HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY FORMATION IN THE
KINGS MOUNTAIN HISTORICAL MUSEUM

by

Julia Ruth Mileski

A thesis presented to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in
Anthropology

Charlotte

2021

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Dennis Ogburn

_____
Dr. Gregory Starrett

_____
Dr. Alan May

ABSTRACT

JULIA RUTH MILESKI. Historical Consciousness and Collective Identity Formation in the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. (Under the Direction of DR. DENNIS OGBURN)

Many studies have been completed on historical consciousness in museum visitors of all ages, however, the topic of collective historical consciousness as compared to the potential of a collective current identity in small, rural history museums lack the same exploration. The Kings Mountain Historical Museum is a local history museum and nonprofit corporation created to honor the history and 'edu-tain' the small, rural community of Kings Mountain, North Carolina. In these small towns, there is such a powerful and extensive sense of community, and the ways in which residents understand and connect to their own histories is of particular importance and interest as a model for other small museums. Through electronic and paper mail surveys to visitors and patrons of the museum, I have attempted to understand levels of historical consciousness and collective identity development amongst Kings Mountain Historical Museum visitors, and the formation of a place attachment and general placemaking.

Survey questions were formatted with response options that generally provide positive, negative, or neutral information about the subject matter, and the survey concluded in two short-response style questions specifically included for respondents to provide voluntary additional information relevant to the museum and other questions in the survey. The results from my survey and the short-response questions showed that the Kings Mountain Historical Museum is successful in promoting a collective identity amongst Kings Mountain community members, positively influences placemaking and place attachment for the community, and promotes historical consciousness amongst visitors. Additionally, the museum is successful in educating and engaging visitors both with new information and by affirming prior knowledge, and positive correlations between length of residency and frequency of visits and higher levels of historical

consciousness. Future direction for the museum should involve the engagement of the minority populations in Kings Mountain. The survey results have the potential to catalyze conversations between small museums and the communities they represent, and spur the development of additional programming, volunteer engagement, and education initiatives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

While the physical buildings of museums stand as a symbol for knowledge (Karp, 1992), their impact goes beyond the physical spaces because their relationships with visitors allow for their presence in the public sphere. As part of the public sphere, museums provide people with the opportunity to address matters of public importance and historical significance. Like the ancient Green agoras, museums exist as a public space wherein visitors meet as equals to discuss and debate matters of society, cultural norms, and values (Barrett, 2012). Museums in the public are then "embroiled in the attempt to culture a public and encourage people to imagine and experience themselves as members of an ordered but nevertheless sentimentalized nation-state" (McDonald, 2012, p. 5). As agents of civil society, museums are social apparatuses responsible for providing the public with those aforementioned opportunities, as well as contextual information to discuss and understand their history, individual, and collective identity (Karp, 1992).

Contemporary museums, and local history museums in particular, then face a unique set of challenges in creating spaces where these conversations can take place while also ensuring that their content is engaging, accurate, and inclusive. Knowing and understanding the community that a museum represents involves knowing the actualities of their community history, especially where history museums are concerned, and putting that into effect means creating programs that are designed to fit their needs (Gaither, 1992). It also means playing an active role in the learning and unlearning processes of their visitors and helping them to understand their role and placement in their community both in the present and historically.

My research study focused on a local history museum, the Kings Mountain Historical Museum - I was interested in determining how they fulfill those responsibilities, if at all. The

following paper will discuss popular literature on my grounding theories of historical consciousness, collective identity, and place/placemaking, as well as detail my data collection and analysis process. Through electronic and paper mail surveys to visitors and patrons of the museum, I endeavored to understand the accuracy of community representation and levels of historical consciousness and collective identity development amongst visitors. By attempting to quantify the levels of historical consciousness and collective identity formation by museum visitors, I gained insight into the success of the museum in fulfilling these responsibilities, and its perceived role as part of the Kings Mountain community

THEORIES AND LITERATURE

A local history museum must "be a power station sending out a current that illuminates the community and gives a clearer vision of social values" (Parker, 1935). It should be a place within the community for historical topics, controversial or otherwise, and ideas that challenge the current paradigm must be addressed (Alexander et al., 2017). Museums as agents of civil society (Karp et al., 1992) are responsible for being dialogic places where individuals can define and contest their identities and beliefs. Their existence as archives for historical knowledge and objects of visual interest cements their role in aiding the production of social ideas and community identities. As social agents, museums are usually authorities in the education and promotion of community history and pride (Hirzy, 1995).

Museums are "cultural institutions where individual expectations and institutional, academic intentions interact" (Crane, 1997), making them particularly interesting for the study of historical consciousness, collective identity, and placemaking (Macdonald, 2012). As institutions of education and entertainment, history museums specifically are charged with presenting history to the public. The exhibits and the narratives presented are integral to helping visitors use the history they encounter to understand and contextualize the present (Rowe et al., 2002). Collective and individual identity formation, development of historical consciousness, and place attachments have all been studied and employed in the museum space (Crane, 1997; Macdonald, 2012; Pinto & Ibañez-Etxeberria, 2018) and serve as my grounding theories, as discussed in this section.

Collective Identity

Collective identity necessitates that an individual (in this case, the museum visitor) understands the concept that they may be differentiated from some groups or persons and closely

associated with others (Dunn & Wyver, 2019), and is beneficial in understanding the variability

between individuals (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Collective identity is defined as a compilation of

the actions and emotions that constitute an individual's belonging with a specific group or place.

Identities, collective or individual, are intersectional, and include self-described aspects of who

they are and what they relate to. Individuals often connect a place with a particular identity locus,

or a portion of their own intersectional identity (Cresswell, 2009). Museums create and reinforce

collective identity and operate with a heavy emphasis on the experiences that constitute

belonging, of which there is no singular experience (Trofanenko, 2006).

Identity and self then have both very literal and abstract meanings. In the literal sense,

they can be explained as simply as the information on our birth certificates and electronic

profiles (Rounds, 2006), to a more elastic and abstract existence described by Seigel:

> "the particular being any person is, whatever it is about each of us that distinguishes you
>
> or me from others, draws the parts of our existence together, persists through changes, or
>
> opens the way to becoming who we might or should be" (2005, p. 3).

This knowledge of what constitutes our selves and identities matters to us as both individuals and

socially interactive and conscious beings, as it shapes our relationships with those who do or do

not share qualities of our sense of self. Our personal identity is incredibly complex, but is created

by and from community identities, and vice versa. The community identity that resonates with an

individual emerges from aspects of their personal identity. As emphasized by Karp (1992),

without individuals and individual identities, there can be no community. Visitors to any type of

museum can use the information they learn and absorb there as a vehicle for developing and

understanding their own personal identity (Falk, 2009; MacDonald, 2012). Additionally, identity

can be used as a variable for predicting levels of visitor engagement and willingness to participate in the museum space.

Narrative Construction and Importance

Much of the creation and reinforcement of collective identity is relevant to museum narratives. In this context, narrative creation involves taking a more personal perspective to curate a specific emotional response to a series of events or a particular event that is authentic within its historical context. The narrative can act as the story that museums desire to tell about a historic group or event. Storytelling is a very effective method of communication, as the art transcends cultural and linguistic boundaries, and treating narratives as stories allows for a wide variety of presentation techniques for visitors (White, 1980; Bedford, 2001). Narrative has been shown to play a key role in discussions of memory, history, and identity, and the inclusions of both 'big' and 'little' narratives provide different perspectives and approaches for educating visitors (Rowe et al., 2002; Mullholland et al., 2016).

The narratives presented by history museums are directly intertwined with the meanings created by visitor emotions and reactions. Meaning-making is composed of a multitude of factors such as the visitor's agenda and preconceived notions (Scorch, 2013). In museums, the historical narrative presented is typically used to define a specific community, the power structures that exist around that community, and how it existed in the past and present. The structure of these historical narratives can drastically affect the ways that visitors relate to the historical events and figures present in the narrative (Savenije & de Bruijn, 2017).

However, the effectiveness of the narrative is determined by the willingness of the visitor to participate and interact with the story presented by the narrative. The synthesis of visitor participation and museum presentation is what makes or breaks the quality of knowledge

absorbed by the visitor, and thus the effectiveness of the museum (Chronis, 2012). The use of well-constructed and accessible narratives has been crucial to the transition of museums from a static academic entity to inter- and multi-disciplinary space (Andermann & de Simine, 2012; MacLeod et al., 2012). As heavily as visitors react to narrative, they also possess the ability to create and produce their own personal narrative within the museum space. Visitors' previous knowledge of content and subject material has a massive influence on what narratives they are willing to interact with and how they may create narratives personalized to their experiences and agenda (Falk, 1998; Leinhardt et al., 2002; Jeong & Lee, 2006; Falk, 2009).

By taking into consideration the visitor's agenda and agency to decide how they interact with the space, museum professionals have the potential to assist in this through collaborative and inclusive developments. Additionally, the role of narratives in museums in relation to the artifacts and other media used in their exhibition materials exists to mediate the stories and importance between history and collective memory (Rivera-Orraca, 2009). History museums are constantly making attempts to define and understand their community as a method of reinforcing collective identity, and one of the main ways this occurs is through the development of historical consciousness.

Historical Consciousness

Historical consciousness is the capacity to differentiate and also make connections between the past, present, and future. As a skill set, it is developed easiest in childhood and is beneficial in achieving personal growth and self-awareness throughout our lives. Crane (1997) and Dunn & Wyver (2019) contribute ideas about the development of historical consciousness in the museum space for children of all ages. They additionally focus on how the representation of different historical events and cultural identities in the museum space impacts its development.

The ability to negotiate ideas about the present and the past separately and concurrently are crucial for the construction of historical consciousness, and the understanding of 'us' in the present compared to 'them' in the past (Smith, 2016).

Historical consciousness involves the collaboration of subjective and objective interpretations and presentation of historic groups and events. Crane (1997) asserts the position of the museum as a cultural institution wherein the museum elements interact to harness individual and collective memories. These memories are expressed via different pathways in the museums and vary inter- and intra-personally. Historical consciousness explains how historical learning contributes to the growing sense of belonging to a group and setting for both adults and children. Additionally, it can also function as a type of orientation - to assist with understanding the self as existing within a fluctuating stream of time and place (Seixas, 2004; Thorp, 2014).

Museums can exist as experimental and experiential places that allow visitors to participate in memories that may not literally exist for or belong to them. These 'prosthetic memories' permit visitors to take on a more personal version of the memory and feel the event(s) more deeply, despite not having actually lived them (Andermann & de Simine, 2012). These new memories have the ability to shape the visitor's sense of self in the present and how it relates to the past.

Developing one's historical consciousness requires the ability and desire to move from having basic knowledge and recognition of the past and its interpretations to being able to successfully historicize and place past events and their interpretations into a historical and cultural context. The ultimate goal would then be that of achieving the "capacity to derive understanding in the present from events occurring in the past (Trofanenko, 2008, p. 584). It may also be helpful to discuss and understand a typology of historical consciousness in order to

determine the best ways museums may encourage visitors to develop their own sense of historical consciousness. There are four proposed umbrella categories for historical consciousness (Rüsen1987, 2004; Wallace-Casey, 2017). Traditional historical consciousness established that the presented historical narratives are pre-given and provide visitors with origin stories of our values. Exemplary historical consciousness considers that historical narratives exist as examples providing lessons or fables for present visitors. Critical historical consciousness challenges the traditional historical narratives and includes different points of view and counterstories. Finally, genetic historical consciousness states that change is considered central to the past and is what provides meaning to the history we know. It is important that historical exhibits and narratives encourage visitors to consider or develop at least one of these types.

One of the challenges then is to help visitors attempt to go beyond 'deliberate binding' (Seixas, 2004) - the active selection of one specific historical event or narrative representation to understand the past, to work towards the creation of historical consciousness. Museum visitors, on average, only look at a third of the elements in an exhibit, and often do not give that third sufficient attention (Rounds, 2006). This 'browse mode' as described by Rounds (2006) is the typical pattern of museum visitors and has positive and negative impacts on visitor learning and engagement. 'Browse mode' may be an effective method for observing the museum elements in their entirety, allowing visitors to use their agency to interact with the narratives of most interest to them, and thus learning more about a specific narrative. On the other hand, wandering between displays and exhibits and only devoting sufficient time to a select few creates merely a base-level knowledge about a topic, and is done at the expense of experiencing the museum space and its narratives in its full context (Schauble et al., 2002; Lanir et al., 2017). Visitors have multidimensional interactions with every aspect of the museum space, and this obstacle must be

assessed in order to optimize their learning potential, however, that is outside the scope of my research.

Place & Placemaking

Historical exhibits in museums are increasing in popularity and are typically intended to make the institutions more relevant and accessible to the community members they represent, as well as represent the community to outside visitors (Anderson, 1991). The 'hands-on' visitor approach to exhibit design and content expression is becoming more frequently employed to transform heavily collection-based museums, which history museums tend to be, into a space for social interaction and consciousness formation.

The concepts and practices associated with place and placemaking have their roots in historic preservation, human geography, and cultural planning. Place is at the center of conversations in these fields and has many different applications and definitions. Its everyday and commonsense definition is more in relation to a physical geographic location, however in the 1970s was reconceptualized as "a particular location that has acquired a set of meanings and attachments" (Cresswell, 2009, p. 1), which is the definition I am utilizing in my research. Meanings are based on an individual's personal or shared group biography and are indicative of some level of association and sense of belonging between that place and that person (Cresswell, 2004; 2009). The feelings and emotions that a place evokes are heavily based in the collective identity of a group, and therefore make them particularly relevant for consideration in the museum space.

Place in anthropology is a fluctuating concept, with conflicting usage and application throughout time. However, it remains a central concept of anthropology, and is fundamental to the practices of anthropologists. Place, in anthropology, has evolved to be conceptualized as a

locale with physical (i.e., geographic) and metaphorical (i.e., emotional, cultural) significance (Ward, 2003). It is of particular concern and interest for ethnographers (Hinkson, 2017), who deal with the establishment and transformation of place, and study the placemaking activities and behaviors of different cultural groups.

Placemaking has different meanings and involves different applications depending on the discipline that it is applied. A term that is popular in geographic, urban development and nonprofit disciplines has grown in more recent years to mean a grassroots, collaborative community process surrounding a specific place with the intention of transforming settings around their respective communities (Toolis, 2018). This shift has led to an understanding of the fundamental nature of place as something constituted, relational, and fluid (Ward, 2003). The idea of placemaking within museums is that communities can be transformed into stronger, more useful places by executing what Rappaport (2000) describes as collecting 'community narratives.' Understanding these community narratives is a way to "understand culture and context and its profound effects on individual lives" (Rappaport, 2000, p. 6).

The key for developing a sense of place, as emphasized by Walsh (2002), is to provide individuals with the opportunity to create their own understanding of place and to avoid the potential of creating 'artificial places' by imposing rigid meanings and boundaries onto what place and space can be. Places are constantly being acted on and are constantly acting upon the individuals connected with them, and by the other places associated with those individuals. They have never been static, and their implications are continuously changing through time. Developing an understanding and sense of place is incredibly important for individuals to exist and thrive in a world in which they have little control over as a whole and is accomplished

through the settled and unique relationship between person and place (Walsh, 2002; McCarthy & Ciolfi, 2008).

The connections between people and place exist on many conceptual levels, as do the feelings of being rooted to and within a specific place, but have been more succinctly described by Low & Altman (1992) as 'place attachment'. The creation of this attachment is described as a combination of individual and collective meaning, and as something shaped by personal and cultural/community ties, once again relying on the intersectionality of identity. Museums can provide visitors with the opportunity to strengthen their 'place attachment' by allowing and encouraging dialogue between visitors that is interwoven with their sense of collective community identity (Kinghorn & Willis, 2008; Rosenberg, 2011; Toolis, 2018).

Museums often attempt to define themselves as places of specific activities or concepts, such as places of memory and places of community. The objects on display and the way that they are arranged in the space can assist in the way visitors process the information and help them understand their preconceived notion of events versus the actuality of the events and memories that they might not have directly participated in but are still aware of. By adopting such a mission and intention, museums become "instruments of self-knowledge and a place to learn and regularly practice the skills and attitudes for community problem-solving" (Andermann & de Simine, 2012, p. 6).

If museums, and history museums in particular, are reconstructed in this new light, they can be thought of as places for visitors to debate what history means, and by extension participate in the construction of history (Trofanenko, 2014) and their own historical consciousness. Museums can then provide the cultural and experiential opportunities in a place that creates the sense that there is something of lasting value in it (McCarthy & Ciolfi, 2008).

With this, history museums can exist as pedagogical places that allow the visitors to strengthen their historical thinking and application skills and provide opportunities for learning that may not be available to them in school curriculums or the outside world.

THE KINGS MOUNTAIN HISTORICAL MUSEUM

The Kings Mountain Historical Museum is a local history museum and nonprofit

corporation created to honor the history of Kings Mountain, North Carolina. Their mission is to

"collect, preserve, and interpret history through exhibits, educational

programs, tours, and other appropriate means, in order to foster a deeper

understanding of the history of our community and the region" (KMHM, 2018).

The Kings Mountain Historical Museum is housed in the old post office for the town of Kings

Mountain, NC. The post office was built in 1940, and in 1996 the building was purchased from

the federal government and became the residence of the Kings Mountain Historical Museum.

After several years of renovations, the Kings Mountain Historical Museum opened its new doors

in 2000 (Shelby Star, 2015). The museum is a product of community members' desire to create a

space to honor the history of Kings Mountain, accompanied by support from former Mayor John

Henry Moss and the city council (KMHM, 2018).

This enthusiasm for honoring a town's history is fairly common and typical amongst

smaller towns in the United States. "When you have a small town, everyone knows one another

and has personal relationships with those in power" January Costa, director of the Kings

Mountain Historical Museum stated. "In Kings Mountain, most of the residents are from families

that are long standing members of the Kings Mountain community, often going back to the

original inhabitants of the town" (J. Costa, personal communication, September 1, 2020).

Smaller (i.e., local) museums in America outnumber the larger, more well-known

museums in the country by ratio of three-to-one (Johnson, 2000), and tend to be located in

communities that have experienced population loss (Kotler & Kotler, 1998) and are not typically

tourist destinations. In these small towns, there is such a powerful and extensive sense of

community, and projects like mine allow residents to understand how their histories are intertwined, and how their present existence relates to the town's past. People are constantly searching for a sense of place and belonging, and somewhere to connect their history to (J. Costa, personal communication, September 1, 2020).

The Kings Mountain Historical Museum has a typical rotation of three exhibits a year-spring, summer, and a Christmas/winter themed exhibit with additional programming. One of January's main motivations when curating these exhibits and programs is to create new ways to engage the public, ensure that visitors of all ages can feel included, and include hands-on interactive components as frequently as possible. The Kings Mountain Historical Museum does not currently have an exhibit about the history of Kings Mountain due to lack of space, however, the exhibits are created with the intention of engaging visitors with aspects of that history and educating them about potentially unexplored topics. When curating exhibits, January includes visual and creative elements as frequently as possible. Seeing "what's on display [in a museum] and getting to recreate it or apply it yourself" (J. Costa, personal communication, September 1, 2020) is one of the most effective methods for visitors to absorb the information presented to them. This experience was a very common one in the Kings Mountain Historical Museum prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, however, moving forward the museum has adapted these methods to engage visitors and families without that hands-on interaction.

Many studies have been completed on historical consciousness in museum visitors of all ages (Wallace-Casey, 2017; Toolis, 2018; Dunn & Wyver, 2019; Huang, 2019), however, the topic of collective historical consciousness as compared to the potential of a collective current identity in small, rural history museums lack the same exploration. I selected the Kings Mountain Historical Museum for this research because it is a local history museum representing and

catering to a small town, and I was interested in exploring the effects of the museum on the population, and the community's view of the museum. I feel as though ideas of small history museums in the American South are forced into the stereotype of Civil War propaganda and pride. While that may be the case for some, the Kings Mountain Historical Museum works with the community to foster a deeper understanding of the history of the region.

COVID-19 CHALLENGES & CONSIDERATIONS

Museums globally have faced challenges due to COVID-19. Job loss, early retirements, and sudden closures have caused decreases in income in both large and small museums that will make reopening difficult and will likely cause budget issues in the coming fiscal years (Bonin-Rodriguez & Vakharia, 2020; Pennisi, 2020). However, closed doors have led to the opening up of museums and their content on virtual platforms. The public is being engaged by museums and in museum research in ways rarely seen prior to COVID-19, and through these efforts museums may play a much more impactful role in their communities than seen in the past century.

People everywhere are adjusting to life without access to the spaces that are integral to their sense of belonging within their community. These 'third spaces', as described by Low and Smart (2020) refer to "commercial establishments such as bars, restaurants, gyms, malls, barbershops and other places frequented between work and home" (p. 1). Third spaces are unique and different from fully public or private spaces in that they are semi-private locations, excluding home and work, that perpetuate community ties and group association. These ties and associations can be expected to remain regardless of the status of the place in which they originated and the time spent away from them.

The survival of fully public spaces (e.g., parks, sidewalks, playgrounds, beaches) and an individual's identity ties to them is unfortunately being called into question. In these fully public spaces, we have casual interactions with others we might not know, and those interactions can be unpredictable. Interacting with strangers and people outside of our home and work presents anxieties that were not present before - transmission and infection of COVID-19. The importance of safe and accessible spaces is an integral part of our sense of identity and creating a divide within those spaces between 'sick' and 'healthy' invokes the familiar and controversial

anthropological concept of 'othering'. The 'us' and 'them' mentality has the potential to poison the positive and necessary ties to public spaces held by members of the surrounding community.

The divide between individuals in public spaces has the potential to be exacerbated by safety recommendations such as mask wearing and social distancing, however I argue that the need for such precautions currently outweighs the potential consequences (Andersen, M., 2020; Huang, V. S. et al., 2020). This time period will undoubtedly be one of the most formative in modern human history. The 'Coronacene' (Higgins et al., 2020) has been marked by transformations of societal norms, and changes in research methods at all levels. Globally, nationally, and locally, private and public spaces will be transformed at the core by COVID-19, and economic and governmental shifts are sure to follow.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, I have been working with January Costa, the Director of the Kings Mountain Historical Museum to conduct my research. The nature and exact methodology of this research have undergone multiple changes due to the limitations surrounding the pandemic. The exclusion of personal interviews and direct interactions with individuals out in the community have almost certainly altered the findings and implications of this research. To work within these limitations, I contacted past visitors and patrons for structured email and paper mail surveys. This research was conducted during the Fall of 2020.

METHODS

To measure intangible concepts and quantify the development of collective identity, historical consciousness, and placemaking, I collected data from museum visitors by designing and distributing a survey to be sent via email and paper mail. The survey was distributed on November 11th, 2020, and remained live until December 15th, giving the recipients over one month to complete and return the survey, either electronically or via regular paper mail.

Surveys: Sample and Design

Surveys, or questionnaires, are one of the most economical, broadly accepted, and common research instruments used in social science research. The quality of the data collected via surveys depends on the format of questions, focus on the research questions, and overall the credibility of the data it collects and analyzes (Coderre et al., 2004; Parajuli, 2004; Regmi et al., 2016). Online surveys for data collection have the ability to efficiently collect and organize large amounts of data and are incredibly convenient for reaching a large number of respondents. Respondents can answer questions and return the survey at a time convenient for them, and online surveys are capable of question diversity that may not be possible in other data collection methods (Regmi et al., 2016).

When composing questions for a survey, Parajuli (2004) and Weller (1998) recommend that the researcher keep the study's purpose at the forefront of their mind, and attempt to translate that purpose into questions that will provide information relevant to the research purpose, directly or indirectly. The researcher must consider how questions are worded and arranged in order to ensure focused responses. I designed my survey with multiple question types to maintain participant attention, and to allow for the clearest response options possible. Likert Scale (assumes that the strength/intensity of an attitude is linear, and that attitudes can be measured), List, and Open-ended question styles were primarily employed, as they promote

participant agency while staying directly relevant to the major research questions and themes (Youngman, 1986; Kerlinger, 2001; Laws, 2003).

Information related to demographics, socio-economic status, the knowledge, values, and beliefs of individuals, and explanations and patterns of behavior can all be extracted from surveys if they are appropriately executed by the researcher(s). When creating a survey, it is important to start with simple questions and concepts and build to more complex and thought provoking questions (Weller, 1998). A good survey appears professional, tells the purpose of the study through the title, gives instructions on how to complete and return the survey, and maintains question diversity. Questions are ordered logically, similar questions are grouped together, and are as clear and unambiguous as possible.

Collaboration with the Kings Mountain Historical Museum

My research involved sending surveys primarily via email and secondarily through postal mail to visitors of the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, as well as museum patrons that are invested in the community and cultural engagement taking place at the museum. The Kings Mountain Historical Museum has a voluntary sign-in table for visitors located at the front of the museum and provides email and mailing lists for those interested in frequently receiving museum content, updates, and invitations. I created a survey that was sent out electronically and via mail to those patrons and past visitors of the museum to collect data about visitor experience and connections. There are approximately 4607 records in the visitor log from 2019, along with 764 subscribers for emailed content and 30 individuals who receive information through the mail (KMHM, 2019). From the 794 emails and letters sent to visitors, I hoped to receive around 200-250 responses.

Visitor information was collected voluntarily and provided to me in collaboration with my research. Working with January Costa and the Kings Mountain Historical Museum was

mutually beneficial. The results of my survey may be used by KMHM to better understand the visitor experience, and working with such a heavily community-based and oriented organization allowed me to design a survey specific to the Kings Mountain community.

My Survey in the Kings Mountain Historical Museum

As previously stated, I used a survey to measure and understand intangible constructs. Since so much of the American population is connected digitally, making a shift to electronic and/or short-form surveys is generally in the interest of both academic and commercial researchers, and is ideal for my research in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Understanding the behavior of museum visitors has not been neglected in previous research, and contemporary museums typically rely on either self-reported exit surveys or through manual tracking of visitors' movement and engagement patterns within the museum space (Lanir et al., 2017). Surveys are useful for receiving demographic and motivational information, however one aspect that is important to consider is not the number of people visiting museums, but the quality of their visit (Alexander et al., 2017).

Within the museum research community, these questions have prevailed and evolved with technological and historical advancements. Museums are becoming more visitor-oriented and focusing on their experiences, wants, and needs to increase the number of visitors, but more importantly to increase the quality of their visits (Lanir et al., 2017). This transition is accompanied by a shift in the treatment and understanding of visitors from a large, homogenous population to individuals with the ability to add to the experience as active participants. These changes are part of Vergo's 'new museology', arguing that museums should be accessible intellectually and physically to all people, and are more concerned with visitors' interactions and takeaways than in previous centuries (Vergo, 1989; Barrett, 2012).

Survey construction and analysis methods were based heavily on E. Toolis' (2018) dissertation research reviewing museums as sites of social change, which includes invaluable information about types of questions to include and ways to measure intangible concepts, and T.R. Huang's (2019) thesis addressing how identity ownership of certain communities is represented and understood through a local museum. My survey has nineteen questions split into four sections: Demographic, Collective Identity, Historical Consciousness, and Museum Participation. My survey in full can be found in Appendix A. The demographic questions are less important for specifically addressing my research questions, but can help in understanding more about the individuals providing me with these responses. The sections on Collective Identity and Historical Consciousness relate directly to the theoretical foundations for my research question, and the section on Museum Participation will show how those foundations are applied by and within the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. My questions were formatted with response options that generally provide positive, negative, or neutral information about the respondent and the subject matter. I included demographic questions in order to categorize respondents and better understand what pre-existing biases they may hold that may influence their responses. Gender identity, age, name, ethnicity, and length of residence in the area are all included, however, the names of respondents will not be included in my final research product. This information was important in understanding the ways an individual's demographic characteristics could potentially provide correlations to the strength of their response indicators.

Additionally, I asked questions that attempted to measure place attachment that include quantity style response options such as 'I like living in Kings Mountain', 'When I am not here, I miss Kings Mountain', and 'I do not feel a strong attachment to Kings Mountain'. Scales such as this have a long history of successful use in a number of different academic and commercial

contexts, and show construct validity. This scale has been used in a number of studies in different contexts, showing construct validity and excellent internal reliability (Casakin, Hernández, & Ruiz, 2015; Toolis, 2018). One of my primary concepts of interest was collective identity, and questions will be included to measure visitors' feelings of belonging and shared emotional connection and identity relations. Response options such as 'I have a strong bond with other members of Kings Mountain', and 'I do not feel connected as a member of Kings Mountain' were key indicators of positive, negative, or neutral community attachments.

Additionally, I attempted to assess visitor participation and engagement within the museum. Questions regarding the frequency of visits from 2019 and before, how they move throughout the museum space, and what activities they participated in/what they engaged within the museum were included. In terms of visit frequency, response options such as 'several times a year' and 'once a year or less' were provided. Questions regarding behaviors during the visit included how their time was spent (i.e., browsing, interacting with children, stopping at exhibits in a self-assigned pathway, etc.). Additionally, questions regarding the visitors' comfort with the museum content, the level of freedom they felt to ask questions about exhibits, and their comfort interacting with the staff and other visitors were included. Questions about family histories in Kings Mountain, the importance of the Kings Mountain Historical Museum for the community, and levels of engagement with historic materials were helpful in understanding historical consciousness levels amongst visitors. Looking for place-based themes in my questions and the visitors' responses was important in quantifying the museum's role in accurately and responsibly engaging visitors with their local history.

Web-Based Data Collection

As previously stated, my primary method of data collection is web-based. I chose to use Qualtrics Research Suite as accessed through the University of North Carolina at Charlotte to create and distribute my survey, and to collect and safely manage the data collected from responses. Qualtrics is "an online tool that allows creating, distributing and controlling the received answers" (Machado, 2012, p. 34) with many functions designed specifically for academic research. Survey protection options allow for surveys to be accessed by invitation only through their HTTP Referer Verification option, surveys can be password protected as an added layer of security, and provides the option to prevent multiple responses from a single user (Qualtrics, 2020). For an additional layer of security, I used a laptop owned by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte's Department of Anthropology to store response data, rather than storing data on my personal computer.

Web-based data collection methods have several advantages over other collection methods, such as low cost, short response delay, and high selectivity. I designed my survey to have a user-friendly design and layout, making only basic computer or smartphone navigation skills necessary for completion. Generation of user-specific survey links prevented access to the survey by individuals outside the selection pool and multiple responses from the same participant, and efficient storage and transfer of response data into Excel allowed for safe and simple data management (Carbonaro & Bainbridge, 2000; Illieva et al., 2002; Van Gelder et al., 2010; Regmi et al., 2016).

I must also make note of potential concerns or errors to consider with web-based surveys. Errors in survey responses are typically due to issues with participant pool coverage or sampling, lack of responses, or measures for quantifying responses (Couper, 2000). Some additional concerns involve poor verbalization of participant thoughts and experiences, less organic

responses, and the lack of researcher control in how participants interpret survey questions (Comley, 1997; Coderre et al., 2004; Parajuli, 2004). My questions were designed to be unambiguous and direct in wording and format, and the option to select multiple response options should curb the potential for these errors.

Excel

Response data was consolidated, organized, and analyzed in Microsoft Excel. Individual worksheets were created for each non-short response question, and an analysis was conducted on each question. Responses to each survey question were coded to further ensure respondent privacy (Ose, 2016). The coding process involved replacing the response items with numbers counting up from one and restarting with the next question, and as responses were coded their codes were added to a separate worksheet - my 'codebook' (Leahy, 2004; Ose, 2016). For example, a question with response options a), b), c), and d) has correlating response codes of 1, 2, 3, and 4, with additional numbers added to account for multiple response options being selected (i.e., selecting a) and b) would be assigned code 5). These codes were crucial to the creation of tables to determine the frequency and percentages of each response item. Response item coding, frequencies, and percentages can be seen in Appendix B: Response Frequency and Analysis.

Histograms were created from these frequencies to provide a graphic representation of the occurrences of each response item. Histograms provide a visual aid that accompanies statistical approximations and resemble bar graphs. Finally, each question's worksheet included a table with the Descriptive Statistical Values of the data from that question. These values include standards such as the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and standard error mean of the data set.

Response Analysis

My response analysis was relatively direct, and the questions included in the survey were worded in a way that lends their responses to this direct analysis. Table 1 shows a question from the Historical Consciousness section of my survey as an example of the response analysis.

Table 1: *Survey Question 10*

Question	Response Options
10. Select which of the following option(s) are most accurate for you:	a. I know details of ancestors of mine that were involved in the history of Kings Mountain. b. My ancestors were involved in the creation of Kings Mountain. c. I am aware of family stories of ancestor involvement in the history of Kings Mountain, but do not know any specific information. d. None of my ancestors that I am aware of were involved in the history of Kings Mountain.

It is quite common for families to keep extensive records on their ancestors and to be familiar with the history of the town they are tied to. If the participant chooses response(s) indicating that their family has a historic relationship with the town, they are likely to have higher levels of developed historical consciousness. This is due to their increased knowledge of the town's history, and therefore is it reasonable to extrapolate from their experiences an increased level of understanding of the history versus present of Kings Mountain and how they compare and contrast. Table 2 below provides an additional example.

Table 2: *Survey Question 17*

Question	Response Options
17. Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree':	a. When visiting the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, I feel welcomed and as though I belong. b. When visiting the museum, I often ask questions and interact with the staff. c. When visiting the museum, I often interact with other visitors. d. I do not like to visit the museum.

I provided participants with the option to score every response option on a scale of 1-5 as explained above. This question helped understand how visitors interact with the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, and their opinions on the museum space. Rating 1-2 on the positive response options indicate lower rates of enjoyment and positive experiences within the museum, whereas Rating 4-5 on the positive response options indicate the opposite. Responses and overall reception to this question in particular is crucial to opening a dialogue at the Kings Mountain Historical Museum about visitor reception. New programming and exhibit ideas could result, as well as the potential to open more efficient lines of communication with members of the Kings Mountain community to understand what they want to see.

Research Ethics and the Institutional Review Board

I completed and submitted an IRB application required for my research, and have included my survey in Appendix A. My research study has been approved under an Exemption Category (Study No. 21-0058) by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte's IRB (Institutional Review Board) committee. In order to ensure ethical research conduct and the overall quality and comprehensiveness of the survey, a pilot was conducted to identify unforeseen issues and potential practical problems in the research process (Van Teijlingen &

Hundley, 2001; Lumsden, 2007; Regmi et al., 2016). My pilot test consisted of five individuals-

two of which have visited KMHM and are aware of the area, and three who were unfamiliar with

the Kings Mountain Community. Participants looked through my survey and assessed its

comprehensiveness and general ease of navigability. The pilot test did not show that any changes

or adjustments to my survey were necessary.

RESULTS & ANALYSIS

I consider the Kings Mountain Historical Museum to be successful in influencing collective identity, community attachments, and historical consciousness if 50% or more of the responses received are generally positive. I have evaluated individual questions on their own, and also assessed any correlations between the answers to different questions in order to get a deeper understanding of the issues and the concepts of interest in my research questions.

Overview and Nonresponse Error

From the approximately 794 email and letter survey correspondences, I received 28 responses electronically and 9 responses through paper mail, leaving me with a total of 37 responses. Before proceeding with data analysis and interpretation, I want to acknowledge the limited nature of my research due to a small and already biased participant pool, and also address Nonresponse Error possibilities for my research. I previously discussed the positive and negative aspects of primarily web-based data collections, and one of the most obvious of these is lack of responses, or nonresponse error.

Nonresponse error is relatively self-explanatory, as it occurs when much of the participant population neglects to respond to the survey, actively or passively. As described by Couper (2000), it is a function of both nonresponse rate and the "differences between respondents and nonrespondents on the variables of interest" (p.473). When analyzing nonresponse error and rates there are several main explanations to consider for why that rate occurred. Lack of participant motivation, technical issues, slow internet speeds, unreliable connections, use of older technology, and privacy/confidentiality concerns could absolutely inhibit web survey completion from home (Groves & Couper, 1998; Couper, 2000). The majority of nonresponse in surveys can be classified as passive, which seems to be unintentional

and unplanned (Rogelberg et al., 2003). Passive nonrespondents include those who,

unknowingly, may not have even received the survey, those who may have started their response

but forgot to complete it, or who were too busy to devote the time necessary to complete it

(Peiperl & Baruch, 1997; Rogelberg et al., 2003). Based on this, I am making the assumption

that the majority of the nonresponse seen with my survey is passive.

One clear negative of nonresponse error is that it causes smaller sample sizes, which then

decreases statistical value, increases the size of confidence intervals, and overall limits the

statistical techniques available for analysis (Rogelberg & Stanton, 2007). Unfortunately,

nonresponse error due to low response rates has the potential to undermine the credibility of the

data and can produce misleading conclusions that may not be generalizable to the entire

population (Rogelberg & Luong, 1998; Rogelberg & Stanton, 2007). As previously stated,

however, I will not be basing the validity of my results based solely on response rate. All data

will be analyzed and included in the interpretation.

Demographics

Results from the Demographic section of the survey are organized in Table 3, and this

includes both paper mail responses and ones completed online. In this section, I will be detailing

the results from the Demographics section of my survey and comparing them to their respective

overall population statistics from the U.S. 2019 Census Bureau records. Exactly 50% of the

respondent population indicated being 66 years or older when asked to select their age category.

That is not necessarily surprising, given that 18% of the Kings Mountain, NC population is 64

years or older, and the second and third most populous age ranges of 36-45 and 56-65 constitute

10.8% and 14.2% of the population, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Regarding gender,

there were over twice the amount of female respondents (68%) to male respondents (29%), and

the gap widened when comparing female, male, and 'Prefer not to state' (3%). A higher

percentage of female respondents is supported by population statistics of 54.8% female and

45.2% male, however not to the extent seen in the survey respondents (U.S. Census Bureau,

2019). Further discussion on the demographic results will be included in the Discussion section.

Table 3: *Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents*

Demographic Variables	n	%
Age		
18-25	0	0%
26-35	2	5%
36-45	7	21%
46-55	1	3%
56-65	7	21%
66 or older	17	50%
Gender		
Female	23	68%
Male	10	29%
Prefer not to state	1	3%
Ethnicity		
White	31	91%
Latino/Latina or Hispanic	1	3%
African American	0	0%
Native American	0	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3%
Other	1	3%

Ethnicity also saw responses that seemed to reflect the overall population of Kings

Mountain, NC. 91% of respondents identified as White, compared to 74.3% of the entire

population (U.S Census Bureau, 2019). No respondents identified themselves as Native

American, and 0.7% of the population was reported to identify as Native American or

Indigenous. Two of the lowest reporting groups- Latino/Latina or Hispanic and Asian/Pacific

Islander- are also two of the lowest reporting groups in the 2019 census, with 2.8% and 1.7%

reporting, respectively. No residents identifying as African American responded to my survey, compared to the 22.5% of Black or African American residents of the Kings Mountain population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). The primary respondent groups, therefore, can be identified as white females aged 66 or older.

Place Attachment

The second section of my survey contained questions relevant for understanding levels of place attachment from the Kings Mountain community. Measures selected for determining high or low levels of place attachment included: positive or negative responses about the town, positive or negative responses about the museum, and positive or negative responses about community connectivity and engagement. Length of residency was compared to these measures to see if there was any correlation between the two.

Question 5, listed and coded in Table 4, contained response options that indicated either positive or negative levels of placemaking and place attachment. Because respondents were given the option to select more than one response option, an additional response code was created to account for respondents selecting both a) and b). Selecting response options a), b), or both indicates that respondent as having higher levels of place attachment to Kings Mountain, whereas selecting options c), d) or both indicate lower or no place attachment to Kings Mountain. 95% of responses to Question 5 were positive, meaning that respondents selected any combination of a) and/or b), whereas 5% of respondents were negative, selecting c) or d). The overall response then to Question 5 is positive, indicating higher levels of placemaking and place attachment to Kings Mountain. Detailed examples of the analysis process can be found in Appendix B.

Table 4: *Survey Question 5*

Question 5	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select which statement(s) you most identify with in terms of how you feel about living in Kings Mountain:	a. When I am away, I miss it. b. I like living here. c. I do not feel a strong attachment to the town. d. I do not like living here.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 (both a and b selected)	a. 18% b. 59% c. 5% d. 0% e. 18%

Question 6, listed and coded in Table 5, allowed respondents to categorize their length of

residency in Kings Mountain. 81% of respondents indicated long term residency (more than 15

years) in Kings Mountain- any combination of options a), b), c), and d). Responses to this

question were compared to Questions 5 and 7 to examine any potential correlation between

length of residency and place attachment, and those results will be discussed later in this paper.

Table 5: *Survey Question 6*

Question 6:	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select which statement(s) are most accurate for you in terms of how long you have lived in Kings Mountain:	a. I have lived here my entire life. b. My family has lived here for as long as I can remember. c. I have lived here for 25 years or more. d. I have lived here between 15 and 25 years. e. I have lived here between 5 and 15 years. f. I have lived in Kings Mountain for 5 years or less.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 f. 6 g. 7 (both a and b selected) h. 8 (both b and c selected)	a. 9% b. 23% c. 27% d. 5% e. 18% f. 0% g. 9% h. 9%

Question 7, listed in Table 6, asked respondents to rate six statements on a scale from 1-5, from 'I do not agree' to 'I absolutely agree'. Statements 7.1-7.4 are positive statements about place attachment and branch into collective identity, while Statements 7.5-7.6 are indicative of a lack of attachments to the Kings Mountain community and allow respondents to self-select and remove themselves from that community. Rating positive statements highly (with a 3, 4, or 5) and negative statements lower (with a 1 or 2) denotes an attachment to the community and the town of Kings Mountain, while rating positive statements lower and negative statements higher indicates the opposite. Statement 7.4 specifically allows for branching into and emphasis of collective identity. The ratings for each Statement from Question 7 can be seen below in Table 6. Overall, the majority of ratings for all statements in Question 7 were positive.

Table 6: *Survey Question 7*

Question 7:	Statements:	Percentages:
Rate each statement on a scale from 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree':	7.1: I feel like a connected member of this community. 7.2: I would be a different person without this community. 7.3: When something bad happens in the community, I personally feel hurt. 7.4: My personality, morals, and beliefs are similar to others in the community. 7.5: I do not feel like a connected member of this community. 7.6: I do not consider myself to be a member of this community.	7.1: 86% positive, 14% negative 7.2: 80% positive, 20% negative 7.3: 90% positive, 10% negative 7.4: 79% positive, 21% negative 7.5: 79% positive, 21% negative 7.6: 81% positive, 19% negative

Historical Consciousness

The third section of my survey contained questions relevant for determining levels of historical consciousness and collective community identity amongst the Kings Mountain

community. Measures selected for determining high or low levels of historical consciousness and collective community identity included: time spent outside of the museum actively considering the history of the town, time spent actively comparing the past and present of the town, knowledge of family history in the town, and positive or negative opinions about the Kings Mountain community. Length of residency was compared to knowledge of family history in the town to see if there was any correlation between the two.

Question 8, listed and coded in Table 7, required respondents to report the level at which they consider the history of Kings Mountain on their own time and in their daily lives. Selecting any combination of response options a) and b) indicates the active intention of the respondent to consider the history of Kings Mountain on their own time, denoting levels of historical consciousness and consideration. 100% of respondents selected option a), b), or both, therefore the overall response to Question 8 is positive, indicating active or higher levels of historical consciousness.

Table 7: *Survey Question 8*

Question 8:	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select which statement(s) you most agree with in terms of the history of Kings Mountain:	a. I think a lot about the history of the town. b. I sometimes think about the history of the town. c. I never consider the history of the town.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 (both a and b selected)	a. 60% b. 36% c. 0% d. 4%

Question 9 (Table 8) asked respondents to disclose their opinions and level of comfort with the history of Kings Mountain as compared to the present day Kings Mountain. Selecting a combination of a), b), and/or d) indicates the respondents take the time to consider the history of

the town and its influences on their personality and existence individually and as a community today. 79% of respondents selected a), b), and/or d), denoting an overall positive opinion and positive levels of historical consciousness amongst respondents.

Table 8: *Survey Question 9*

Question 9:	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select which statement(s) you most agree with about the history of the Kings Mountain community:	a. I feel as though I understand the history of the community. b. The history of the town has a large impact on my life and who I am today. c. I do not think the history of the town has an impact on my life and who I am today. d. I feel that there is an issue with other members of the community not knowing and understanding the history of the town. e. I am not familiar enough with the history of the town to have an informed opinion.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 f. 6 (both a and b selected) g. 7 (both a and d selected) h. 8 (both b and d selected) i. 9 (a, b, and d all selected)	a. 12.50% b. 8.33% c. 12.50% d. 8.33% e. 8.33% f. 25% g. 16.67% h. 4.17% i. 4.17%

Option d) intentionally addresses collective identity levels, as it requires respondents to also consider the knowledge levels of other members of their community, thereby introducing an element of potential intra-group conflict. It also specifically speaks to the consideration of a collective present day identity and the importance of the town's past in how it exists today. Table 9 shows the frequency of option d) being selected either individually or in combination with other response options. 33% of respondents selected d) as one of their responses, suggesting a positive overall response correlating historical consciousness and collective identity.

Table 9: *Survey Question 9 Responses Containing Option d)*

Code	Frequency	Percentage
4	2	8%
7	4	17%
8	1	4%
9	1	4%
Total	**8**	**33%**

Question 10 (Table 10) asks respondents to disclose knowledge of family history and involvement in Kings Mountain, asking specifically for knowledge of family involvement in the creation of the town of Kings Mountain. 59% of respondents reported having any level of knowledge of ancestor history in the town- any combination of a), b), and c), and 33% of respondents indicating knowledge of ancestors involved in the creation of the town- any combination of a) and b). Responses to this question were compared to Question 6 (length of residency), as well Questions 8, 9, 11, and 12 to examine any potential correlation, and those results will be discussed later in the paper.

Question 11 (Table 11) measured for positive levels of collective identity and opinions on the Kings Mountain Historical Museum amongst respondents. 92% of respondents selected any combination of options a) and b), indicating positive opinions about the museum, and that the museum plays some role in community building and engagement. Considering the Kings Mountain community and having positive opinions of the museum in the community requires that respondents position themselves as members of that community, which can be interpreted as a developed sense of collective identity.

Table 10: *Survey Question 10*

Question 10:	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select the following statement(s) that are most accurate for you:	a. I know details of ancestors of mine that were involved in the history of Kings Mountain. b. My ancestors were involved in the creation of Kings Mountain. c. I am aware of family stories of ancestor involvement in the history of Kings Mountain, but do not know any specific information. d. None of my ancestors that I am aware of were involved in the history of Kings Mountain.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 (both a and b selected) f. 6 (both a and c selected) g. 7 (both c and d selected) h. 8 (a, b, and c all selected)	a. 8.33% b. 0% c. 8.33% d. 37.50% e. 33.33% f. 4.17% g. 4.17% h. 4.17%

Table 11: *Survey Question 11*

Question 11:	Response options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select which of the following option(s) you most agree with:	a. The Kings Mountain Historical Museum is an incredibly important asset for bringing the community together. b. The museum is important to the community, but is not the primary source of community building. c. The museum is sort of important for bringing the community together, but does not have a large influence. d. The museum is not necessary in the community.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 (both a and b selected)	a. 52% b. 28% c. 8% d. 0% e. 12%

Question 12 (Table 12) asked respondents to rate five statements on a scale from 1-5, from 'I do not agree' to 'I absolutely agree'. Statements 12.1-12.2 are positive statements about historical consciousness and collective identity, and Statement 12.3 contains more neutral statements about the connections between past and present Kings Mountain. Statements 12.4-

12.5 are more negative and are indicative of a separation or dissonance between the past and present Kings Mountain. Rating positive statements highly (with a 3, 4, or 5) indicate and negative statements lower (with a 1 or 2) denotes higher levels of historical consciousness and active consideration of the Kings Mountain community. Rating positive statements lower and negative statements higher indicates the opposite. Lower ratings for Statement 12.3 (1, 2, 3) specifically indicate disagreement and therefore neutral leaning positive, and higher ratings (3, 4) imply the opposite. The ratings for each Statement from Question 12 can be seen below in Table 12. With the exception of Statement 12.3, this question received overall positive ratings, and therefore higher levels of historical consciousness and consideration of the community.

Table 12: *Survey Question 12*

Question 12:	Statements:	Percentages:
Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree': I believe Kings Mountain's history…	12.1: … values, events, and community are very similar to those of today. 12.2: … directly contributes to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of it today. 12.3: … is important to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of the town today, but it is not a direct cause or contributor. 12.4: … is too different from the present Kings Mountain for there to be an influence. 12.5: … does not influence or relate to the values, community, and overall existence of the town today.	12.1: 82% positive, 18% negative 12.2: 85% positive, 15% negative 12.3: 50% neutral/positive, 50% neutral/negative 12.4: 63% positive, 37% negative 12.5: 68% positive, 32% negative

Museum Participation

The final section of my survey contained questions relevant for understanding levels of engagement in the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, measuring the museum's success in educating the community, and opinions of the museum's role in the Kings Mountain community-particularly in boosting community collective identity. Measures selected for determining high or low levels of museum engagement, collective identity, and the role of the museum in the community included: positive and negative opinions about the museum, ideas of the museum circulating and teaching new content, frequency of visits, visitor comfort while inside the museum, and positive or negative opinions of the museum as creating/strengthening community identity. Visit frequency was compared to visitor comfort, length of residency (Question 6), and Questions 14-16 to see if there was any correlation.

Question 13 (Table 13) asks respondents to quantify the frequency of their visits to the Kings Mountain Historical Museum from the year 2019 and previous. 80% of respondents reported visiting the museum once or more in 2019 and before, while 20% reported visiting sometime in the past two to five years. Responses for this question were compared to length of residency and the other questions in this section, and those results will be discussed later.

Question 14 (Table 14) asks respondents to report their level(s) of engagement within the museum and its content, as well as provide information about the intentions behind their movement throughout the museum. Engagement with content is considered positive and successful if response options a), b), e), f), or any combination of the four are chosen. 88% of respondents selected any combination of the above positive response options, indicating overall positive levels of engagement and intentional movement amongst respondents.

Table 13: *Survey Question 13*

Question 13:	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Please select the following that is most accurate to you: In 2019 and before, I have …	a. … visited the Kings Mountain Historical Museum more than once a year. b. … visited the museum once a year. c. … visited the museum sometime in the past 2 years. d. … visited the museum sometime in the past 5 years. e. … never visited the museum.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5	a. 64% b. 16% c. 8% d. 12% e. 0%

Table 14: *Survey Question 14*

Question 14:	Response Options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Please select the following option(s) that are most accurate for you: When visiting the museum, I…	a. … stop and read/look at every display. b. … spend more time at displays that are more interesting to me and tend to bypass any others. c. … tend to wander between displays with no intended pathway. d. … I spend more time engaging with other visitors than the displays. e. … went to see a specific display. f. … went for a specific program or event.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 f. 6 g. 7 (both a and c selected) h. 8 (both a and e selected) i. 9 (both b and c selected) j. 10 (both b and e selected) k. 11 (both b and f selected) l. 12 (both e and f selected) m. 13 (a, c, and d all selected) n. 14 (a, e, and f all selected) o. 15 (b, e, and f all selected)	a. 24% b. 16% c. 0% d. 0% e. 4% f. 4% g. 4% h. 4% i. 4% j. 4% k. 4% l. 4% m. 4% n. 20% o. 4%

Question 15 (Table 15) asks respondents to quantify the nature of education received, and to compare that education with prior knowledge they may have had before visiting. Selecting response options that indicate learning new information, correcting incorrect information, or affirming previous knowledge are considered positive- any combination of response options a), b), c), e), f), or any combination of them. 100% of respondents indicated that the museum taught at least some new information, corrected prior misinformation, or correctly affirmed prior knowledge.

Table 15: *Survey Question 15*

Question 15:	Response options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select the following option(s) that are most accurate for you: When viewing exhibits…	a. … I always learn new information. b. … I sometimes learn new information. c. … I learn some new information but I mostly have some prior knowledge of the subject matter. d. … I have prior knowledge of all information included in exhibits. e. … I have prior knowledge of the information included, but through viewing I learned that some of that information is incorrect. f. … the information included in exhibits affirms my prior knowledge of the subject. g. … I pay more attention to the objects than to the text included.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 f. 6 g. 7 h. 8 (both a and c selected) i. 9 (both a and e selected) j. 10 (both b and c selected) k. 11 (both b and f selected) l. 12 (both c and f selected)	a. 48% b. 24% c. 0% d. 0% e. 0% f. 0% g. 0% h. 8% i. 4% j. 4% k. 8% l. 4%

Question 16 (Table 16) asks respondents to report their opinion on the Kings Mountain

Historical Museum and its role and value in the Kings Mountain community. This question is

important for assessing the role that the museum plays specifically in building or affirming this

community's collective identity. The museum would be considered to be successful in building

or affirming collective identity if respondents select response options that indicate positive

opinions and attitudes- any combination of response options a), b), and c). 92% of respondents

reported positive opinions on the museum's role in the community and in creating or affirming

collective identity. 8% of respondents selected response options still indicating positive opinions

about the museum however did not indicate that the museum had any meaningful impact in

maintaining or affirming collective identity.

Table 16: *Survey Question 16*

Question 16:	Response options:	Codes:	Percentages:
Select the following option(s) you most agree with: The Kings Mountain Historical Museum…	a. … accurately represents the community. b. … plays an active role in bringing the community together. c. … works with the community to build us up. d. … is a fun addition to the community but does not have any meaningful impact. e. … does not represent or impact the community.	a. 1 b. 2 c. 3 d. 4 e. 5 f. 6 (both a and b selected) g. 7 (both b and c selected) h. 8 (a, b, and c all selected)	a. 8% b. 8% c. 8% d. 8% e. 0% f. 4% g. 30% h. 34%

Question 17 (Table 17) asked respondents to rate four statements on a scale from 1-5,

from 'I do not agree' to 'I absolutely agree'. Statements 17.1-17.3 are positive statements about

the museum and visitor's feelings while inside the museum. Statement 17.4 is more negative and indicative of disliking visiting the museum. Rating positive statements highly (with a 3, 4, or 5) indicate and negative statements lower (with a 1 or 2) denotes higher levels of engagement with the Kings Mountain Historical Museum and overall positive opinions and feelings associated with visiting. Rating positive statements lower and negative statements higher indicates the opposite. The ratings for each Statement from Question 17 can be seen below in Table 17. Overall, the responses for Question 17 are all positive.

Table 17: *Survey Question 17*

Question 17:	Statements:	Percentages:
Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree':	17.1: When visiting the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, I feel welcomed and as though I belong. 17.2: When visiting the museum, I often ask questions and interact with the staff. 17.3: When visiting the museum, I often interact with other visitors. 17.4: I do not like to visit the museum.	17.1: 96% positive, 4% negative 17.2: 90% positive, 10% negative 17.3: 75% positive, 25% negative 17.4: 94% positive, 6% negative

Short Response Questions

The final two questions from the survey (Questions 18 and 19) were optional short-response style questions. These two were specifically included for respondents to provide voluntary additional information relevant to the museum and other questions in the survey. Not every respondent provided responses to these questions, and several responses received were not relevant to the nature and subjects of my research.

Question 18 asked respondents to explain or provide an example of any aspect(s) of their visit to the museum that were noticeably positive or negative, and received twelve responses. Of these twelve, there were nine responses that included language or experiences with the museum that were clearly positive or negative. 89% (eight out of nine) of these responses used positive language and relayed either general or specific positive feedback about the museum. Of these positive responses, three made reference to a specific event or exhibit, four referenced donating family historical materials to the museum or using the museum as a historical resource, and five provided positive feelings and experiences about the museum in general and museum staff. The one negative response ("This a small town museum. I feel that the Director and staff should always be actively involved in welcoming visitors and explaining the exhibits and this has not always been the case"; Respondent ID 232) provides feedback specifically about museum staff and makes no mention of exhibit/museum content.

Question 19 provided space for respondents to write any questions or additional comments regarding the survey and my research in general, and also received twelve responses. Of these twelve, four responses provided positive feelings and feedback about the museum and hopes for its continued success, and one response indicated negative feelings about the museum and staff (Respondent ID 151). One of the twelve responses (Respondent ID 414) contained additional response comments to specific questions in the survey (Question 6 and Question 9). Four responses contained additional information regarding their personal history in Kings Mountain (i.e., involvement with museum board, length and history of residency in the town). One response (Respondent ID 222) indicated concerns about the quality and future of the museum due to a lack of economic support from the Kings Mountain government. Finally, one response (Respondent ID 444) raised concerns about reaching and engaging minority

populations in Kings Mountain, but does not specify which minority groups (i.e., ethnic/racial, gender/sexuality, age, etc.).

DISCUSSION

The Community Attachment, Historical Consciousness, and Museum Participation sections of my survey all received overall positive responses at the levels of both the individual question and cumulative sections. The following section will discuss the implications of the responses in each section, and how they are useful both to myself and the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. Additionally, I will discuss relevant trends and correlations seen between questions and sections and discuss the relevant responses from Questions 18 and 19, the two open-ended questions at the very end of the survey. Countless correlations and comparisons could be made between these questions, however I have focused on those most relevant to my theoretical questions and of most interest to a history museum.

Community Identity and Attachment

This section consisted of three questions and measured for place attachment amongst respondents. 51% of respondents completed every part of all three questions, and of that 65% of responses were positive across all three questions. The level of place attachment or placemaking abilities is heavily reliant on the creation of a bond and association between a person and that place, and the responses from this section being position overall indicate that the Kings Mountain community shares that bond and clear association with the town. Kings Mountain meets the anthropological definition of place established earlier in this paper- a locale with physical (i.e., geographic) and metaphorical (i.e. emotional, cultural) significance (Ward, 2003). The town itself exists as the physical memory of culturally and historically symbolic events, the 1780 Battle of Kings Mountain and the settlement of southwestern North Carolina.

The Kings Mountain Historical Museum itself is a product of community placemaking desires and skills. It was conceived by the collaborative (i.e., grassroots) efforts of the former

Mayor of the town and the residents at the time with the intention of transforming the material belongings of past residents into a community-oriented educational and entertainment experience. With its constant flow of artifact loans and donations from residents with historic relatives, the Kings Mountain Historical Museum is a dynamic space wherein community relationships are changing for the better, according to my survey responses.

Several responses to Questions 18 and 19 also reflect heavy place attachment and placemaking amongst Kings Mountain residents. In response to Question 18, Respondent 131 said "I love history and the history of KM so hope the community (and especially town government) will better embrace, appreciate and promote the town's history." This is one of several responses that reference the role of Kings Mountain's government as well. Respondent 212 replied "I am very proud of the growing accomplishments the museum has made over the years. It is an honor to have a museum in one's town for the people of the town and surrounding areas to visit." Both responses indicate a personal appreciation and connection to the town, and pride in the history of the town.

In Question 19, Respondent 200 provided information about their personal history in the town- "I was born in KM and grew up here. I lived away for over 20 years and returned 6 years ago and am very happy to return to my hometown. I want to see it grow and prosper." Their choice to return to Kings Mountain after growing up indicates strong connections and positive attachments to the town. Respondent 212 references the role of the museum in establishing attachment to the town and its history by replying "Kings Mountain has a rich history, and I am pleased the Museum exists to keep that history alive." Finally, Respondent 222 provides another reference to the town's government, saying "I honestly believe that the governing body and the citizens of Kings Mountain while they claim to value their history do not adequately support this

museum. Case in point while the city of Kings Mountain government provides financial support to the museum that support was cut in 2009 due to the recession and has never been restored to its prior level." This response indicates frustration with the lack of support and involvement with the museum and town's history. This person also references a specific year and event where the government deliberately cut financial support to the museum, indicating that this individual is closely involved and informed about the town and the museum.

Questions 11 and 16 are of particular importance to understanding the museum's ability to curate or perpetuate a collective identity amongst Kings Mountain community members. Question 11 asks respondents to select response option(s) regarding the role and importance of the Kings Mountain Historical Museum in the Kings Mountain Community and received 92% positive responses and 8% negative (as noted in Results & Analysis). Question 16 asks respondents to report how well the Kings Mountain Historical Museum represents and supports their community and also received 92% positive responses and 8% negative. When comparing the responses between the two questions, 62% of participants responded to both Question 11 and 16, and of that 88% of respondents provided positive responses for both, suggesting that the museum is in fact successful in curating and perpetuating a collective Kings Mountain identity. Responses to this section of my survey indicate overall positive levels of placemaking and place attachment in Kings Mountain, as well as a positive influence on the collective identity of the Kings Mountain community.

Historical Consciousness

This section consisted of five questions and measured for historical consciousness and community/collective identity development amongst Kings Mountain Historical Museum

visitors. 46% of respondents responded to every part of all five questions, and of that 17% of respondents chose positive response options across the entire section.

Statement 12.3 ("I believe Kings Mountain's history… is important to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of the town today, but it is not a direct cause or contributor.") was a more neutral statement as compared to 12.1-12.2 and 12.4-12.5. As mentioned in Results & Analysis, Statement 12.3 received 50% neutral leaning positive ratings (rating a 1 or 2) and 50% neutral leaning negative (rating a 3, 4, or 5). Of the five, it was the only Statement in Question 12 to not have received a majority response, and the other Statements in Question 12 all received majority positive responses. It is important to note that 'negative' response options do not necessarily imply adverse or unfavorable feelings about the town or subject matter but are merely a marker for the opposite or absence of active positive responses.

One reason for this may have been lack of question clarity. When constructing a survey, the researcher must consider how questions are worded and arranged in order to ensure focused responses (Weller, 1998; Parajuli, 2004). Likert Scale questions, such as Questions 7, 12, and 17 in my survey, were created and are employed "to measure 'attitude' in a scientifically accepted and validated manner" (Joshi et al., 2015, p. 397) and are applied in studies in different contexts (Youngman, 1986; Laws, 2003; Casakin, Hernández, & Ruiz, 2015; Toolis, 2018). It is possible that Statement 12.3 lacked the clarity necessary for a majority 'positive' or 'negative' response.

As previously discussed, there are four main umbrella categories for historical consciousness: Traditional, Exemplary, Critical, and Genetic (Rüsen 1987, 2004; Wallace-Casey, 2017). If we were to examine the history of exhibits and visitor experiences within the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, it is likely that all four would present at some point in time, and the four are not mutually exclusive. Based on responses to the survey and review of the short

responses, it seems as though traditional historical consciousness is the primary category present amongst visitors. Traditional historical consciousness establishes that the historical narratives present within the space are part of common background knowledge or are embedded into the exhibit and provides visitors with origin stories of our values.

Several of the short responses to Question 18 also speak to the presence of traditional historical consciousness in respondents, mostly by speaking to personal experiences of using the museum as a historical resource generally or as a place to better understand their family history. Respondent 151 replied " … I have the added bonus of my relative [X] being featured in displays…", indicating that they are clearly aware of their family history in Kings Mountain. This is additionally supported by their responses to Questions 8-10 in the Historical Consciousness section of the survey. Respondent 151 selected response options to these questions indicating that they do think about the history of the town (Questions 8), they understand and are directly influenced by the history of the town (Question 9), and they have direct knowledge of family history in the creation of the town (Question 10).

To Question 18, Respondent 202 replied "I have used the museum to copy Civil War letters in my family archive and to keep a copy at the museum. They were very helpful. We are fortunate to have the museum here!" A similar reply comes from Respondent 404, with "Museum has great resources and is a wonderful place to donate family history to preserve for generations to come!" This is again echoed by Respondent 424, who said "I love being able to share or donate historical information/items to the museum for others to enjoy. I also enjoy what the museum or others have to share. The museum works to educate and also entertain the residents and visitors of Kings Mountain. Pleasing, friendly, learning environment." All three respondents reported having relationships with the museum that involve a personal connection to

the town's history, primarily through the donation of relevant family memorabilia. Comparing their responses to the Historical Consciousness section of the survey, all three respondents reported that they do think about the history of the town (Questions 8), that they feel directly influenced by the history of the town (Question 9), and they have knowledge of family history in Kings Mountain (Question 10).

For all four of these respondents, elements of traditional historical consciousness are present. Historical knowledge and narratives are part of their background knowledge, and the use of the museum as a historical resource allows them to better understand the origins of relevant family history and current values. More generally, and with the exception of Statement 12.3, the responses to the questions in this section were positive overall and therefore indicative of levels of historical consciousness amongst respondents.

Museum Participation

This section consisted of five questions that measured museum engagement, collective identity, and general opinions of the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, and also asked generally about frequency of visits. 49% of respondents responded to every part of all five questions, and of that 37% of respondents chose positive response options across the entire section.

As previously mentioned, museum visitors typically only stop and look at one third of all elements of an exhibit and might not always give that third sufficient attention to absorb information (Rounds, 2006). Questions in this section directly addressed this 'browse mode' (Rounds, 2006), the pros and cons of which were previously discussed. Questions 14, 15, and 17 asked respondents about their levels of engagement and interaction with museum objects, exhibits, and staff members, all of which received positive responses. Several responses to

Question 18 corroborate the museum's success in countering visitor 'browse mode', referencing either general museum experiences or a specific exhibit or event they attended.

In response to Question 18, Respondent 151 replied "We love visiting the museum when we visit my hometown. The exhibits are always interesting and informative. My family particularly enjoys the trains and toys exhibit each year. My daughter loves the trains, my husband and I love speaking with the volunteers who run the exhibit, and I have the added bonus of my relative [X] being featured in displays because he was a conductor." This individual grew up in Kings Mountain and makes an active effort to return for specific exhibits. They reference levels of engagement within the museum space with themselves and with members of their family, and also indicate being aware of ancestor involvement in the town. A cross reference of this Respondent 151's responses to the Historical Consciousness section of the survey show positive levels of historical consciousness as well. Finally, Respondent 252 replied "Museum workers are very welcoming and friendly. We go every year for the trains. Try to see the other exhibits if of interest", indicating enjoyment in the museum's content and referencing repeat visitation.

Question 15 is particularly important for understanding the success of the museum in educating visitors. The question asked respondents to select what response option(s) they felt were most accurate for them regarding the content and level of education they receive from museum exhibits. The Results & Analysis section showed that responses to this question were overall positive, with 100% of respondents selecting options that indicated the museum has a positive impact on their education, but here I will include a more in depth breakdown of responses to this question. 48% of respondents selected option a) "I always learn new information", followed by 24% selecting option b) "I sometimes learn new information". 4% of

respondents selected options that indicated learning no new information, having prior knowledge affirmed by the museum content, or focusing on the objects rather than their accompanying text description (response options c), d), f), and g)). This in combination with the positive responses to Question 18 and 19 indicate that the museum is successful in educating and entertaining its visitors.

Correlations

As previously mentioned, many correlations and comparisons could be made between response data from this survey, however I am focusing on the most pertinent and informative to my research and a history museum like the Kings Mountain Historical museum. There was a positive correlation between length of residency and knowledge of ancestor involvement or family history in Kings Mountain (Questions 6 and 10). 62% of respondents who indicated living in the town for 15 years or more (i.e., long-term residency) also indicated having knowledge of ancestor involvement and family history in the town. Additionally, a positive correlation between length of residency and frequency of visits (Questions 6 and 13) was seen, where 71% of respondents indicated long-term residency and visiting the museum once a year or more.

Demographic Influences

As mentioned in the Results & Analysis section, the Demographic results of my survey generally reflect the overall population statistics for Kings Mountain, NC as reported in 2019 U.S. Census Bureau records. Here, I will discuss several of these results in greater detail and their implications.

Gender

68% of survey respondents identified as Female, compared to 29% identifying as male. This also reflects the population statistics of Kings Mountain generally in 2019 (as reported in

the Results & Analysis) of more females (54.8%) to males (45.2%) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). This may reflect the gender ratio of visitors to the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, however the membership and subscription documents do not include gender identity and would therefore require additional research. Women may be more likely to go to museums due to several fluctuating factors such as amount of free time and level of cultural interests and awareness (Burton & Scott, 2003; Chang, 2006). Additionally, women may be more likely to participate in surveys than men, however the literature on gender motivations in all forms of surveys are mixed and in need of expansion (Underwood et al., 2000; Curtin et al 2000; Singer et al 2000; Kwak & Radler, 2002; Moore & Tarnai, 2002; Sax et al., 2003; Smith, 2008).

Age

The largest category of respondent age was 66 years or older with 50% of respondents (as reported in the Results & Analysis section). When compared to US Census Bureau records, the largest adult population is residents 65 years and up at 18.1% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). The smallest category of respondent age was 18-25 at 0% as compared to population records at 5.5% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). The overwhelmingly large difference in the youngest and oldest age groups does not reflect the current literature about survey respondent demographics, as previous studies suggest that younger individuals seem to be more likely to respond to surveys in all formats (Goyder, 1986; Moore & Tarnai, 2002; Kaplowitz et al., 2004; Smith, 2008; Yan & Tourangeau, 2008).

One cause for this discrepancy may be addressed in several of the responses to Question 19. Several respondents provided information about their personal history in town and concerns about lack of engagement by younger residents. Respondent 200 noted that they were "... born in KM and grew up here. I lived away for over 20 years and returned 6 years ago…", and

Respondent 414 replied "... I grew up in KM, left for college, then lived in Charlotte for 26 years then returned to KM…". Growing up and moving away from a small rural hometown is increasingly common from the 1950s onward, particularly once people reach college-age or their early twenties (Fuguitt and Heaton, 1995; Johnson & Fuguitt, 2000; Johnson et al., 2005; Johnson, 2006). As a small and relatively rural town, Kings Mountain would not be exempt from that trend. This is further corroborated by Respondent 424's reply to Question 19: "… I wish more younger people would show an interest in our museum. Like many small towns, our young people grow up and leave. I DID." This trend of younger residents migrating out of their small towns once they reach adulthood likely accounts for the lack of responses from that age category. This suggests a need for the Kings Mountain Historical Museum to engage with this age group (late teens-early twenties) through new programming or different volunteer or internship opportunities.

Ethnicity

The majority of survey respondents were white (91%), and white residents make up the majority of the Kings Mountain population (73.6%) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Some data seems to suggest that white individuals are more likely to participate in surveys than non-white individuals (Curtin et al., 2000; Groves et al., 2000; Voight et al, 2003; Smith, 2008), however there is relevant population data that is relevant.

Despite historic perceptions of rural American towns as overwhelmingly white, data suggests that BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) populations in these spaces are continuously increasing (Johnson, 2006). Additionally, the current literature suggests that even currently, rural areas are much more ethnically diverse than historical data and perceptions suggests. Specifically, there are substantial African-American and Hispanic communities in the

American Southeast (Johnson, 2006), and the past decade has shown great numeric increase in Asian/Pacific Islander populations taking place in the non-metro South (Brown & Kandel, 2006).

The second largest ethnic population in 2019 was African Americans, with 22.5% reported in 2019 U.S Census Bureau Records, however 0% of survey respondents reported being African American. Clearly there is an African-American population in Kings Mountain, however they may not be being reached by the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. This concern is echoed by Respondent 444 in their response to Question 19: "I often wondered if any outreach to the minority community in KM has been made with respect to getting more interest and historical overview and involvement." A museum, particularly a local history museum, cannot adequately represent their community if such large portions of the population are not included or being engaged, so this data suggests that BIPOC engagement and inclusion should be advocated for and acted upon, potentially through conversations with the community, new programming, or new education initiatives.

Negative Responses

As discussed, the majority of responses from the survey were positive overall, however I want to discuss the negative short responses from Question 18 and 19. There were only two, and both seem to center around experiences with the staff as opposed to things directly related to the grounding theories and measures for Collective Identity, Historical Consciousness, and Placemaking/Attachment.

In response to Question 18, Respondent 232 replied: "This a small town museum. I feel that the Director and staff should always be actively involved in welcoming visitors and explaining the exhibits and this has not always been the case." When reviewing their responses to the three main sections of my survey, 56% of their responses were positive. In response to

Question 19, Respondent 151 said "They are not friendly and they are very cold", assuming the 'they' being referenced is the museum staff or volunteers. In contrast to Respondent 232, Respondent 151 provided 88% positive responses across the three main sections of the survey.

CONCLUSIONS

The cultural and experiential opportunities within a museum are unlike other spaces of education and entertainment. History museums are constantly making attempts to define and understand their community as a method of reinforcing collective identity, and we have seen how this manifests through the development of historical consciousness and place attachment. The results from this survey show that the Kings Mountain Historical Museum is successful in promoting a collective identity amongst Kings Mountain community members, positively influences placemaking and place attachment for the community, and promotes historical consciousness amongst visitors. Additionally, the museum is successful in educating and engaging visitors both with new information and by affirming prior knowledge. The low response rate to this survey indicates that this is not truly a comprehensive sample of the Kings Mountain population, and results would almost certainly be different if a larger portion of the potential respondent population participated.

The Kings Mountain Historical Museum is a product of community placemaking desires and skills. It was conceived by the collaborative (i.e. grassroots) efforts of the former Mayor of the town and the residents at the time with the intention of transforming the material belongings of past residents into a community-oriented educational and entertainment experience. With its constant flow of artifact loans and donations from residents with historic relatives, the Kings Mountain Historical Museum is a dynamic space wherein community relationships are changing for the better, according to my survey responses. Representing a community well involves helping members understand their role and placement in their community in the past and present.

We can better understand the nature of the historical consciousness present amongst visitors by reviewing the four umbrella categories proposed by Rüsen (1987, 2004) and Wallace-

Casey (2017): Traditional (establishes that the presented historical narratives are pre-given and provide visitors with origin stories of our values), Exemplary (considers that historical narratives exist as examples providing lessons or fables for present visitors), Critical (challenges the traditional historical narratives and includes different points of view and counter-stories), or Genetic (states that change is considered central to the past and is what provides meaning to the history we know). It is very important that historical museums, their exhibits, and especially their narratives encourage the development or employment of one of these four, and The Kings Mountain community demonstrates developed levels of traditional historical consciousness intertwined with clear and strong place attachment bonds.

Additionally, the educational and entertainment content presented by the Kings Mountain Historical Museum clearly resonates with visitors, both in influencing the level of knowledge absorbed by visitors and the quality and quantity of visits. As stated by museum director, January Costa, smaller towns hold a powerful sense of community, and clearly, most of the residents of Kings Mountain specifically have family ties to historic members of the original Kings Mountain community.

Future directions for similar research at the Kings Mountain Historical Museum post-Coronacene could involve attempts to reach the resident population that are not familiar with the museum, or choose not to visit the museum to assess for any statistically significant differences in place attachment, collective identity, or historical consciousness. The addition of exit interviews with visitors in the museum space could remove the barriers created by remote data collection, however they would come with their own potential errors and biases. Participant observation of visitor engagement and movement throughout the museum is a common methodology in museum studies research, and would likely prove beneficial here to better

understand how behaviors and knowledge acquisition in the museum translate in their survey responses. I hope that the methodology and analysis employed in this research proves adaptable, useful, and comprehensible for other museums similar to the Kings Mountain Historical Museum that are interested in similar concepts.

This brings us to future directions for the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. Based on comments from survey respondents and the demographic results, there is still a large portion of the population untouched by the museum, or that may be unaware entirely. Creating plans and programming to actively engage BIPOC residents, particularly African Americans, and younger residents, particularly those in the 18-25 age range, would benefit both the museum and the community. As a local history museum, the Kings Mountain Historical Museum is charged with understanding and representing every member of their community, and achieving that means creating programming and providing interpretations for everyone.

REFERENCES

Agostino, D., Arnaboldi, M., & Lampis, A. (2020). Italian state museums during the COVID-19 crisis: from onsite closure to online openness. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, *35*(4), 362-372. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2020.1790029

Alexander, E. P., Alexander, M., & Decker, J. (2017). *Museums in motion: An introduction to the history and functions of museums.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Andermann, J., & Arnold-de Simine, S. (2012). Introduction: memory, community and the new museum. *Theory, Culture & Society, 29*(1), 3-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276411423041

Andersen, M. (2020). Early evidence on social distancing in response to COVID-19 in the United States. *Available at SSRN 3569368.*

Anderson, M. (1991). Selling the past: History in museums in the 1990s. *Australian Historical Studies, 24*(96), 130-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/10314619108595875

Backmann, D.P., Elfrink, J., & Vazzana, G. (2000). E-mail and snail mail face off in rematch. *Marketing Research, 11*(4), 10-15.

Barchard, K. A., & Williams, J. (2008). Practical advice for conducting ethical online experiments and questionnaires for United States *psychologists. Behavior research methods*, *40*(4), 1111-1128. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.4.1111

Barrett, J. (2012). *Chapter 3: Museums as Public Space. Museums and the public sphere.* John Wiley & Sons.

Bedford, L. (2001). Storytelling: The real work of museums. *Curator: the museum journal, 44*(1), 27-34.

Bonin-Rodriguez, P., & Vakharia, N. (2020). Arts entrepreneurship internationally and in the age of COVID-19. *Artivate, 9*(1), 3-7.

Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this" We"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 71*(1), 83.

Burton, C., & Scott, C. (2003). Museums: Challenges for the 21st century. *International journal of arts management, 5*(2), 56-68. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/41064787

Casakin, H., Hernández, B., & Ruiz, C. (2015). Place attachment and place identity in Israeli cities: The influence of city size. *Cities, 42*(2), 224–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2014.07.007

Chang, E. (2006). Interactive experiences and contextual learning in museums. *Studies in Art Education*, *47*(2), 170-186. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2006.11650492

Christens, B. D., Winn, L. T., & Duke, A. M. (2016). Empowerment and critical consciousness: A conceptual cross-fertilization. *Adolescent Research Review*, *1*(1), 15-27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-015-0019-3

Chronis, A. (2012). Tourists as story-builders: Narrative construction at a heritage museum. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 29*(5), 444-459. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2012.691395

Code of Federal Regulations. (2009). Protection of human subjects (45 CFR 46). Bethesda, MD: Office for Protection from Research Risks, Federal Register. Retrieved from https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/ohrp/humansubjects/regbook2013.pdf.pdf

Coderre, F., Mathieu, A., & St-Laurent, N. (2004). Comparison of the quality of qualitative data obtained through telephone, postal and email surveys. *International Journal of Market Research, 46*(3), 349-357. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/147078530404600303?casa_token=yICZn Oh5z7kAAAAA:BIPrWMcm2_agF0ZWiDIAtHVVZ3dAUc59QesP2oqmz7e5zHFrdD1-C9cU-vdpdW3DXgdGG3yC7C1A

Comley, P. (1997, September). The use of the Internet as a data collection tool. In *ESOMAR Annual Conference, Edinburgh*.

Couper, M.P. (2000) Web surveys: a review of issues and approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*(4), 464-494. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3078739

Crane, S. A. (1997). Memory, distortion, and history in the museum. *History and Theory, 36*(4), 44-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/0018-2656.00030

Cresswell, T. (2004). Place: A short introduction. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Cresswell, T. (2009). Place. Amsterdam, NL: Elsevier Inc.

Curasi, C. F. (2001). A Critical exploration of face-to face interviewing vs. computer-mediated interviewing. *International Journal of Market Research, 43*(4), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530104300402

Curtin, R., Presser, S., & Singer, E. (2000). The effects of response rate changes on the index of consumer sentiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly 64*(4), 413–428. https://doi.org/10.1086/318638

Dunn, R., & Wyver, S. (2019). Before "us" and "now": developing a sense of historical consciousness and identity at the museum. *International Journal of Early Years*

Education, 27(4), 360–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2019.1628009

Falk, J. (2009). *Identity and the museum visitor experience*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.

Falk, J. H., Moussouri, T., & Coulson, D. (1998). The effect of visitors' agendas on museum learning. *Curator: The Museum Journal, 41*(2), 107-120. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1998.tb00822.x

Fuguitt, G. V., & Heaton, T. B. (1995). The impact of migration on the nonmetropolitan population age structure, 1960–1990. *Population research and policy review*, *14*(2), 215-232. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01074459

Gaither, E. B. (1992). "Hey! That's Mine". In Karp, I., Mullen Creamer, M. and Lavine, S. D. (Eds.). *Museums and Communities.* (pp.56-64). Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Goyder, J. (1986). Surveys on surveys: Limitations and potentialities. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *50*(1), 27-41. https://doi.org/10.1086/268957

Groves, R. M., & Couper, M.P. (1998). *Nonresponse in Household Interview Surveys*. New York: Wiley.

Groves, R. M., Singer, E., & Corning, A. (2000). Leverage-saliency theory of survey participation: description and an illustration. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *64*(3), 299-308. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3078721

Higgins, R., Martin, E., & Vesperi, M. D. (2020). An anthropology of the Covid-19 pandemic. *Anthropology Now, 12*(1), 2-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/19428200.2020.1760627

Hinkson, M. (2017). Precarious placemaking. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 46*(1), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102116-041624

Hirzy, E. C. (1995). Museums in the life of a city: Strategies for community partnerships. *Washington DC: American Association of Museums*.

Huang, T.C. (2019)."Whose community museum is it? Collaboration strategies and identity affirmation in the Amache museum". *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*, 1585. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/1585

Huang, V. S., Sutermaster, S., Caplan, Y., Kemp, H., Schmutz, D., & Sgaier, S. K. (2020). Social distancing across vulnerability, race, politics, and employment: How different Americans changed behaviors before and after major COVID-19 policy announcements. *medRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20119131

Hundley, V., & Van Teijlingen, E. (2001). The importance of pilot studies. *Social Research Update, University of Surrey, Surrey*.

Jeong, J. H., & Lee, K. H. (2006). The physical environment in museums and its effects on visitors' satisfaction. *Building and Environment, 41*(7), 963-969. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2005.04.004

Johnson, K. M., & Fuguitt, G. V. (2000). Continuity and change in rural migration patterns, 1950–1995. *Rural Sociology*, *65*(1), 27-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2000.tb00341.x

Johnson, K. M., Voss, P. R., Hammer, R. B., Fuguitt, G. V., & McNiven, S. (2005). Temporal and spatial variation in age-specific net migration in the United States. *Demography*, *42*(4), 791-812. https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2005.0033

Johnson, K. M. (2006). Demographic trends in rural and small town America. *National Report 1(1), Carsey Institute, University of New Hampshire*. https://dx.doi.org/10.34051/p/2020.6

Johnson, L. A. (2000). Rural museums and their communities (Order No. 1398722). Available from Business Premium Collection; ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (230655572). Retrieved from https://librarylink.uncc.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/230655572?accountid=14605

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, *7*(4), 396-403. https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975

Kaplowitz, M. D., Hadlock, T. D., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public opinion quarterly*, *68*(1), 94-101. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfh006

Karp, I. (1992). *Introduction: museums and communities: The politics of public* space. In Karp, I., Mullen Creamer, M. and Lavine, S. D. (Eds.). *Museums and Communities*. (pp.1-18). Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Karp, I. (1992). *Part 1: On civil society and social identity*. In Karp, I., Mullen Creamer, M. and Lavine, S. D. (Eds.). *Museums and Communities*. (pp.19-33). Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research*. Wadsworth. CA: Thomson Learning.

Kinghorn, N., & Willis, K. (2008). Measuring museum visitor preferences towards opportunities for developing social capital: an application of a choice experiment to the discovery museum. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *14*(6), 555-572. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250802503290

Kings Mountain Historical Museum. (2018). History. Retrieved from
    https://www.kingsmountainmuseum.org/about.

Kings Mountain Historical Museum. (2018). Mission. Retrieved from
    https://www.kingsmountainmuseum.org/about.

Kings Mountain Historical Museum. (2019). Unpublished raw data.

Kotler, N., & Kotler, P. (1998). *Museum strategy and marketing*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
    Publishers.

Knussen, C., & McFadyen, A. (2010). Ethical issues involved in using Survey Monkey.
    Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved January, 15, 2021.

Kwak, N., & Radler, B. (2002). A comparison between mail and web surveys: Response pattern,
    respondent profile, and data quality. *Journal of official statistics*, *18*(2), 257-273.

Lanir, J., Kuflik, T., Sheidin, J., Yavin, N., Leiderman, K., & Segal, M. (2017). Visualizing
    museum visitors' behavior: Where do they go and what do they do there?. *Personal and
    Ubiquitous Computing*, *21*(2), 313-326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-016-0994-9

Laws, S., Harper, C., Jones, N., & Marcus, R. (2013). *Research for development: A practical
    guide*. Sage.

Leahy, Jennifer. (2004). *Using Excel for analyzing survey questionnaires*. Madison, Wisconsin:
    University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Leinhardt, G., Crowley, K., & Knutson, K. (Eds.) (2002). *Learning conversations in museums*.
    Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.

Low, S., & Smart, A. (2020). Thoughts about public space during Covid☐19 pandemic. *City &
    Society, Washington, DC, 32*(1), 1-5.

Low, S. M. & Altman, I. (1992). *Place attachment: A conceptual framework*. In I. Altman and S.
    Low (Eds.), *Place attachment* (pp. 1-12). New York: Plenum Publishing.

Macdonald, S. J. (2012). Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities. *Museum
    studies: An anthology of contexts, 1*(1), 1-16.

Machado, C. (2012). Qualtrics research suite in academic context. *Revista Onis Ciencia,* 1(2),
    32-54.

MacLeod, S., Hanks, L. H., & Hale, J. (2012). *Introduction. Museum making. Narratives,
    Architectures, Exhibitions*. Oxon: Routledge.

McCarthy, J., & Ciolfi, L. (2008). Place as dialogue: Understanding and supporting the museum experience. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 14*(3), 247-267. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250801953736

Mehta, R. & Sivadas, E. (1995) Comparing response rates and response content in mail versus electronic mail surveys. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 37*(4), 1-12.

Montero M. (2009). *Methods for liberation: Critical consciousness in action*. In: Sonn C., Montero M. (Eds.). *Psychology of liberation. Peace psychology book series.* Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-85784-8_4.

Moore, D. L., & Tarnai, J. (2002). *Evaluating nonresponse error in mail surveys*. In: Groves, R. M., Dillman, D. A., Eltinge, J. L., and Little, R. J. A. (Eds.)., *Survey Nonresponse*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 197–211.

Mulholland, P., Wolff, A., Kilfeather, E., Maguire, M., & O'Donovan, D. (2016). Modelling museum narratives to support visitor interpretation. *Artificial Intelligence for Cultural Heritage,* 3-20.

Ose, S. O. (2016). Using excel and word to structure qualitative data. *Journal of Applied Social Science,* 10(2), 147-161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1936724416666494

Parajuli, B. K. (2004). Questionnaire: A tool of primary data collection. *Himalayan Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 1*, 51-63.

Parker, A. C. (1935). *A manual for history museums*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Peiperl, M. A., & Baruch, Y. (1997). Models of careers: Back to square zero. *Organizational Dynamics, 35*(4), 7-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(97)90033-4

Pennisi, E. (2020). Shuttered natural history museums fight for survival. *Science, 368*(6495), 1042-1043.

Pinto, H., & Ibañez-Etxeberria, A. (2018). Constructing historical thinking and inclusive identities: Analysis of heritage education activities. *History Education Research Journal*, *15*(2), 342-354. https://doi/org/10.1126/science.368.6495.1042

Qualtrics. (2020). Data Protection and Privacy. Retrieved from https://www.qualtrics.com/support/survey-platform/getting-started/data-protection-privacy/

Qualtrics. (2020). Survey Protection. Retrieved from https://www.qualtrics.com/support/survey-platform/survey-module/survey-options/survey-protection/

Regmi, P. R., Waithaka, E., Paudyal, A., Simkhada, P., & Van Teijlingen, E. (2016). Guide to the design and application of online questionnaire surveys. *Nepal journal of epidemiology, 6*(4), 640-644. https://doi.org/10.3126/nje.v6i4.17258

Rivera-Orraca, L. (2009). Are museums sites of memory? *The New School Psychology Bulletin, 6*(2), 32-37.

Rappaport, J. (2000). Community narratives: Tales of terror and joy. *American journal of community psychology*, *28*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005161528817

Rogelberg, S. G., Conway, J. M., Sederburg, M. E., Spitzmuller, C., Aziz, S., & Knight, W. E. (2003). Profiling active and passive-non-respondents to an organizational survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(6), 1104-1114. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.6.1104

Rogelberg, S. G., & Luong, A. (1998). Nonresponse to mailed surveys: A review and guide. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 7*(2), 60-65.

Rogelberg, S. G., & Stanton, J. M. (2007). Introduction: Understanding and dealing with organizational survey nonresponse. *Organizational Research Methods*, *10*(2), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106294693

Rosenberg, T. J. (2011). History museums and social cohesion: Building identity, bridging communities, and addressing difficult issues. *Peabody Journal of Education, 86*(2), 115-128. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2011.561171

Rounds, J. (2006). Doing identity work in museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal, 49*(2), 133-150. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2006.tb00208.x

Rowe, S. M., Wertsch, J. V., & Kosyaeva, T. Y. (2002). Linking little narratives to big ones: Narrative and public memory in history museums. *Culture & Psychology, 8*(1), 96-112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X02008001621

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Sage.

Rüsen, J. (1987). The didactics of history in West Germany: Towards a new self awareness of historical studies. History and Theory, 26(3), 275–286. https://doi.org/10.2307/2505063

Rüsen, J. (2004). Historical consciousness: Narrative structure, moral function, and ontogenetic development. *Theorizing historical consciousness*, 63-85.

Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K., & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in higher education*, *44*(4), 409-432.

Savenije, G. M., & de Bruijn, P. (2017). Historical empathy in a museum: uniting contextualisation and emotional engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 23*(9), 832-845. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1339108

Schaefer, D.R. & Dillman, D.A. (1998) Development of a standard e-mail methodology: results of an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 62*(3), 378-397.

Schauble, L., M. Gleason, R. Lehrer, K. Bartlett,, A. Petrosino, A. Allen, K. Clinton, E. Ho, M. Jones, Y. Lee, J. Phillips, J. Siegler & J. Street. (2002). *Supporting science learning in museums*. In Leinhardt, K. Crowley and K. Knutson, *Learning Conversations in Museums*. (eds). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scorch, P. (2013). Museum encounters and narrative engagements. *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies,* 437-457. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118829059.wbihms121

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. Teachers college press.

Seigel, J. 2005. *The idea of the self: Thought and experience in Western Europe since the seventeenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2004. "Introduction." In P. Seixas (Ed.)., *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, pp. 3–24. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Singer, E., Van Hoewyk, J., & Maher, M. P. (2000). Experiments with incentives in telephone surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *64*(2), 171-188. https://doi.org/10.1086/317761

Smith, G. (2008). Does gender influence online survey participation? A record-linkage analysis of university faculty online survey response behavior. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 501717.*

Smith, L. 2016. *Changing views? Emotional intelligence, registers of engagement and the museum visit.* In V. Gosselin & P. Livingston, *Museums and the past: Constructing historical consciousness,* pp. 101-121.Vancouver: UBC Press.

Taylor, H. (2000) Does Internet research work? *International Journal of Market Research, 42*(1), 51-63.

Thorp, Robert. 2014. Towards an Epistemological Theory of Historical Consciousness. *Historical Encounters, 1*(1), 20–31.

Toolis, E. E. (2018). Museums as sites of social change: Exploring processes of placemaking and barriers to access and participation for underrepresented communities. *UC Santa Cruz*. ProQuest ID: Toolis_ucsc_0036E_11691. Merritt ID: ark:/13030/m5sb9458. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1sb502b2

Trofanenko, B. (2006). Chapter 7: The public museum and identity: Or, the question of belonging. *Counterpoints, 272*, 95-109. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/42978900

Trofanenko, B. M. (2008). More than a single best narrative: Collective history and the transformation of historical consciousness. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38*(5), 579-603.

Trofanenko, B. (2018). *16: On the museum as a practiced place: Or, reconsidering museums and history education*. In R. Sandwel & A. von. Heyking (Eds.)., *Becoming a History Teacher* (pp. 269-282). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442619241-018

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte. (n.d.). *Guidance: examples of activities that do and do not require UNC Charlotte IRB review and approval.* Retrieved from https://research.uncc.edu/sites/research.uncc.edu/files/media/files/irb/Guidance-IRB-or-Not-To-IRB.pdf.

Underwood, D., Kim, H., & Matier, M. (2000*). To Mail or To Web: Comparisons of Survey Response Rates and Respondent Characteristics*. AIR 2000 Annual Forum Paper.

U.S. Census Bureau (2019). ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates- Kings Mountain, NC. Retrieved from https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Kings%20Mountain%20NC&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05&hidePreview=false.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). QuickFacts Kings Mountain, NC. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/kingsmountaincitynorthcarolina.

United States Government. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (April 4, 2019). Institutional Review Boards Frequently Asked Questions: Guidance for Institutional Review Boards and Clinical Investigators. Retrieved from https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/institutional-review-boards-frequently-asked-questions.

Voigt, L. F., Koepsell, T. D., & Daling, J. R. (2003). Characteristics of telephone survey respondents according to willingness to participate. *American journal of epidemiology*, *157*(1), 66-73. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwf185

Wallace-Casey, C. (2017). "I like to take everything and put it in my own words": Historical Consciousness, Historical Thinking, and Learning with Community History Museums. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, *40*(1), 1-28.

Walsh, K. (2002). Chapter 7: A Sense of Place. In *The representation of the past: Museums and heritage in the post-modern world.* (pp.148-160). London: Routledge.

Ward, S. (2003). On shifting ground: changing formulations of place in anthropology. *The Australian journal of anthropology, 14*(1), 80-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1835-9310.2003.tb00222.x

Weller, S. C. (1998). Structured interviewing and questionnaire construction. *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology,* 365-409.

White, C. (July 30, 2015). Historic Honor: Former Kings Mountain Post Office Added to National Register. *Shelby Star*. Retrieved from https://www.shelbystar.com/article/20150730/NEWS/150739926.

White, H. (1980). The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. *Critical inquiry, 7*(1), 5-27.

Whitehead, L. C. (2007). Methodological and ethical issues in Internet-mediated research in the field of health: an integrated review of the literature. *Social science & medicine, 65*(4), 782-791. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.03.005

Yan, T., & Tourangeau, R. (2008). Fast times and easy questions: The effects of age, experience and question complexity on web survey response times. *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *22*(1), 51-68. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1331

Youngman, M. B. (1986). *Analyzing questionnaires*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham School of Education.

APPENDIX A: CONSENT & SURVEY

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Title of the Project: Historical Consciousness and Collective Identity Formation in the Kings Mountain Historical Museum
Principal Investigator: Julia Mileski, Graduate Student, UNCC Department of Anthropology
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Dennis Ogburn, Professor, UNCC Department of Anthropology

You are invited to participate in a research study. Participation in this research study is voluntary. The information provided is to give you key information to help you decide whether or not to participate. The purpose of this study is to examine the levels of historical consciousness and collective identity amongst the Kings Mountain, N.C. community through the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. You must be age 18 or older to participate in this study. You are asked to complete a survey asking a series of questions about your demographics, your relationship with the Kings Mountain community, and your relationship with the Kings Mountain Historical Museum. The questions are not sensitive or overly personal.
- You may take as long as you need to complete the survey, however quick responses are greatly appreciated.
- I do not believe that you will experience any risk from participating in this study.
- You will not benefit personally by participating in this study. What I learn about the Kings Mountain community and the Kings Mountain Historical Museum may be beneficial to other museums.
- Your privacy will be protected, and confidentiality will be maintained to the extent possible. Your responses will be treated as confidential and will not be linked to your identity. Upon receiving your response and the signed consent form, your name will be replaced with an identification number or a pseudonym.

Other researchers might use the survey data for future research studies and the non-identifiable survey data may be shared with other researchers for future research studies without additional consent from you. After this study is complete, study data may be shared with other researchers for use in other studies without asking for your consent again. The data shared will NOT include information that could identify you.

Participation is voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study. You may start participating and change your mind and stop participation at any time.
If you have questions concerning the study, contact the principal investigator, Julia Mileski at (919) 576-6001, or by email at jmileski@uncc.edu or Faculty Advisor Dr. Dennis Ogburn at dogburn@uncc.edu. If you have further questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, contact the Office of Research Protections and Integrity at (704) 687-1871 or uncc-irb@uncc.edu.

You may print a copy of this form. If you are 18 years of age or older, have read and understand the information provided and freely consent to participate in the study, you may proceed to the survey, and click "I AGREE".

Survey

Demographic
1. What is your name?   _____
    a. Note: Your name will be kept anonymous and will not be included in the final product of this research.
2. What is your age?
    a. 18-25
    b. 26-35
    c. 46-55
    d. 56-65
    e. 66 years or older
3. What gender do you identify with:
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other: _____
4. Ethnicity:
    a. White
    b. Latino/Latina or Hispanic
    c. African American
    d. Native American
    e. Asian/Pacific Islander
    f. Other: _____

Community Attachment
5. Select which statement(s) you most identify with in terms of how you feel about living in Kings Mountain:
    a. When I am away, I miss it.
    b. I like living here.
    c. I do not feel a strong attachment to the town.
    d. I do not like living here.
6. Select which statement(s) are most accurate for you in terms of how long you have lived in Kings Mountain:
    a. I have lived here my entire life.
    b. My family has lived here for as long as I can remember.
    c. I have lived here for 25 years or more.
    d. I have lived here between 15 and 25 years.
    e. I have lived here between 5 and 15 years.
    f. I have lived in Kings Mountain for 5 years or less.
7. Rank each statement on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree':

    a. I feel like a connected member of this community.
    b. I would be a different person without this community.
    c. When something bad happens in the community, I personally feel hurt.
    d. My personality, morals, and beliefs are similar to others in the community.
    e. I do not feel like a connected member of this community.
    f. I do not feel like a member of this community.

Historical Consciousness

8. Select which statement(s) you most agree with in terms of the history of Kings Mountain:
    a. I think a lot about the history of the town.
    b. I sometimes think about the history of the town.
    c. I never consider the history of the town.

9. Select which statement(s) you most agree with about the history of the Kings Mountain community:
    a. I feel as though I understand the history of the community.
    b. The history of the town has a large impact on my life and who I am today.
    c. I do not think the history of the town has an impact on my life and who I am today.
    d. I feel that there is an issue with other members of the community not knowing and understanding the history of the town.
    e. I am not familiar enough with the history of the town to have an informed opinion.

10. Select the following statement(s) that are most accurate for you:
    a. I know details of ancestors of mine that were involved in the history of Kings Mountain.
    b. My ancestors were involved in the creation of Kings Mountain.
    c. I am aware of family stories of ancestor involvement in the history of Kings Mountain, but do not know any specific information.
    d. None of my ancestors that I am aware of were involved in the history of Kings Mountain.

11. Select which of the following option(s) you most agree with:
    a. The Kings Mountain Historical Museum is an incredibly important asset for bringing the community together.
    b. The museum is important to the community, but is not the primary source of community building.
    c. The museum is sort of important for bringing the community together, but does not have a large influence.
    d. The museum is not necessary in the community.

12. Please rank the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree': I believe Kings Mountain's history…

a. values, events, and community are very similar to those of today.
b. directly contributes to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of it today.
c. is important to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of the town today, but it is not a direct cause or contributor.
d. is too different from the present Kings Mountain for there to be an influence.
e. does not influence or relate to the values, community, and overall existence of the town today.

Museum Participation

13. Please select the following that is most accurate to you: In 2019 and before, I have …
    a. visited the Kings Mountain Historical Museum more than once a year.
    b. visited the museum once a year.
    c. visited the museum sometime in the past 2 years.
    d. visited the museum sometime in the past 5 years.
    e. never visited the museum.

14. Please select the following option(s) that are most accurate for you: When visiting the museum, I…
    a. stop and read/look at every display.
    b. spend more time at displays that are more interesting to me and tend to bypass any others.
    c. tend to wander between displays with no intended pathway.
    d. I spend more time engaging with other visitors than the displays.
    e. went to see a specific display.
    f. went for a specific program or event.

15. Select the following option(s) that are most accurate for you: When viewing exhibits…
    a. I always learn new information.
    b. I sometimes learn new information.
    c. I learn some new information but I mostly have some prior knowledge of the subject matter.
    d. I have prior knowledge of all information included in exhibits.
    e. I have prior knowledge of the information included, but through viewing I learned that some of that information is incorrect.
    f. The information included in exhibits affirms my prior knowledge of the subject.
    g. I pay more attention to the objects than to the text included.

16. Select the following option(s) you most agree with: The Kings Mountain Historical Museum…
    a. accurately represents the community.
    b. plays an active role in bringing the community together.
    c. works with the community to build us up.
    d. is a fun addition to the community but does not have any meaningful impact.
    e. does not represent or impact the community.

17. Please rank the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being 'I do not agree' and 5 being 'I absolutely agree':
    a. When visiting the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, I feel welcomed and as though I belong.
    b. When visiting the museum, I often ask questions and interact with the staff
    c. When visiting the museum, I often interact with other visitors.
    d. I do not like to visit the museum.

18. Please explain below any aspects of your museum experience that were noticeably positive or negative:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

19. Please provide any additional information you would like regarding your answers to the above questions or any comments you would like to share:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

APPENDIX B: RESPONSE FREQUENCY & ANALYSIS

Question 2: What is your age?

Code	Response Item	Frequency	Percent
1	18-25	0	0%
2	26-35	2	5.88%
3	36-45	7	20.59%
4	46-55	1	2.94%
5	56-65	7	20.59%
6	66 or older	17	50%
	Total	34	100%

Question 3: What gender do you identify with?

Code	Response Item	Frequency	Percent
1	Female	23	67.65%
2	Male	10	29.4%
3	Prefer not to state	1	2.94%
	Total	34	100%

Question 4: What is your ethnicity?

Code	Response Item	Frequency	Percent
1	White	31	91.18%
2	Hispanic or Latino/Latina	1	2.94%
3	African American	0	0%
4	Native American	0	0%
5	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	2.94%
6	Other	1	2.94%
	Total	34	100%

Question 5: Select which statement(s) you most identify with in terms of how you feel about living in Kings Mountain:

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	4	18.18%	**Positive (a/1,b/2,5)**	1	4	18.18%
2	13	59.10%		2	13	59.10%
3	1	4.54%		5	4	18.18%
4	0	0%		**Total**	**21**	**95.46%**
5	4	18.18%				
Total	22	100%	**Negative (c/3,d/4)**	3	1	4.54%
				4	0	0%
				Total	**1**	**4.54%**

Question 6: Select which statement(s) are most accurate for you in terms of how long you have lived in Kings Mountain

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	9.09%	**Longer residency:**	1	2	9.09%
2	5	22.73%	all response	2	5	22.73%
3	6	27.27%	options for >15	3	6	27.27%
4	1	4.55%	years	4	1	4.55%
5	4	18.18%		7	2	9.09%
6	0	0%		8	2	9.09%
7	2	9.09%		**Total**	**18**	**81.82%**
8	2	9.09%				
Total	22	100%	**Shorter residency:**			
			all response	5	4	18.18%
			options for <15	6	0	0%
			years	**Total**	**4**	**18.18%**

Question 7: Rate each statement on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being "I do not agree" and 5 being "I absolutely agree"

     7.1: I feel like a connected member of this community

     7.2: I would be a different person without this community.

     7.3: When something bad happens in the community, I personally feel hurt.

     7.4: My personality, morals, and beliefs are similar to others in the community.

     7.5: I do not feel like a connected member of this community.

7.6: I do not consider myself to be a member of this community.

7.1

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	0	0%	**Positive (3,4,5)**	3	2	9.52%
2	3	14.29%		4	5	23.81%
3	2	9.52%		5	11	52.38%
4	5	23.81%		**Total**	**18**	**85.71%**
5	11	52.38%				
Total	21	100%	**Negative (1,2)**	1	0	0%
				2	3	14.29
				Total	**3**	**14.29%**

7.2

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	10.00%	**Positive (3,4,5)**	3	6	30%
2	2	10.00%		4	4	20%
3	6	30.00%		5	6	30%
4	4	20.00%		**Total**	**16**	**80%**
5	6	30.00%				
Total	20	100%	**Negative (1,2)**	1	2	10%
				2	2	10%
				Total	**4**	**20%**

7.3

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	10.00%	**Positive (3,4,5)**	3	3	10%
2	0	0%		4	5	25%
3	2	10.00%		5	11	55%
4	5	25.00%		**Total**	**19**	**90%**
5	11	55.00%				
Total	20	100%	**Negative (1,2)**	1	2	10%
				2	0	0%
				Total	**2**	**10%**

7.4

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	10.53%	**Positive (3,4,5)**	3	3	15.78%
2	2	10.53%		4	6	31.58%
3	3	15.78%		5	6	31.58%
4	6	31.58%		**Total**	**15**	**78.94%**
5	6	31.58%				
Total	19	100%	**Negative (1,2)**			
				1	2	10.53%
				2	2	10.53%
				Total	**4**	**21.06%**

7.5

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	11	57.89%	**Positive (1,2)**	1	11	57.89%
2	4	21.05%		2	4	21.05%
3	2	10.53%		**Total**	**15**	**78.94%**
4	2	10.53%				
5	0	0%	**Negative (3,4,5)**	3	2	10.53%
Total	19	100%		4	2	10.53%
				5	0	0%
				Total	**4**	**21.06%**

7.6

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	12	57.14%	**Positive (1,2)**	1	12	57.14%
2	5	23.81%		2	5	23.81%
3	0	0%		**Total**	**17**	**80.95%**
4	1	4.76%				
5	3	14.29%	**Negative (3,4,5)**	3	0	0%
Total	21	100%		4	1	4.76%
				5	3	14.29%
				Total	**4**	**19.05%**

Question 8: Select which statement(s) you most agree with in terms of the history of Kings Mountain:

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	15	60.00%	**Positive (1,2,4)**	1	15	60%
2	9	36.00%		2	9	36%
3	0	0%		4	1	4%
4	1	4.00%		**Total**	**25**	**100%**
Total	25	100.00%				
			Negative (3)	3	0	0%
				Total	**0**	**0%**

Question 9: Select which statement(s) you most agree with about the history of the Kings Mountain community:

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	3	12.50%	**Positive (1,2,4,6,7,8,9)**	1	3	12.50%
2	2	8.33%		2	2	8.33%
3	3	12.50%		4	2	8.33%
4	2	8.33%		6	6	25%
5	2	8.33%		7	4	16.67%
6	6	25.00%		8	1	4.17%
7	4	16.67%		9	1	4.17%
8	1	4.17%		**Total**	**19**	**79.17%**
9	1	4.17%				
Total	24	100.00%	**Negative (3,5)**	3	3	12.50%
				5	2	8.33%
				Total	**5**	**20.83%**

Question 9: Responses containing answer choice d)

Code	Frequency	Percentage
4	2	8.33%
7	4	16.67%
8	1	4.17%
9	1	4.17%
Total	**8**	**33.34%**

Question 10: Select the following statement(s) that are most accurate for you:

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	8.33%	**Positive (1,2,3,5,6,8)**	1	2	8.33%
2	0	0%		2	0	0%
3	2	8.33%		3	2	8.33%
4	9	37.50%		5	8	33.33%
5	8	33.33%		6	1	4.17%
6	1	4.17%		8	1	4.17%
7	1	4.17%		**Total**	**14**	**58.33%**
8	1	4.17%				
Total	**24**	100%	**Negative (4,7)**	4	9	37.50%
				7	1	4.17%
				Total	**10**	**41.67%**

Question 11: Select which of the following option(s) you most agree with:

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	13	52%	Positive (1,2,5)	1	13	52%
2	7	28%		2	7	28%
3	2	8%		5	3	12%
4	0	0%		**Total**	**23**	**92%**
5	3	12%				
Total	25	100%	Negative (3,4)	3	2	8%
				4	0	0%
				Total	**2**	**8%**

Question 12: Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being "I do not agree" and 5 being I absolutely agree": I believe Kings Mountain's history…

        12.1: values, events, and community are very similar to those of today.

        12.2: directly contributes to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of it today.

        12.3: is important to the values, knowledge, and overall existence of the town today, but is it not a direct cause or contributer.

        12.4: is too different from the present Kings Mountain for there to be an influence.

        12.5: does not influence or relate to the values, community, and overall existence of the town today.

12.1

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	3	13.64%	Positive (3,4,5)	3	8	36.36%
2	1	4.55%		4	6	27.27%
3	8	36.36%		5	4	18.18%
4	6	27.27%		**Total**	**18**	**81.81%**
5	4	18.18%				
Total	22	100.00%	Negative (1,2)	1	3	13.64%
				2	1	4.55%
				Total	**4**	**18.19%**

12.2

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	10%	Positive (3,4,5)	3	9	45%
2	1	5%		4	3	15%
3	9	45%		5	5	25%
4	3	15%		**Total**	**17**	**85%**
5	5	25%				
Total	20	100%	Negative (1,2)	1	2	10%
				2	1	5%
				Total	**3**	**15%**

12.3

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	11.11%	Neutral/Positive	1	2	11.11%
2	3	16.67%	(1,2,3)	2	3	16.67%
3	4	22.22%		3	4	22.22%
4	5	27.78%		**Total**	**9**	**50.00%**
5	4	22.22%				
Total	18	100.00%	Neutral/Negative	4	5	27.78%
			(4,5)	5	4	22.22%
				Total	**9**	**50.00%**

12.4

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	6	31.58%	Positive (1,2)	1	6	31.58%
2	6	31.58%		2	6	31.58%
3	6	31.58%		**Total**	**12**	**63.16%**
4	0	0%				
5	1	5.26%	Negative (3,4,5)	3	6	31.58%
Total	19	100.00%		4	0	0%
				5	1	5.26%
				Total	**7**	**36.84%**

12.5

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	11	57.89%	Positive(1,2)	1	11	57.89%
2	2	10.53%		2	2	10.53%
3	5	26.32%		**Total**	**13**	**68.42%**
4	1	5.26%				
5	0	0%	Negative (3,4,5)	3	5	26.32%
Total	19	100.00%		4	1	5.26%
				5	0	0%
				Total	**6**	**31.58%**

Question 13: Please select the following that is most accurate for you: In 2019 and before, I have…

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	16	64%	More visits (1,2)	1	16	64%
2	4	16%		2	4	16%
3	2	8%		**Total**	**20**	**80%**
4	3	12%				
5	0	0%	Less visits (3,4,5)	3	2	8%
Total	25	100%		4	3	12%
				5	0	0%
				Total	**25**	**20%**

Question 14: Please select the following option(s) that are most accurate for you: When visiting the museum, I…

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	6	24.00%	Positive (1,2,5,6,8,10,11,12,14,15)	1	6	24%
2	4	16.00%		2	4	16%
3	0	0%		5	1	4%
4	0	0%		6	1	4%
5	1	4.00%		8	1	4%
6	1	4.00%		10	1	4%
7	1	4.00%		11	1	4%
8	1	4.00%		12	1	4%
9	1	4.00%		14	5	20%
10	1	4.00%		15	1	4%
11	1	4.00%		**Total**	**22**	**88%**
12	1	4.00%				
13	1	4.00%	Negative (3,4,7,13)	3	0	0%
14	5	20.00%		4	0	0%
15	1	4.00%		7	1	4%
Total	25	100.00%		9	1	4%
				13	1	4%
				Total	**3**	**12%**

Question 15: Select the following option(s) that are most accurate for you: When viewing exhibits…

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	12	48.00%	Positive (1,2,3,5,6,8,9,10,11,12)	1	12	48%
2	6	24.00%		2	6	24%
3	0	0%		3	0	0%
4	0	0%		5	0	0%
5	0	0%		6	0	0%
6	0	0%		8	2	8%
7	0	0%		9	1	4%
8	2	8.00%		0	1	4%
9	1	4.00%		11	2	8%
10	1	4.00%		12	1	4%
11	2	8.00%		Total	25	100%
12	1	4.00%				
Total	25	100.00%	Negative (4,7)	4	0	0%
				7	0	0%
				Total	0	0%

Question 16: Select the following option(s) you most agree with: The Kings Mountain Historical Museum…

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	8.33%	Positive (1,2,3,6,7,8)	1	2	8.33%
2	2	8.33%		2	2	8.33%
3	2	8.33%		3	2	8.33%
4	2	8.33%		6	1	4.17%
5	0	0%		7	7	29.18%
6	1	4.17%		8	8	33.33%
7	7	29.18%		**Total**	**22**	**91.67%**
8	8	33.33%				
Total	24	100.00%	Negative (4,5)	4	2	8.33%
				5	0	0%
				Total	**2**	**8.33%**

Question 17: Please rank the following on a scale of 1-5 according to how much you agree, with 1 being "I do not agree" and 5 being "I absolutely agree"

17.1: When visiting the Kings Mountain Historical Museum, I feel welcomed and as though I belong.
17.2: When visiting the museum, I often ask questions and interact with the staff.
17.3: When visiting the museum, I often interact with other visitors.
17.4: I do not like to visit the museum.

17.1

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	4.17%	Positive (3,4,5)	3	1	4.17%
2	0	0%		4	2	8.33%
3	1	4.17%		5	20	83.33%
4	2	8.33%		**Total**	**23**	**95.83%**
5	20	83.33%				
Total	24	100.00%	Negative (1,2)	1	1	4.17%
				2	0	0%
				Total	**1**	**4.17%**

17.2

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	10%	Positive (3,4,5)	3	3	15%
2	0	0%		4	3	15%
3	3	15%		5	12	60%
4	3	15%		**Tota**	**18**	**90%**
5	12	60%				
Total	20	100%	Negative (1,2)	1	2	10%
				2	0	0%
				Total	**2**	**10%**

17.3

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	2	10%	Positive (3,4,5)	3	6	30%
2	3	15%		4	2	10%
3	6	30%		5	7	35%
4	2	10%		**Total**	**15**	**75%**
5	7	35%				
Total	20	100%	Negative (1,2)	1	2	10%
				2	3	15%
				Total	**5**	**25%**

17.4

Code	Frequency	Percentage	Rating	Code	Frequency	Percentage
1	16	94.12%	Positive (1,2)	1	16	94.12%
2	0	0%		2	0	0%
3	1	5.88%		**Total**	**16**	**94.12%**
4	0	0%				
5	0	0%	Negative (3,4,5)	3	1	5.88%
Total	17	100.00%		4	0	0%
				5	0	0%
				Total	**1**	**5.88%**