

European
Centre for
Cultural
Exploration

ECCE

UNIVERSITY *of York*

**Measuring the Social Impact of Art:
A Focus on the 21st Century Eden Project in York**

Alice Venir & Peggy Lockwood-Lord
Supervised by Professor Sharon Macdonald and Dr Laurie Hanquinet
Sociology Dept. at the University of York
July 2014



In completion of this project, we would like to thank John Newling for kindly letting us work alongside his artistic process. Also thanks to the New School House Gallery, in particular Robert Teed, and to the Sociology department at the University of York, in particular Prof. Sharon Macdonald and Dr. Laurie Hanquinet for supporting us in our work.

Contents:

Acknowledgements	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Methodological Observations	7
3. Knowledge Level	10
4. Public Values for Public Art	12
5. Critical Observations	17
6. Conclusion	19
Bibliography	20
Appendix. 1	21
Appendix. 2	25

1. Introduction

What we did, description of project and aims, overview of content

Throughout the month of July, we have been investigating public responses to the work of the artist John Newling, in his project inspired by the concept of a 21st Century Eden. Our research aims to understand the audience perception of the social value of art, as well as people's appreciation of art projects similar to the piece we are currently involved with.

As part of our research we have been carrying out an observation of people's interactions with the art, and recording general responses, in addition to the answers to some more specific queries. We have made an effort to engage with participants, and to ask them to answer brief questions on the subject. In our questioning, we did not ask for names or identifying details of participants, though we requested some socio-demographic data to assist us in our analysis. Participation was entirely voluntary and respondents were given the option to choose not to answer any particular questions. They were also free to raise their own questions and make further comments.

The results will be fed back to the artist and the New School House Gallery, and they will also be expanded upon within this text, in order to report our findings and to potentially aid in the design of future research and art projects. In this report we are then going to give an overview of the common official conceptualisations of social value. We are going to shed light on the methodology that our research was based on, focusing particularly on limitations of the method chosen, on the different artistic and sociological standpoints present and on our analytical method. A brief mention of the self-declared knowledge level (concerning art) of the participants will follow, with its implications. The analytical section will present the three main values that stood at the core of our interactions with the public when viewing art. As a final section, the two key critical observations that emerged from various interviews regarding the project will be presented.

How is the social value of art constructed?

The social value of art and culture and its measurement are important but problematic topics for policy makers, public officials, investors, non-profit organisations, funders and the various cultural stakeholders. Since the introduction of the Social Value Act (2012) by the UK Government, the search for a measurement of social value is even more prominent. The aim of the Act is to change the way in which money is spent in local public services, placing an emphasis on the future impact of those same services on the local community (Hurd, 2014; see also Compact Voice, 2014). However, measuring social value is not straightforward, as Mulgan (2010) highlights: “funders, non-profit executives and policymakers are very enthusiastic about measuring social value. Alas, they cannot agree on what it is, let alone how to assess it” (n.a.). Indeed there are discrepancies regarding what is considered to be social value and regarding how to measure it. As Mulgan (2010) asserts, an obstacle to this search for a common definition is the assumption that “social value is objective, fixed, and stable” (n.a.). Mulgan suggests that “when people approach social value as subjective, malleable, and variable, they create better metrics to capture it” (ibid.).

Among various papers and reviews the economic aspect seems prominent. Is social value to be considered in monetary terms or not? What actually counts as social value? Mulgan (2010) underlines how it is useful to conceptualise social value in terms of demand and supply, i.e. the social value of a service corresponds to the amount of money someone is willing to pay for that service; while O’Brien (2010) stresses how:

“the problem of valuing culture becomes how best to fit the unique aspects of culture, outside of the social and economic impacts, into the economic language of the welfare economic paradigm” (p.16).

An opposite perspective comes from those emphasizing the intrinsic and noneconomic social value of art and culture. The tension between an

outcome-oriented and economically efficient approach to social value and, on the other hand, an approach more oriented towards personal meanings and values is underlined by Jones (2013) as a “tension between institutional or ‘official’ values, and the values people produce in and for themselves; a tension that is an endemic and difficult issue across the cultural sector” (n.a.). Social value is there defined as “a concept that encompasses identity, distinctiveness, belonging, and wellbeing, as well as forms of memory, spiritual association and cultural practice” (Jones, 2013, n.a.). This conception of social value as linked to identity, wellbeing and belonging is forwarded also in Newman, Goulding and Whitehead (2013), a case study on responses of older adults to contemporary visual art. The study points out particularly how the encounter with contemporary art may act as a trigger to memories of personal experience, the sense-making of biographies and the challenging of habitus: “by making links to their pasts, participants were able to maintain a sense of continuity over time, which is important for the wellbeing of older people” (ibid., p.477).

A division between economic and non-economic orientation seems also to correspond to a division between quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The advocates of a non-economic approach and one appreciating also the intrinsic value dimension of art and culture, would then make use of, and advocate, non-quantitative methods (RAND, 2005) and a more in-depth qualitative approach (see Newman, Goulding and Whitehead, 2013, and their use of interviews and focus groups). On the other hand, those advocating an economic framework (such as Mulgan, 2010), would also advocate the use of metrics and objective quantitative methods. However, as Reeves (2002) points out, criticisms to both quantitative and qualitative approaches can be made: qualitative approaches are sometimes unreliable and anecdotal, and a quantitative one is often arbitrary and reductionist.

2. Methodological Observations

The John Newling “21st Century Eden” art project is part of a series of artistic residencies organised by the New School House Gallery in York, the nature of which is described by the website of the gallery as follows:

John Newling is an internationally known artist recognised as a pioneer of public art with a social purpose, and he will be based in St Helen’s Square, in the centre of York, throughout July 2014. Newling’s residency is entitled ‘21st Century Eden’, and from a market stall in the square - the artist’s temporary studio for the month - he will interact with the public, asking them the question ‘What Do We Really Want?’ and researching what a ‘21st Century Eden’ would look like. In advance of his residency, Newling has created a series of sculptures suggesting Adam and Eve and the Fall, with the figures of Adam and Eve represented by gilded elastoplasts. ‘I want to ask people what they really want’, the artist explains. ‘Why is it that as a species of 7 billion beings we are intent on knowingly bringing about our own extinction? Why are we so reluctant to address causality, focusing on the symptoms of problems instead?’ (The New School House Gallery Website, 2014)

We took part in the project representing the University of York Sociology Department and assisted John in his enquiries and interaction with the public. We conducted our own parallel research project on public reactions and appreciation of art in general. However it may be worth acknowledging the use of the apparently controversial word ‘art’, as John was reluctant to refer to his sculptures as pieces of art. Indeed the sculptures were part of a wider artistic project, of which they were just an initial component. In light of this, we may draw a comparison between the two different lines of enquiries we followed, i.e. the artistic enquiry and the sociological investigation.

The 21st Century Eden project involved, as explained, a stall in St Helen’s Square exposing six small sculptures representing different Adam and Eve-echoing figures, and made of materials varying from peat and wood to gold-gilded plasters. These were used as inspiration for our interactions with the audience. We, the artist and a few other volunteers engaged with the passers-by, drawing their attention by a request for a ‘quick chat’, and asked them the following question (variously phrased): “What would be essential to your idea

of a contemporary Eden?” The answer was noted down on the spot, as we were carrying a clipboard with data sheets for participants to sign after being filled by us. The tone of the enquiry was very informal and friendly, to put the participants at ease. Sometimes the interviews involved people already observing the sculptures at the stall, but most of the time they involved people passing by or sitting on the nearby benches in the square. After discussing the participants’ idea of Eden, we asked additional questions for our own sociological investigation, clearly stating the difference between the two sections to the people interviewed. The second section included questions designed to investigate opinions about the 21st Century Eden project itself, but also more generally on art, as well as some demographic details, including each participant’s occupation, which was an open-ended self-ascription. Each interview referenced in this report will be introduced using our coding scheme, which refers to the first initial of the interviewer’s name, and the number of the interview (e.g. P1).

The use of a public space in this project produced a large number of extraneous variables, which we attempted to navigate as best we could. We tried to maintain some sense of consistency and control throughout the interviews we conducted, by repeating the same set of questions for each participant, and keeping the same informal tone. However we could not control the number of people present in the square at any particular time, or how many people were around the participants while they were interviewed. An interesting reflective insight was provided by an individual who was the sister of a participant, and was present during their interview, she later revealed that she had herself been interviewed the previous day. Participant P17’s sister noted that she believed her answer (on her personal Eden) had been affected by the person she was stood with during her interview, and that in different circumstances she may have given different answers to the questions.

P17’s sister: *“Well the woman I was with gave her answer about world peace and all that, so I thought I should say something along the same lines”*

Another important variable to consider is the characteristics of each interviewer, and how they may have affected the interviews, as – for example – one of the two researchers is a native of Yorkshire (where this research was conducted) while the other is Italian. The accent of the researcher may have influenced the kind of answers or the attitude towards the interview. This suspicion is partly confirmed by the fact that while the British researcher collected quite a few mentions of hostility towards ‘foreigners’, the Italian interviewer collected none. Similarly, the young age and physical appearance of the female interviewers is to be taken into consideration as this could be connected to the reactions of the passers-by and attitudes towards them.

Often, the interviews conducted may have been obstructed by the surrounding activity of the square (e.g. the Taxpayers Alliance stall a few feet away on one day of data collection) and of the other interviews being conducted around the stall. In some cases, the participant would ask either John or us to give our own explanation of the sculptures before they gave their own opinion. Both the presence of the artist and the prior explanation of the works would have a definite impact on the kinds of answers given to our questions, and would therefore affect the nature of the data collected.

The issue of objectivity is one we were conscious of from the very beginning of the project, and was originally a cause for concern. In terms of the limitations of a cross-discipline study using both sociological methods and artistic processes, there may be a possible clash of standpoints. However, in reflection, the methods of a sociologist in their research could be criticised on similar grounds of objectivity to that of an artist, due to the encroaching bias of the researchers’ ideological value system. We aimed to use questions in our interviews which were not unnecessarily leading. Using the sculptures as a starting point for discussion meant that we were not beginning on neutral ground (as pointed out by participant P6 later in this piece). Similarly, the high number of variables just discussed implies that the objectivity and representativeness of the interviews gathered is questionable. Our approach to this project could be seen as an ethnographic study of the artistic process.

However, the combination of sociological and artistic enquiries revealed itself to be a stimulating ground for conversation with people in a free and friendly environment, meaning that the data gathered is of high qualitative value. The results of this analysis show a variety of interesting themes, suggestions, observations and insights from the public that probably would have never emerged if engaging with a different and less subjective method such as a large-scale quantitative survey, a purely sociological interview or a focus group. The very nature of this research is then implying both a potential lack of objectivity and representativeness, but at the same time a high validity and qualitative value.

In the analysis of the data gathered through the interviews, we used a mainly qualitative approach, inspired by Braun and Clarke's (2006) account of thematic analysis. However, this was preceded by a preliminary quantitative division of the interviews, as shown by the tables in Appendix 1. The themes we chose to emphasise are then both quantitatively significant – as the number of interviews associated with them shows – and qualitatively significant. This will be shown by the quotes presented alongside each theme, which will contribute to the understanding of each value as complementary to the broader analytical picture.

3. Knowledge level

Before presenting the different standpoints from which art was given value by the members of the public interviewed, it might be interesting to point out another focal point in our questions. One of the key areas of focus in our questioning related to each participant's perception of their own knowledge of art. Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) shared our interest, as in their piece *The Love of Art* they explain:

“...considered as symbolic goods, works of art only exist for those who have the means of appropriating them, that is: of deciphering them” (Bourdieu & Darbel, 1991, p. 39)

We were interested in the public's self-awareness and how they may value their own approach and ability to 'decipher' art and artistic endeavours in contrast with other, perhaps more or less knowledgeable, individuals. Those who identified themselves as knowledgeable in art often referenced their previous study of art-related subjects, for example History of Art or Fine Art, or their own experience with creating art. However some individuals we interviewed cited these same experiences and yet claimed no knowledge of art in terms of interpretation and analysis.

A8: (about John's art) *"It's about taste. I like the first sculpture, rustic"* (about own knowledge) *"I can appreciate but not really understand, I never took art classes seriously, and wish I had more understanding to discuss it. I haven't got the right vocabulary to engage in conversation about it"* (m, 24, tiler)

Although the participants who claimed to be 'not knowledgeable' may give a thorough interpretation of the sculptures in front of them, these explanations are often followed by qualifiers related to the insignificance of their interpretation, because of their perceived lack of skill or artistic education.

Some participants did however acknowledge that, despite their lack of formal education in art and critical theory, their insights were of value. As participant P13 states:

P13: *"I have no artistic or musical talent at all, but I know the observer role is important in art"* (f, 52, bookkeeper)

In a similar sense, a declaration of ignorance in the area of art was not always a source of distress for participants, as some individuals seem comfortable with their particular position. Participant P18, who engaged epistemologically with our question of his knowledge, provided an interesting insight:

P18: *"I think that the more you know about art, the more aware of your ignorance you are"* (m, 57, teacher)

4. Public Values for Public Art

Interestingly, what emerges from the responses gathered is a wide range of criteria through which the public gives meanings, significance and value. We aim to analyse those values in the light of public response to John's work, to the interaction with us and to art in general. Through our interactions with the public, and through the questions we posed to the individuals involved, we gathered a substantial variety of responses and insight that we present in this section, divided by sub-themes. Hopefully, those will provide an indication of the social impact that John's work, and participatory art in general, can have for the public. The majority of the response gathered was indeed positive towards John's project, with 43 out of 60 participants expressing a positive or neutral opinion towards the works. 11 out of the 60 people interviewed expressed a negative reaction towards John's work, while 6 out of 60 expressed no appreciation or interest towards art in general, therein including the current project. Most of the appreciative answers presented one or more of the following themes: economic value, social value and intrinsic value. Some of the quotes presented all those values, as for example the following:

P2: When interrogated on John's artwork this respondent declared "*artistic wise: good, very good. I am interested in organic and recycled materials*". And concerning the interaction on the theme of Eden stated "*I like the question, it got my brain working. I can sit and talk for ages.*" When asked to give his general opinion on art, he answered "*it's where my holiday money goes*" (M, 63, retired graphic designer).

The sets of criteria through which art can be approached and valued should then not be seen as necessarily mutually exclusive, but, rather, as at least potentially intertwined and interconnected.

Economic value

As referenced earlier, Mulgan (2010) stresses the importance of the economic value of art and its social implications. Even if our research does not aim to evaluate the economic impact of John's project, monetary aspects were brought to our attention during various interviews. Indeed, various participants

suggested viewing art as valuable in correlation to a potential financial value, specifically 8 out of the 60 interviewed.

This message, in some cases, took the form of explicitly addressing John's works as commodities, and thus valuing them in a price-oriented light.

A20: *"I like the 3D and gold, and I like the boobs. I would buy it"* (F, 21, student)

The same view can also be applied to devalue art and discredit it, implying it has not enough monetary value to please some of the people interviewed, both referring to John's works and to art in general. These extracts seem to echo the previously mentioned view of value of art as commanded by demand and supply and by how much people are willing to pay for it (see Mulgan, 2010):

S2: *"A lot of modern art: her who did the unmade bed (Tracey Emin)... I'd put it down a mineshaft. I'm sure I'd find something better to do with a couple of million (£)"* (M, 68, retired)

P11: *"not something you would spend money on"*(referring to John's works) (M, 23, Youth worker)

In other cases, the reference to an economic value of art was conflated with a potential social contribution, and was less direct. The participant A17, a 64 year-old tourist guide, made a strong statement in favour of more public art, which he argued would be very much appreciated by tourists. He argued for public art in the streets to be more easily accessible than when "closed" in galleries:

A17: *"money is better spent when on public art rather than in galleries"* (M, 64, tourist guide).

Another participant interestingly discussed the contradiction that artists make when creating art, using John's works as a prompt. She pointed out the contrast between the need to make art as provocative and personal as possible and the need to make art commercial and easy in order to sustain one artistic activity:

A25: *“you have to make it as personal as you can, there has to be a balance between commercial and edgy. Like here [in John’s work] it would be more interesting if it had been made more personal. There is often a problem between funds and creative freedom”* (F, 65, psychotherapist)

She therefore saw a tension between the art she deemed as valuable (i.e. the provocative art), and the art viewed as “commercially valuable”, or the “safe option”.

Intrinsic Value: Practical, Skills and Aesthetic

Intrinsic social value of art can be understood as deriving from aesthetic appreciation, appreciation of skills and practicalities of the art, and thus as “intrinsic” to it. This value category is quantitatively the most common among our respondents, being present in 27 of the 60 interviews, and it is equally distributed through all socio-demographic groups.

We are aware of the existing critiques addressed to the implicit opposition between ‘intrinsic’ and ‘instrumental’ value of art. The main one, as pointed out by O’Brien (2010):

“all forms of value are socially constructed and therefore it is unsustainable to argue that objects, practices or institutions have intrinsic qualities that subsist within them” (p.20).

However, we choose to group the responses mentioning the practical aspects of the artwork together with the expressions of aesthetic praise, under the term ‘intrinsic’. We do so with the sole purpose to emphasise instances where respondents refer to the aesthetic qualities or physical nature of the sculptures. For example the praising of the choice of material or of the visual impact of the sculptures are here seen as referring to the physicality of the art, hence the use of the word ‘intrinsic’.

During our interaction with the public, we gathered numerous responses appreciative of the materiality of John’s work. Some of them were concerning a more aesthetic appreciation of the materiality of the works, and some devalue it on an aesthetic level:

A2: *“nice mixture of metal and wood”* (F, 40, teacher)

A18: *“it’s clunky”* (M, 49, art lecturer at Glasgow)

Appreciation of the purely aesthetic aspects was present as a comment also to the value of art in general, as this quote shows by pointing out at the intrinsic nature of art as a vehicle for beauty and creativity:

A27: *“I love it, creativity and expression is important. Making beautiful things is important”* (F, 63, granny and ex-life model)

Others seemed to value not only the aesthetic component of the material nature of the works, but more the practicalities of it and its implications, like the participant A15, who declared:

A15: *“I appreciate the recycled material, I don’t like plastic bags”* (F, 65+, housewife)

In the same way, a value was placed on the skills behind the works, as stated for example in the following quote of a participant closely observing the sculptures:

A10: *“useful, fantastic, a lot of thought and work has gone into it...I am surprised by the plasters!”* (questioning, 54, Journalist)

This appreciation of the skills behind art was found again in our interviews as referring to other art forms in a more general discussion about the appreciation of art. For example a retired man, talking about an acquaintance's art work -and interestingly referring back to the economic value of art- stated:

A19: *“I can see the skill, but I wouldn’t buy it. My friend’s partner is a very well known artist, I appreciate the skills in her work but would not buy it, why would she paint a dolphin on a chair?! I am more the kind of person that would appreciate a scenery”* (M, 60+, retired)

While a retired woman gave the example of her appreciation of art as related to her perceived knowledge level of it:

P19: *“I am not knowledgeable about art but I like the practicality of it. You can stand back and appreciate the craft with something like pottery”* (F, 58, retired).

The appreciation of the skills and material nature of the artworks can be read in a Bourdieusian light as a meaning-making device to make sense of the art in the absence of an appreciation of the conceptual nature of it. As Newman, Goulding and Whitehead (2013) point out observing elderly people's responses to contemporary art, when the audience is unfamiliar with the cultural field, the value of the art observed can be drawn from other aspects of it correlated with one's life experience, as for example with the appreciation of the material skills behind it. This was indeed observed in our interaction, as the previous quotes show.

Social value

The value derived from an appreciation of intrinsic characteristics of the art is not to be deemed as strictly individual, as they can indeed contribute to the "creation of social bonds" and the "expression of communal meaning" (RAND, 2005, n.a.). References to the social value of art were present in 14 interviews. Indeed, during our data collection we clearly perceived a positive sense of willingness to talk and share views concerning the art project (i.e. people's personal view of Eden), which was sometimes explicitly stated:

P14: *"I feel quite flattered, I was just stood minding my own business and then someone starts talking to me!"* (M, 75, retired dental surgeon)

Participants often critically engaged in a personal interpretative process concerning both the question of their view of Eden and the sculptures shown. A correlation between the art they were engaging with and the general social value of art was also shown:

A14: described John's sculptures: *"inspirational for conversation"* and described his general view of art in these terms: *"art inspires people, allows us to think further and escape from reality"* (M, 27, intern)

A23: a young couple stated how the art project would prompt further discussion and reflection *"we will talk about it later!"* (F, 18, student and NA, 18, student)

A clear appreciation of the social and communal value of art was articulated:

P5 *“There are certain limitations to my interest in art. I think the discussions around art are of more value than the aesthetic of art”.* (M, 20, student)

P6: (art in general) *“I love it. It’s what I study, it informs politics and social life, and vice versa. It’s very important and not just in an aesthetic way”.* (F, 20, student/barmaid)

In both of these quotes the acknowledgement of art as valuable beyond its intrinsic nature and materiality is present, and its importance as a trigger for social and political discussion. Notably, there is a difference in age and occupational cohort between those placing emphasis on the art as valuable for the skills behind it and those emphasising the social value of art (elderly or retired people and students or young people).

Communication with the audience in terms of involvement and social contribution becomes then a fundamental aspect of art, as stressed in the following quote, from an Art Lecturer, who advocates for art to be more communicative to the public, i.e. to society:

A18: *“in contemporary art, there’s an awful lot that doesn’t communicate to people but just to the artist”* (M, 49, art lecturer at Glasgow)

5. Critical observations

In their engagement with the project, some participants made some pertinent and interesting critical comments about the project and sculptures. These may be grouped into two main themes: incongruity with the environment and issues of heteronormativity. Some participants felt that the project, and more specifically the sculptures, did not fit with the space chosen, that being St. Helen’s Square in York city centre. Participant A15 was the first to note this:

A15: *“(John’s sculptures are) incongruous with the square, because most people don’t come here for this”* (f, >65, housewife)

A17: *“I don’t like them, not particularly original, would be better if much larger! They don’t fit their environment”* (m, 64, tourist guide)

These comments imply an understanding of the art project as connected to the surrounding space and audience, and are surely interesting views to take into account.

The second strand of critical comment from the participants centred around the choice of visual depictions of people within the sculptures. Some individuals were confused about the specifically gendered nature of the figures, and aimed to draw attention to the kind of relationships present in John's Eden, and the possible heteronormativity displayed in these works.

P8: *"I don't understand it, and it's too straight! Why male and female?"* (f, 22, sales assistant).

The sculptures featured two human-like figures, constructed from stiffened and gilded plasters (as seen on cover page). One of the figures was adorned with two circular pieces of plaster on its chest, supposedly representing breasts, the other figure did not feature any additional body parts other than the standard arms, legs, body and head. Participant P5 mentioned this difference, and claimed to be unsettled by the artistic choices made in the creation of the figures:

P5: *"I am made uncomfortable by the sexualisation of the female figures. I don't understand why there are sexual characteristics on them and not on the male ones. The couples are exclusively heterosexual and there are no... complex interpretations of gender. Also I find it interesting that the natural products used in the sculptures were paradoxically structured in an artificial scene"* (m, 20, student)

P5's reference to the 'complex interpretations of gender' is also worthy of note, as an element of cissexism was picked up on by another participant:

P6: *"it kind of seems like they (the sculptures) are leading and are asking for a specific answer. The gender binarism is strange and doesn't fit with my idea of Eden, but I like the colours"* (f, 20, student/barmaid)

In this sense, it seems that some of the people interviewed would have preferred to see a range of more ambiguously gendered individuals, a less physically essentialist vision, or a more diverse presentation of gender among the figures in the sculptural depictions of Eden. In particular, this last element

of critique can be read as an example of the kind of socially valuable discussion that can be related to art and that artwork can elicit.

6. Conclusion:

What can be drawn from our research is the presence of three core value structures through which people place a judgement on art. As emphasised by previous papers, the economic component of art value was indeed present, but was interestingly outnumbered by comments on the aesthetic or practical value of art. The value of art in purely social terms was more or less explicitly present in many interviews, and was testified by the apparent willingness of the participants to engage in extensive conversations during the interviews. Indeed, most people seemed enthusiastic to interact, and voiced their interest in the project.

The overwhelming insight provided by some of the participants in their critical engagement was impressive, as the acknowledgements of heteronormativity, in particular, suggested an original sociological analysis that was not prompted by our own academic interest.

This engagement with the participants was facilitated by the nature of the two-fold approach of the investigation. The synergy of artistic and sociological disciplines is revealed to be a trigger for fruitful social inquiry and could be a fertile ground for further study.

Word count: [5248]

Bibliography

Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. (1991). *The Love of Art*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). 'Using thematic analysis in psychology'. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 3(2): 77-101.

Hurd, N. (2014). One year on: what impact has the Social Value Act had so far? *The Guardian*. February 4, 2014. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/feb/04/public-services-social-value-act-nick-hurd>

Jones, S. (2013). Valuing the Historic Environment. *Cultural Value Project Blog*. [Online]. Available at: <http://culturalvalueproject.wordpress.com/tag/social-value/>

Mulgan, G. (2010). Measuring Social Value. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/measuring_social_value

Newman, A., Goulding, A., and Whitehead, C. (2013). How cultural capital, habitus and class influence the responses of older adults to the field of contemporary visual art. *Poetics* (41): 456-480.

O'Brien, D. (2010). Measuring the value of culture: a report to the Department for Culture Media and Sport. *Department of Culture, Media and Sport* (n.a.): 1-65.

RAND (2005). Reframing the Debate About the Value of the Arts. *Wallace Foundation*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/audience-development-for-the-arts/key-research/Documents/Gifts-of-the-Muse-RAND-Research-Brief.pdf>

Reeves, M. (2002). Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts: a review. *Arts Council Report*. [Online]. Available at <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/media/uploads/documents/publications/340.pdf>

Social Value Act (2012). [Online]. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/3/enacted>

The New School House Gallery Website (2014). *John Newling: 21st Century Eden*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.schoolhousegallery.co.uk/exhibitions-future/309-john-newling-residency>

Appendix. 1

We include here a table for each public value analysed, with the demographic information collected about the participants. The columns stating ‘k/not k?’ indicate each participant’s response to the question: “Would you say you were knowledgeable about art?” (‘K’ meaning knowledgeable). The last column in each table refers to the overall interest shown by each participant in either the sculptures on display, the discussion with us about their Eden, or in art in general. Those coded ‘Yes (both)’ imply an interest shown in both the 21st Century Eden Project and art in general.

Economic Value

A9	f	23	student	apolitical	Outside York	Not k	Yes (discussion) No (sculptures / art in gen)
A19	m	60+	retired	none	Cumbria	Not k	No (both)
A10	f	21	student	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes (in project)
A25	f	65	psychotherapist	none	Oxford	k	Yes (discussion and in gen)
S2	m	68	retired	socialist	Lang Eaton	Not k?	Yes (in gen)
P2	m	65	Retired Graphic designer/craftsman	Conservative	York	k	Yes (both)
P11	m	23	Youth Worker	n/a	York	Not k	No (both)
P20	m	75	Retired Deep Seaman/Ex Coast Guard	UKIP	Cumbria	K?	Yes (both)

Practicality, Skills and Aesthetic Value

Name:	Gender:	Age:	Occupation:	Politics:	Origin:	k/not k?	Interest:
A2	f	40	teacher	liberal	York	k	Yes (both)
A8	m	24	tiler	liberal	Drifffield	Not k	Yes (project) No (in gen)
A10	questioning	54	journalist	none	London	Not k	Yes
A11	m/m	21/ 21	Sailing teacher/non e	n/a	Outside York	Not k	yes
A12	m/m	18/ 18	students	Green	York	Not k	No (both)
24	f	65+	Housewife	Apolitical	Outside York	Not k	Yes (in gen)
A18	m	39	Art lecturer	none	Glasgow	k	Yes (in gen)
A20	f	21	student	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes (in project)
A24	f	24	student	Green	Germany/ York	Not k	Yes (both)
A27	f	63	Granny/ex- life model	none	York	Not k	Yes (both)
A30	f	57	Art teacher	none	Africa/S pain	k	Yes (both)
S1	f	22	student	Green	Near Flaming oland	n/a	Yes (both)
P1	m	18	Sales assistant	Conserv ative	York	Not k	Yes (both)
P2	m	65	Retired graphic designer/cra ftsman	Conserv ative	York	k	Yes (both)
P3	f	39	childminder	Labour	York	Not k	Yes (both)
P4	f	61	retired	Lib Dem	Acomb	Not k	Yes (both)
P7	m	50	Consultant	Labour	Germany	k	Yes (both)
P9	f	51	Interior Designer/Le cturer	US Democr ats	Provo, Utah	Not k	Yes (both)
P15	m	68	Full-time carer	Labour	Scarbor ough	Not k	No (both)
P16	f	n/a	Housewife/a rtist	none	Scarbor ough	k	Yes (both)
P17	f	21	Barmaid	none	Outside York	Not k	Yes (both)

P19	f	58	retired	Labour ("Reds")	York	Not k	Yes (both)
P20	m	75	Retired Deep Seaman	UKIP	Cumbria	K?	Yes (both)
P21	f	50	Self-employed artist/writer / coffee roaster	Green/Left	Bristol/York	K?	Yes (both)
P22	f	60+	retired	Green	York	k	Yes (both)
P23	m	27	Passenger transport assistant	none	York	Not k	No (both)
P24	f	35	Paramedic	none	York	Not k	No (both)

Social Value

Name:	Gender:	Age :	Occupation:	Politics:	Origin:	k/not k?	Interest:
A1	f	33	Artist/s-e/textiles and craft	apolitical	York	k	Yes (both)
A14	m	27	Intern	Left of centre	France/York	k	Yes (both)
A16	f/m	46/48	Doctors	none	Sydney	Not k?	Yes (both)
A17	m	64	Tourist Guide	none	York	n/a	Yes (in gen)
A18	m	39	Art Lecturer	none	Glasgow	k	Yes (in gen)
A23	f/n/a	18/18	student	none	Lincoln/York	k	Yes (both)
S3	f/f/f	50/20/36	students	Labour	South Korea/York	n/a	Yes (both)
P2	m	65	Retired graphic designer/craftsman	Conservative	York	k	Yes (both)
P5	m	20	student	Green	York	Not k	Yes (both)
P6	f	20	Student/barmaid	Green	York	k	Yes (both)
P14	m	75	Retired Dental Surgeon	Conservative	Buxton, Derbyshire	k	Yes (discussion and in gen)

P16	f	n/a	Housewife/artist	none	Scarborough	k	Yes (both)
P18	<u>m</u>	57	teacher	Libertarian	California	k	Yes (discussion and art in gen)
P22	f	60+	retired	Green	York	k	Yes (both)

Here we include the questionnaire form used in our interviews:

John Newling
21st Century Eden

A project by John Newling constructing a view of a contemporary Eden.

We are trying to bring together people's views and thoughts in response to a number of questions. The responses will be used as material in the final installation work and for a University of York Sociology Project. All responses will be anonymous.

What would be essential to your idea of a contemporary Eden?

Your response here and in what follows will be anonymous but in order for us to gather and use your responses we need your agreement. Please sign here.

If you would like to be kept up to date with how the project is progressing please leave email contact here.

What do you think about these works?

How did you feel about being asked the questions on the previous page?

Would you like to take part in more projects/discussions like this?

What do you think about art in general?

Do you count yourself as being interested in art?

- have you studied it in any capacity? would you say you were knowledgeable about art?

- do you attend cultural and artistic venues?

Where have you come from today?

Is that where you live?

What is your occupation?

What is your age?

Gender? (Would you mind declaring your gender?)

If you don't mind me asking, do you belong to a political party?

- how do you tend to vote?