The Meaning of 'Heritage': Mapping Discursive Perspectives with Q Methodology

Emma Waterton

RCUK Academic Fellow, Keele University

Abstract: 'Heritage' is not a fixed, unchanging 'thing', but is something that is constructed, created, constituted and reflected by discourses. This contingency of 'heritage' upon discourse means that policy is not simply a neutral domain within which 'heritage' problems and solutions are mapped. Rather, policy becomes a site for analysis or a means by which to explore through discourse the social realities of heritage management, particularly in terms of the power relations that monitor and sustain social hierarchies and social change. This article maps a range of heritage perspectives using Q methodology. Key here is the idea that while expressions of heritage may be vocalised in similar ways, the meanings underpinning those vocalisations may be directed by different motives and underlying assumptions. Q methodology is thus used here to offer a way by which to recognise not only the natural or commonplace definitions of heritage privileged in national legislation, but those alternative perceptions understood and adhered to by other, and often subaltern, groups. As such, this article presents an overview of the different ways in which 'heritage' is perceived, examining both the nuances of the dominant perspective embedded in heritage policy, as well as a range of alternative experiences and perspectives that exist in tension with that dominant – and authorised – discourse.

Introduction

It is probably fair to say that the idea of 'heritage'—what it actually *is*—is rarely, if ever, talked about in a policy sense. What is surprising about this omission is that the very notion of heritage is itself almost entirely caught up in the language we use to talk and write about it. Indeed, as Hall (1997a, p. 3) points out, a 'thing' will rarely have one fixed meaning. What that 'thing' *means* will vary according to different circumstances—how it is consumed, used, expressed or appropriated, and, importantly, who is doing 'the doing' (Hall 1997a, p. 3). In the English public policy domain, heritage has tended to be uncritically constructed as a nationalised and monolithic collection of sites, monuments and buildings, a construct Smith (2006) refers to as the *authorised heritage discourse* (henceforth the AHD). The subject-

---

positionings caught up within this characterisation posit 'experts' and heritage organisations as those in a position to *do, own* and *control*, with virtually everybody else constructed as passive, inactive audiences. This type of policy approach has worked to solidify the tacit assumption that consensus and homogeneity are to be valued at all costs. An important consequence of this has been an attempted transferral of *one* fixed meaning of heritage into a range of academic and popular contexts.

This paper begins from a proposition that stands at odds with the notion of a singular construction of heritage, and argues instead that heritage is something that is continuously remade and remembered. Often in this process of (re)creation, heritage is called upon to do important social, emotional, cultural and political work (Harvey, 2001; Graham, 2002; Bagnall, 2003; Smith, 2006). From this perspective, heritage ceases to be about the discovery of a monolithic, tangible and physical past, and becomes instead an attempt to map, often *through* physicality but not always, a sense of belonging, inclusion and connection (Till, 2005, p. 14; Smith, 2006). This idea of 'inclusion' is important to the arguments advanced in this article because of current calls for community involvement, multiculturalism and civic engagement in the English policy sphere, within which heritage has been earmarked as a crucial element. Here, the influence of New Labour initiatives under Tony Blair has nurtured a 'career' for heritage within governmental plans for tackling social exclusion. The successful embedding of discourses of exclusion/inclusion within the heritage sector has subsequently fostered specific attempts by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)[†] and English Heritage[‡] to document how cultural preferences, tastes and knowledges mediate the production and consumption of heritage.[§] This proliferation of publications demonstrates an assumed therapeutic and instrumental nature of heritage, which can be used to alleviate the negative affects of exclusion and *". . . the poverty of aspiration"* (Jowell, 2004, p. 3).

Despite attempts to create a more socially inclusive sense of heritage, these advances have tended to occur at the level of rhetoric only, as resultant debates and policies continue to share considerable conceptual space with the

---

[†] DCMS is the government department responsible for heritage, although strategic priorities will also come from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the Department for Communities and Local Government (Waterton 2007).

[‡] English Heritage acts as the Government's statutory adviser on issues relating to heritage.

[§] DCMS (1999) *Social Inclusion Progress Report*. Available on-line; DCMS (1999) *Policy Action Team 10: A Report to the Social Exclusion Unit: Arts and Sports*. London: DCMS; DCMS (2002) *People and Places: Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment*. London: DCMS; DCMS (2002) *Count Me In: Research Project on Social Inclusion through Culture and Sport*. London: DCMS.

Uncritical—and unquestioned—AHD. This failure to translate rhetoric into genuine inclusion policies is symptomatic of a much larger issue: a failure to recognize—and deal with—the latent power issues implicated in current policies for managing heritage, which continue to act in favour of a particular and prioritised social group, namely the white, middle- and upper-classes. In this article, I do not claim to have the answers for circumventing this failure. What I do attempt, however, is to provide a wider overview of *some* of the perspectives held by *some* of the people who identify with heritage issues than has previously been acknowledged. My purpose is to force a move away from the assumption that there exists a consensual view of heritage, and propose, instead, that for social inclusion policies to succeed those often unheard voices must be found.

To do this, the article is organised into two parts: first, I want to make a case for Smith's authorised heritage discourse; and second, I want to map a re-definition of heritage through subjectivity. For these reasons Q methodology is drawn upon as a mechanism capable of recognising both 'dominant' definitions of heritage, as well as marginalised and excluded discourses. While the results are by no means exhaustive, they provide a sense of the wider argumentative texture that surrounds heritage, accounting not only for the ways in which these *different* storylines find consensus, but also the degree of difference that lies in and between them. It is only by identifying the existence of alternative discourses that the political and social relations of power that continue to sustain the AHD can be acknowledged, unpacked and questioned.

The Nature of Heritage in England

In the last forty years, acceptance of the AHD has mushroomed in associated heritage literature, which has consequently tended to focus upon the procedures and technicalities of management (cf. Lowenthal & Binney, 1981; Cleere, 1989, 1993; Ross, 1991; Delafons, 1997; Creighton-Tyte & Gallimore, 1998; Campbell, 2001; Beacham, 2006). This discourse has similarly been embedded in a range of national and international policy instruments that collectively work to define and regulate what heritage means and how it ought to be managed and encountered (Smith, 2006; Waterton, 2007). In England, these include the enactments of the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act of 1979*, the *Heritage Act of 1983*, the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, and *Planning Policy Guidance Notes 15* and *16*. Internationally, it is a discourse drawn upon by the influential *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* (Venice Charter) (ICOMOS, 1964), the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage* (The World Heritage Convention) (UNESCO, 1972), and *The Burra Charter (The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance)* (Australia ICOMOS, 1999), all three of which are prominent pieces of policy referred to at both national and international levels.

While a relatively recent discourse in terms of its formal uptake, the AHD developed over a long period of time, and owes many of its characteristics to the Enlightenment, Romanticism and the rise of modern nation-states. Through various combinations of power and circumstance, these timeframes gave rise to a discourse characterised by an apparent need for expertise, objectivity and efficiency, and driven by a responsibility to 'act for' and 'steward' an assumed 'universal' past, valued for the statements it is able to make about national identity. This past is consensual, and is made up of 'grand', 'tangible', and 'aesthetically pleasing' sites, monuments and buildings. In reality, this collective definition was championed by, and 'made sense' to, a particular social grouping, defined by its class position and ethnicity, and has come to privilege and naturalise a distinct understanding of heritage. This framing of heritage revolves around the notion of a people-less heritage anchored to a past that is saved for, and inherited by, a nebulous future generation. Here, active agency on the part of present generations is downplayed, and, according to this narrative, people are reduced and re-imagined as passive receptors of education and information. Simultaneously, the authority of expertise is exhorted, with only specific collections of knowledge (archaeology, art history and architectural conservation) considered capable of extending 'proper' care to the past. The point, here, is that the nature of heritage—and the cultural practices designed to manage that heritage—have assumed a 'taken-for-granted' quality, allowing them to remain unquestioned and problem-free in England. This is a logic *made apparent* by the absence of any serious critical analysis aimed at unpacking heritage in England. As a result, it is also a logic that *makes apparent* the social and ideological effects of discourse, revealing the innocuous form of power that underpins the management process. It is also precisely this logic that fleshes out the argument that a particular construction of heritage has been—and continues to be—bolstered and protected by the very language we use to talk about it, and is buried within the internal consistencies of policy documents and legislation.

Despite a renewed interest in social inclusion and multiculturalism, very few scholars have drawn attention to the limited understanding of heritage operating at the heart of a range of policies (but see for example Littler & Naidoo, 2005; Smith, 2006). Indeed, the academic response has been surprisingly circumspect. By contrast, a range of policy reactions have ensued, observable in the arrival of projects such as *Black History Month*, the *Upstairs/Downstairs* projects, *Hidden Histories*, the *Blue Plaque Schemes* and the introduction of *Heritage Open Days*. What these projects share in common is a propensity towards access and audience development (Newman, 2005, p. 327) and a desire to measure and reveal, rather than understand and explore, the social nature of heritage. Moreover, these initiatives might better be conceived of as instruments of social reform, concerned as they are with the development of proactive efforts to 'improve' and 'educate' excluded pockets of society. In this guise, social inclusion

policies are perhaps better understood as attempts to convince or cajole the 'deviant other' into the cultural realm of the 'normal majority' (Evans & Harris, 2004, p. 70). It is a passive construction of the inclusion/exclusion dyad, in which the social, cultural and civil rights of a range of people are obscured—indeed deferred—in favour of the discretionary judgements of expert and/or professional opinion. As this attempt at realignment seems to be taking place in the absence of a re-theorisation of heritage at the policy level, it thus becomes a process that is inevitably exclusionary. Indeed, it *actively* disinherits those values and experiences of heritage associated with the 'excluded' (cf. Caffyn & Lutz, 1999; Ashworth, 2002). Thus, without first recognising the longevity of a dominant discourse, initiatives in the policy sphere will always be controlled and framed by the parameters of the AHD. One way forward from here is to begin to take account of the range of ways heritage is understood and experienced *outside* of the AHD.

Method

Drawing on arguments advanced by Fiske (1989, p. 2), Q methodology rests on the proposition that there will *always* be elements of heritage that are constructed by 'quieter' voices. It thus presents a mechanism by which to trace those quieter voices and unpack a fuller picture of the complex weave of meanings and interpretations regarding heritage, *even though* some storylines may be obscured or foreclosed by those more dominant in a policy sense. While a central aim of this article is to unpack intuitively obvious constructs (Butteriss *et al.*, 2001, p. 51), such as the AHD, it also aims to move beyond a simple 'either-or' situation and offer a means by which to transgress the sanctified boundaries imposed between a hegemonic discourse and its opposition.

Concourse

As this study aims to draw out an understanding of heritage extending beyond the technical/procedural elements of management most often found in the literature, the concourse of statements needed to be carefully put together. The statements gathered draw from a variety of written sources, including primary material derived from policy documents, reports and Acts of Legislation, and secondary material gathered from newspapers, magazines, journal articles, advocacy papers, internet discussion forums, website home pages, dictionaries and television documentaries. This material was supplemented by quotes acquired from in-depth interview transcripts undertaken with 34 individuals. Bearing in mind that a completely random reduction of the concourse to a Q sample runs the risk of inadvertently under- or over-exposing a particular discourse (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 28; Brown, 1996; Addams, 2000, p. 20), this analysis is based upon the semi-structured reduction technique used by Dryzek & Berejikian (1993, p. 52). This is achieved through the use of a 4 × 4, 16-cell structure for selecting statements based on 'type' and 'element' (Table 1). Using this matrix, the concourse was reduced to 64 statements, ensuring that each of the

types and elements were evenly represented in the resultant Q sort pack (Dryzek and Berejikian, 1993, p. 51; Corr, 2001, p. 294).

Table 1: From concourse to matrix

Discourse element	Type of claim
Ontology	Definitive
Agency	Designative
Motivation	Evaluative
Natural/unnatural relationships	Advocative

P Sample

A total of 119 participants took part in the study, drawing from a diversity of ages, gender and educational histories (Table 2), as well as a range of professional/social/economic backgrounds.

Table 2: Demographic profile of the P sample

	Number	%
Gender		
Women	64	54
Men	55	46
Total	*119*	*100*
Age		
20–29	34	28.57
30–39	30	25.21
40–49	29	24.37
50–59	17	14.29
60–69	4	3.36
70–79	5	4.20
Total	*119*	*100*

While respondents were chosen both randomly and non-randomly, they always shared an interest in, or involvement with, cultural heritage. I attempted to incorporate participants I expected to 'epitomise' a discourse, as well as those who have a self-identified interest in heritage issues and/or represent interest groups, including those that are traditionally associated with heritage issues, such as archaeologists, architects, conservation officers and policy officers. I targeted those working within English Heritage and the DCMS, as well as organisations feeding into the management process, including the Heritage Lottery Fund, the Council for British Archaeology, Yorkshire Archaeological Trust, Heritage Link and county councils. In addition, I gathered the opinions of community heritage group members. Equally, a large number were randomly sampled at conferences, seminars

and community heritage events. The overall P sample was therefore guided both by person-locations and subject-positionings (Stainton Rogers, 1995, p. 182). Despite random participant selection, the spread of participants in terms of age and sex is uniform, with both young and older interested parties represented in the survey. Among the participants, the largest interest groups surveyed were: archaeologists (14); civil servants (15); community heritage group members (15); professionals working within international heritage organizations (18); and students (25). While the first four categories are unsurprising in their dominance (these groups were intentionally targeted), the latter group (students) were unintentionally targeted, and thus provide the majority of 'practical' participants. In conjunction with each Q sort, participants also either engaged in short, informal conversational interviews, or longer, more in-depth interviews, both of which were used to give a clearer contextualisation of the nuances and subtleties of each perspective.

Procedure

Participants taking part in the study did so in one of three ways: (1) Q sorts were undertaken as part of a wider interview process; (2) Q sorters participated during meetings or conferences; or (3) Q sorts were undertaken individually, usually posted to people who had agreed to participate via email correspondence. The Q sort pack was sorted into a quasi-normal pyramid shape using a thirteen-point scale ranging from –6 to +6, with the former representing 'strongly disagree' and the latter 'strongly agree'.

The Q sorts gathered were correlated and analysed with Centroid Factor Analysis, using the freeware package PQ Method 2.11 (Schmolck, 2002), and were then subjected to varimax rotation with final theoretical rotations used to further tease out the factors. Factors were determined to be significant following Stephenson's (1967, p. 24) 'rule of thumb', which suggests that a factor should be accepted if two or more Q sorts provide a significant loading on it. During the correlation phase, eight factors were extracted for consideration, four of which were retained for the rotation phase of the process. All four extracted factors had an eigenvalue above 1.0 and, as such, were considered statistically significant. While all four factors contain both positive and negative sorts, only one—Factor Two—was truly bipolar, with fourteen participants negatively defining the factor and seven positively defining it, and a further eleven providing significant Q sorts at the negative end and one at the positive end. Thus, while statistically producing four factors, these results provide analytical material capable of revealing five viewpoints or ways of seeing. Significance was determined using the formula advanced by Schlinger (1969, p. 57),[*] with loadings larger than 0.39 considered significant. Table 3 gives the number of defining and significant sorts for each factor, a point that will be returned to in the

---

[*] Schlinger's formula: $3 \times 1/\sqrt{n}$, or for this study, $3 \times 1/\sqrt{64} = 0.39$

analyses of each individual factor.

Table 3: Occupational profile of the P sample

Occupation	Number (%)				
	Factor 1	*Factor 2A*	*Factor 2B*	*Factor 3*	*Factor 4*
Academic	1 (1.54)	0	3 (12.00)	0	2 (3.28)
Archaeologist	6 (9.23)	1 (12.5)	2 (8.00)	2 (15.38)	4 (6.56)
Architect	1 (1.54)	0·	0	0	0
Civil Servant	9 (13.85)	6 (75)	2 (8.00)	2 (15.38)	8 (13.11)
Community Heritage Group Member	9 (13.85)	0	7 (28.00)	2 (15.38)	13 (21.31)
Conservation Officer	4 (6.15)	1 (12.50)	0	0	2 (3.28)
County Councillor	2 (3.08)	0	0	1 (7.69)	2 (3.28)
Heritage Professional	6 (9.23)	0	2 (8.00)	0	5 (8.2)
International Organisation	8 (12.31)	0	1 (4.00)	0	6 (9.84)
Museum/Curator	3 (4.62)	0	1 (4.00)	1 (7.69)	4 (6.56)
Researcher	1 (1.54)	0	0	0	1 (1.64)
Student	15 (23.06)	0	7 (28.00)	5 (38.48)	14 (22.94)
Total (includes multiple loadings)	65 (100)	8 (100)	25 (100)	13 (100)	61 (100)

Suffice to say for the moment that Factor One is defined by 46 participants and bears significant loadings from a further nineteen. Factor Two, which is bipolar, has 21 sorts that work to define it in total, with an additional eleven participants loading significantly in the negative and one in the positive. The third factor is defined by twelve sorts, one of which associates negatively with the factor, and carries a significant loading from a

further sort. Finally, Factor Four is defined by 20 sorts, none of which assign negative meaning to the Factor, with 41 further participants loading significantly on this factor, two of whom do so negatively. (Appendix Table A tabulates defining and significant factor loadings.)

Heritage Revealed: The Factors and their Interpretations

As Brown (2006, p. 376) points out, the ability to render visible views constructed outside of a dominant discourse is an empowering act. The following analysis documents five 'discourses', four of which are constructed outside of the AHD. (See Appendix Table F for factor arrays.)

Factor One

The first factor is defined by 21 distinguishing statements (see Appendix Table B), and reflects a very optimistic approach to heritage, albeit perhaps also a little blinkered, romantic and/or naïve:

Statement 31: If you sideline heritage, you sideline the nation's soul. (+5)

Regardless of what heritage actually *means* to this factor, it is of utmost importance, a point reinforced by the significantly low ranking of statement 9, particularly in comparison to the placement of this statement by three of the other factors, for which it is more or less meaningless:

Statement 9: I would not be willing to pay any extra money in tax to pay for heritage management improvements. (–5)

Heritage is given a somewhat reverent image, which for this factor is caught up in perpetuity:

Statement 2: Heritage is an inheritance: It is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. (+6)

As argued by Smith (2006, p. 19), this inspires a particular sense of duty to heritage, embedding it in a state of continual transference that requires it to pass, more or less unchanged, from one generation to the next. This idea of continual transference has important implications for ideas of ownership, and implicitly draws upon a sense of expertise and stewardship. The normalised responses of this factor to statements such as 27, 32 and 37 are notable, and one can recognise within them a belief in a universal, common heritage (Appendix Table F). As Zimmerman (1998) points out, however, a significant consequence of this belief emerges with the legitimacy it extends to the idea of 'expertise' and those who take up responsibility for *representing*, as well as *managing*, different viewpoints and situations.

The importance of the informational and educational content of heritage is exceptionally apparent for this factor, suggesting an engagement with heritage that is fixated on 'outcomes' within the management process:

Statement 51: I think it is important that people should be able to feel that they can access heritage and use it freely as a learning tool. (+5)

Statement 52: It is important to conserve the heritage resource for the educational benefit of today's and future generations. (+6)

While there is an acknowledgment of the social value of heritage within the factor, this value is qualified particularly in terms of how people will *receive* the benefits of engaging with heritage, in the form of education, information and understanding. This is a positive framing of heritage—indeed, this 'positivity' is all-pervasive—yet it holds to this at the expense of developing a more nuanced conceptualisation of heritage. As a consequence, the factor rejects, quite explicitly, the critical, questioning statements found within the Q sample, such as:

Statement 34: Heritage panders to vulgar English nationalism. (–5)

Statement 33: The British Heritage industry is a loathsome collection of theme parks and dead values. (–5)

Statement 35: The heritage industry imposes one ruling group's version of history on everyone and declares that it cannot be changed. (–4)

Issues of power, control and hegemony are thus vigorously denied, yet it is always a particular conception of heritage that moves and motivates policy direction—Factor One, however, remains oblivious to this. Precisely what heritage *is* appears confused within the factor, as evidenced by the seemingly inconsistent ranking of statements regarding science, materiality, community and social history. While this factor accepts the more-or-less-straightforward commentary regarding intangible heritage, social value and multiplicity (statements 5, 6, 23, 64), the more ambiguous statements regarding these issues are rendered meaningless:

· *Statement 58: There is a danger that while the material fabric of heritage is being preserved, the history of the people is being lost. (0)*

Statement 21: I feel more confident in the decision making process if it is based on objective, scientific fact. (0)

Statement 24: The concept of community is recurrent in heritage policy and planning, but I don't think this focus is as democratic as it pretends to be. (+1)

Statement 17: Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage. (0)

A wave of uncertainty is thus cast over the nature and meaning of heritage within this discourse, which suggests that for those people occupying this factor, heritage simply *is* and thus does not warrant defining. As such, statements that demand a response to precisely those questions of 'what is heritage' throw the discourse into confusion. Debating the nature of heritage has been momentarily subverted in favour of upholding the central, core assumptions of expertise, the educational outputs of heritage, and the idea of inheritance and patrimony.

The above factor interpretation suggests that Factor One is Smith's AHD in transit, responding to changes sponsored by wider social debates. In particular, a three-point link can be forged between Factor One, the AHD, and contemporary calls for social inclusion. Factor One is a hybrid factor that blurs the reactionary impulses of social inclusion with an implicit romanticisation of the dominant heritage discourse. It is an attempt to respond to criticisms levelled at the restrictive definitions of heritage that have tended to dominate, without actually giving up on the fundamental assumptions that lie at the heart of the AHD. This is illustrated, for example, by an embracing of the concept of 'community', but little clarity as to where that concept ought to be positioned *within* the management process.

In output terms, such as education, the factor is far more certain:

Statement 51: I think it is important that people should be able to feel that they can access heritage and use it freely as a learning tool. (+5)

What this factor suggests is that interpretations cannot be limited to a clear-cut dispute housed within the binary model of the AHD and its critical response, but must also acknowledge the possibility that the AHD is in transition. This notion of hybridity moves the analysis away from purely oppositional discourses, and offers what Bhabba (1990, p. 211, cited in Rose, 1994, p. 50) terms a 'third space', which opens up discursive spaces beyond the oppositional. The possibility that this factor may be persuasive in a policy sense is thus an important one for two reasons: first, it flags up the potential tenacity of the AHD; and second, it reveals the occurrence of alternative approaches. The factor suggests that while the voices of alternative discourses should be heard, this should not occur at the expense of the core values of the AHD. In short, the factor compromises on compromise.

It is useful in summing up each factor to consider who makes up both the defining and significant sorts. This will be examined in terms of occupational profile, although this does run the risk of generalising particular professions. Where appropriate, nuances between particular participants will be introduced to produce a more accurate and robust picture.

The professional composition of Factor One, which I have suggested represents a hybrid discourse combining the AHD with social inclusion overtures, is illustrated in Table 3 above. This factor is defined and signified by a varied populace and is statistically reflective of the overall P sample. Reflecting back on the major categories included in the P sample (but discounting 'students' for the moment), this factor contains the majority of participants who are archaeologists (40%), civil servants (33%) and professionals working with an international organisation (53%), as shown in Table 4. This is quite revealing in terms of 'dominance' and flags up a discursive strand that must be attended to with great rigour in the following analysis. Not only does this factor account for the greatest percentage of the variance, but it also appears to find congruence across all of the selected groups.

Table 4: Professional groupings by defining and significant factor loadings

Professional group	Number (%)					
	Factor 1	Factor 2A	Factor 2B	Factor 3	Factor 4	Total
Archaeologists	6 (40.00)	1 (6.67)	2 (13.33)	2 (13.33)	4 (26.67)	15 (100)
Civil servants	9 (33.33)	6 (22.22)	2 (7.41)	2 (7.41)	8 (29.63)	27 (100)
Community heritage group membership	9 (29.03)	0	7 (22.58)	2 (6.45)	13 (41.94)	31 (100)
International organisations	8 (53.33)	0	1 (6.67)	0	6 (40.00)	15 (100

Note: Totals include compound sorters. Student sorters omitted.

Factor Two

Factor Two represents a highly polarised account of heritage, which flags up two sharply different opinions, as tabulated by the distinguishing statements in Appendix Table C.

Factor Two 'A'

The positive pole of this factor is a very close characterisation of Smith's AHD, offering a perspective on heritage that is explicitly materialistic, scientistic and nationalistic, and firmly roots its idea of heritage to the past. With the backward glance of this materialistic approach, people become marginalised due to their perceived passivity and irrelevance to heritage issues, and are considered as outsiders to the decision-making process. Science, neutrality, rationality and impartiality are tantamount to the cause, contributing to the unabashedly elitist tone of the factor:

> *Statement 37: Only a select few are in a position to decide what is worthy of preservation and how it should be preserved. (+6)*

> *Statement 12: The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation. (+5)*

> *Statement 16: Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues. (+5)*

In terms of materiality, this factor lays out quite a specific, fabric-orientated image of heritage:

> *Statement 1: Only great architecture, buildings, archaeological sites and monuments count as heritage. (+5)*

> *Statement 8: It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England. (+4)*

Statement 42: The stately homes of England, it is now often claimed, are that country's greatest contribution to Western civilization. (+3)

This materiality is affirmed through its coupling with those statements that define the negative axis of the factor, which dismiss as irrelevant the intangible and immaterial aspects of heritage:

Statement 6: Language, memory and conveying meaning are as important as material culture in the creation of a socially relevant heritage. (–5)

Statement 5: Heritage is about the intangibles: the values, meanings, expressions and knowledges— it is the living, cultural stuff. (–4)

This factor reads as an extremely robust, self-assured approach to heritage that is irreversibly tied up with a tangible, structural and grand 'past'. This factor also indicates the type of national identity it sees for England, aligning itself with the grand, impressive and powerful. In further teasing apart the subtleties of the factor, a strong orientation towards the 'national' and 'global' emerges, with substantial gaps existing between the emphasis afforded to these in comparison to what is offered to 'local' and 'community':

Statement 26: I don't see why there is an interest in local levels, when, in fact, we should be looking towards this new global world. (+5)

Statement 64: Community input is an important part of heritage policy making. (–6)

An important aspect of this factor is that it is almost entirely lacking in the self-reflection needed to adequately and critically comment upon the implications of this rationalisation:

Statement 36: Heritage is the medium through which a particular version of the national past becomes hegemonic. (–3)

Statement 11: There are a lot of people in this country that are not recognized. (–4)

Statement 43: The heritage world is "too middle class" and puts too much emphasis on grand houses. (–5)

While this factor is the smallest in terms of those subscribing to it, an overwhelming 75% are civil servants working within English Heritage and DCMS, with the remainder coming from a background in archaeology and conservation (see Table 3 above). Of the three civil servants working with English Heritage, two are policy officers, with the third involved in the area of conservation. For DCMS, this can be broken down into one policy officer and two research officers involved in a current review of heritage policy ongoing in the UK. This factor is thus entirely made up of those professionals not only working within heritage organisations and institutions, but those involved in the policy process, either directly through their work within *Policy and Communications* (English Heritage) or through their role

as researchers within the process of conducting a review of existing policies. This is a significant point in terms of the proposition that there exists an *authorised* heritage discourse, as it makes a powerful suggestion regarding the degree to which it has been institutionalised. Across the four isolated groups (archaeologists, civil servants, community heritage group membership and organisations), this factor is marked by the lowest percentage of congruence in all but one group—the civil servants. Seven percent of archaeologists associate with this factor, as are 22% of civil servants. Both community groups and those working in international organisations are entirely absent (Table 4 above). This is an observation of considerable import—if this discourse accounts for only a small percentage of perspectives, how and why, then, is it being maintained within a range of introductory heritage texts and policy documents?

Factor Two 'B'   -

Factor Two 'B' presents an equally powerful perspective defined entirely by its reaction to Factor Two 'A'. To suggest that it takes exception to the sentiments expressed by the positive pole of this discourse would be understating its response. Although the distinguishing statements for the factor are simply the flipside of Factor Two 'A', the reversal of the statements offers a dramatically different effect. To begin, this factor is characterised by a moral reaction to the perceived imposition of a narrowly defined heritage. Immediately striking is the factor's denial of both the 'materiality' of heritage and the utility of scientific investigation for understanding its meaning. This is a substantial rejection of traditional assumptions surrounding the nature of heritage, and is suggestive of a move away from the perceived importance of the historical and aesthetic values of heritage. For this factor, heritage is imagined as something that is subjectively communicated and understood, positioned and emotionally experienced in the present, rather than relegated to a neutral past:

> *Statement 12: The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation. (–5)*
>
> *Statement 16: Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues. (–5)*
>
> *Statement 4: Heritage places are relics of the past, and not places with living cultural value. (–4)*
>
> *Statement 5: Heritage is about the intangibles: the values, meanings, expressions and knowledges—it is the living, cultural stuff. (+4)Statement 6: Language, memory and conveying meaning are as important as material culture in the creation of a socially relevant heritage. (+5)*

It is important to note, however, that this is a response aimed not so much at dismissing materiality as such, as statement 6 above illustrates, but at de-privileging *specific* types of material heritage and attempts to legislate in line

with very prescriptive and limited definitions:

Statement 1: Only great architecture, buildings, archaeological sites and monuments count as heritage. (–5)

Statement 3: English heritage is made up of spectacular structural remains, prehistoric tombs, stone circles, hillforts, Roman villas, medieval abbeys, castles and palaces. (–4)

Statement 8: It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England. (–4)

Perhaps the most obvious feature of the factor is its critical nature, fuelled by a belief in equity and inclusion:

Statement 61: Following current policy, the opinions and perspectives of many individuals have been curtailed in preference of a narrow interpretation of what constitutes heritage.(+6)

Statement 24: The concept of community is recurrent in heritage policy and planning, but I don't think this focus is as democratic as it pretends to be. (+5)

The strength of this factor lies in its coupling of cynicism with idealism. The robust rejection of a particular 'way of seeing' heritage operates in tandem with a very forward-looking spirit that talks implicitly of inclusion and engagement, and an abandonment of the authority of 'the expert'. This is more explicitly explored in the ranking of statements such as:

Statement 22: It is important to establish how communities themselves, as agents of culture, define their perceptions of heritage. (+5)

What is interesting about the reaction underpinning this factor is the serious alignment it has with the critical commentary both Factor One and Factor Two 'A' were *unimpressed* with, as indicated by the scores associated with the following statements (Following each statement are factor scores for Factors 1, 2A, 2B, 3 and 4; See also Appendix Table F):

Statement 43: The heritage world is "too middle class" and puts too much emphasis on grand houses. (–2 –5 +5 –2 1)

Statement 59: It feels a bit like you can only do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right? (–1 –4 +4 2 0)

11: There are a lot of people in this country that are not recognized. (+1–4 +4 0 2)

Statement 35: The heritage industry imposes one ruling group's version of history on everyone and declares that it cannot be changed. (–4 –4 +4 –2 –1)

Statement 36: Heritage is the medium through which a particular version of the national past becomes hegemonic. (–1 –3 +3 2 0).

The heart of this commentary has as much to do with addressing the *social* context surrounding heritage as the nature of heritage itself. Issues of

disempowerment, along with expressions of conflict and contestation, are integral to this approach, which appears to pivot around the complexities of power, control and hegemony. It occupies an emancipatory position and works towards picking out the power behind the management process. This is in direct contrast to the more passive approaches of factors One and Two 'A', both of which appear to be oblivious to the hidden power of discourse. The distinction to be made here is that heritage is not simply discovered, found or reclaimed in the present for a range of social, cultural or political means, but is a process of meaning-making situated and produced *entirely* in the present, *". . . even if it does so in terms of the past"* (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1995, p. 370; see also Handler, 2003, p. 359). It is not so much the bringing of the past to life *for* the present, but an activity motivated *by* the present.

This critical reaction to the AHD is made up of three academics, seven students, two archaeologists, one museum curator, two lower-level civil servants working for English Heritage, two heritage professionals, seven community heritage group members and one professional working within an international heritage organisation (Table 3 above).

Those working at the forefront of policy within EH and Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) do not feature on this factor, which is instead mediated by community, academic and student perspectives. Important here are the two civil servants (defining sorters for this Factor), who self-identified in interview as actively critical of the current heritage management and policy process.

Factor Three

Factor Three is perhaps the most sober of the factors. The romance of Factor One, the conviction of Factor Two 'A' and the activism of Factor Two 'B' are replaced by a more distanced, less emotional and perhaps more pragmatic acceptance of the more 'manufactured' aspects of heritage. The debates surrounding the *nature* of heritage that so exercised both poles of Factor Two are dissipated as the factor concerns itself with issues of management. This is reflected in the loadings of those statements highlighted as distinguishing the factor, for which there are only two statements with loadings of five or higher (Appendix Table D). These two distinguishing factors are:

> *Statement 50: Our encounters with the past are becoming increasingly managed for us. (+6)*

> *Statement 48: In heritage terms, tourism is a great liberalising force, enabling people to both appreciate cultural diversity and to see beyond cultural difference. (+5)*

The above statements reveal almost a disinterest in heritage issues, although this is not to say that heritage is a negative thing. Rather, it is a means to something else. If that means becomes too difficult, too constrained or too unstable, is it then discarded in favour of something else? Indeed, the

sentiment emanating from these initial statements is certainly one of scepticism, in which the utility of heritage is noted (and here heritage is seen as a springboard to alleviating cultural difference), but has been compromised by those in positions of power, both in terms of closely legislating the uses of heritage, and promoting neurotic and unhelpful responses. The implicit undertone drawn out of the above statements is more clearly stated in the following:

> *Statement 53: Changes in funding mean private bodies increasingly pay for—and possibly influence—research projects. (+3)*

> *Statement 46: Heritage has become a commercial 'product' to be marketed to customers seeking leisure and tourism experiences. (+3)*

Here, the malleability and availability of heritage is a recognised area of concern, as is illustrated by the following:

> *Statement 36: Heritage is the medium through which a particular version of the national past becomes hegemonic. (+2)*

> *Statement 59: It feels a bit like you can do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right? (+2)*

Of the factors examined so far, this is the first to express such an avid concern for what other factors have flagged up as peripheral issues, rather than 'the main event', so to speak. For this factor, the debate revolves not around the material nature of heritage, nor the critical commentary it can make about the complexities of power and control (while these issues are recognised and accepted, they are not the central concern). Rather, it lies with the suspicious, almost chameleonic, weaknesses of heritage.

This factor is also defined by its lack of opinion, one way or the other, regarding the role of scientific investigation within the heritage management process. For the preceding factors, this was an issue of extreme importance (whether viewed negatively or positively), but for Factor Three, statements concerned with questioning the usefulness and strengths of science in heritage matters remain consistently neutral:

> *Statement 12: The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation. (0.*

> *Statement 16: Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues. (0)*

> *Statement 21: I feel more confident in the decision-making process if it is based on objective, scientific fact. (0)*

> *Statement 25: The blanket application of scientific methods offers only a partial picture of what is significant about heritage. (+1)*

In terms of defining what heritage actually is, this factor is a little more confused than its counterparts. While there are elements of concurrence in and between this factor and the others, overall consistency is lacking. The idea that heritage should be defined around the concepts of sites, monuments and buildings is explicitly rejected, as are all references that

these may somehow be expressive of English or British national identity. Indeed, those statements that make assumptions about relationships between very tangible and dominant ideas of heritage and expressions of national identity are very much rejected:

> *Statement 17: Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage. (–6)*
>
> *Statement 8: It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England. (–5)*
>
> *Statement 42: The stately homes of England, it is now often claimed, are that country's greatest contribution to Western civilization. (–4)*
>
> *Statement 7: The country house symbolises the idea of heritage in Britain. (–3)*

While this suggests a strong commitment against tangibility, it is not clear if it is 'tangibility' itself that is the problem, or the tying of these aspects of heritage to national identity. One might expect an adherence to intangibility as a natural counterpoint, but it is here that issues of inconsistency emerge. While on the one hand 'heritage as intangible' is framed in either a neutral or negative light (see statements 5, 28 and 29), when rephrased to specifically incorporate language, memory and oral history, the rankings alter significantly towards the positive (see statement 6 and 60). Again, it adds to the argument that what heritage *is* is not so much the issue so much as what it is *for*.

In turning to issues of management, the factor begins to clarify. Here, it is possible to detect a belief in expertise and in those institutions traditionally responsible for managing heritage. Criticisms voiced by this factor are not so much aimed at the work done by these institutions and disciplines, but, as was revealed earlier, are directed towards the idea of heritage itself. Moreover, this factor explicitly reacts *against* criticism levelled at those professionals engaging with both heritage and the policy process:

> *Statement 14: Public policymaking is dominated by technocratic, empiricist approaches. (–2)*
>
> *Statement 41: Museums, and site curation, like archaeology, have a tendency to be about the dead, and can have that undertaker's parlour feel – solemn, reverent, well cared for, but disconnected from life. (–4)*

The idea of challenging expertise is also implicitly rejected when examining the collection of statements concerned with community involvement and values, which are generally ranked very positively:

> *Statement 64: Community input is an essential part of heritage policy. (+3)*
>
> *Statement 22: It is important to establish how communities themselves, as agents of culture, define their perceptions of heritage. (+4)*

The exception occurs when this sentiment is taken further, and expressed in the more concrete terms of control:

> *Statement 63: The community engaging with a particular heritage should be the ones defining it and proposing methods for its maintenance. (–1)*

In this instance, the limits of community involvement in the management process are realised for Factor Three. As such, the Q exercise has introduced a less conspicuous, but nonetheless interesting, discourse within the management process. This factor has the feel of an onlooker, and is perhaps best characterised as the articulation of external social practices with the social practice of heritage management, or the recontextualisation of heritage in line with the idea of governance. It is practical, chooses to be ignorant of those debates surrounding the nature of heritage, and is sceptical. The malleability of heritage leaves a question mark above its utility for progressing wider societal aims under the guidance of expertise. This factor was unpredicted at the outset of the Q study, and it is compelling for this reason. Importantly, it loosens the AHD's hold on the concrete and tangible idea of heritage and asks questions of its malleability. It is reminiscent of Foucault's (1984, p. 82) warning that heritage is not:

> . . . an acquisition, a possession that grows and solidifies; rather, it is an unstable assemblage of faults, fissures, and heterogeneous layers that threaten the fragile inheritor from within and from underneath.

The links between heritage and social inclusion have, for the most part, been almost entirely taken for granted, as have those frequently made links between heritage and identity. This recontextualisation of heritage offers a questioning of the soundness of heritage. The perspectives revealed by the other factors appear so absorbed by the very *idea* of heritage that it has been naturalised. As a counterpart to this naturalisation, the recontextualisation of heritage by Factor Three, with a combination of ideas of governance and management, injects a hint of scepticism into the study that requires a more cynical questioning of the uses put to heritage. It flags up the role of promotional genres, the transferral of heritage into the realm of commodity, and allows heritage to be seen as a naturalised 'brand' that may be bought and sold.

Factor Three is comprised of thirteen defining and significant sorts, including five students, two archaeologists, one museum curator, two civil servants working with English Heritage, one county councillor and two members of community heritage groups (Table 3 above). Once again, this is a fairly varied group of sorters, although the self-identified critical input from academics, community heritage group membership and students as found on Factor Two 'B' is missing here. In percentage terms, 13% of archaeologists, 7% of civil servants, 6% of community heritage group members and none of those working in international heritage organisations subscribe to this discourse.

Factor Four

Factor Four is distinguishable from the other four discourses discussed so far by virtue of a particularly comprehensive list of statements (Appendix Table E). Thirty-six of the statements in the overall Q sample—which is a little over half—are drawn upon to distinguish this factor from the others. This does not mean that these statements are meaningless to Factors One, Two and Three, but that Factor Four has ranked this collection of statements in such a way as to separate itself. The top end of the list is composed of statements that were positively meaningful to Factor Two 'B'. For example, a belief in community input, the importance of intangibility, coupled with a rejection of the relevance of scientific investigation are reminiscent of some of the features defining Factor Two 'B'. Likewise, this factor also reacts strongly against ideas of monumentality and the privileging of heritage most commonly associated with the middle- and upper-classes. Again in line with Factor Two 'B', Factor Four questions aspirations that aim to promote global ideas of heritage above that of the local:

Unlike Factor Two 'B', however, this factor is decidedly *uncritical.*

Statement 18: There is a legacy of presenting 'traditional heritage' such as manor houses, which I think suggests elitism. (0)

34: Heritage panders to vulgar English nationalism. (–2)

Statement 35: The heritage industry imposes one ruling group's version of history on everyone and declares that it cannot be changed. (–1)

It also diverges sharply from Factor Three, in that it worries precisely about what heritage *is*, rather than the implications of what it *does*. As such, it is passionate about defining a heritage that is socially relevant and contemporarily useful, and is quite willing to ignore those issues that are extraneous to this particular task. It rejects suggestions of monumentalism and tangibility without providing an indication as to what drives this aversion outside of a belief in language, memory and meaning.

The factor is animated by a belief in local and community voices. The statements that find positive positions within the normalised sort for this factor are intimately tied up with issues of community values, social meanings, participation and responsibility:

Statement 22: It is important to establish how communities themselves, as agents of culture, define their perceptions of heritage. (+5)

Statement 24: The concept of community is recurrent in heritage policy and planning, but I don't think this focus is as democratic as it pretends to be. (+3)

Statement 64: Community input is an essential part of heritage policy-making. (+5)

This is coupled with the more obvious rejection of a hierarchical interest

in global or world heritage over local:

> *Statement 26: I don't see why there is interest in local levels when, in fact, we should be looking towards this new global world. (–5)*

Moreover, the sense of heritage that is developed by this factor is personal, emotional and considered entirely relevant in today's society. This reflects the theoretical underpinnings of research carried out by Poria *et al.* (2003; 2004, p. 21; see also Herbert, 2001), who assert that heritage is about a want, need or desire to be exposed to, and involved in, personal heritage experiences. This brings forward an important dimension often overlooked by Factor One and Two 'A', which tended to characterise heritage users as passive receptors in need of education and/or entertainment. As Poria *et al.* (2004, p. 21) point out, *". . . there [is] something else going on that has yet to be discovered"* (see also Poria *et al.*, 2003, p. 239), and it is this sense of heritage that emerges with Factor Four. Heritage, here, is about the present, rather than the past, although it does also share a sense of 'inheritance'. It is forward-looking, hopeful and also possesses an element of individualism. At the same time, it clings to a belief in what I will here term 'contented democracy', based on a strong acceptance of political equality, bound up not with issues of power and control, but with something that simply *is*. For this factor, there is room for further people to be recognised, indeed this is what we should aspire towards, and the barrier currently preventing their voices being heard is choice. However, as the following statement reveals, it remains a choice, and people are free to engage or disengage with heritage issues:

> *Statement 19: Heritage should not be forced on people. (+3)*

For those who do engage, such as those occupying Factor Four, heritage really does matter, but it is a cause that needs to remain within the hands of the people. The conjunction of individualism with a belief in the importance of local and community levels allows a very personal sense of heritage to characterise this factor. It is thus not surprising that the defining sorts that are aligned with it fail to register, or respond favourably to, issues of tourism and commodification:

> *Statement 54: Heritage is about wanting to commodify the past. (–3)*
>
> *Statement 55: Heritage is about tourism and raising the national economy. (–5)*
>
> *Statement 47: Demands for heritage are defined as demands for heritage experiences which generate benefits that tourists and other enjoy. (–2)*

Factor Four becomes vaguely inconsistent at this point, and denies 'freedom of choice' to those wishing to consume heritage beyond their own locality. Heritage is not a commercial product; it should not be commodified, nor should it be shackled to the national economy. In short, then, this factor becomes a post-modern perspective attempting to deny what many have paraded as the 'quintessential post-modern industry', namely, tourism (Urry,

1990, p. 87; see also Walsh, 1992).

Based on the above factor interpretations, it is possible to argue that this fifth factor also represents a reaction to the AHD. While this factor is intertextually entwined with notions of social inclusion, it does not appear to be hybrid. Rather, it is a pure and emotional response to the AHD that lends substantial support *to* the notion of social inclusion. It is not so much born out of it as *underpinning* it. Factor One gave the impression of duality in response, hence the hybridity in factor outcome, but with this factor, it is not quite clear which came first: the occurrence of those subscribing to this viewpoint or notions of social inclusion. What is interesting is the very high level of community activists subscribing to this factor (42%—see Table 4 above), along with an equally high number of academics or those associated with a university or similar institution. Significantly, it was to this factor that those working with the Intangible Cultural Heritage Division of UNESCO subscribed. The strong sense of the political life of a community in combination with heritage is aptly supported by those subscribing to this factor, people who are themselves in a position to be forceful in agitating for the rights of community groups to be more than simply educated and informed. The vibrancy of heritage in the present characterises this discourse, which suggests that while it is clearly oppositional to the AHD, it is also subtly oppositional to the fusing of the AHD with concepts of social inclusion. Indeed, this triggers a social inclusion discourse of its own that differs significantly from that sponsored by Factor One in its belief in the potency of the political voice of the community.

What is interesting about this discourse is the level of overlap it shares with Factor Two B, the critical reaction to the AHD. While there is little of its critical scrutiny absorbed within this factor, the two are certainly not mutually exclusive. Although this final factor does not readily recognise the appropriation of heritage by distinct social groups, the commonality of rejecting both monumentality and notions of inheritance is nonetheless deeply held. As Graham *et al.* (2000, p. 34) point out, this is because the notion of 'disinheritance' operates on a spectrum, and thus while for Factor Two B this is tied up with notions of power and marginalisation, for Factor Four this act of empowerment is less clearly defined. The two find consensus in how they approach the nature of heritage and develop the idea that it, ultimately, resides within us. Reflecting arguments developed by Hall (1997b, p. 61), heritage becomes a signifying practice:

> It is us—in society, within human culture—who make things mean, who signify. Meanings, consequently, will always change, from one culture or period to another.

However, unlike the scepticism of Factor Three, both Factor Two 'B' and Factor 4 embrace the inherently revisionist nature of heritage as central for its alignment with the present. Where Factor Four digresses from Factor Two 'B', however, is in the lack of attention placed upon any debates that

attempt to unpack and explore the power that occupies those spaces of resistance and contestation. This factor is comprised of four archaeologists, two academics, five heritage professionals, four museum curators, fourteen students (with one reacting strongly against the factor), one researcher with Institute for Public Policy Research, two conservation officers, six professionals working with international heritage organisations (four within the ICH Division and two with the Smithsonian Centre for Folklife and Cultural Heritage), 13 local community heritage group members, eight civil servants (six with English Heritage and two with DCMS) and two county councillors (one of whom is reacting against this factor) (Table 3 above). With 42% of all community heritage group member loadings falling on to this factor, it is, to all intents and purposes, driven by a distinct community focus, and this interpretation is compounded by the high proportion of community members who define and signify this factor. The diversity of professionals loading on this factor carries a message that appears to find synergy across all four occupational categories, and is suggestive that issues of 'community' have taken up a powerful political edge. How this interest is translated into policy is a question that requires further exploration.

Discussion: Mapping the Discourses

The five discourses analysed and discussed expand the initially anticipated two factors (the AHD and its critical reaction). While the analysis falls short of offering definitive answers regarding the operationalisation of a dominant heritage discourse within heritage organisations and institutions, it does offer a handful of discourses that may be seen to mediate that process. How, and in what ways, these discourses interact, communicate and direct each other remains to be seen, but that was never really the purpose of this article. Rather than taking for granted the existence of a binary model of heritage, confined to the bipolarity of Factor Two, this study has brought to the surface a further three perspectives that may have hitherto gone unnoticed. An important distinction highlighted in this exercise is that the heritage terrain is polarised and convoluted, with different perspectives clustering around a number of alternative approaches to management. The problem becomes how to identify and expose the central arguments of each discourse, and that answer, to a significant degree, can be found with Q methodology. While it is a methodology that carries a certain disadvantage in terms of time constraints and heavy cognitive loads for the researcher in defining both samples (stimulus and person) and judgmentally rotating the results, the information it yields is both fascinating and informative (Stainton Rogers, 1991, p. 154).

Factor Two 'A' is the quintessential AHD. It is concerned with materiality, expertise, patrimony and a belief in positivism. It is this strong characterisation that is found in much of the heritage literature and owes its legacy to a history steeped in nationalism and romanticism. It is also this discourse that emerges from within the lexical, syntactical, and grammatical

constructions of a range of policy documents, despite the low number of participants subscribing to it, a point that I have argued in more detail elsewhere (Waterton, 2007). The point for this article is that it has been empirically identified as operating within the heritage field. Unsurprisingly, a critical reaction to the AHD also emerged. Far from accepting the ideals of materiality, expertise, patrimony and positivism, this discourse was far more amenable to notions of heritage as a social process that is situated in the present, and subjectively constructed. For this factor, heritage is intimately entangled with emotions and personal experience, not only in terms of embodied and experiential encounters with heritage, but with a heightened sense of the political and moral ramifications of a mishandled heritage. This factor is predicated around being critical—it is about recognising the power, ideology and dominance implicated in the managing of heritage. What I am referring to here is not simply a reorientation of the gaze of history towards 'ordinary lives', 'living history' or 'vernacular pasts' as opposed to the lives and lifestyles of the elite (Dicks, 2000, p. 62; Tivers, 2002), but a wholesale refashioning of that gaze. It is not satisfied with making visible a wider range of people *within* museum displays, for example. Rather, what this factor is interested in revealing is how an equally wide-range of people *produce, understand, experience* and *consume* the heritage they gaze upon. This critical approach to heritage is starting to emerge within the heritage literature, and has been documented by Smith (2006) in particular.

While the above two discourses were anticipated, Factors One, Three and Four were not. The first of these, Factor One, has been labelled the Romantic Hybrid, which is concerned primarily with an idea of heritage as something that is inherently good. Moreover, for this discourse the idea of 'good' heritage it is fundamental—an essential. Like Factor Two 'A', notions of patrimony are prevalent, but it is not this outcome that principally animates the discourse. Rather, education and information appear to be the central uses of heritage. This factor lacks the critical acuity of Factor Two 'B', which reinforces the neglect of the power relations tied up in the social practice of heritage reminiscent of much of the heritage literature. Instead, as heritage is a social 'good', it is also a social 'right', and through this it is naturalised into something that 'simply is', no questions asked. It represents the AHD in transition, or in an alternative guise, and is the type of discourse one might expect to find in the social inclusion documentation, due to the overriding assumption that heritage is inherently good and capable of harbouring positive social change. This approach to heritage suggests that the conflict between the AHD and its critical reaction is perhaps not as intractable as it may seem. Indeed, Factor One, while still largely influenced by the core assumptions of the AHD, is illustrative of the ways in which policy frames can be subtly changed.

In contrast, Factor Three proposes a heritage that is quite the opposite: malleable, corruptible and susceptible to the whims of commercialism. The scepticism and suspicions of the nature of heritage are prevalent here, as is a

sense of nostalgia for a time in which heritage was 'easy'. This factor is not concerned with issues of tangibility or intangibility but, rather, seeks to address what heritage does, or, perhaps more importantly, what it can be made to do. As such, this factor also draws upon the 'therapeutic' nature of heritage, but suggests that it is a nature that needs to be properly and firmly harnessed and used for a wider social purpose—social order. This is an instrumental discourse in every sense. It is the sort of discourse that can be seen to be emerging in recent policy debates in England, particularly those that attempt to unify a therapeutic and inherently 'good' notion of heritage to ideals of social inclusion and public value. Further work needs to be undertaken so as to understand *why* instrumentalist tropes of 'comfort', 'security' and 'therapy' are being woven into the policy discourse.

Finally, Factor Four introduced the strongest community-oriented focus, and perhaps the strongest discourse, of all five in terms of its transferability across a range of interest groups. This factor shares much conceptual space with Factor Two 'B', but loses a little of the critical edge. Again, this is a discourse I expect to see making concerted discursive efforts in policy documents, although unlike Factor One, it is difficult to see this factor making any intertextual moves with the AHD. Once again, this is an area within which further research needs to be done, particularly in terms of extending the Q study to engage with a wider range of social, economic, ethnic and political groups.

Conclusion

The range of heritage discourses this exercise has produced is arresting for three reasons: first, it has revealed a factor that shares substantial characteristics with what Smith (2006) has labelled the authorised heritage discourse; second, it has unearthed a collection of four competing, but often latent, perspectives in the heritage process; and, third, no sense of overlap or consensus emerged across these viewpoints. While at this point it is difficult to put together a more comprehensive analysis of what these factors might mean in terms of the heritage management process in England, they nonetheless add credence to the proposition that heritage is not so much a 'thing', but a discursive practice. It is not a bounded entity that is simply passed through time from one generation to the next, unchanged and improving—signed, sealed and delivered—but is a complicated process of constructing meaning. Nor is it solely about monumentality and grand, elite lifestyles to be imbibed to the rest of the populace. Nor, for that matter, is it always a tool for education, wellbeing and self-improvement. Moreover, it cannot be conceived as a straightforward mechanism for mediating wider social practices, nor simply a personal belonging used to promote the political life of a community. Rather, it is a number of different things to a number of different people. However, in documenting and mapping the range of ways people think about heritage, as well as capturing a snap-shot of Smith's AHD, this exercise has revealed both the anchoring weight and

mutability of the AHD, which was seen to influence, in one way or another, all of the other discourses. It thus provides the clarity with which to further interrogate the heritage policy field, and a number of different avenues of exploration that arise directly out of the factor interpretations offered here. This research was never intended to produce definitive results, but rather, 'feel' the rhetorical texture of the range of discourses in the heritage field, and importantly, how these discourses 'talk past' one another.

Acknowledgements

References

Addams, H. (2000). Q methodology. In Addams, H. & Proops, J. (Eds.), *Social discourse and environmental policy: An application of Q methodology* (pp. 14–40). Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Ashworth, G.J. (2002). Holocaust tourism: The experience of Krakow-Kazimierz. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 11*(4), 363–367.

Bagnall, G. (2003). Performance and performativity at heritage sites. *Museum and Society, 1*(2), 87–103.

Beacham, P. (2006). Transforming heritage protection: English heritage and the Heritage White Paper. *Conservation Bulletin, 52*, 3–4.

Brown, S. (1996). Q methodology and qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research, 6*, 561–567.

Brown, S.R. (2006). A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality and Quantity, 40*, 361–382.

Butteriss, C., Wolfenden, J. & Goodridge, A. (2001). Discourse analysis: A technique to assist conflict management in environmental policy development. *Australian Journal of Environmental Management, 8*(1), 48–58.

Caffyn, A. & Lutz, J. (1999). Developing the heritage tourism product in multi-ethnic cities. *Tourism Management, 20*, 213–221.

Campbell, G. (2001) *Heritage law and policy: Listed buildings and conservation areas*. Bembridge: Palladian Law Publishing Ltd.

Cleere, H. (1989). *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world*. London: Routledge.

Cleere, H. (1993). Managing the archaeological heritage. *Antiquity, 67*(255), 400–402.

Corr, S. (2001). An introduction to Q methodology, a research technique. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy, 64*(6), 293–297.

Creigh-Tyte, S. & Gallimore, J. (1998). The built heritage in England: The history and development of government policy. *Current Trends, 32*, 25–36.

Delafons, J. (1997). *Politics and preservation: A policy history of the built heritage 1882-1996*. London: E & FN Spon.

Dicks, B. (2000). Encoding and decoding the people: Circuits of communication at a local heritage museum. *European Journal of Communication, 15*(1), 61–78.

Dryzek, J. & Berejikian, J. (1993). Reconstructive Democratic Theory. *The American Political Science Review, 87*(1), 48–60.

Evans, T. & Harris, J. (2004). Citizenship, social inclusion and confidentiality. *British Journal of Social Work, 34*(1), 69–91.

Fiske, J. (1989). *Reading the popular*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1984). *The history of sexuality, Volume one: An introduction*. Hurley, R. (Trans). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Graham, B. (2002). Heritage as knowledge: Capital or culture? *Urban Studies, 39*(5-6), 1003–1017.

Graham, B., Ashworth, G. & Tunbridge, J. (2000). *A geography of heritage: Power, culture and economy*. London: Arnold.

Hall, S. (1997a). Introduction. In Hall, S. (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 1–14). London: Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (1997b). Representation, meaning and language. In Hall, S. (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 15–74). London: Sage Publications.

Handler, R. (2003). Cultural property and cultural theory. *Journal of Social Archaeology, 3*(3), 353–365.

Harvey, D. (2001). Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 7*(4), 319–338.

Herbert, D. (2001). Literary places, tourism and the heritage experience, *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 312–333.

Jowell, T. (2004). *Government and the value of culture*. London: DCMS.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1995). Theorizing heritage. *Ethnomusicology, 39* (3), 367–380.

Littler, J. and Naidoo, R. (Eds.). (2005). *The politics of heritage: The legacies of 'race'*. London: Routledge.

Lowenthal, D. & Binney, M. (Eds.) (1981). *Our past before us: Why do we save it?* London: Temple Smith.

McKeown, B. & Thomas, D. (1988). *Q methodology*. California: Sage Publications.

Newman, A. (2005). 'Social exclusion zone' and 'the feelgood factor'. In Corsane. G. (Ed.), *Heritage, museums and galleries* (pp. 325–332). London: Routledge.

Poria, Y., Butler, J. & Airey, D. (2003). The core of heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 238–254.

Poria, Y., Butler, J. & Airey, D. (2004). Links between tourists, heritage, and reasons for visiting heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*, 19–28.

Rose, G. (1994). The cultural politics of place: Local representation and oppositional discourse in two films. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 19*(1), 46–60.

Ross, M. (1991). *Planning and the heritage: Policy and procedure*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Schlinger, M.J. (1969). Cues on Q-technique. *Journal of Advertising Research, 9*(3), 53–60.

Schmolck, P. (2002). *PQMethod*. (Version 2.11) [software]. from http://www.rz.unibw-muenchen.de/~p41bsmk/qmethod/

Smith, L. (2006). *The uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.

Stainton Rogers, W. (1991). *Explaining health and illness: An exploration of diversity*. Exeter: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Stainton Rogers, R. (1995). Q methodology. In Smith, J., Harré, R. & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 178–192). London: Sage Publications.

Stephenson, W. (1967). *The play theory of mass communication*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Till, K.E. (2005). *The new Berlin: Memory, politics, place*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tivers, J. (2002). Performing heritage: The use of live 'actors' in heritage presentations. *Leisure Studies, 21*, 3–4.

Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary society*. London: Sage Publications.

Walsh, K. (1992). *The representation of the past: Museums and heritage in the post-modern world*. London: Routledge.

Waterton, E. (2007). Rhetoric and 'reality': Politics, policy and the discourses of heritage in England. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of York.

Zimmerman, L. (1998). When data becomes people: Archaeological ethics, reburial and the past as public heritage. *International Journal of Cultural Property, 7*(1), 69–88.

Appendix Table A: Factor loadings

Sort #	Factors 1-4				Sort #	Factors 1-4			
1	57X	-14	08	50	61	48X	10	36	13
2	-02	-74X	13	44	62	41	-21	34	46
3	08	-15	04	56X	63	70X	-12	18	48
4	18	-77X	13	50	64	59X	08	09	46
5	17	-43	15	63X	65	16	-29	62X	28
6	14	-36	56X	38	66	55X	-03	36	39
7	42	-53X	12	27	67	48	-42	20	48
8	34	-35	31	59X	68	54X	-15	18	21
9	39	-47	26	43	69	11	-29	13	70X
10	-05	-12	45X	12	70	21	04	56X	52
11	50	-57X	10	28	71	51X	-05	40	14
12	61X	-11	35	27	72	32	-06	-02	60X
13	-01	-51	30	56X	73	50X	-20	16	23
14	35	-33	33	39	74	57X	-21	17	17
15	32	-59	12	54	75	34	-07	33	66X
16	19	-48X	29	-03	76	61X	-23	32	20
17	26	-29	25	39	77	38	-20	33	53
18	44	-45	24	38	78	36	-09	08	35
19	34	-38	38	53X	79	54	-35	19	49
20	14	-76X	16	52	80	64X	-00	36	44
21	41	65X	21	-06	81	71X	12	33	02
22	60X	22	13	23	82	68X	-09	22	32
23	09	-55X	-10	49	83	64X	03	24	21
24	72X	-29	27	40	84	69X	-17	20	29
25	68X	03	34	32	85	42	-30	13	53X
26	29	-50	30	49	86	33	-33	16	63X
27	65X	-02	32	39	87	76X	19	23	04
28	05	-21	28	54X	88	03	-49X	10	-00
29	37	-38	25	34	89	56X	-10	26	39
30	15	-20	40X	24	90	26	-30	08	53X
31	55X	39	04	-01	91	79X	-04	27	31
32	34	60X	04	01	92	42	-40	02	57X
33	51	53X	-06	18	93	30	-23	12	67X
34	65X	-27	12	42	94	50	-18	32	46
35	54X	-38	31	42	95	71X	-16	31	30
36	31	09	58X	04	96	54	-12	21	53
37	23	76X	-23	-05	97	57X	-33	06	33
38	17	62X	-22	02	98	57X	-08	03	22
39	42	70X	04	03	99	-13	-08	19	53X
40	06	-73X	12	14	100	27	-13	12	30
41	45	06	27	55X	101	20	-09	25	26
42	52	59X	14	08	102	52X	01	16	06
43	39	-39	31	40	103	72X	-14	16	38
44	44	-27	35	58X	104	57X	-26	24	20
45	83X	04	11	20	105	57X	-01	17	26
46	33	-13	13	68X	106	72X	-10	06	48
47	65X	-28	31	28	107	59X	-24	30	21
48	45	-00	55X	43	108	-84X	17	27	-41
49	62X	-28	31	43	109	-28	13	-85X	-39
50	-64X	09	-25	-43	110	26	-12	35	26
51	10	-10	30X	06	111	27	-13	85X	38
52	16	-45	01	53X	112	34	-49	22	75X
53	68X	-23	25	45	113	-23	-91X	08	20
54	68X	02	17	16	114	17	-77X	15	50
55	61X	-33	33	36	115	79X	-08	22	37
56	35	04	31	46	116	14	-76X	16	52
57	42X	08	25	-08	117	14	-80X	15	41
58	07	-02	66X	-01	118	11	-77X	16	43
59	47X	-04	26	35	119	22	-00	82X	31
60	30	-56	23	48					

Appendix Table B: Distinguishing statements for Factor One

No.	Statement	Rank
2	Heritage is an inheritance: It is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations.	6
45	Many heritage sites contain information of great value. They reveal earlier technology, architecture and culture, information about earlier environments and sometimes about otherwise unknown past occurrences. As such they are an important educational resource.	5
31	If you sideline heritage you sideline the nation's soul.	5
29	A new, inclusive and unified vision of heritage is needed which acknowledges the interdependence of tangible and intangible heritage.	4
64	Community input is an essential part of heritage policy making.	4
10	Responsibilities of all government bodies to the historic environment need to become statutory.	2
60	Oral history offers a tremendous potential for constructing and understanding the meaning of English heritage and history.	2
24	The concept of community is recurrent in heritage policy and planning, but I don't think this focus is as democratic as it pretends to be.	1
58	There is a danger that while the material fabric of heritage is being preserved, the history of the people is being lost.	0
17	Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage.	0
59	It feels a bit like you can only do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right?	−1
18	There is a legacy of presenting 'traditional heritage' such as manor houses, which I think suggests elitism.	−1
12	The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation.	−2
16	Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues.	−2
43	The heritage world is 'too middle-class' and puts too much emphasis on grand houses.	−2
42	The stately homes of England, it is now often claimed, are that country's greatest contribution to Western civilization.	−2

No.	Statement	Rank
55	Heritage is about tourism and raising the national economy.	−2
8	It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England.	−3
49	As more and more heritage sites are taken over to develop their tourist potential, the world is being turned into one massive theme park.	−3
37	Only a select few are in a position to decide what is worthy of preservation and how it should be preserved.	−4
34	Heritage panders to vulgar English nationalism.	−5

Appendix Table C: Distinguishing statements for Factor Two

No.	Statement	Rank 2A	2B
37	Only a select few are in a position to decide what is worthy of preservation and how it should be preserved.	6	−6
21	I feel more confident in the decision making process if it is based on objective, scientific fact.	6	−6
12	The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation.	5	−5
16	Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues.	5	−5
1	Only great architecture, buildings, archaeological sites and monuments count as heritage.	5	−5
26	I don't see why there is interest in local levels when, in fact, we should be looking towards this new global world.	5	−5
3	English heritage is made up of spectacular structural remains, prehistoric tombs, stone circles, hillforts, roman villas, medieval abbeys, castles, and palaces	4	−4
8	It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England.	4	−4
4	Heritage places are relicts of the past, and not places with living cultural value.	4	−4
2	Heritage is an inheritance: It is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations.	3	−3

No.	Statement	Rank	
		2A	2B
42	The stately homes of England, it is now often claimed, are that country's greatest contribution to Western civilization.	3	−3
13	There is only one correct way to understand what happened in the past.	3	−3
62	For the most part the essential thing is to have time to record the details of any discovery before it is destroyed . . . once this work has been done, the destruction of the great majority of archaeological sites can be accepted as inevitable.	3	−3
17	Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage.	2	−2
52	It is important to conserve the heritage resource for the educational benefit of today's and future generations.	2	−2
44	The cultural value of a site is equated with archaeological research value, and it is assumed that archaeologists alone can realise and preserve that value.	2	−2
55	Heritage is about tourism and raising the national economy.	2	−2
47	Demands for heritage are defined as demands for heritage experiences which generate benefits that tourists and others enjoy.	1	−1
54	Heritage is about wanting to commodify the past.	1	−1
57	Above all people think that the historic environment is vital to educate children and adults about England's past.	1	−1
7	The country house symbolises the idea of 'heritage' in Britain.	1	−1
51	I think it is important that people should be able to feel that they can access heritage and use it freely as a learning tool.	0	0
9	I would not be willing to pay any extra money in tax to pay for heritage management improvements.	0	0
41	Museums, and site curation, like archaeology, have a tendency to be about the dead, and can have that undertaker's parlour feel—solemn, reverent, well cared for, but disconnected from life.	0	0
49	As more and more heritage sites are taken over to develop their tourist potential, the world is being turned into one massive theme park.	−1	1
31	If you sideline heritage you sideline the nation's soul	−1	1

No.	Statement	Rank 2A	2B
15	National governments, cultural agencies and professional bodies still use descriptive criteria for defining 'heritage'.	−1	1
40	There is sometimes a tendency to stress in interpretation those elements of a place for which there is impressive archaeological evidence, even if they are peripheral to the place's major significance.	−1	1
25	The blanket application of scientific methods offers only a partial picture of what is significant about heritage.	−1	1
56	Cultural heritage is intimately linked to identity but this has tended to be played down by the heritage profession, due primarily to the central focus placed on material remains and their technical details.	−2	2
18	There is a legacy of presenting 'traditional heritage' such as manor houses, which I think suggest elitism.	−2	2
23	Assessing the social value of heritage is as important as assessing the archaeological significance of it.	−2	2
38	The past is endlessly constructed in and through the present.	−2	2
58	There is a danger that while the material fabric of heritage is being preserved, the history of the people is being lost.	−2	2
63	The community engaging with a particular heritage should be the ones defining it and proposing methods for its maintenance.	−2	2
60	Oral history offers a tremendous potential for constructing and understanding the meaning of English heritage and history.	−3	3
28	Full importance must be accorded to the intangible heritage, which is still largely neglected in favour of the monumental vision of the heritage.	−3	3
36	Heritage is the medium through which a particular version of the national past becomes hegemonic.	−3	3
11	There are a lot of people in this country that are not recognized.	−4	4
59	It feels a bit like you can only do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right?	−4	4
5	Heritage is about the intangibles: the values, meanings, expressions and knowledges—it is the living, cultural stuff.	−4	4

No.	Statement	Rank	
		2A	*2B*
43	The heritage world is 'too middle-class' and puts too much emphasis on grand houses.	−5	5
22	It is important to establish how communities themselves, as agents of culture, define their perceptions of heritage.	−5	5
6	Language, memory and conveying meaning are as important as material culture, in the creation of a socially relevant heritage.	−5	5
24	The concept of community is recurrent in heritage policy and planning, but I don't think this focus is as democratic as it pretends to be.	−5	5
61	Following current policy, the opinions and perspectives of many individuals have been curtailed in preference of a narrow interpretation of what constitutes heritage.	−6	6
64	Community input is an essential part of heritage policy making.	−6	6

Appendix Table D: Distinguishing statements for Factor Three

No.	Statement	Rank
50	Our encounters with the past are becoming increasingly managed for us.	6
48	In heritage terms, tourism is a great liberalising force, enabling people to both appreciate cultural diversity and to see beyond cultural difference.	5
20	Nostalgia and escapism are innocent, but every now and then there is a touch of the neurotic in the national discussion of heritage.	3
53	Changes in funding mean private bodies increasingly pay for—and possibly influence—research projects.	3
46	Heritage has become a commercial 'product' to be marketed to customers seeking leisure and tourism experiences.	3
64	Community input is an essential part of heritage policy making.	3
36	Heritage is the medium through which a particular version of the national past becomes hegemonic.	2

No.	Statement	Rank
59	It feels a bit like you can only do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right?	2
23	Assessing the social value of heritage is as important as assessing the archaeological significance of it.	2
58	There is a danger that while the material fabric of heritage is being preserved, the history of the people is being lost.	2
18	There is a legacy of presenting 'traditional heritage' such as manor houses, which I think suggest elitism.	1
27	World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located.	0
55	Heritage is about tourism and raising the national economy.	0
16	Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues.	0
12	The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation.	0
5	Heritage is about the intangibles: The values, meanings, expressions and knowledges – it is the living, cultural stuff.	−1
63	The community engaging with a particular heritage should be the ones defining it and proposing methods for its maintenance.	−1
54	Heritage is about wanting to commodify the past.	−1
9	I would not be willing to pay any extra money in tax to pay for heritage management improvements.	−2
3	English heritage is made up of spectacular structural remains, prehistoric tombs, stone circles, hillforts, roman villas, medieval abbeys, castles, and palaces.	−3
30	The permanent protection of World Heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole.	−3
37	Only a select few are in a position to decide what is worthy of preservation and how it should be preserved.	−3
31	If you sideline heritage you sideline the nation's soul.	−4

No.	Statement	Rank
41	Museums, and site curation, like archaeology, have a tendency to be about the dead, and can have that undertaker's parlour feel—solemn, reverent, well cared for, but disconnected from life.	−4
8	It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England.	−5
62	For the most part the essential thing is to have time to record the details of any discovery before it is destroyed . . . once this work has been done, the destruction of the great majority of archaeological sites can be accepted as inevitable.	−5
13	There is only one correct way to understand what happened in the past.	−5
4	Heritage places are relics of the past, and not places with living cultural value.	−5
17	Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage.	−6

Appendix Table E: Distinguishing statements for Factor Four

No.	Statement	Rank
38	The past is endlessly constructed in and through the present.	6
64	Community input is an essential part of heritage policy making.	5
28	Full importance must be accorded to the intangible heritage, which is still largely neglected in favour of the monumental vision of the heritage.	4
25	The blanket application of scientific methods offers only a partial picture of what is significant about heritage.	4
19	Heritage should not be forced on people.	3
56	Cultural heritage is intimately linked to identity but this has tended to be played down by the heritage profession, due primarily to the central focus placed on material remains and their technical details.	3
52	It is important to conserve the heritage resource for the educational benefit of today's and future generations.	3

No.	Statement	Rank
58	There is a danger that while the material fabric of heritage is being preserved, the history of the people is being lost.	2
11	There are a lot of people in this country that are not recognized.	2
29	A new, inclusive and unified vision of heritage is needed which acknowledges the interdependence of tangible and intangible heritage.	2
40	There is sometimes a tendency to stress in interpretation those elements of a place for which there is impressive archaeological evidence, even if they are peripheral to the place's major significance.	2
46	Heritage has become a commercial 'product' to be marketed to customers seeking leisure and tourism experiences.	2
43	The heritage world is 'too middle-class' and puts too much emphasis on grand houses	1
50	Our encounters with the past are becoming increasingly managed for us.	1
41	Museums, and site curation, like archaeology, have a tendency to be about the dead, and can have that undertaker's parlour feel—solemn, reverent, well cared for, but disconnected from life	1
31	If you sideline heritage you sideline the nation's soul.	1
61	Following current policy, the opinions and perspectives of many individuals have been curtailed in preference of a narrow interpretation of what constitutes heritage.	0
59	It feels a bit like you can only do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right?	0
18	There is a legacy of presenting 'traditional heritage' such as manor houses, which I think suggests elitism.	0
57	Above all people think that the historic environment is vital to educate children and adults about England's past.	0
37	Only a select few are in a position to decide what is worthy of preservation and how it should be preserved.	0
14	Public policymaking is dominated by technocratic, empiricist approaches.	0

No.	Statement	Rank
7	The country house symbolises the idea of 'heritage' in Britain.	−1
30	The permanent protection of World Heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole.	−1
44	The cultural value of a site is equated with archaeological research value, and it is assumed that archaeologists alone can realise and preserve that value.	−1
48	In heritage terms, tourism is a great liberalising force, enabling people to both appreciate cultural diversity and to see beyond cultural difference.	−2
32	English Heritage is working to give everyone the chance to enjoy, understand and feel a part of England's heritage.	−2
27	World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located.	−2
17	Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage.	−2
10	Responsibilities of all government bodies to the historic environment need to become statutory.	−3
21	I feel more confident in the decision making process if it is based on objective, scientific fact.	−3
8	It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England.	−4
16	Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues.	−4
55	Heritage is about tourism and raising the national economy.	−5
12	The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation.	−5
26	I don't see why there is interest in local levels when, in fact, we should be looking towards this new global world.	−5

Appendix Table F: Factor array

No	Statement	Factor 1	2A	2B	3	4
1	Only great architecture, buildings, archaeological sites and monuments count as heritage.	−5	5	−5	−6	−6
2	Heritage is an inheritance: It is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations.	6	3	−3	5	5
3	English heritage is made up of spectacular structural remains, prehistoric tombs, stone circles, hillforts, roman villas, medieval abbeys, castles, and palaces.	0	4	−4	−3	−1
4	Heritage places are relicts of the past, and not places with living cultural value.	−6	4	−4	−5	−5
5	Heritage is about the intangibles: The values, meanings, expressions and knowledges—it is the living, cultural stuff.	3	−4	4	−1	2
6	Language, memory and conveying meaning are as important as material culture, in the creation of a socially relevant heritage.	3	−5	5	5	6
7	The country house symbolises the idea of 'heritage' in Britain.	−3	1	−1	−3	−1
8	It is perhaps in our country houses and churches that one comes closest to the spirit of England.	−3	4	−4	−5	−4
9	I would not be willing to pay any extra money in tax to pay for heritage management improvements.	−5	0	0	−2	−4
10	Responsibilities of all government bodies to the historic environment need to become statutory.	2	0	0	1	−3
11	There are a lot of people in this country that are not recognized.	1	−4	4	0	2
12	The best way to understand the past is through scientific investigation.	−2	5	−5	0	−5
13	There is only one correct way to understand what happened in the past.	−6	3	−3	−5	−6

		Factor				
No	*Statement*	*1*	*2A*	*2B*	*3*	*4*
14	Public policymaking is dominated by technocratic, empiricist approaches.	–1	–3	3	–2	0
15	National governments, cultural agencies and professional bodies still use descriptive criteria for defining 'heritage'.	0	–1	1	1	1
16	Scientific enquiry is neutral in terms of matters pertaining to social, economic, ethical and emotional issues.	–2	5	–5	0	–4
17	Traditional historic towns and beauty spots are correctly symbolic of England's heritage.	0	2	–2	–6	–2
18	There is a legacy of presenting 'traditional heritage' such as manor houses, which I think suggests elitism.	–1	–2	2	1	0
19	Heritage should not be forced on people.	1	1	1	1	3
20	Nostalgia and escapism are innocent, but every now and then there is a touch of the neurotic in the national discussion of heritage.	–1	0	0	3	–1
21	I feel more confident in the decision making process if it is based on objective, scientific fact.	0	6	–6	0	–3
22	It is important to establish how communities themselves, as agents of culture, define their perceptions of heritage.	4	–5	5	4	5
23	Assessing the social value of heritage is as important as assessing the archaeological significance of it.	5	–2	2	2	4
24	The concept of community is recurrent in heritage policy and planning, but I don't think this focus is as democratic as it pretends to be.	1	–5	5	4	3
25	The blanket application of scientific methods offers only a partial picture of what is significant about heritage.	1	–1	1	1	4
26	I don't see why there is interest in local levels when, in fact, we should be looking towards this new global world.	–4	5	–5	–3	–5

No	Statement	Factor				
		1	2A	2B	3	4
27	World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located.	4	4	–4	0	–2
28	Full importance must be accorded to the intangible heritage, which is still largely neglected in favour of the monumental vision of the heritage.	2	–3	3	1	4
29	A new, inclusive and unified vision of heritage is needed which acknowledges the interdependence of tangible and intangible heritage.	4	–1	1	–2	2
30	The permanent protection of World Heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole.	3	2	–2	–3	–1
31	If you sideline heritage you sideline the nation's soul.	5	–1	1	–4	1
32	English Heritage is working to give everyone the chance to enjoy, understand and feel a part of England's heritage.	2	3	–3	2	–2
33	The British heritage industry is a loathsome collection of theme parks and dead values.	–5	–3	3	2	–3
34	Heritage panders to vulgar English nationalism.	–5	–1	1	–1	–2
35	The heritage industry imposes one ruling group's version of history on everyone and declares that it cannot be changed.	–4	–4	4	–2	–1
36	Heritage is the medium through which a particular version of the national past becomes hegemonic.	–1	–3	3	2	0
37	Only a select few are in a position to decide what is worthy of preservation and how it should be preserved.	–4	6	–6	–3	0
38	The past is endlessly constructed in and through the present.	3	–2	2	4	6
39	Our heritage and arts represent much of our wealth in the full financial sense of the word.	1	1	–1	–1	–2

No	Statement	Factor				
		1	2A	2B	3	4
40	There is sometimes a tendency to stress in interpretation those elements of a place for which there is impressive archaeological evidence, even if they are peripheral to the place's major significance.	1	−1	1	0	2
41	Museums, and site curation, like archaeology, have a tendency to be about the dead, and can have that undertaker's parlour feel—solemn, reverent, well cared for, but disconnected from life.	−2	0	0	−4	1
42	The stately homes of England, it is now often claimed, are that country's greatest contribution to Western civilization.	−2	3	−3	−4	−4
43	The heritage world is 'too middle-class' and puts too much emphasis on grand houses.	−2	−5	5	−2	1
44	The cultural value of a site is equated with archaeological research value, and it is assumed that archaeologists alone can realise and preserve that value.	−4	2	−2	−2	−1
45	Many heritage sites contain information of great value. They reveal earlier technology, architecture and culture, information about earlier environments and sometimes about otherwise unknown past occurrences. As such they are an important educational resource.	5	2	−2	3	4
46	Heritage has become a commercial 'product' to be marketed to customers seeking leisure and tourism experiences.	−1	0	0	3	2
47	Demands for heritage are defined as demands for heritage experiences which generate benefits that tourists and others enjoy.	0	1	−1	0	−1
48	In heritage terms, tourism is a great liberalising force, enabling people to both appreciate cultural diversity and to see beyond cultural difference.	2	1	−1	1	1
49	As more and more heritage sites are taken over to develop their tourist potential, the world is being turned into one massive theme park.	−3	−1	1	1	1

No	Statement	Factor				
		1	2A	2B	3	4
50	Our encounters with the past are becoming increasingly managed for us.	0	0	0	6	1
51	I think it is important that people should be able to feel that they can access heritage and use it freely as a learning tool.	5	0	0	5	1
52	It is important to conserve the heritage resource for the educational benefit of today's and future generations.	6	2	–2	6	3
53	Changes in funding mean private bodies increasingly pay for—and possibly influence—research projects.	1	0	0	3	0
54	Heritage is about wanting to commodify the past.	–3	1	–1	–1	–3
55	Heritage is about tourism and raising the national economy.	–2	2	–2	0	–5
56	Cultural heritage is intimately linked to identity but this has tended to be played down by the heritage profession, due primarily to the central focus placed on material remains and their technical details.	0	–2	2	–1	3
57	Above all people think that the historic environment is vital to educate children and adults about England's past.	3	1	–1	2	0
58	There is a danger that while the material fabric of heritage is being preserved, the history of the people is being lost.	0	–2	2	2	2
59	It feels a bit like you can only do something the English Heritage way, but who says they are right?	–1	–4	4	2	0
60	Oral history offers a tremendous potential for constructing and understanding the meaning of English heritage and history.	2	–3	3	4	3
61	Following current policy, the opinions and perspectives of many individuals have been curtailed in preference of a narrow interpretation of what constitutes heritage.	–1	–6	6	–1	0

No	Statement	Factor				
		1	2A	2B	3	4
62	For the most part the essential thing is to have time to record the details of any discovery before it is destroyed. . . once this work has been done, the destruction of the great majority of archaeological sites can be accepted as inevitable.	−3	3	−3	−5	−3
63	The community engaging with a particular heritage should be the ones defining it and proposing methods for its maintenance.	2	−2	2	−1	1
64	Community input is an essential part of heritage policy making.	4	−6	6	3	5