Analysing the Manchester Street Urban Landscape

GEOG309-16S2: RESEARCH METHODS IN GEOGRAPHY
ASSIGNMENT FOUR: THE GROUP REPORT

SEAN BAUTISTA 35731079
LIAN CINZAH 69635323
KATE HINES 31424275
FELICITY-JANE POWELL 67327676
MICHAEL SCANLAN 13061661
### Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Research Context</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Research Findings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortcomings and Limitations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Future Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Secondary Sources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating the Booklet</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy of Booklet Information</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Disaster Perspectives on Heritage</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Pay for the Booklet</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

Research Question:

- To analyse the historical streetscape of Manchester Street North and then convey this information to a contemporary audience in an original and effective way.

Aims and Objectives:

- To portray the cultural and historical narratives of the local community, to create appropriate information directed to a broader audience of visitors to Manchester Street.
- To combine primary and secondary information on people and places in Manchester Street North.
- To draw on literature to justify key findings or ideas from our own research.
- To create a booklet prototype with the combined data, in a contemporary and original way.
- To analyse quantitative data to understand how the booklet was received by a variety of people.

Brief Research Context:

- The 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes severely damaged Christchurch’s Central Business District, and led to over 1000 demolitions in the following five years, including 238 heritage buildings. The Manchester Street North streetscape is located on the outskirts of the City Centre, between Bealey Avenue and Cambridge Terrace, and is the location of many historical sites. By outlining important people and places in the area, either historical or contemporary, this task highlighted the importance of public memory and sense of place within communities. In association with the Peterborough Village Incorporated Society and Manchester Street resident Di Lucas, our task was find a way in which the cultural and historical heritage of the Manchester Street North vicinity could be conveyed to communities in an effective and original way.

Summary of Methods

- We have used mixed-method research approaches to combine qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis in order to create depth to our project.
- An individual literature review was undertaken to establish the key themes our project should be based around These were:
  - Historical information relevant to our streetscape
  - Diverse research methods and approaches
  - Assessing tourism analysis methods.
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- Qualitative research was another key method used to obtain information for the booklet. Semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to collect personal memories and insights of the people and places of Manchester Street over time.
- Secondary data relevant to our streetscape was also sought as it provided a context in which the primary data from the interviews could be placed and then interpreted.
- A small booklet prototype was designed to collate the primary and secondary information in a creative and effective way through fun facts, stories and photographs. It also included historic and current maps of important places in the vicinity. 40 hand-guides were published and distributed.
- To analyse how effective our booklet was, a questionnaire survey accompanied the hand-guide, with a page dedicated to a QR code and URL link to an online survey. The survey used a combination of open and closed questions, linear scale statement questions, and tick box answers.
- Quantitative research methods were used to analyse the survey results.

Key Research Findings:

- Participants older than 46 are more interested in cultural and historical heritage preservation than those aged 45 years and younger.
- Overall, respondents found the information in the booklet relevant regardless of how infrequent they are in the vicinity of Manchester Street North, or their lack of prior association with the area.
- Those who have lived in Christchurch for longer than seven years (therefore, during the earthquake periods), believe that historical and cultural conservation, preservation and documentation is important in post-disaster cities.
- 85 % of respondents believed that our hand-guide was an effective way to share historical information, with 95 % highlighting they would recommend it to others.

Shortcomings and Limitations:

- Interviewing:
  - Contacting interviewees was more difficult than our group anticipated, and while we had a variety of contacting methods, it was often frustrating when there was no response.
  - Due to the nature of semi-structured interview methods, interviewees had the agency to go off topic and provide information irrelevant to our project. Transcribing the interviews became a longer process than we anticipated, in order to decipher what
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Information was relevant. This limitation could have been prevented by using more targeted questions.

- **Expectations:**
  - As we needed to meet both the task standards set by our community partner as well as the GEOG309 course assessment criteria, we experienced the challenge of meeting different expectations. We mitigated this through clearer communication with a course coordinator and our community partner.

- **Time frame:**
  - As this project is a University project, our time frame was limited to one semester to create a prototype booklet and analyse how it was received. As a result, the area researched and the amount of information included in the booklet was less than our initial plan.
  - We also set a deadline for our online surveys to be completed, however by this time, there was only 30 responses, where we had aimed for at least 50. The extension of this deadline brought our response rate up to 40, but did impact the data analysis that was already underway with the initial data received.

**Suggested Future Research:**

- This booklet is a prototype to determine the efficacy of this type of publication, but there are many alternative approaches to follow in future. We researched a limited residential area of Manchester Street, and recommend that a more in-depth analysis of the whole street would provide a better understanding of the area. To accommodate this wider scope, a larger hand-guide should be designed in order to show a ‘full’ story of Manchester Street. Surveys could be more effective by increasing the number and variability of participants, in order to undertake a more comprehensive statistical analysis.
INTRODUCTION:

Jessica Halliday describes in Losing Our Collective Memory how, in the immediate aftermath of the 2010-2011 Canterbury Earthquakes, “the Government had made their position clear: the public good of historic buildings was now irrelevant in Christchurch.” (Halliday, 2014:213) and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority was able to enact the demolition of 235 listed of registered heritage buildings in Canterbury without any public recourse, (Halliday, 2014). More than five years on from the Canterbury earthquakes, though the ‘immediate’ danger has passed, many treasured places still have their fate to be decided – while the environmental, built, and social landscape of Christchurch continues to transform with alarming rapidity. Buildings are

‘physical anchors in a city rapidly drifting away from its structural past. Our relationship with a city is based on such readings: familiar or evocative sites or structures that make up personal maps,’ (Blundell, 2014: 48).

The events of recent years have demonstrated how little the public truly has control over the fate of these physical anchors; however, their existence in public memory is something that can be influenced by public interest. Sally Blundell describes how community organisations have since, “succeeded in drawing people, activities and a much-needed sense of engagement into the inner city [...] not on a blank and flattened cityscape but in and in relation to existing structures, features, and historic uses” (Blundell, 2014: 47).

Yet the destruction and erasure of historic places and spaces continues, either out of necessity (to ensure safety) or to make way for newer ideas. Manchester Street and the area covered by the Peterborough Village Incorporated Society is just one example where this loss may not be recognized until it is too late to recover. This was perhaps one of the motivations behind the request from our community partner, Di Lucas, who requested for a storyboard to be created of the stately homes along Manchester Street.

To align with the parameters of a research project, we modified and established our group’s research objectives as “to analyse the historical streetscape of Manchester St North, and then to convey this information to a contemporary audience”. The task later evolved to become an investigation of how to effectively convey the information (gained through the ‘analysis of the historical streetscape of Manchester St North’) to a contemporary audience. Though the scope of our project was initially just Manchester Street, we created it with the vision of our findings having relevant application to the implementation of historical documentation projects throughout the city. The modification of our research objectives from the initial brief was only one of the many ways we developed our project to be both effective and relevant to the different requirements and
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expectations of the task at hand. This report describes the processes, instruments, and results gained from the implementation of the research. We will first address the preliminary literature review we underwent to better understand previous research projects with similar perspectives, and methods that could support our research. Later, the report outlines the three key stages to our project and the methods we used to achieve the objectives at each stage, and how they informed our methods and outcomes later on in the project. Last, we examine the results gathered from our research, with concentrated data analysis on the correlations and contiguities between data trends and how that informs, affirms, or dismisses the hypotheses we used to approach our research in the first place.

We also outline the varying limitations and challenges encountered during the project, and strategies we adopted to overcome them. The main objective for this report is to present our analysis of the streetscape of Manchester Street North and how we conveyed this to a contemporary audience, and to report what we learned through that process so that our findings may be used to inform future projects.
LITERATURE REVIEW:
A critical review of previously published literature allowed the group to identify key concepts that were relevant to our project. Historical information relevant to the streetscape, diverse research methods and assessing tourism analysis methods were the three key concepts that highlighted our project aims.

Historical information relevant to our streetscape:
- Secondary data was needed to provide context in which our primary data could be placed. This meant finding references and resources that were based on either Manchester Street’s history, or other research methods that incorporated historical streetscapes. Schein (2010: 227) emphasises that using previous research allows us to put the Manchester Street streetscape into ‘perspective that can then help you see and interpret the environment you are interested in.’ This is a vital approach as we were combining personal accounts with archives, previous literature and photographs into one hand-guide, and therefore needed consistency with our information.

Diverse Research Methods and Approaches:
- Hemmings (2008) explains that mixed method approaches are being used to create more in-depth research through combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. This is a key idea to consider as we are wanting our project to use a wide variety of resources in order to be critical about which methods worked in our project context.
- Secor (2010) and Gomez & Jones (2010) both discuss the advantages of interviewing in order to provide insight on how people present themselves. Critically analysing their literature allowed us to see what aspects of interviewing worked well, and which didn’t.

Assessing Tourist Analysis Methods:
- Zillinger (2007:40) emphasised that hand-guides are an ‘important information source’ for tourists visiting a site. Guided Tourism: The Role of Guidebooks in German Tourist Behaviour in Sweden states:

  “Tourists consume the tourism space created in guidebooks, and simultaneously recreate this space when travelling, as they choose individually how to respond to the information provided.”

This directly relates to our project as how well received an information hand-guide is in an area, is what makes up the data analysis aspect of our research.
METHODS:

Following the literature review, we were able to identify the approaches that worked for similar projects and apply them to our own research. We identified four key methods that supported previous projects. These were:

- Semi-structured interviews to collect primary information;
- Collection of historical information and archive documentation;
- An interactive booklet to present the information gathered;
- A survey to assess respondent’s perspective on the booklet, and their views on historical and cultural conservation, preservation and documentation.

Interviewing:

The first method used was interviewing, a qualitative research approach intended to collect personal experiences and local knowledge about the history of Manchester Street North. There are three types of interviews that can be used in qualitative researching: structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Gill, et. al, 2008). For this project, semi-structured interviews were used as they enabled,

“the discovery or elaboration of information that is important to participants, but may not have previously been thought of, as pertinent by the research team” (Gill, et. al, 2008: 291).

This allowed for more natural and personal responses from interviewees, while remaining on topic.

Our group was provided a list of people who may have had information relevant to the project. This list, provided by our community partner, was divided out so that each group member had three to five people to interview within a two week period. This initial contact set acted as an ‘entry point’ (Secor, 2010) to a wider network of possible interviewees as a ‘snowball technique, (Secor, 2010) and expanded our connections for more data collection. 20 participants were interviewed and were either current or former residents of Christchurch, or individuals with particular interest in the area.

Interviews were then held in person with those who had responded to emails or phone calls that the group initiated. According to Keats (1993), interviews should take place in an environment where participants will feel comfortable to communicate and interact with the interviewer. With this in mind, the interviewees chose the conditions of where and when the interview would occur. Written consent was obtained prior to commencing the interview. Interview questions were adjusted depending on the participant’s knowledge or experience of Manchester Street North - questions acted as prompts to encourage participants to recount personal anecdotes around their experiences.
The group voice-recorded the interview with phones to transcribe later, and these transcripts were used to select relevant information to use in the booklet during the next step of our project.

**Limitations of the Interviewing Method:**

Limitations of interviewing included time constraints, unavailable contacts, participant’s perspectives, and technical problems. Due to the two week time frame, we were unable to interview people who may have been available outside of this period, regardless of the information they may have had. Another limitation was the reliability of personal accounts, miscommunication or incorrect contact details. When recording and transcribing the interview, there were sometimes technological issues with devices on which the interviews were recorded, which led to longer transcribing periods. Aveyard & Schofield (2002) noted that the process of transcribing recorded interviews can take hours and depends on the researcher’s experience, the quality of the voice recording, and the number of interviews.

**Secondary information sources:**

In addition to the primary data collected from interviews, we also searched secondary resources for information about Manchester Street and its history. These resources were used to provide contextual background to the information gathered from the interviews, such as the information collected on McLean’s Mansion.

**Booklet:**

We decided a booklet would be an effective way to convey our information of public memory of Manchester Street North’s heritage sites to a contemporary audience. The booklet was intended to influence residents and visitors of Christchurch to be more curious about, and to have a better understanding of, Manchester Street and its historical significance. We understood that guidebooks can influence which places tourists visit and how they recall their experiences and memories (Zillinger, 2007), which is an influence we sought to replicate with our booklet.

The booklet was formatted to be A3 paper size with 16 folded pages, and designed to be colourful and visually stimulating, which would ideally make it interesting to read. We had to be precise when selecting what information was most relevant from the interviews, as we discovered some information was not appropriate for our audience or was not relevant to the location. Due to the nature of our research task, heritage attractions were a key element of the booklet. The booklet
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content consisted of information on significant historic stories, heritage buildings and sites, personal accounts, fun facts, mini activities, and a street map of Manchester Street North.

The booklet was then used as a research tool to measure perspectives on whether it was an effective method of communicating historic information. 40 booklets were published and distributed to selected groups, including members of the Peterborough Village Incorporated Society, University of Canterbury students and staff, family, friends, and interviewees. The booklet was printed with a link to an online survey.

The booklet was then used to analyse people’s perspective of whether it was an effective way of presenting information of cultural preservation, documentation and conservation of historic places. 40 booklets were published and distributed to selected groups, including members of the Peterborough Village Incorporated Society, University of Canterbury students and staff, group member’s family and friends and as well as those interviewed. The booklet was accompanied with a link to an online survey in which we could collect statistical data in order to do our analysis.

Limitations of the Booklet:

The initial booklet design was on A2 printing paper size, but had to be re-designed and re-formatted to A3 to meet UC Print’s capacities - this was challenging and time-consuming, as information had to be eliminated, re-filtered, and reselected.

Surveying:

The last method used was a survey to accompany the booklet. This survey had 15 questions about the respondents, their views towards historical preservation and documentation and their feedback on the hand guide contents and design. The survey used a variety of tick box questions, short answer questions and linear scale statement questions.

The survey was created online using Google Forms, with a QR code and URL link in the booklet to access it. One of the advantages of the QR code was creating easy access to the online survey through mobile phones, without having to type in the URL link, (Liu et al, 2008). We also created paper copies of our survey questions for respondents who might have found the QR code or URL link difficult to use. The results from the paper surveys were entered manually by our group, which enabled us to include all responses in our data analysis.

The survey collected respondent’s opinions on historical and cultural preservation, as well as their
GEOG309: Analysing the Manchester Street Urban Streetscape response to the design of the booklet, its efficacy, and whether they would recommend it to others. Respondents included interviewees, members of the Peterborough Village Incorporated Society, members of St Luke’s church, University of Canterbury students and staff members from the Geography department. Our survey methods were both quantitative and qualitative as we needed both statistical data and exploratory research to analyse, and analysis was solely based on survey responses. Quantitative data enabled us to analyse the statistics from the linear scale and tick box questions, whereas qualitative data provided overall feedback on the booklet. Short answer questions enabled respondents to give further comment on the booklet design, content and overall efficacy.

Limitations of Survey:
Time was a major limitation to our data collection, having only received 30 of our intended 50 responses by our set deadline. We extended this deadline to bring the response rate to 40 participants.
RESULTS:
We approached our research with a few key hypotheses that referred to specific questions and responses within the survey. Our data analysis was based on a total of 40 survey responses.

1. Relevancy of Booklet Information:
Our first hypothesis was that respondents would not find the booklet information relevant if they were not frequently in the vicinity of Manchester Street North and did not have any prior association with the area. The questions in the survey that referred to this assumption were:

- Do you have any prior association with Manchester Street?
- How frequently are you in the vicinity of Manchester Street North?
- Did you find the information relevant?

Analysing the answers to the above survey questions would enable us to see if the assumption had any grounding or if it was not relevant. Of the 40 survey responses received, 18 respondents answered ‘no’ to having prior association with Manchester Street or being frequently (daily or weekly) in the area, yet also found the information relevant (45% of responses). The following analysis is based on the 45% of respondents who did not have any prior association, nor were they frequently in the area, but found the information relevant.

Of the 45% of respondents who had no prior association, 72.2% were aware of someone who was associated with Manchester Street. The other 27.8% had not been previously aware of Manchester Street or its buildings (Fig. 1).

![Fig. 1: "Do you have any prior association with Manchester Street?"

- No - But I am aware of people who do
- No - I was not previously aware of Manchester Street or its buildings

27.8%
72.2%
Fig. 2 shows how frequently respondents reported being in the vicinity of Manchester Street North.

**Fig. 2: "How frequently are you in the vicinity of Manchester Street North?"**

- 33.3% Monthly
- 33.3% Yearly
- 11.2% I have been here once
- 22.2% I have never been here

\[ n = 18 \]

From the data subset, 55.5% of respondents perceived the information in the booklet as somewhat relevant, 27.8% found it to be very relevant and 16.7% were neutral about its relevance (Fig. 3).

**Fig. 3: "Did you find the information relevant?"**

- 55.5% Somewhat relevant
- 16.7% Very relevant
- 27.8% Neutral

\[ n = 18 \]

88.3% of respondents believed that the information was ‘somewhat relevant’ or ‘very relevant’, which contradicts the assumption that those who had little connection to the street would not find the information relevant.
2. Post-Disaster Perspectives on Heritage:

Our second hypothesis stated that respondents who had been in Christchurch for longer than seven years (therefore, during the earthquake periods) would view cultural preservation, documentation and conservation of historic places as being important in post-disaster cities. This assumption was used to analyse the correlation between how long people have been in Christchurch and their connectedness with heritage buildings, places, objects and landscapes.

The questions in the survey that correlated with this assumption were:

- How long have you been in Christchurch? (Open answer)
- Historical and Cultural Preservation and documentation is important or relevant to me, (linear scale response)
- Conservation of historic places is important in the recovery of post-disaster cities, (linear scale response).

Analysing the answers to the questions above confirmed our assumption; there was a strong correlation between how long respondents had been in Christchurch and their prioritisation of conservation of historical places, cultural preservation and documentation in post-disaster cities.

Of the 40 respondents, 72.5% reported being in Christchurch for longer than seven years, which would place them in the city at the time of the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquakes. Those who had not lived in Christchurch during this time were excluded from the data analysis for this assumption, reducing the data set to a subset of 29 survey responses. Of these respondents, 82.8% “strongly agree” and “agree” to the statement “Conservation of historic places is important in the recovery of post-disaster cities”. A small percentage (6.9%) answered “disagree” and 10.3% answered “neutral”.
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75.9% of respondents “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement “Historical and cultural preservation and documentation is important or relevant to me” with only 3.4% of respondents choosing “strongly disagree”. 20.7% answered “neutral”. (Fig 5)
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Jha (et. al, 2010: 173) outlined, “Cultural heritage conservation helps a community not only protect economically valuable physical assets, but also preserve its practices, history, and environment, and a sense of continuity and identity.”

The positive relationship between how long respondents have been in Christchurch and their view on conservation of historic places (etc.) in post-disaster cities aligns with this statement.

It is worth noting that 82.8% of this subset also strongly agreed or agreed with “I feel this is an effective way to share historical information”, and 96.6% chose ‘Yes’, when asked if they would recommend this booklet to others. (Fig. 6 and Fig. 7)
3. Willingness to Pay for the Booklet:

We hypothesised that respondents who found the information relevant and interesting and are interested in historical and cultural preservation might be willing to pay for the booklet. The 28 respondents who ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ to the statement “Historical and cultural preservation and documentation is important or relevant to me” were included in the data set for this analysis. Of this subset, 67.9% would be willing to pay for the booklet, which confirms the above hypothesis. (Fig. 8).

From this subset, 92.9% of the respondents found the information in the booklet ‘somewhat interesting’ or ‘very interesting’, and of that percentage, 73.1% of them would be willing to pay for the booklet. (Fig. 9).
These respondents also believed that the information in the booklet was ‘somewhat relevant’ or ‘very relevant’. From the 28 respondents, 92.9% found the information in the booklet ‘somewhat relevant’ or ‘very relevant’, and from that, 69.2% demonstrated willingness to pay for the booklet. (Fig. 10)

Fig. 10. Would you be willing to pay for the booklet in regards to relevance of the information?

- Willing to pay: 69.2%
- Not willing to pay: 30.8%

n = 26
CONCLUSION:

Our booklet was created and distributed in order to analyse how effective this method was in conveying the importance of historical and cultural heritage. We approached our research on the use of the booklet with three key hypotheses, to illuminate areas of the publication (and its contents) that could be improved, refined, or redesigned based on feedback from the public. The findings from our research are not only enlightening – they are also, somewhat, encouraging:

1. The prevalence of public interest and belief in the importance of historic conservation in post-disaster Christchurch suggests that similar projects will be met with public approval, and that there is a place for these projects to thrive with community involvement.

2. It is further encouraging to see a monetary value being attributed to these efforts, supporting the projected financial sustainability and continuity of such projects.

3. Last, the indiscriminate perceived relevancy of the information in the booklet supports the creation of historic documentation and publication projects in areas that may not have large resident populations, such as that of the residential red zone or industrial areas of Christchurch. The short-form feedback on our survey is also an abundant resource for adaptation of future publications, and is included in the appendices of this report.

We set out to create something that would place the ownership of historic public memory as something more overtly inviting and engaging to wider contemporary audiences – essentially, making those ‘physical anchors’ and the “evocative sites or structures that make up our personal maps” (Blundell, 2014: 48) more available and accessible to those who might be otherwise unaware. We recognized that “socio-cultural, economic and environmental public goods are produced by the promotion and protection of historic buildings and places” (Halliday, 2014: 212), and sought to create value through the promotion of the geophysical and social history of Manchester Street North. We used three key methods to convey these themes: interviewing, a booklet and surveying. This mixed-method approach enabled us to use a variety of resources and practices that we could then apply to our project. Our research shows that not only are similar projects in the future likely to be positively received, but also reiterates how imperative it is that these projects continue. Though we may have lost the ‘gradually evolving city’ (Halliday, 2014: 215), we may yet lose the more rapidly changing cityscape of Christchurch without appropriate efforts to preserve and document the changes as they happen.

Our booklet is just a prototype, but one that we hope will lay the foundation for more (and improved) community-led historical documentation and publication projects. For more practical future iterations of the project, a more comprehensive analysis of the historical streetscape of Manchester Street North (and further afield) could be covered, with increased methods of collecting data - citing archival sources, professional insights and dialogues, as well as personal anecdotes. The results of the surveys, and the individual feedback provided, could be used to tailor further publications to specific audiences.

To keep up with the pace at which Christchurch is metamorphosing, community involvement and public interest are key components of such projects. We hope that the outcome of our project will not be the end of this important step, but the beginning of further measures to establish the value of Christchurch in every stage of its transition - from what was, to what is, to what will be.
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### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Area of Analysis</th>
<th>How frequently you visit Manchester Street (the area)</th>
<th>How long have you been in Manchester?</th>
<th>Did you find the historical information important or relevant?</th>
<th>Did you find the information interesting?</th>
<th>Would you recommend this website to others?</th>
<th>How many times would you be interested in seeing further information about Manchester Street?</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>No, but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Yes, I have a photograph of the building</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>No, I have not seen the building</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>No, but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>No, but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Yes, I have a photograph of the building</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Yes, I have a photograph of the building</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Yes, I have a photograph of the building</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Yes, I have a photograph of the building</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 times at any time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEOG309: Analysing the Manchester Street Urban Streetscape

APPENDICES:
<p>| ID | Name          | Relationship | Note | Frequency | Years | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 14 | 00+          | Employed     | Yes  | - I currently live/ work/ socialise there | Daily | 30 years | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | YES | 50 - I would only take it if it is free | YES | The booklet has a very unusual format, with the central cut-out being a little awkward. There were a few stubborn homes on the street too, why were they concentrated in this area? Might you have addressed more of them in the book? |
| 15 | 31-45        | Employed     | Yes  | - I currently live/ work/ socialise there | Daily | On and off for 25 years | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NO | 50 - I would only take it if it is free | NO | I didn’t understand its purpose |
| 16 | 31-45        | Employed     | No   | but I am aware of people who do | Yearly | On and off around 10 years | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | YES | 52-5 | NO | Would be good if the actual physical location of the point of interest (1.2) were more clearly located on the map, for example. What are the cross roads called? It is a little hard to be sure exactly where to find the features discussed. |
| 17 | 00+          | Employed     | Yes  | I have previously lived/ worked/ socialised there | Weekly | 40 years | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | YES | 52-5 | YES | Very well designed and full of good information |
| 18 | 96-60        | Employed     | No   | but I am aware of people who do | Daily | 25 years | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | YES | 52-5 | YES | I live just around the corner in Petersborough St and enjoyed reading about the places I live close to. I was unaware of McLean’s farm and so this was very interesting |
| 19 | 31-45        | Employed     | No   | I was not previously aware of Manchester Street or it's buildings | Monthly | I have been here once | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | YES | 52-5 | YES | Spelling mistake – should be ‘Kaumatau’ not to maika |
| 20 | 31-45        | Employed     | No   | I was not previously aware of Manchester Street or its buildings | Monthly | 1 year | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | YES | 52-5 | NO | N/A |
| 21 | 16-30        | Employed     | Yes  | I have previously lived/ worked/ socialised there | Yearly | 9 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | YES | 52-5 | NO | Booklet was a bit hard to understand the layout at the start |
| 22 | 96-60        | Seasonal     | Yes  | I have previously lived/ worked/ socialised there | Yearly | Thirty years | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | YES | 52-5 | YES | On welcome page ‘overline’ should be two words in the correct |
| 23 | 96-60        | Student      | Yes  | I have previously lived/ worked/ socialised there | Monthly | 18 years | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | YES | 52-5 | NO | Nice colourful, good black and white contrast, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Previous Knowledge</th>
<th>Years Living/Working</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked here</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>32 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>No - I was not previously aware of Manchester Street or its buildings</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked here</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked here</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>No - I was not previously aware of Manchester Street or its buildings</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>51 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I currently live/WORK/STUDY here</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>28 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked/taught here</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked/taught here</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>No - I was not previously aware of Manchester School or its buildings</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>No - but I am aware of people who do</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked/taught here</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes - I have previously lived/worked/taught here</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>