

The value and meaning of young people's engagements with heritage

Item Type	Research report
Authors	Blamire, Joshua;Rees, James;Sojka, Bozena;Elkington, Rob
Citation	Blamire, J., Rees, J., Sojka, B. and Elkington, R. (2022) The value and meaning of young people's engagements with heritage. Institute for Community Research & Development with Arts Connect and Historic England.
Publisher	Institute for Community Research and Development, University of Wolverhampton
Download date	2025-05-24 06:54:25
License	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/2436/625054

THE VALUE AND MEANING OF YOUNG PEOPLE'S ENGAGEMENT WITH HERITAGE

LITERATURE REVIEW

June 2022

Institute for Community Research & Development with Arts Connect and Historic
England



Historic England



arts connect

Executive Summary

Historic England (HE) commissioned the Institute for Community Research & Development (ICRD) and Arts Connect to explore young people's engagement with heritage through a two-part study; first, a review of existing evidence concerning young people, heritage, and heritage programmes which will inform, two, qualitative research with young people to further explore these themes.

There is a lack of evidence regarding the effectiveness of programmes which aim to engage young people with heritage; while some anecdotal knowledge suggests that this work is powerful in engaging young people and does support a range of personal, social, health and learning benefits, there is an overall weak evidence base to support these claims. Or, at least, that evidence is retained across a multitude of individual project evaluation reports and other 'grey' literature which is not easily accessible or made actionable to the sector as a whole. The task, then, is to construct a single, authoritative body of evidence which brings together the learning in a coherent and actionable way.

Moreover, very little is known about engaging young people in their local heritage outside of the more obvious existing structures such as formal education, heritage venues, and museums. Meanwhile, there are also signs of an upswell of interest in heritage matters and emerging questions about who gets to define what heritage is, and these require further exploration. Finally, there is also a big gap around other forms of informal engagement, particularly that which is local and place-based.

Aims

- To conduct a **literature review** concerning young people's engagement with heritage and the historic environment which will inform primary data collection in Summer 2022
- To follow-up by conducting fieldwork with young people to further explore these issues
- To publish a report which collates existing research on the topic which can be accessed across the heritage and cultural sectors in order to influence the ambition, design and focus of work engaging young people with heritage

Key Findings

- ICRD/Arts Connect circulated a call for research/reports; over 100 items were received. This was combined with a review of relevant academic and policy-focused literature
- While there is a well-established body of evidence concerning arts-related activities and themes of personal development, skills, identity, belonging, social inclusion, social cohesion, health and wellbeing, the evidence concerning heritage and young people is less developed
- While we located some evidence about outcomes pertaining to enjoyment, skills development, and learning about heritage, this evidence is largely confined to individual project evaluation reports which are not immediately accessible or actionable to the sector as a whole

- Another challenge is that the evidence is not robust and relies primarily on staff reporting, participant self-reporting and survey data
- Learning more about these benefits is vital at a time when heritage organisations are seeking to engage a wider and younger audience and wish to state the case for the broader societal benefits that arise from engagements with heritage
- This also coincides with debates about the need for a more holistic approach to education, with many young people themselves embracing the opportunity to develop the ‘soft’ skills associated with such activities
- We have also documented the key opportunities and challenges facing young people, the heritage and youth sectors, and funders in terms of developing this work
- Meanwhile, these proclaimed benefits are rarely brought into conversation with key policy hooks such as social and cultural capital, inequality and, more recently, ‘left behind’ places and the Levelling Up agenda – further research must address this
- There is scope to develop a distinctive grant-making programme that develops heritage work with young people set within this wider policy context

Authors

This review was written by Dr Joshua Blamire with input from Dr James Rees and Dr Bozena Sojka (ICRD), and Rob Elkington (Arts Connect).

The Institute for Community Research and Development (ICRD) works with and in local communities to deliver effective community-based transformational projects, drive policy developments, and to promote social mobility. ICRD uses interdisciplinary expertise to affect positive change by working collaboratively with local communities and partnership networks.

Arts Connect has a mission to lead change in provision and access to high quality creative opportunities for young people, especially those who are disadvantaged and have the highest barriers to engagement. In pursuing this mission we aim to democratise the benefits of creativity and culture for children and young people and to build their agency to lead and influence change. We design and deliver large scale creative and development programmes across the West Midlands that cover first creative experiences for young children to accessing a career in the industry (www.artsconnect.co.uk).

Acknowledgements

We would like to sincerely thank everyone who responded to our call for evidence without which this work would not have been possible. We would also like to thank the steering group for their valuable support and contribution to the review: Sandra Stancliffe, Lois Gyves and Emma Forsyth (Historic England); Rosi Lister and Marie Millward (IVE); Kelly Allen (Curious Minds); Sally Clifford (North Yorkshire Youth); Bill Griffiths (Tyne and Wear Museums).

Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Authors.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	iv
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Defining Young People and Heritage	1
3. Engaging Young People with Heritage	2
3.1 <i>The success of arts</i>	2
3.2 <i>The importance of heritage</i>	3
3.3 <i>The contribution of heritage to society</i>	3
3.4 <i>Young people are underrepresented</i>	4
3.5 <i>The barriers that young people face</i>	5
3.6 <i>Listening to young people</i>	5
3.7 <i>What do young people think about heritage?</i>	6
3.8 <i>Young people engaging with heritage</i>	6
4. Specific Heritage Programmes for Young People	7
4.1 <i>Young Roots</i>	7
4.2 <i>Kick the Dust</i>	10
4.3 <i>Heritage Schools</i>	10
5. Outcomes.....	11
6. Summarising the Learning.....	16
7. Key Challenges.....	18
8. Conclusion: The Gaps in Knowledge.....	20
Bibliography.....	22
Appendices.....	28

1. Introduction

A call for reports was circulated widely in November 2021, and over 100 items were received including individual programme and project evaluation reports, project summaries, case studies and examples of project output (such as YouTube videos, e-Books, blogs, and reports) as well as industry blogs and links to project websites. See **Appendix A** for the call, **Appendix B** for further details on the methodology, and **Appendix C** for a summary of the material received. It should be noted that the material reviewed is by no means universal – in fact, one particular difficulty is accessing historic evidence regarding programmes engaging young people with heritage – and there is also a substantial range in the quality of evidence received, with the existing evidence base relying predominantly on staff reporting, participant self-reporting and basic survey data. Nonetheless, a significant volume of material was received relating to the project brief and is deemed suitable for analysis.

This review first defines the scope of analysis and key definitions (Section 2) before moving to consider the histories, development and wider policy context of young people’s engagements with heritage (Section 3), before assessing the impact of specific programmes/projects on young people (Section 4) and the various outcomes that ensue relating to knowledge, social action, skills and social and cultural capital, as well as exploring their relationship to themes of health and wellbeing, social inclusion, place, identity and belonging (Section 5).

Alongside the review, ongoing conversations with key stakeholders and practitioners have shed light onto key areas of priority and interest, learning, and gaps in knowledge across the sector as a whole, as well as informing us about the ongoing opportunities and challenges involved in engaging young people with heritage. Reflections from these meetings are also included here. Section 6 considers the learning for programmes that engage young people with heritage, Section 7 reflects on the challenges, and Section 8 concludes by summarising existing gaps in knowledge.

2. Defining Young People and Heritage

For the purposes of this review, ‘heritage’ is conceived in its broadest sense to encompass *physical* heritage such as historic sites, buildings, monuments, objects, artefacts and property deemed worthy of preservation as well as the *natural* environment (such as a landscape, coastline, biodiversity) but also encompassing the *practices* of heritage that relate to the cultural environment including past and continuing cultural practices, knowledge and living experiences (e.g. traditions, language, identities, collective memories). We also understand heritage to be something that is contested and, as a result, is personal, partial, and political (see also Common Ground, 2020a). Indeed, we have encountered a wide range of interpretations of ‘heritage’ during our scoping review. One goal is to therefore document those programmes that claim to engage young people with any aspect of ‘heritage’ and to then ascertain how these interpretations match the understandings of young people themselves. Allowing young people to define what counts as heritage is, indeed, the ethos of our project¹.

There are also no universal definitions for children and young people, although most conceive of the groups collectively spanning the 0-25 years bracket. Therefore, this review considers all

¹ Historic England’s own definition of heritage can be found [here](#). A useful definition of ‘heritage organisations’ appears in NLHF Digital Skills (2021).

collated material relating to children and young people in the broadest sense – ultimately, practicalities will determine the precise extent and scope of the fieldwork. The role of children and young people in society has been subject to much academic focus over the past few decades, and there is a now burgeoning field which explores innovative conceptual and methodological approaches to working with children and young people (see James and Prout, 1990; Holloway and Valentine 2000; Punch, 2002; Hopkins, 2007; Hörschelmann, 2008; Nayak, 2010), although, arguably, it is work on the former that has developed at a faster pace (Valentine, 2019). In turn, this learning will inform our development of the fieldwork.

On what constitutes engagement, our review has brought us into conversation with a vast array of heritage-based programmes in both formal and informal settings, and we assess both here. We are also mindful that young people’s engagements with heritage can range from longer-term participation in a heritage-based programme with pre-defined activities and outcomes through to, for instance, their everyday experiences, thoughts, and memories relating to news topics or the place that they live, as well as engagements through social media. While these more everyday engagements might be more fully captured through the fieldwork, this review focuses on the various programmes and projects which we have encountered so far.

3. Engaging Young People with Heritage

This section reviews themes emerging from the available literature (e.g. policy reports, industry research, and academic literature) and contextualises the wider histories, development and policy context for engaging young people with heritage.

3.1 *The success of arts*

Over recent years, there has been increasing representation within society amongst young people. At the same time, arts-related activities have gained increasing prominence as a means for young people to express themselves (Harland et al., 1995), and research highlights links between improved health and social action – such as volunteering or participating in a political campaign – as a result of engaging with the arts (Konlaan et al., 2000; Fancourt and Finn, 2019), while there is also a strong correlation between higher levels of neighbourhood deprivation and lower arts, cultural and heritage engagement (Mak et al., 2021). Yet, arts activities have also been shown to effectively address aspects of social exclusion and inequality (Newman and McLean, 1998; Belfiore, 2002).

Matarasso (1997) identified 50 social impacts for participation in the arts, grouped under: personal development, social cohesion, community empowerment and self-determination, local image and identity, imagination and vision, and health and well-being. These experiences demonstrate multiple innovative and creative ways to engage young people and there is arguably much that the heritage field could learn from this area (NLHF, 2003). Indeed, much less is known about the impact of heritage; Jones (2017) argues that qualitative social research methods are not ‘mainstream’ within heritage practice and Bradley et al. (2011: 7) discovered “virtually no earlier work on the views of young people on their local environment”. This is also echoed by Historic England (2018), who identify a lack of work particularly on issues of intangible heritage.

3.2 *The importance of heritage*

Yet, crucially, at the same time, the heritage sector is seeking to engage a wider and specifically younger audience; the three national heritage bodies of Historic England, Cadw, and Historic Environment Scotland have dedicated activities and programmes for schools and young people. Meanwhile, debates about children's quality of life in Britain, and the need for a more holistic approach to education, also provide the basis for a re-evaluation of the powerful contribution that heritage has to offer (Layard and Dunn, 2009). Indeed, Historic England, and the heritage sector more widely, are considered to be transitioning from positioning themselves as exclusively interested in heritage to a more holistic role relating to health and wellbeing, with potential to support a social prescribing offering (SQW, 2020). Yet they face a challenge in articulating the relevance of heritage to wider spheres – such as health and wellbeing – in a clear and compelling way. Stakeholders are “not confident that Historic England currently has the knowledge or the language to effectively articulate the specific tangible benefits of exposure to heritage” (SQW, 2020: 32). The wider questions therefore concern whether, and how, those arts-related benefits might equally be applied to heritage.

3.3 *The contribution of heritage to society*

There is research to suggest that engagements with heritage can have positive impacts not only for individuals but communities and societies also. Wavell et al. (2002) suggest that heritage has a compelling impact on the personal acquisition of skills, confidence and self-esteem, changed attitudes, creativity, cultural awareness and cognitive abilities. Long et al. (2002) demonstrate how cultural and sport-based heritage can contribute to social inclusion, renewal, and regeneration through people feeling more involved in their communities. Equally, BOP (2011) highlight how visiting heritage sites and participating in heritage projects enables people to connect with each other and form new friendships and networks, leading to increased social capital within the community, while visitors to heritage sites are more likely than non-visitors to report high levels of happiness (Lakey et al, 2017). Heritage Counts (2017) furthered that heritage projects can contribute to a greater public spirit and mutual understanding as well as to increased civic pride and positive feelings about people's local area, while work by NLHF also shows how 'heritage makes local areas better to live' in the way that it boosts local economies, makes local areas more attractive and encourages local pride (Britain Thinks, 2015).

In terms of health and wellbeing, Pennington et al. (2018) also highlight improved emotions, empowerment, sense of belonging, self-worth, motivation and reduced anxiety as a result of heritage engagements, while NLHF (2009) found that local community members felt that quality of life was better as a result of their work. *Heritage and Society* – published by Historic England (2019) – has highlighted the therapeutic effects of historic landscapes and 'natural' spaces for life satisfaction, while The National Trust's *Places That Make Us* (2017) showed that the amygdala (an area in the brain which processes emotion) was activated by any place deemed special by an individual, and their subsequent work found a link between having a deep-rooted emotional connection to a place and having a better sense of wellbeing. DCMS (2017: 8) equally recognised that “the social benefits of heritage range from increased social cohesion and a greater sense of identity to improved wellbeing and better learning and skills outcomes”. Research also highlights the social benefits of parks and green spaces and underlines their potential to deliver multiple health benefits for local communities (Dobson et al., 2019).

Yet, although the benefits of the natural environment to health and wellbeing are well established (see Natural England, 2013), the role played by the historic environment is less well-articulated. Indeed, it is “possible, indeed likely, that many projects carried out across the sector have resulted in positive public value, yet the methodologies and language to articulate this has not yet been sufficiently developed” (Historic England, 2018: 9). Graham et al. (2009) concluded that there were no major studies which directly link historic environment, ‘sense of place’ and social capital. Moreover, where research has explored this link “the outcomes were limited by patterns of self-selection and mainly reflected the experiences of groups that were predominantly older, white, retired, well-educated and based in more prosperous areas” (Historic England, 2018: 30).

Anecdotally, it is believed that heritage projects provide a wide range of opportunities for young people who do not just learn about ‘history’ during these visits, but a whole range of other subjects are brought to life thus enriching the educational experience. Such out-of-classroom activities are also cited as examples of outstanding teaching by Ofsted, enabling students to appreciate their studies from a different, and more active, perspective. Heritage is also considered to provide a lens to explore contemporary themes such as equality, social justice, fairness, power, democracy, environment, social responsibility, peace and conflict, and rights (YouthLink Scotland, n.d.). That said, the existing evidence base for outcomes focusing on young people is weak within the policy-focused and academic literature; hence our call for evidence.

3.4 *Young people are underrepresented*

Despite the evidence that positive outcomes may arise from engagements with heritage, young people remain largely anonymous from heritage conservation policy and practice and are underrepresented across a range of heritage sites. DCMS’s (2019) *Taking Part* survey showed that visitors to museums and galleries are disproportionately well-educated professionals aged 55-75, and young people of Black Caribbean origin have particularly low levels of heritage engagement (Lakey et al., 2017). NLHF-commissioned research also highlighted how young people value heritage less than older people, are less satisfied with what is on offer and are less likely to participate in heritage activities. According to 2020 research into DCMS-sponsored museums in London, only 12% of 16–24-year-olds felt they told stories that were relevant to them. Other research also highlights how most young people have never visited stately homes (73%), galleries (66%), castles (61%) or theatres (53%) (Ecclesiastical, 2020). While some stakeholders simply see this as an inevitable lifecycle, others express concern about heritage being ‘lost’ (Britain Thinks, 2015).

Beyond formal heritage sites, research also shows that young Black and Asian Britons feel alienated from England’s countryside (Garland and Chakarabarti, 2006). Slee (2002) too identifies that young people, particularly those from low-income groups, ethnic minorities, and those with disabilities, are underrepresented within the countryside. DTLR (2002) meanwhile find that while young people are frequent users of parks and open spaces – and value them highly – they are typically viewed with suspicion by other park users and are associated with crime and anti-social behaviour.

3.5 *The barriers that young people face*

Work by Kids in Museums (Whitaker, 2016) has identified practical barriers to the participation of children and young people in museums, including: i) cost and availability of public transport, entrance fees, and refreshment costs; ii) socio-economic concerns, as children who visit museums tend to have affluent backgrounds; iii) lack of parental influence, which affects a child's view of history's relevance in their lives; iv) poor collaboration between local communities, schools, and museums. Other research found that a lack of child-friendly activities, and a perception that heritage organisations are not child-friendly prevent parents from taking their children to heritage attractions (Ecclesiastical, 2020). Where children do visit cultural sites, this may be perceived as an overt cultural choice by parents who wish to cultivate their children's overall academic and social development (Smyth, 2016).

Other research highlights a discrepancy between what is offered by cultural and heritage organisations and what is valued by young people (Manchester and Pett, 2015), with museums seen as remote, dusty and daunting (Mason and McCarthy, 2006; Bellamy and Oppenheim, 2009) and traditional heritage sites as uninteresting and irrelevant (PLB Consulting, 2001; Icarus, 2015). Equally, children have not always been welcomed at heritage sites, but have instead been seen as 'unruly' and in need of control (Gill, 2017). This has fostered the view that some heritage organisations need to better understand where young people are 'at', rather than the other way round.

Indeed, Habib (2021) argues that cultural and heritage institutions such as museums must create more safe spaces for young people from diverse ethnic and class backgrounds to explore and celebrate the meanings and complexities of their own lived experiences; this approach requires institutions to adopt a more emancipatory and transformative approach in order to radically transform and democratise these spaces of heritage.

3.6 *Listening to young people*

DCMS's *Youth Review* (2021a) highlights how many young people are uncertain about their future in the workplace. At the same time, young people recognise the importance of 'soft' skills – such as communication and confidence – to gaining employment, seeing this as important as getting good grades. Yet, many feel that they do not receive enough support to develop these skills within school, and young people are also concerned about their lack of meaningful work experience; many even suggest that it should be a compulsory component of formal education. Meanwhile, young people view social action very positively because it looks good on a CV, it helps build skills, and it helps build self-confidence.

DCMS's *Youth Review* (2021b) also highlights what young people feel is missing, including: spaces to hangout; access to a wider range of activities locally; and activities for older teens. **These factors each support the case for involving young people with heritage activities.** Indeed, where young people do participate in extracurricular activities and/or clubs, the range of benefits include meeting new people and socialising with friends; physical and mental health benefits; increased confidence; improved social skills; enhanced life skills and educational and career benefits.

3.7 *What do young people think about heritage?*

Madgin et al. (2018) have shed crucial light on how young people conceive of heritage in comparison to heritage organisations themselves. Importantly, it was the social *significance* and perceived *authenticity* of a site – in this case a skatepark – that was valued much more than its age. This conception also depends much more on a present-future continuum rather than past-present, as typically conceived by heritage organisations. In turn, the authors see the young people as highly engaged political subjects capable of defining their own claims to urban space and what counts as heritage. This work further emphasises the need to interrogate exactly what makes history relevant, and heritage valuable, to young people.

3.8 *Young people engaging with heritage*

A wider search of the academic literature also uncovered a number of studies which explore the multiple ways in which young people engage with heritage more broadly, including;

- How young people perceive and value heritage sites including vis-à-vis external tourism (McAra, 2020);
- How young people engage with heritage sites such as museums (Tzibazi, 2013) and buildings (Ismail and Nadarajah, 2016);
- How young people engage with heritage through social media, apps, and VR (Shabalina et al., 2019; Koutromanos, 2020)
- How they contest aspects of built heritage regeneration through place attachment and identity (Davison and Russell, 2017); and
- How young people respond to social and political events through the lens of local histories, memory, community, identity and belonging (Benwell et al., 2020)
- There are also studies which appraise the role of the National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) more generally (Clark, 2004; Clark and Maer, 2008; Maer, 2017), as well as specific NLHF-funded projects themselves (e.g. Brookfield, 2018) although this is outside the scope of our review
- Finally, there is a corpus of sociological literature on adolescence and young people's lives in Britain. This work explores the changing boundaries of adolescence (Coleman and Roker, 1998); changing family structures; and shifting labour markets and transformations in IT (Holloway and Valentine, 2000). However, these works are rarely extended to the specific context of heritage.

4. Specific Heritage Programmes for Young People

This section considers the development of larger funded programmes engaging young people with heritage. For an overview of all programmes and projects gathered through the call, see **Appendix C**.

4.1 *Young Roots*

The National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) was established in 1994 under the National Lottery Act and distributes money raised by the National Lottery to support projects involving the national, regional, and local heritage of the UK. In the early 2000s, NLHF found that projects involving young people were rare and that young people's groups had little experience of working with heritage (NLHF, 2003). The strategic plan for 2002-07 therefore sought to place young people at the heart of grant-making. Yet, in these early days, NLHF was considered to hold a somewhat narrow vision of what constituted 'heritage'.

Young Roots was subsequently launched to target young people in informal settings. Evaluation from the *Young Roots* pilot evidenced that "young people, with the enthusiastic, professional guidance of youth workers, could readily be switched on to heritage" (NLHF, 2003: 4). Indeed, projects which fully involved young people in their design and management, and which used a fusion of creativity, good youth work practice and a heritage context, were particularly powerful in harnessing participants' enthusiasms. Yet there were also significant barriers; heritage as a concept was not immediately attractive to young people. Meanwhile, heritage organisations were not always amenable to working in collaboration with young people nor did they necessarily have the appropriate skills to do so. It was also concluded that knowledge gaps about how young people engage with heritage present another barrier for organisations wishing to develop their work with this age group (NLHF, 2003). *Figure 1* summarises the key findings from NLHF-commissioned research in 2003 which informed *Young Roots*.

- There is a limited amount of literature relating specifically to young people and heritage as conventionally defined
- The literature on conventional heritage demonstrates that young people have a low level of engagement in these activities and sites
- Where projects to increase young people's involvement in traditional heritage have been successful, this has been aided by (i) directly involving young people in designing and running projects, and (ii) using others who have credibility to introduce young people to the activities, such as youth workers
- More recent literature adopts a broader and more critical account of 'heritage'. This focuses on heritage as expressed through identity, culture, and nationhood
- Research demonstrates that many young people have a very individualised and personalised view of heritage
- An understanding of young people's lives and of 'youth culture' needs to be incorporated into any consideration of heritage for this age group
- There are some consistent findings in relation to young people and heritage, but it must be stressed that the research evidence is poor, and much more focused, rigorous research is needed.

Figure 1: Review of Evidence (Adapted from: NLHF, 2003)

In all, NLHF invested over £27 million in more than 1,250 *Young Roots* projects, supporting an estimated 65,000 young people (NLHF, 2011). Importantly, projects were **youth-led** and **delivered through partnerships** between youth organisations and heritage organisations. Successful applications needed to show that individuals will have developed skills; learnt about heritage; changed their attitudes and/or behaviour; and had an enjoyable experience. The majority of projects pertained to place-based 'intangible heritage' such as histories of communities, memories, and language. *Figure 2* highlights the key outcomes pertaining to *Young Roots*.

- An increased awareness, understanding and appreciation of heritage for both young people and youth organisations. Partnerships with heritage partners created opportunities for training of various forms to be provided to young people in an array of heritage skills including research, archiving, handling artifacts, producing exhibitions and recreation of historical events
- Young people also developed an increased awareness of their local area and community, understanding how history can shape and impact upon their present and future lives. For many the projects also had a direct impact upon how they viewed their own personal identity
- There was joint learning as partnerships between heritage and youth organisations produced positive benefits on both sides. Direct contact with young people, in particular from diverse groups, has also helped to challenge stereotypes and negative perceptions of young people
- The project developed new partnerships with youth organisations and increased the profile of local heritage organisations. They also brought ‘new voices’ to heritage organisations at a crucial time
- There was also intergenerational mixing which is seen as leading to greater community cohesion
- In particular, ‘a greater understanding of heritage’ resonates with how young people were able to learn about community/place, compared to school which they deemed to have less application to their own lives. As well as skills specific to each project, young people reported the development of ‘soft’ or transferable skills such as interpersonal, social and communication skills as well as confidence and self-esteem
- There was some evidence of heritage-based progression following a project such as work within the heritage sector or further study, but this is somewhat anecdotal
- Follow-up work looking at *Young Roots* shows that involvement made a significant contribution to community life by boosting social capital, increasing mutual understanding and cohesion, and encouraging a stronger sense of place

Figure 2: *Young Roots* Key Outcomes (Adapted from: NLHF, 2003)

In 2015, NLHF commissioned positioning research on the *Young Roots* programme to better understand the changing policy environment for youth engagement, and to consider how the programme could be better situated in relation to local authorities, commissioning frameworks, and the wider landscape for youth work across the UK. While *Young Roots* was considered to support the development of soft skills, technical skills, learning, leadership, project management and volunteering/social action, these outcomes were **often not fed into the relevant local commissioning and strategic partnerships** meaning that this ‘learning’ was somewhat lost (CPI, 2015).

4.2 *Kick the Dust*

In response, in 2016, NLHF launched *Kick the Dust* (KtD), a £10 million pilot grants programme for young people aged 11-25. Grants of £500,000-£1m were awarded to twelve projects to run from 2017-2023 led by a consortium of heritage and youth partners. Despite significant investment over the years, young people continued to be under-represented as audiences, users, and volunteers across heritage (Renaissi, 2019). It was also considered that heritage organisations required more time to test, develop and embed high quality practice, and the result was therefore longer and larger grants. While *Young Roots* typically focused on small-scale, place-based projects involving the youth sector, KtD was focused more on **developing skills, expertise and confidence within the heritage sector** itself. This move was also in recognition of the wide-ranging cuts in funding on the youth sector during this period.

Project evaluator Renaissi argues that KtD actively engages young people in a more bottom-up way than before, and that heritage staff are gaining more experience of working with young people. While these projects are still ongoing, there is emerging evidence that young people feel listened to by heritage staff and enjoy being given more power and responsibility than perhaps expected. There is also a belief that heritage is being made more relevant to young people and that KtD has increased young people's awareness of career opportunities within heritage. However, further research is required to more fully scrutinise these claims.

4.3 *Heritage Schools*

Meanwhile, Historic England's *Heritage Schools* encourages teachers at over 500 schools "to think about using what is local to their school, to bring their local history and heritage to life, increase a sense of local pride and use the resources 'on the doorstep' to help teach the 'national story'" (QA Research, 2021: 4). Over the last ten years there has consistently been almost universal agreement over the positive impacts learning about local heritage has on pupils, including raising aspirations, improving their sense of place, an increased sense of pride in their local area, and self-esteem and confidence. Yet, despite this success, there is clear scope for further engagement strategies across a range of formal and informal settings.

5. Outcomes

This section reflects specifically on the learning from our [call for reports](#) issued in November 2021; principally, we find that there is evidence to support positive outcomes for young people in their engagements with heritage, although this evidence typically lacks depth. We therefore summarise the proclaimed outcomes that arise from young people's engagements with these heritage-based projects and consider how these outcomes relate to knowledge, social action, skills and social and cultural capital, as well as exploring their relationship to themes of health and wellbeing, social inclusion, place, identity and belonging. Moreover, we are interested in the outcomes for young people as well as parents and families, teachers, communities and heritage organisations more broadly. *Figure 3* summarises the key findings for this section.

- The projects investigated unanimously report positive outcomes pertaining to enjoyment, skills development, and learning about heritage
- Many projects also consider themes of 'sense of place', identity, belonging, social cohesion, and health and wellbeing
- Yet these claims are not typically supported by robust evidence, largely relying on staff reporting, participant self-reporting and small surveys
- There is also a considerable lack of depth to this evidence, such as in determining precisely what it means to gain a 'better sense of place'
- There is also no mention of any potential negative outcomes associated with young people's engagements; such as whether they learn to dis-identify with a place due to their participation. The evidence seems to romanticise young people's engagements
- These claimed benefits are rarely 'scaled-up' and brought into conversation with wider concepts around social and cultural capital, social polarisation, inequality and, more recently, 'left behind' places and the Levelling Up agenda which have key policy appeal
- There is also a question to what extent these benefits are really heritage-specific or whether they may have been equally accrued through other arts-based or cultural activities

Figure 3: Key Findings from the Call

Through *Heritage Schools*, local studies of heritage are claimed to bring enormous benefits for children and young people including: understanding how and why their local community has developed in the way it has; seeing how their locality was involved in, responded to and was affected by regional, national and international events and actions; being aware of the features of their local community and the extent to which they are an asset; developing their enquiry skills, and strengthening their skills in using resources such as maps, photographs, census returns and directories. Meanwhile, the heritage sector has also taken advantage of the UK Government's *Kickstart* scheme, which offers six-month job placements for unemployed 16–24-year-olds on Universal Credit. Initial evidence is slim, but for some young people at National Museums Liverpool the scheme is reported as being rewarding, helping to overcome barriers to the sector, and serving to launch a career in museums. The scheme also contributes to making museums

more inclusive places. Equally, participating in the *Young Archaeologists' Club* (YAC) allows for the acquisition of skills that benefit young people for other areas of study, leisure activities and life in general. Many individuals have also benefitted from pathways to work experience and Higher Education through participation in the YAC (Henry, 2004).

At the Museum of London Archaeology, engaging with archaeological heritage has allowed participants to learn new skills (such as photography, presenting to an audience, research skills, and critical thinking) whilst simultaneously helping them to understand and engage with their local heritage. *DIG Manchester*, a community archaeology project which took place between 2004-2007, also produced a number of personal and community wellbeing outcomes. The project was set-up by Manchester City Council with the support of NLHF and appears to have impacted personal wellbeing through stress-alleviation; physical exercise; more time spent outdoors; reduced social isolation; and increased social interaction. It also created connections between participants from different community groups, age groups and socio-economic status, and helped to develop local voluntary groups. The work of the project was also deemed to be partly connected with a drop in street and petty crime and a reduction in antisocial behaviour.

Unloved Heritage? in Wales encompassed seven community archaeology projects. The main areas of change have been in improved social skills and better communication. Young people have also benefitted from speaking at conferences and events and reported feeling more positive about themselves and others. They also learned new skills in photography and video, history in relation to their local area including people, buildings, and how the environment is changing. In one project, young people were able to visit their twin town in France, although there is limited appraisal of the intercultural benefits of this. By having greater responsibility in the project design, participants were able to develop team working, communication and planning skills. *Unloved Heritage?* also cites the **transformational potential** in simply enjoying novel experiences not linked to heritage, such as socialising and travelling. Young people are deemed to have a greater sense of ownership of their local heritage and a greater sense of pride in their locality. This has also entailed the coming together of communities where the activities are located, and the development of broader community skills. Some projects have plans for ongoing involvement in heritage activities led by young people themselves, while heritage organisations report learning how to better capitalise on opportunities afforded with young people.

Continuing the archaeology theme, *Boston Big Dig* shows how through community archaeology local people increased their knowledge not just about archaeological processes but also the history of Boston, and some health/wellbeing benefits are noted (e.g. such as feeling relaxed). The Boston Hanse Group has also gained members, showing how such activities can benefit heritage organisations. Through schools work, young people also learned about the diverse history of the town. That said, there was “lack of widespread engagement by the Eastern European local communities, despite much work to engage them with the project”. *Small Pits, Big Ideas* in Worcestershire worked with Looked After children. The project was deemed successful in developing skills such as problem-solving, reflection and teamwork, as well as confidence, while the group also became more interested in archaeology, history and their local heritage.

Our review also highlighted important work conducted with museums; at the Egypt Centre, some young volunteers went on to be university undergraduates studying Egyptology, and in some cases became the first person from their family to access Higher Education (Gill, 2017). On *No Man's Land*, research by young people has contributed new understandings about the

lives of women photographers in the First World War and has helped to publicise the Impressions Gallery. The project also sparked interest in war, and women's roles in particular, and enabled them to develop research and communication skills. *Panjab Connections*, which ran in museums in Scotland between 2015-16, helped young Sikhs in Scotland to engage with their own heritage, to connect more with their community and to develop new skills and interests (Voigt et al., 2017). In the *Mobile Museum Schools Project*, primary school pupils made gains in knowledge and understanding of the importance of plants and of other cultures, leading to increased awareness/celebration of cultural diversity in the school community. They also developed transferable skills in terms of creativity and innovation, critical thinking and problem solving, communication and collaboration, made possible through an emphasis of learning through objects rather than about them. The project also saw results in **intergenerational involvement within family** (see Cornish et al., 2021).

The Adventurers History Club (2010-16) involved a mixed ability cohort of a dozen students from British Asian and Somali backgrounds. These students had bonded as a group and had had their imagination fired by previous trips to museums and archives across London. The students helped to plan and cost a programme of activities; visits included heritage sites in London and across the UK. Outcomes included increased enthusiasm for history; knowledge about the history of London, and interest in visiting other areas of the UK, as well as a positive impact on students' self-confidence, social and communication skills. They also enjoyed spending time with friends and feeling as though they are part of something special.

Evaluation by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust shows that for every £1 invested, their activities with primary school children create £9.75 of social value for identified stakeholders. The outcomes experienced include improved confidence in education and personal learning abilities for pupils; increased motivation and engagement in school leading to improved attitude towards learning for pupils; improved skills in oracy, grammar and writing for pupils as well as improved professional skills, confidence, and job satisfaction for teachers (Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2019). Crucially, this research identifies increased cultural capital for pupils and higher social mobility potential.

Finally, a qualitative evaluation of the *Young Musicians for Heritage* project based in Manchester and South Cheshire reported improvements in participants' emotional awareness, self-esteem and perceived sense of belonging within a group (Clennon and Boehm, 2014). The Apollo Project in Ireland equally reports an active demonstration of creativity and intelligence of young people, feeling being heard and empowered, and that the programme had left a cultural legacy. *Figure 4* below illustrates specific outcomes emerging from the larger NLHF-funded *Kick the Dust* programmes.

Y Heritage – Leicester YMCA

- Individuals valued the opportunity to participate in a range of activities that they would never have had prior to their involvement in the project, such as trips to conferences, museums, heritage sites and the opportunity to learn about the history of places and people from inside and outside of Leicester
- For instance, *Y Heritage Make a Splash* offered new experiences in archaeology and diver training, both of which have transferable skills; diving fosters a sense of responsibility, discipline and can give young people the sense of accomplishment and increasing confidence to take on other challenges. For MSDS Marine, the activity created new advocates for underwater cultural heritage
- On *Spark Arts*, heritage content that is inclusive and diverse became more accessible to young people and new forms of heritage were produced. Skills included confidence, organisation skills, storytelling and presenting, as well as community connection and engagement
- On *The Heritage of our Lives*, young people were involved in learning skills in photography, storytelling, narrative development, digital skills, and report writing building a stronger sense of teamwork, confidence, and self-esteem. They also reported that their level of knowledge about the concept of heritage and how to undertake heritage research had improved since taking part
- Through *Nupur Arts*, participants were able to create new heritage content through community interviews and gained increased community awareness of Gujarati heritage
- On *Leicester's Health Heritage*, young people utilised skills of problem solving, time management, critical thinking and decision making
- Within Y Heritage, some young people had participated in mystery visit training to museums. This provided them with an understanding of customer service and how to treat people with respect, use manners, appreciate difference, and manage their expectations of how they should be treated as individuals or visitors to heritage sites

Common Ground – Norfolk Museums Service

- Young people are more likely to visit a heritage site in future, to take an interest in heritage in the media, and to seek out heritage volunteering opportunities. The project also learned about what heritage means to young people, and empowered their ownership of heritage interpretation

Hope Streets – Curious Minds

- 'Hubs' turned the focus from heritage and museums towards culture, creativity, politics, protest, the personal and community – making heritage relevant to young people, and young people relevant to museums

Ignite Yorkshire – IVE

- Heritage provides a space to express oneself, a feeling of belonging, a sense of achievement, confidence, developing one’s identity, new experiences and expanded possibilities
- Engagement has also proven an important part of some young people’s progression to employment or further education
- On the *Made in Huddersfield* project, young people explored the role of fast fashion through which they encountered the legacies of colonialism and economic exploitation that the fast fashion industry is reliant upon. “Feedback during reflections from the young people showed that they felt, in order to understand the context of current social and political movements, pandemics and the textiles industry, it was fundamental to understand the industrial history of not just Huddersfield and the UK, but also the world” (Ignite Yorkshire, 2021: n.p)

Keeping it Wild – London Wildlife Trust

- There was a significant increase in London Wildlife Trust communications content about natural heritage produced by young people, including blogs, films, photographs, surveys, social media campaigns and exhibitions
- Young people also felt positively engaged and empowered through their experiences, have a better understanding of natural heritage, and feel that heritage is now more engaging and that nature and wildlife is accessible and inclusive
- Participants developed soft skills such as communication, team working and leadership as well as knowledge about jobs in the conservation sector
- 77% of young people also feel their overall health and wellbeing has improved (Keeping it Wild, 2021)
- Partners also reported considerable organisational change in terms of embedding new ways of engaging young people in nature and wildlife

Figure 4: Emerging Outcomes from Selected NLHF-Funded *Kick the Dust* Projects

As well as for young people, NLHF volunteers report levels of mental health and wellbeing far higher than for the general population, particularly with regard to their ability to ‘play a useful part in things’ – an indicator that combines a measure of self-worth with social connectedness (BOP, 2011). Meanwhile, on *Young Roots*, young people described a range of competencies which contribute to good emotional health: an increase in confidence, social engagement, self-worth, recognising their own and other’s achievements, and a sense of pride and happiness. More recently, during the COVID-19 pandemic, KtD projects have played an important role in supporting young people’s wellbeing and online activity has encouraged participation.

In terms of wider outcomes, some University Museums also have well-established relationships with schools, and thus harbour the potential to act as a link between young people and Higher Education, though a fuller analysis is beyond the scope of this review (see Universities Museums Group). In deprived areas, the Museums and Schools Programme was established in 2012 for

primary schools; key outcomes include enjoyment, fostering inspiration, creativity and motivation as learning is brought to life and supports the curriculum. Children have also gained an appreciation of their locality and the programme has exposed children to new career opportunities (SQW, 2018). Indeed, within this context many museums have worked hard to integrate their collections into the framework of the national curriculum (Gill, 2017). Allied to this, *Kids in Museums* has launched Takeover Days to empower young people to make their voices heard by taking control of museums' social media accounts for the day. These changes each seek to shift museums towards being agents for social change, particularly for the most marginalised within society (Tzibazi, 2013). This connects to research which shows that school-led museum experiences have a profound holistic impact on individual vulnerable young people, and they also work towards community cohesion (Hooper-Greenhill et al., 2009).

6. Summarising the Learning

Having assessed the available literature and material from the call, this review now considers the learning for engaging young people with heritage. This section is informed through the literature review alongside conversations with key stakeholders and practitioners within the sector.

Firstly, there is a large and growing volume of commentary on determining 'what works' when it comes to engaging young people with heritage, such as:

- [How to involve young people in heritage projects](#) (NLHF, 2013)
- [Why Is Engaging Young People With Heritage Such A Tough Nut To Crack?](#) (Curious Minds, 2019)
- [5 tips to make your next heritage project youth-led](#) (Common Ground, 2020b)
- [Engaging young people in heritage from home](#) (Ceredigion Heritage Youth Panel, 2020)

These commentaries variously advise involving young people in the planning, focusing on youth-led content, allowing young people to define their own heritage, to recognise their achievements, to forge partnerships across heritage and youth sectors, to involve an experienced youth worker or teaching professional as well as the wider community, and to involve young people in setting the wider agenda within heritage organisations. Other key learning includes:

- ✓ NLHF (2011) illustrate how the opportunity to receive an accreditation significantly encourages young people's involvement in such programmes
- ✓ Working together with arts organisations is commonplace and really works – much transformative work has taken place over the years (Icarus, 2015)
- ✓ NLHF is increasingly attentive to issues of co-production and recent reports advocate increasing possibilities for youth representation across all stages of project planning (Practical Participation, 2016). This work also highlights the requirement for *rewards* (e.g. pay, fun activities), *incentives* (such as learning new skills) and *recognition* (such as being acknowledged in reports). However, there is some debate about the practicalities, appropriateness and relevance of engaging young people in this way. For instance, the requirement to involve young people in the design stage is sometimes seen as a hindrance if capacity and experience

does not allow within the heritage organisation (Icarus, 2015). There is also a tension between doing ‘what works’ and the pressures to innovate (CPI, 2015)

- ✓ Unloved Heritage? (2021) argue that practical sessions are most enjoyable where the young people have a tangible ‘product’ at the end. Other key factors for fun include food incentives, free merchandise, physically doing things and getting out and about
- ✓ Partnership working really works. For heritage organisations, having key partners such as youth services and schools has helped to support engagement with staff being involved who the young people know and trust. Similarly, new partners may come to the fold. However, external partners must ensure they have the skills to engage young people, and this is variable across the sector. Partners such as schools also often require much notice (in terms of time) to be involved in a project
- ✓ Young people are often put off by the term ‘heritage’ and it is often more useful to use terminology such as ‘finding the past’ or ‘history’, or just explaining what the activity itself tries to achieve
- ✓ Young people also enjoy doing ‘real’ archaeology or research, not staged events ‘for the sake of it’ but activities which make a genuine contribution towards knowledge. This *authenticity* has proved crucial in engaging young people and empowering them to take ownership of the projects and the knowledge coming out of them (Unloved Heritage?, 2021)
- ✓ Paying participants: young people could afford to participate in a way they may not have if the project were marketed as a volunteering opportunity. Paid opportunities are also an important way of demonstrating to young people that their input is valued and respected
- ✓ Early evidence suggests that interpreting heritage as personal and political may be an effective means of reaching new audiences and celebrating heritage away from formal heritage sites (Common Ground, 2020a)
- ✓ Within museums and galleries, more success is achieved when getting young people involved as curators and guides, introducing peer-led work, and getting young people’s active participation in devising layout, design, content, and explanations
- ✓ Getting young people interested and involved often depends on them having prior opportunities and engagements with interesting aspects of heritage as a child or young person
- ✓ Given the high turnover of staff and restructuring within the sector, heritage organisations must ensure that learning is written into staff training and policy rather than being forgotten as staff move roles – embedded systems change is key
- ✓ Some heritage organisations are learning to be more flexible in order to engage young people. For instance, on *Reimagine, Remake, Replay*, young people prefer to engage with local museums on evenings and weekends, requiring museums to diversify opening hours and ensuring that staff can work weekends

7. Key Challenges

Some of the key challenges to the practice of engaging young people with heritage include:

- X There's a view that heritage partners sometimes don't want to pass over creative freedom to young people – so the spirit of co-production is not always embraced – while some sites continue to display an attitude of 'education' rather than 'exploration'
- X There's a view that not enough work is done to engage those with complex needs (for an exception see *Y Heritage*), leading to a belief that established projects typically engage 'the same people' being predominantly white, middle class young people with a pre-established interest in heritage (although again there are some exceptions such as IVE's work exploring industrial heritage, place, migration, and memory). This might arise from the fact that some museums really lack the skill and/or expertise amongst their volunteer base to support this demographic
- X Engaging the youth work sector – there's a feeling that youth workers expect heritage to be boring, so it's about challenging those assumptions. Youth work could also be a gateway for a greater emphasis on working with young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) as well as exploring more contested issues around identity that are not necessarily covered within schools
- X Programmes do work when young people report feeling heard and being treated respectfully – although these experiences are not universal across heritage sites in the country with many still operating as significant spaces of exclusion for young people (examples include young people acting as mystery visitors to museums – they reported feeling unwelcome and being treated rudely)
- X There is insufficient skill and knowledge across the sector as to how to better utilise social media to engage young people. This point has become particularly poignant given the COVID-19 pandemic and the forced closure of many heritage sites – so one challenge is how to best mobilise social media, though many heritage organisations have grown in confidence following the pandemic (NLHF Digital Skills, 2021)
- X Connecting with schools is also a challenge given the increased pressures placed on teachers, although Ofsted's renewed focus on cultural capital (added in 2019) is a key hook moving forward. Ofsted (2019: 10) now asks whether schools are "equipping pupils with the knowledge and cultural capital they need to succeed in life"
- X There is also a risk that across established projects young people's experiences are a one-off and that there is no legacy, especially when organisations are working so hard to reach out to 'hard to reach' people – so the task is to build a community of heritage advocates who are social media-trained and active operating as young leaders to ensure legacy
- X On some smaller projects, there is a feeling that young people's wishes worked in conflict with those of a typical funder e.g. finishing a heritage visit with a trip to Nando's was a major treat and key to young people's participation but would not typically be supported by larger funding bodies

- X Doing more interesting and novel activities can be logistically challenging, while trying to engage and retain individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds can also be difficult (NLHF, 2011)
- X Heritage organisations also feel the approach by funders can be too inflexible – rather, their approach should be enabled to be adapted over time and respond to different circumstances (Icarus, 2015)
- X The practice of offering young people leadership roles or genuine influence over decision-making is not embedded in most heritage organisations (Icarus, 2015)
- X Heritage organisations are not integrated into local multi-agency partnerships resulting in a low profile within local decision-making processes. Equally, at a local authority level, heritage is not generally viewed as in alignment with employment and educational strategies (CPI, 2015)
- X Icarus (2015) highlight that constraints for heritage organisations include a lack of funds to develop the work, limited staff capacity to build partnerships, and limited staff capacity to deliver the work – hence, engaging young people is seen as resource-intensive. The shrinkage of the public and youth sectors is also seen as a significant challenge, as is the “red tape” of various statutory requirements
- X The problem of short-term funding is that resource provision comes to an end at the precise point a model of delivery becomes effective (Icarus, 2015) – although KtD has somewhat responded to this
- X There is too much relying on volunteers and goodwill across the sector as well as partner institutes – so this is all built on unstable ground and the learning is neither fixed nor sustainably actionable moving forward
- X Finally, there are also wider challenges to the sector more generally – such as austerity and COVID-19 – which have reduced visitor numbers and put pressure on funding streams. This has led many heritage sites to return to their core audience and to drop their commitments to youth engagement despite recent progress. Equally, youth organisations are likely to turn their service-delivery focus only to targeted groups (CPI, 2015)

8. Conclusion: The Gaps in Knowledge

In November 2021, ICRD/Arts Connect circulated a call for evidence and over 100 items were received; this was then combined with a wider scoping of relevant policy-focused and academic literature. We learned that while there is a well-established body of evidence on the relationship between arts-related activities and themes of personal development, skills, identity, belonging, social inclusion, social cohesion, and health and wellbeing, the evidence concerning heritage and specifically young people is less developed. Moreover, while the review located some evidence about outcomes pertaining to enjoyment, skills development, and learning about heritage, this evidence is largely confined to individual project evaluation reports which are neither immediately publicly accessible nor easily actionable to the sector as a whole. Our review has thus sought to scrutinise this evidence and to package it in a coherent way. Yet, notably, this evidence base is not robust and relies primarily on staff reporting, participant self-reporting and small survey data, and lacks sufficient depth in more fully exploring these proclaimed outcomes.

Most recently, in early 2022, the influential GEM *Case Studies* newsletter was published under the theme of ‘young people in museums, heritage sites and cultural organisations’. Drawing on a wide and eclectic range of examples, a large number of benefits were reported reflecting those outlined here but, again, these outcomes rested broadly on access data, and were limited to young people’s enjoyment, and personal and heritage skills development. The wider significance of these outcomes, however, remains unexplored.

There are also other challenges to capturing the learning; most heritage organisations do little to evaluate their work with young people and the feedback gleaned is not sufficient to draw conclusions as to its effectiveness or impact. Many projects also do not begin with clearly defined outcomes which makes evaluating their successes difficult, and there is also a lack of central data collection on heritage learning more generally. Hence, despite there being significant resources invested over time, this focus has only enjoyed periodic reviews alongside individual project evaluation reports typically published by different evaluators using different methodologies.

Consequently, two major gaps in knowledge remain:

- To what extent are these benefits in any way *heritage*-specific? Perhaps a deeper investigation of concepts such as identity, place and belonging might help to address this question
- The proclaimed benefits are rarely brought into conversation with key policy hooks such as social and cultural capital, social polarisation, inequality and, more recently, ‘left behind’ places and the Levelling Up agenda, in particular thinking about how engagement with heritage contributes to positive outcomes for young people in deprived areas and how heritage creates a positive sense of place and place identity within this context

Addressing these gaps is essential at a time when heritage organisations are seeking to engage a wider and younger audience and are also required to make the case for the wider societal benefits that arise from people’s engagements with heritage. This also coincides with ongoing debates about the need for a more holistic approach to education, with many young people themselves embracing the opportunity to develop the ‘soft’ skills associated with these activities.

The review, alongside ongoing dialogue with stakeholders and practitioners, has also opened up wider contemporary avenues of research which demand further exploration. These include:

- How do young people come to conceive of, and define, what heritage is? This question is particularly pertinent given the upswell of interest amongst young people in contested heritage matters
- In a rapidly changing and uncertain world, how do young people engage with heritage in terms of civic pride and place-based identities? Also, how does heritage shape their current views of the world and their hopes, dreams, fears, and aspirations for the future?
- How does heritage engagement impact upon young people's health and wellbeing within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic?
- How does engagement with heritage contribute to social cohesion and reduce social polarisation?
- There is also a question as to whether these proclaimed benefits persist through to lifelong learning, and what the legacies and impact of youth engagement are in the longer-term

Finally, our review has highlighted the key opportunities and challenges facing young people, the wider heritage and youth sectors, and funders in terms of further developing this work. Drawn together, this all represents a clear programme of work for researchers to address into the future.

Bibliography

- Belfiore, E. (2002) Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion: Does it really work? A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8: 91-106.
- Bellamy, K. Oppenheim, C. (2009) *Learning to Live: Museums, Young People and Education*, IPPR: London.
- Benwell, M. Davies, A. Evans, B. Wilkinson, C. (2020) Engaging political histories of urban uprisings with young people: The Liverpool riots, 1981 and 2011, *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 38 (4): 599-618.
- BOP (2011) *Assessment of the Social Impact of Volunteering in NLHF-Funded Projects: Year 3*, [online], Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/social_impact_volunteering_2011.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Bradley, D. Coombes, M. Bradley, J. Tranos, E. (2011) *Assessing the Importance and Value of Historic Buildings to Young People: Final Report to English Heritage*, Newcastle University/CURDS.
- Britain Thinks (2015) *20 Years in 12 Places: 20 Years of Lottery Funding for Heritage*, Heritage Lottery Fund, [online], Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/attachments/final_4-NLHF_20-years_12-places-access_0.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Brookfield, K. (2018) The People's Centenary: a perspective from the Heritage Lottery Fund, *Cultural Trends*, 27 (2): 119-124.
- Ceredigion Heritage Youth Panel (2020) *Engaging young people in heritage from home*, [online], Available at: <https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/blogs/engaging-young-people-heritage-home> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Clark, K. (2004) Why fund heritage? The role of research in the Heritage Lottery Fund, *Cultural Trends*, 13 (4): 65-85.
- Clark, K. Maer, G. (2008) The cultural value of heritage: evidence from the Heritage Lottery Fund, *Cultural Trends*, 17 (1): 23-56.
- Clennon, O. Boehm, C. (2014) Young Musicians for Heritage Project: can a music-based heritage project have a positive effect on well-being?, *Music Education Research*, 16 (3): 307-329.
- Coleman, J. Roker, D. (1998) Adolescence, *The Psychologist*, 11 (12): 593-598.
- Common Ground (2020a) *Evaluation 2021 Report*.
- Common Ground (2020b) *5 tips to make your next heritage project youth-led*, [online], Available at: <https://nnfcommonground.org.uk/2020/07/07/example-post-3/> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Cornish, C. Driver, F. Nesbitt, M. Willison, J. (2021) Revitalizing the School Museum: Using Nature-Based Objects for Cross-Curricular Learning, *Journal of Museum Education*, 46 (3): 334-347.

- CPI (2015) *Young Roots Positioning Research, Heritage Lottery Fund*, [online], Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/final_young_roots_positioning_research_js_accessibility_copy.final_.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Curious Minds (2019) *Why Is Engaging Young People With Heritage Such A Tough Nut To Crack?*, [online], Available at: <https://curiousminds.org.uk/curious-blog-engaging-young-people-with-heritage-venues/> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Davison, K. Russell, J. (2017) Disused Religious Space: Youth Participation in Built Heritage Regeneration, *Religions*, 8, 107, 1-15.
- DCMS (2017) Heritage Statement 2017, [online], Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/664657/Heritage_Statement_2017_final_-_web_version_.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- DCMS (2019) *Taking Part Survey*, [online], Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/sat--2#taking-part-adult-statistical-releases> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- DCMS (2021a) *Youth Evidence: Rapid Evidence Assessment Findings*, NatCen: London.
- DCMS (2021b) *Youth Evidence: Deep Dive Focus Group Findings*, NatCen: London.
- Dobson, J. Harris, C. Eadson, W. Gore, T. (2019) *Space to Thrive: A Rapid Evidence Review of the Benefits of Parks and Green Spaces for People and Communities*, The National Lottery Heritage Fund and The National Lottery Community Fund: London.
- DTLR (2002) *Green spaces, better places – final report of the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce*, Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions.
- Ecclesiastical (2020) *Young people shun future visits to heritage attractions over coronavirus fears*, [online], Available at: <https://www.ecclesiastical.com/media-centre/young-people-shun-heritage-attractions/> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Fancourt, D. Finn, S. (2019) *What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review*, Health Evidence Network Synthesis Report.
- Garland, J. Chakraborti, N. (2006) Race, space and place: Examining identity and cultures of exclusion in rural England, *Ethnicities*, 6(2): 159-177
- Gill, D. (2017) *(Re)building Stonehenge: Engaging Children in a Heritage Context*, Working Paper Presented to Children and Childhoods Conference 2017.
- Graham, H. Mason, R. Newman, A. (2009) *Literature Review: Historic Environment, Sense of Place, and Social Capital*, Commissioned for English Heritage, [online], Available at: https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/182155/1/Historic_Environment%252C_Sense_of_Place_and_Social_Capital_Lit_Review.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Habib, S. (2021) Horrible British Histories: young people in museums interrogating national identity through principles and practices of critical pedagogy, *PRISM Journal*, 3 (2): 34-47.
- Harland, J. Hartley, K. Kinder, K. (1995) *Arts in Their View: A Study of Youth Participation in the Arts*, National Foundation for Educational Research: Slough.

Henry, P. (2004) The Young Archaeologists' Club: Its Role within Informal Education, in *Education and the Historic Environment*, Henson, D. Stone, P. Corbishley, M. (eds), Routledge: London: 89-100.

Heritage Counts (2017) *Heritage and the Economy*, [online], Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/heritage-counts/pub/2017/heritage-and-the-economy-2017-pdf> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Historic England (2018) *Wellbeing and the Historic Environment*, [online], Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/wellbeing-and-the-historic-environment/wellbeing-and-historic-environment/> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Historic England (2019) *Heritage and Society 2019*, [online], Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/heritage-counts/pub/2019/heritage-and-society-2019/> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Holloway, S. Valentine, G. (2000) *Children's Geographies: Playing, Living, Learning*, Routledge: London.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. Phillips, M. Woodham, A. (2009) Museums, schools and geographies of cultural value, *Cultural Trends*, 18: 149-183.

Hopkins, P. (2007) Young people, masculinities, religion and race: new social geographies, *Progress in Human Geography*, 31 (2): 163-177.

Hörschelmann, K. (2008) Populating the landscapes of critical geopolitics – Young people's responses to the war in Iraq (2003), *Political Geography*, 27 (5): 587-609.

Icarus (2015) *Young People and the Heritage Sector: Research Report*, [online], Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/young_people_and_heritage_sector_icarus-report-accessible-2.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).

Ignite Yorkshire (2021) *'Made In Huddersfield' is part of Woven festival*, [online], Available at: <https://igniteyorks.org.uk/made-in-huddersfield-is-part-of-woven-festival/> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Ismail, W. Nadarajah, J. (2016) Young Visitors in the City: Their perceptions of heritage buildings, *Procedia: Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 234: 470-477.

James, A. Prout, A. (1990) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*, Falmer Press: Lewes.

Jones, S. (2017) Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage: Problems, Dilemmas and Opportunities, *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 4 (1): 21-37.

Keeping it Wild (2021) *Final Impact Report 2021*, Shephard & Moyes Ltd.

Konlaan, B. Bygren, L. Johansson, S. (2000) Visiting the cinema, concerts, museums or art exhibitions as determinant of survival: a Swedish fourteen-year cohort follow-up, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 28: 174-178.

Koutromanos, G. Pittara, T. Tripoulas, C. (2020) "Clavis Aurea": An augmented Reality Game for the Teaching of Local History, *European Journal of Engineering Research and Science*, 2020: 1-8.

Lakey, J. Smith, N. Oskala, A. McManus, S. (2017) *Culture, Sport and Wellbeing: Findings from the Understanding Society Youth Survey*, NatCen: London.

Layard, R. Dunn, J. (2009) *A Good Childhood: Searching for Values in a Competitive Age*, Penguin Books: London.

Long, J. Welch, M. Bramham, P. Hylton, K. Butterfield, J. Lloyd, E. (2002) *Count Me In: The dimensions of social inclusion through culture and sport*, Project Report for the Department for Culture, Media, and Sport, [online], Available at: https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/638/7/Count%20Me%20In_The%20Dimensions%20of%20Social%20Inclusion%20through%20Culture%252C%20Media%20and%20Sport.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).

Madgin, R. Webb, D. Ruiz, P. Snelson, T. (2018) Resisting relocation and reconceptualising authenticity: the experiential and emotional values of the Southbank Undercroft, London, UK, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 24 (6): 585-598.

Maer, G. (2017) A People-Centred Approach to Heritage: The Experience of the Heritage Lottery Fund 1994–2014, *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 4 (1): 38-52.

Mak, H. Coulter, R. Fancourt, D. (2021) Associations between neighbourhood deprivation and engagement in arts, culture and heritage: evidence from two nationally-representative samples, *BMC Public Health*, 21, 1685, 1-10.

Manchester, H. Pett, E. (2015) Teenage Kicks: Exploring cultural value from a youth perspective, *Cultural Trends*, 24: 223-231.

Mason, D. McCarthy, C. (2006) 'The feeling of exclusion': Young peoples' perceptions of art galleries, *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 21 (1): 20-31.

Matarasso, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*, Comedia: Bournes Green, Stroud.

McAra, M. (2021) 'Living in a postcard': creatively exploring cultural heritage with young people living in Scottish island communities, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 27 (2): 233-249.

National Trust (2017) *Places That Make Us: Research Report*, National Trust.

Natural England (2013) *Monitor of Engagement with the Natural Environment: The national survey on people and the natural environment*, [online], Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/4623124003815424> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Nayak, A. (2010) Race, Affect, and Emotion: Young People, Racism, and Graffiti in the Postcolonial English Suburbs, *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 42 (10): 2370-2392.

Newman, A. McLean, F. (1998) Heritage builds communities: The application of heritage resources to the problems of social exclusion, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 4, 3-4, 143-153.

NLHF (2003) *Young People and Heritage: A Review of Current Literature*, Heritage Lottery Fund.

- NLHF (2009) *Impact of NLHF Funding: 2005 – 2009 Report*, [online], Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/impact_NLHFfunding_visitorsreport2009.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- NLHF (2011) *Evaluation of the Young Roots programme (2008 – 2011)*, [online], Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/evaluation_of_the_young_roots_programme.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- NLHF (2013) *How to involve young people in heritage projects: A practical guide*, [online], Available at: <https://www.youthlinkscotland.org/media/2888/NLHF-how-to-involve-young-people-in-heritage-projects.pdf> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- NLHF Digital Skills (2021) *How do people working in UK heritage use digital technologies, and how has this changed since the pandemic?*, [online], Available at: <https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/attachments/DASH%202021%20REPORT-v2-accessible.pdf> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Ofsted (2019) *School inspection update: January 2019*, [online], Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/772056/School_inspection_update_-_January_2019_Special_Edition_180119.pdf (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Pennington, A. Jones, R. Bagnall, A. South, J. Corcoran, R. (2018) *The impact of historic places and assets on community wellbeing – a scoping review*, What Works Centre for Wellbeing: London.
- PLB Consulting (2001) *Developing New Audiences for Heritage: Executive Summary*, Heritage Lottery Fund.
- Practical Participation (2016) *Heritage Lottery Fund: Youth Participation in Advocacy and Decision-Making*, Heritage Lottery Fund.
- Punch, S. (2002) Research with Children: The Same or Different from Research with Adults?, *Childhood*, 9 (3): 321-341.
- QA Research (2021) *Heritage Schools Evaluation Research 2020-21: for Historic England*, [online], Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/education/heritage-schools-eval-research-2020-21/> (Accessed 24/03/22).
- Renaissi (2019) *The National Lottery Heritage Fund's Kick the Dust Programme: Year 1 Report February 2019*, Heritage Lottery Fund.
- Shabalina, O. Timofeev, G. Davtian, A. Zheltukhina, M. Moffat, D. (2019) *Investigating Regional Heritage Through the Development and Playing of AR Games*, *European Conference on Games Based Learning*, Working Paper.
- Shakespeare Birthplace Trust (2019) *A Predictive Impact Analysis of Shakespeare Week and the Shakespeare Primary School Hubs*, Kingston Smith.
- Slee, B. (2002) Social exclusion in the countryside, *Countryside Recreation*, 10 (1): 2-7.
- Smyth, E. (2016) *Arts and Cultural Participation among Children and Young People: Insights from the Growing Up in Ireland Study*, Arts Council: Dublin.

SQW (2018) *Evaluation of the Museums and Schools Programme: Report for Arts Council England*.

SQW (2020) *Social Prescribing and the Potential of Historic England's Local Delivery: An SQW Report to Historic England*, [online], Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/social-prescribing-potential-historic-england-local-delivery/social-prescribing/> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Tzibazi, V. (2013) Participatory Action Research with young people in museums, *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 28 (2): 153-171.

Unloved Heritage? (2021) *Unloved Heritage? A youth led community archaeology programme*, Project Evaluation Report 2021.

Valentine, G. (2019) Geographies of youth – a generational perspective, *Children's Geographies*, 17 (1): 28-31.

Voigt, F. Nicolson, R. Bennison, L. (2017) 'Panjab' Connections: A Young Roots Heritage Project at National Museums Scotland, *Journal of Museum Ethnography*, 30: 24-48.

Wavell, C. Baxter, G. Johnson, I. Williams, D. (2002) *Impact evaluation of museums, archives and libraries: available evidence project*, The Council for Museums, Archives and Libraries, [online], Available at: <https://www3.rgu.ac.uk/download.cfm?downloadfile=4E339E80-595A-11E1-BF5B000D609CB064&typename=dmFile&fieldname=filename> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Whitaker, S. (2016) *Hurdles to the participation of children, families and young people in museums: a literature review*, [online], Available at: <https://kidsinmuseums.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Hurdles-to-Participation.pdf> (Accessed 24/03/22).

YouthLink Scotland (n.d.) *Using youth work as a means to support young people to engage with heritage*, [online], Available at: <https://www.youthlinkscotland.org/media/2868/ywo.pdf> (Accessed 24/03/22).

Appendices

APPENDIX A: CALL

Call for Relevant Reports and Research: The Impact of Young People's Engagement with Heritage

Researchers at the Institute for Community Research and Development (ICRD) and Arts Connect at the University of Wolverhampton are carrying out research to explore young people's engagement with their historic environment, working closely with colleagues at Historic England.

We would be extremely grateful to hear about and/or receive any relevant literature, evaluation reports, project examples or ongoing research that looks at young people's engagement with heritage, or considers the outcomes of initiatives and programmes which seek to engage young people with heritage.

The current research project is in two parts: first, we will conduct a comprehensive review of existing evidence regarding how such programmes contribute to positive personal, social, health and/or learning outcomes for young people and, second, carry out on the ground fieldwork with established projects across the country to further explore these themes. This project will provide important insights into how the benefits of heritage-based and arts/cultural programmes with young people can be maximised and will bring together this learning for organisations in a coherent and actionable way. Ultimately it will provide Historic England and the wider heritage and cultural sector with a resource to draw upon for planning, resourcing, funding proposals, and inspiration.

To inform the literature review, we are looking for any material that addresses young people's engagement with cultural heritage and the arts, as well as issues regarding (though not limited to) health and wellbeing, social inclusion/exclusion, place, identity and belonging.

Please send any relevant material to project researcher Dr Joshua Blamire (j.blamire@wlv.ac.uk). Please note that we are happy to share the collated material with interested parties, please contact either Dr Joshua Blamire or Dr James Rees (james.rees@wlv.ac.uk) about this, or if you have any other questions about the research project. Also feel free to contact Rob Elkington, Arts Connect (rob.elkington@wlv.ac.uk), for any further information.

APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY

The first call for reports was circulated widely in mid-November 2021 and the call was re-published in December 2021. The call was shared across popular academic and industry mailing lists including the following; Heritage, Heritage Yorkshire, Map Network, Museums, Galleries and Heritage Research, YPPN, York and Heritage, Cultural Participation, Her Forum, GEM, Critical Geography, Participatory Geography and Social Policy. The call was also shared amongst the [10 Bridge Organisations](#) connected to the Arts Council in November 2021. Finally, researchers at ICRD and Arts Connect shared the call amongst colleagues and contacts with interest/expertise within the field and publicly via ICRD and Arts Connect Twitter accounts. Following this, a snowball or chain-referral strategy ensued involving individually contacting suggested leads such as academic and sector professionals as well as individual project coordinators.

As of 4th February 2022, over 30 individuals contacted ICRD with expressions of interest in the project and/or items relating to the project brief. Overall, over 100 items were received including individual programme and project evaluation reports, project summaries, case studies, examples of project output (such as YouTube videos, e-Books, blogs, and reports) often co-produced by young people themselves, as well as industry blogs and links to project websites. The material received is by no means geographically universal, and there is a substantial range in quality of evidence received, while the delay in publishing official evaluation reports for past projects as well as the ongoing nature of some present (and future) projects also somewhat limits the extent and scope of our analysis. It should also be noted that evidence from some larger programmes, such as those funded through NLHF's *Kick the Dust*, has not been fully received at this point although it is hoped that our review will include these programmes at some point. Nonetheless, a significant volume of material was received relating to the project brief and is deemed suitable for analysis.

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF MATERIAL RECEIVED

Project Name	Organisation	Location
NLHF-Funded <i>Kick the Dust</i> Projects		
Ignite Yorkshire	IVE	Yorkshire
Hope Streets	Curious Minds	North West England
Y Heritage	Leicester YMCA	Leicestershire
Hands on Heritage	National Museums Wales	Wales
Our Shared Cultural Heritage	British Council	Glasgow & Manchester
Keeping it Wild	London Wildlife Trust	London
Norfolk Journeys	Norfolk Museums Service	Norfolk
Other		
Adventure Archaeology	Gwynedd Archaeological Trust	North Wales
Adventurers History Club	Bishopsgate Foundation Gareth Butler History Trust	London
Apollo Fellowship	National Gallery of Ireland	Ireland
Boston Big Dig	Lincolnshire County Council, Heritage Lincolnshire & Boston Hanse Group	Boston, Lincolnshire
Built Heritage Youth Engagement Programme	Museum of London Archaeology	Haringey, London
Ceredigion Off Limits (Unloved Heritage?)	CADW/RCAHMW	Wales
Colonial Countryside	University of Leicester/National Trust	UK
Common Ground	Festival Bridge/Norfolk & Norwich Festival	Norfolk
Connecting with Yemeni Elders Heritage	National Museums Liverpool (NML)	Liverpool
Future of the Past	soundLINCS	Lincolnshire
Generation	British Ceramics Biennial	Stoke-on-Trent
Heritage and Inclusion Project	Action for Children	Edinburgh
Heritage Schools	Historic England	England
Imperial War Museum: Battle of Britain	Mighty Creatives/Creative Collective/The Collection Museum (Archaeology)	Lincolnshire
Mobile Museum Schools Project	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew & Royal Holloway	London
N/A	Dundee Historic Environment Trust	Dundee, Scotland
N/A	Heritage Crafts	UK
N/A	Young Archaeologists' Club	UK

No Man's Land – Young People Uncover Women's Viewpoints on the First World War	New Focus/Impressions Gallery	Bradford
Opportunities for Young People at Lancashire Council's Libraries, Museums and Archives	Lancashire County Museum Service/Kickstart	Lancashire
Saltaire Collection	Saltaire World Heritage Education Association	West Yorkshire
Scotswummin, Youngwummin, On Our WaveLength	YouthLink Scotland	Scotland
Shakespeare Week, Shakespeare Primary School Hubs	Shakespeare Birthplace Trust	UK
Small Pits, Big Ideas	Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service	Worcestershire
THREADS	Royal Shakespeare Company	UK
Unloved Heritage?	CADW/RCAHMW	Wales
Y Heritage: Make a Splash!	Leicester YMCA/MSDS Marine	Leicestershire
You Can't Move History. You Can Secure the Future': Engaging Youth in Cultural Heritage	AHRC-Funded Research Project/'Long Live Southbank' Campaign	Southbank, London
Young Volunteer Scheme	Egypt Centre, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities	Swansea University, Swansea