may not know what stewardship or other land management schemes are. Therefore, this question needs to be tailored to different stakeholders. If working with local residents for example, ask: Do you know of any particular land management schemes that are used in the landscape? Do you think these schemes are important and why?).
- Are there things you would like to know about the landscape that you don't currently have information about?
- Do you have any ideas for activities or resources that could help spread more information about any of the different uses or history of the landscape to a wider audience, or are there any events or resources that you would like to see or take part in?
- What are your hopes for the future of the landscape?

4. *Online surveys*

Focused on the same themes as the semi-structured interviews and focus groups, the online surveys aimed to obtain broad baseline data related to levels of knowledge surrounding the history and management of each cultural landscape, as well as the activities and values associated with them. Collected through online and paper surveys,

honed during the UK pilot in consultation with other EU partners, the surveys aimed to capture a wide set of responses by diverse users/non-users of these cultural landscapes, including those who may have never visited and those who may live geographically distant (e.g. one-off visitors or people who have relocated). The surveys provided both quantitative and qualitative data beyond the practicable capacity of the interviews, focus groups and boundary mind-mapping activities and produced broader data on understandings of the history, management and values associated with each cultural landscape.

For an example of the survey questions, see Annex A.

2.2. Data Collection and Data Protection

The format and procedures for all the methodological components outlined above were designed around the European Commission's Horizon 2020 ethics guidance (<http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/ethics>) and approved by the independent ethics committees of each national team's lead organisation. Where necessary, the data collection process therefore included participant information sheets and informed consent forms. All the information collected, whether paper or audio files (in the case of interviews/focus groups), also conformed to each nation's data protection laws with all responses being anonymised.

2.3. Data Limitations

While every effort was made to ensure a broadly representative range of stakeholders was included for each cultural landscape, it is necessary to acknowledge the potential limitations within the data. It is likely, for example, that those who are the most disillusioned with the current use and management of these landscapes were those who declined to participate. This being said, many areas of disagreement as well as consent arose during the consultation process and will be addressed within the synthesis in order to reveal the multiplicity of uses, meanings and management approaches which make up debates surrounding the REFIT cultural landscapes.

The project was also aware of concerns surrounding the economic and ethnic mix of participants, depending on the particular socio-cultural issues of each cultural landscape (e.g. the UK examples reflect a dominantly white, affluent demographic due to the high cost of living and rural nature of the Cotswolds). In terms of gender bias, while equal representation was the aim, the data across all case studies is male dominated, highlighting the continuing lack of women in rural employment/volunteering, political and managerial roles. The representation of different age groups (ranging from 18-25/26-35/35-45/46-55/56-65/ 65+) is more representative, however the pilot data suggests lower levels of engagement from the under 35 age groups. This perhaps reflects issues such as: rural depopulation with younger people moving to cities (especially in the French and Spanish examples); the busy lives of those with young families, a demographic which are not yet landowners or homeowners and who are relatively junior within their organisations and thus unlikely to have been put forward for interviews with the REFIT team.

Differences in sample size also need to be considered. Bagendon for examples is a small village with only a few hundred inhabitants and small number of visitors, whereas Bibracte is a popular tourist

destination and site of National importance. By remaining open and aware of these issues throughout the research, the project is able to look at the data critically and assess potential conflicts during analysis.

2.4. Supporting Data

To complement the information provided by the methodology outlined above, and to help address demographic issues, such as low levels of representation of younger age groups, a survey of online digital media is also underway. This work is examining the number/nature of photographs taken in these landscapes via forums such as Flickr/Snapfish/TripAdvisor/Google images as well as through references in blogs/websites etc. to further assess understanding and attitudes through the way these landscapes are experienced and recorded online. GIS modelling and characterisation is also contributing to wider understanding of the use and management of these landscapes. This step is essential as it will ultimately integrate all the data types, from traditional visitor surveys and the insights gleaned from digital media, to data on archaeological, historic and modern land use, to provide a detailed palimpsest approach to the cultural landscapes from the perspectives of as wide a range of stakeholders as possible within the limitations of research.

2.5. Analysis

The approach to data analysis evidenced in forthcoming publications and reports recognises that participants are likely to provide what they see as the 'best' or most 'noble' answers to questioning (Bourdieu & Darbel [1969] 1991: 3) and that it is important to represent the full extent of views by highlighting contradictions and conflicts within the data (Abu-Lughod 1991, 1993: 1, 32). This will be achieved through a combination of direct quotes, visual representations of perceptions and statistics analysis, supported by wider cultural landscape and stakeholder research. Thus, while the outputs will be shaped by the REFIT research agenda and the liberal, university educated background of the primary researchers, it is hoped that the palimpsest approach to analysis will reveal the collaborative nature of the work.

Summaries of the interview, mapping and survey data will be uploaded to the website during 2017.

Official publications are in progress and will be announced in due course.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. 1991. Writing against culture. In: R. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Abu-Lughod, L. 1993. *Writing women's worlds: Bedouin stories*. London: University of California Press.

Bedford, T. and Burgess, J. 2001. The focus-group experience. In: M. Limb. and C. Dwyer (eds.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 55 - 70.

Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. [1969] 1991. *The love of art: European art Museums and their public*. Translated from the French by C. Beattie and N. Merriman. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boatman, N., Jones, N., Bishop., Blackburn., Conyers, S., Elliott, J., Hallam, C. and Huntly, A. 2013. *Monitoring the Impacts of Entry Level Stewardship. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR133*, The Food and Environment Research Agency. Sheffield: Natural England.

Butler, A. and Berglund, U. 2014. Landscape Character Assessment as an Approach to Understanding Public Interests within the European Landscape Convention, *Landscape Research*, 39:3, 219–236.

Collis, J. 1984. *Oppida. Earliest towns north of the Alps*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Council of Europe. 2000. *European Landscape Convention*

<https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016802f80c6>

Craig, W.J., Harris, T.M. and Weiner, D. 2002. *Community Participation and Geographic Information Systems*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Crang, M. 2006. Circulation and Emplacement: The Hollowed Out Performance of Tourism. In: C. Minca and T. Oakes (eds.), *Travels in Paradox: Remapping Tourism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 47–64.

Daehnke, J. D. 2007. A 'strange multiplicity' of voice: Heritage stewardship, contested sites and colonial legacies on the Columbia River. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 7, 250–275.

Decker, D.J., Riley, S.J. and Siemer, W.F. (eds.). 2012. *Human dimensions of wildlife management*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Dougill, A. J., Fraser, E.D.G., Holden, J., Hubacek K., Press, C., Reeds, M.S., Stagl, S. and Stringer, L.C. 2006. Learning from Doing Participatory Rural Research: Lessons from the Peak District National Park. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 57, 2, 259–275.

Dunford, B. 2016. *The Burren Life programme, Research series paper no. 9*. Dublin: National Economic and Social Council, Ireland.

Duxbury, N., Garrett-Petts, W.F. and MacLeannan, D. (eds.). 2015. *Cultural Mapping as Cultural enquiry*. London: Routledge.

European Commission. No Date. *Ethics*. <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/ethics>

Fairclough, G. 2005. *Boundless Horizons: Historical landscape characterization*. www.english-heritage.org.uk

Fairclough, G. and Rippon, S. 2002. *Europe's cultural landscape : Archaeologists and the management of change*. Brussels: Europae Archaeologiae Consilium.

Fernández-Götz, M. 2014. Reassessing the oppida: the role of power and religion, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 33(4), 379–394.

- Fichtl, S. 2005. *La Ville Celtique. Les oppida de 150 av. J.-C. à 15 ap. J.-C.* (2nd edition). Paris: Editions Errance.
- Fitzjohn, M. 2009. The use of GIS in landscape heritage and attitudes towards place. In: M.L.S. Sørensen and J. Carman (eds.), *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. London: Routledge, 237–252.
- Fontana, A. and Frey, J. H. 2008. The Interview: From Neutral Science to Political Involvement. In: N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. California, CA: Sage Publications, 115–159.
- Fowler, P. J. 2003. *UNESCO World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992-2002*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001331/133121e.pdf>
- Grimble, R. and Wellard, K. 1997. Stakeholder methodologies in natural resource management: A review of principles, contexts, experiences and opportunities. *Agricultural Systems*, 55(2), 173–193.
- Hernandez-Morcillo, M., Plieninger, T. and Bieling, C. 2013. *An empirical review of cultural ecosystem service indicators*. London: Elsevier.
- Ingold, T. 1993. The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25(2), 152–174.
- Lillehammer, G. 2009. Making them Draw: The use of drawings when researching public attitudes towards the past. In: M.L.S. Sørensen and J. Carman (eds.), *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. London: Routledge, 253–269.
- Lock, K. and Cole, L. 2011. *Public Perceptions of Landscapes and Ecosystems in the UK*. A report to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Report No. DEFRA NE0109). London: Policy Studies Institute, DEFRA.
- McManamon, F. and Hatton, A. (eds.) 2000. *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Millennium Ecosystems Assessment. 2005. *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis Report*. Washington DC: Island Press
<http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/index.html>
- Moore, T. 2012. Beyond the oppida. Polyfocal complexes and Late Iron Age societies in southern Britain, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 31(4): 391-417.
- Morgan, D. L. and Krueger, A. 1993. When to use Focus groups. In: D. L. Morgan (ed.), *Successful Focus Groups: advancing the state of the art*. London: Sage Publications, 3–19.
- Natural England. 2009. *Experiencing Landscapes: Capturing the 'cultural services' and 'experiential qualities' of landscape (Study Report) Natural England Commissioned Report NECR024*. Sheffield: Natural England.
- Natural England. 2011. *Experiencing Landscapes Phase II: Towards a judgement-making framework for 'cultural services' and 'experiential qualities' (Final Report) Natural England Commissioned Report NECR045*. Sheffield: Natural England.

- Philip, L. J. 1998. Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to social research in human geography- an impossible mixture? *Environment and Planning A*, 30, 261–276.
- Prell, C., Hubacek, K. and Reed, M. 2009. Stakeholder analysis and social network analysis in natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 22(6), 501–518.
- Reed, M.S., Bonn, A., Slee, W., Beharry-Borg, N., Birch, J., Brown, I., Burt, T.P., Chapman, D., Chapman, P.J., Clay, G.D. and Cornell, S.J. 2009. *The future of the uplands*. *Land Use Policy*, 26, S204–S216.
- Reed, M.S. 2008. Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological conservation*, 141(10), 2417–2431.
- REFIT Project. 2016. www.refitproject.com
- REFIT Project. 2016. *Blog: Our first international workshop*. <http://www.refitproject.com/single-post/2016/04/02/Our-first-international-workshop>
- Réseau des Grands Sites de France (RGSF). 2013. *Projet à 10 ans pour le Réseau des Grands Sites de France*, July 2013. Paris: Réseau des Grands Sites de France.
- Sieber, R. 2006. Public Participation and Geographic Information Systems: A Literature Review and Framework. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 96(3), 491–507.
- Smith, S. 2001. Doing qualitative research from interpretation to action. In: M. Limb. and C. Dwyer (eds.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. Oxford: Arnold Publishers, 23–40.
- Tully, G. and M. Hanna. 2013. One landscape many tenants: Uncovering multiple claims, visions and meanings on the Theban Necropolis, *Archaeologies*, December 9.3, 362–397.
- Tully, G. 2007. Community Archaeology: General Methods and Standards of Practice. *Public Archaeology* 6 (3), 155–187.
- UNESCO World Heritage List. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>
- Waterton, E. 2005. Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural landscapes in England. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(4), September, 309–325.
- YouTube. 2016. Bibracte. <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLPrSUALTWubhJVHUnIFnIITF-igOXOCGB>.

Annex A

Please note the survey below is the one used for Greystones Farm (Salmonsbury). The other three case study surveys were different in terms of the minor details that needed to be altered to match the specific landscape context, e.g. the list of available words in question 5. Replacements were selected to maintain similar numbers and types of options for comparability across the 4 case study sites.

Greystones Farm (Salmonsbury) Survey

1. Have you heard of GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please circle)

Yes / No (if no, this is the end of the survey, if yes, please continue)

2. How many times have you visited?

Never / Once / This is my first time (if on site) / 2-5 times / 5-10 times / 11+ times

3. How did you hear about it? (Please circle all relevant options)

Word of Mouth / Internet / Facebook / Live locally / Tourist Office / Advert / Poster
Other (please state)

4. What is the first thing/word that comes to mind when you think about GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please state)

5. Which of the words from the list below do you associate with GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please circle as many words as you like)

Sheep Farming Cows Iron Age Walking Countryside Nature
Dog walking Archaeology Wildlife Outdoors Beauty Greenspace
Celts Leisure time History Livelihood Cycling Tourism
Hunting/Fishing/Shooting Englishness Cotswolds

Please add any other words that come to mind here

6. Do you know of any other places, in the UK or in other countries that are like GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please circle)

Yes (Please state where and how they are similar)

No (Please move to next question)

7. What is the main reason you visit/activity you do at GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please state)

8. Why is GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) important to you? (Please state)

9. What do you think the majority of the land at GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) is used for today? (Please state)

10. Do you know who owns/manages the land at GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please circle)

Yes – please state who/what organisations

No – please move to question 11.

11. What aspects of the GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) landscape would you be interested in learning more about? (Please state)

12. Can you think of any events or activities that you would like to see/take part in to enhance your understanding of any aspects of GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please state)

13. Have you ever heard the term Cultural Landscape before? (Please circle)

Yes – if Yes, what do you think it means?

No – please move to question 14.

14. Do you know if there are any archaeological remains within the landscape of GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please circle).

Yes – What type of remains do you think are there? (e.g. farmstead, palace, town, fortress, burials, other, please describe)

No (Please move to question 16)

15. Which archaeological time period(s) do you think the archaeological remains at GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) date from? (Please circle one or more)

Stone Age	Bronze Age	Iron Age	Roman	Saxon	Viking	Norman
Medieval	18-19 th century	20 th century	Modern	No idea		

16. Have you heard of an 'oppidum' before? (Please circle)

Yes – What do you think an oppidum is? (Please state)

No (Please move to question 19)

17. Which archaeological time period(s) do you think the archaeological remains of oppida (plural of oppidum) date from? (Please circle one or more)

Stone Age	Bronze Age	Iron Age	Roman	Saxon	Viking	Norman
Medieval	18-19 th century	20 th century	Modern	No idea		

18. Can you identify/describe some of the archaeological remains you might find at an oppidum? (Please state)

19. Have you ever looked at the area where you live, or at areas of your local landscape on google earth or other aerial maps/aerial mapping programmes? (Please circle)

Yes / No

20. How important do you think places like GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) are to your personal quality of life?

0-1-2-3-4-5 (please circle, 0 represents not at all important, 5 means very important)

21. How important do you think places like GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) are for the sustainable management of landscapes for the future?

0-1-2-3-4-5 (please circle, 0 represents not at all important, 5 means very important)

22. Do you feel the local landscape in and around GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) has changed during your lifetime? (Please circle)

Yes (Please go to question 23)

No (Please go to question 24)

23. How do you think it has changed (Please circle from the options below or add your own comments at the end of the section).

The local population has: Increased a lot /Increased/Stayed the same/Decreased/ Decreased a lot

The amount of forest/woods has: Increased a lot/Increased/Stayed the same/Decreased/Decreased a lot

The number of farms has: Increased a lot/Increased/Stayed the same/Decreased/Decreased a lot

The number of people working in agriculture has: Increased a lot/Increased/Stayed the same /
Decreased/Decreased a lot

The diversity of wildlife has: Increased a lot/Increased/Stayed the same/Decreased/Decreased a lot

The rate of new building has: Increased a lot/Increased/Stayed the same/Decreased/Decreased a lot

Other comments

24. What do you think the landscape of GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) should be used for? (Please state your ideas and explain why)

25. Do you know of any laws or policies connected to the use/management/protection of natural and cultural sites and landscape? (Please circle)

Yes, please list below and move to 27

List laws/policies here

No, please move to 27

26. Do you know if any of the laws or policies you have stated above are connected to the use/management/protection of GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY)? (Please state which ones)

Yes, please list below

List laws/policies here

No, please move to 27

27. Where do you think funding to manage and conserve cultural landscapes like GREYSTONES FARM (SALMONSBURY) should come from? (Please circle ALL the options you think are relevant):

Landowners. Local and/or National government Local communities/local charities.

Wildlife trusts National charities (e.g. The National Trust) All different stakeholder

Other, please state.

Demographic data

(Feel free to leave blank any question you do not want to answer)

Age (please circle) 18-25 / 26-35 / 36-45 / 46-65 / 65+ / prefer not to say

Gender (please circle) female / male / trans / other/ prefer not to say

Place of residence (village/town/city – please state) / prefer not to say

Place of birth (village/town/city and country – please state)/prefer not to say

If you were born in the same village/town/local area as you live now, how many generations of your family do you think have lived in the area? (Please circle)

Parents / Grandparents / Great-Grandparents / Great-Great-Grandparents / 6 generations plus

If you were not born in the same village/town/local area as you live now. How many years have you lived there? (Please circle)

Less than a year / 1-5 years / 6-10 years / More than 10 years

How would you describe your current type of employment/career? (Please circle or leave blank if you prefer)

retired / in full-time education / unemployed / small business owner / landowner / farm manager / agricultural worker / in an education profession / senior manager / middle management / supervisor / office employee / manual worker / stay at home parent / unable to work / carer / self-employed / Local government employee / National government employee / Other (Please state).....

How would you describe your ethnic group? (Please select one, or leave blank if you prefer)

White – English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British/Irish/Gypsy or Irish Traveller/

Other White background (Please state).....

Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups – White and Black Caribbean/White and black African/

White and Black Asian/Other mixed background (Please state).....

Asian/British Asian – Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi/Chinese/Other Asian background (Please state).....

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British – African/Caribbean/Other Black background (Please state).....

Arab – North African/Middle Eastern/Other Arab background (Please state).....

Other ethnic group – Any other ethnic groups (Please state).....

Would you like to be kept updated on the project and learn about forthcoming events and new information about the cultural landscape of the area? If yes, please leave your email address here

If you would like to be contacted to take part in a more detailed personal interview regarding your views on the cultural landscape, what it means to you, its current and future management, please talk to the researcher or email us refit.org@gmail.com

Thank you for your time