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# SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme 2016 Overview

The SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme 2016 enabled 17 museums across the region to receive comprehensive feedback in a mystery shopping exercise at a fraction of the cost of buying in industry mystery shopping service. The scheme took place between June and October 2016.

Now in its third year, the scope of the project has been fine-tuned since its inception in 2014. Following an evaluation of the launch pilot in 2014, significant changes were made to the scheme which created a more robust evaluation tool which encouraged more museums to take part. The evaluation of the 2015 scheme enabled SHARE to further refine the scheme in order to roll it out to more museums in 2016.

Comprehensive evaluation took place throughout and at the end of the scheme to assess the strengths of the scheme and what could be changed, to help create a new scheme for 2016.

This report is written for the Steering Group and reflects upon the aims of the SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme and the results of the 2016 evaluation. It aims to provide an overview of the 2016 scheme and make recommendations for potential improvements to the format for the 2017 SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme.

## Introduction to the Scheme

The SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme was initiated by the SHARE Front of House Forum <http://sharemuseumseast.org.uk/networks/> aiming to create a better understanding and delivery of visitor services across the Eastern Region. Recognising that Mystery shopping schemes have been effective in looking at visitor experience and improving visitor services, and in recognition that industry schemes can be expensive for smaller volunteer run museums, the Front of House Forum and SHARE developed their own mystery shopping scheme.

The SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme is different to commercial services through its reciprocal design: It is as beneficial both to the museums receiving feedback from the scheme and to the Shoppers rating museums. A by-product of taking part is encouraging reflection and thought in what constitutes good visitor service, in that the Shoppers consider their own museums in relation to the museum they are assessing.

# 1.1 Aims

* Improve visitor offer
* Develop front of house staff and volunteers
* Generate ideas, income and insight
* Interrogate the viability and feasibility of a sustainable larger mystery shopper scheme across the region.
* Put together a robust mystery shopper scheme model with potential to be marketed outside the Eastern region.
* Ensure the model is effective, as well as cost effective for museums taking part.
* Provide comprehensive feedback and help evidence issues which affect visitor experience in museums and develop services.

## 1.2 Objectives

The scheme sought to meet the aims through these objectives:

* Recruit accredited museums or those working towards accreditation who wish to participate in the scheme.
* Establish mystery Shoppers from within these organisations.
* Recruit an administrator within the SHARE Museums East Team, to ensure smooth running of the mystery shopper scheme
* Ensure timely return of feedback to museums to enable them to make changes rapidly in response to data.

## 1.3 Organisation

### 1.4 Steering Group members

Jane Felstead Head of Visitor Services, UCM  
Linda Dobbs Manager, Welwyn Hatfield Museums Service  
Graham Stratfold Head of Visitor Services, Museum of London  
Simon Floyd SHARE Coordinator, SHARE Museums East (until July 2016)  
Sally Ackroyd SHARE Museum Development Project Officer (replaced Simon Floyd in November 2016)

### 1.5 Recruitment

SHARE recruited museums to take part in the scheme through SHARE networks. Museums put forward a lead staff member who would represent their museum with responsibility for coordinating Shoppers and ensuring that their expenses were paid. This role was termed Museum Lead for the project, and they were responsible for recruiting volunteer Shoppers from within their organisation/their museums to take part in the scheme. Numbers of Shoppers varied from museum to museum, with up to as many as six in some museum taking part and one or two in others.

Museums were given the option of a minimum of three visits and any maximum as long as the number was divisible by three. The ethos of the scheme is that museums give a visit to receive a visit.

## 1.6 Museums taking part

Braintree Museum  
Cromwell Museum  
John Bunyan Museum  
King’s Lynn Museum, Norfolk Museums Service  
Longshop Museum  
Mill Green Mill Museum & Roman Baths, Welwyn Hatfield Museums Service  
Museum of London Docklands  
Museum of London  
Natural History Museum at Tring  
Norwich Castle Museum & Art Gallery  
Ridgmont Station  
Roman Baths  
Stevenage Museum  
The Fitzwilliam Museum, UCM  
Verulamium Museum  
Warner Textile Archive  
Whittlesey Museum

## 1.7 Funding

Shoppers were recruited by museums on a voluntary basis, they were not paid to shop but Museum Leads were responsible for ensuring the Shoppers’ expenses from visiting the museums were paid following visits.

SHARE agreed small grants to cover the expenses for two repeat visits due to a museum being closed unexpectedly on arrival on two separate occasions. SHARE agreed a small grant to pay volunteer Shoppers to carry out museum visits when a museum was unable to fulfil its allocations due to circumstances beyond their control.

A shopper’s budget is intended to cover the following:

* Travel costs to and from the museum
* Purchasing something from the museum café/ restaurant
* Purchasing something from the museum shop
* Paying for any additional exhibitions/ events/ special features at the museum

Costs were limited to £100.00 per visit. The budget was discussed during the training sessions and information circulated to all participants and suggested the absolute maximum of £150 for the museums at the outer boundaries of the region.

## 1.8 Timeframe

The scheme was promoted through SHARE networks, Twitter and the SHARE website from February 2016 through to May 2016; and museums were recruited between March and May 2016. Training was held at the Fitzwilliam Museum on the 20th and 21st May 2016. The first mystery shopping visits took place in June 2016 and the scheme extended throughout the summer season to October 2016.

## 2. Analysis - Scheme overview

## 2.1 Training

All Shoppers participating in the scheme were invited to attend training with Graham Stratfold, Head of Visitor Services at Museum of London, the SHARE Coordinator and the Scheme Coordinator.

Two successful training days were held at the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge as well as a smaller session for those who missed the training run by the Scheme Coordinator at Norwich Castle Museum & Art Gallery.

Participants were provided with handout notes, a list of survey questions a hard copy of the survey and given the opportunity to see the survey live online and invited to make recommendations for changes to the survey where necessary. SHARE also collected useful information about when people can visit/ where/ and any holidays planned.

Volunteers left the training day with a clear idea of what was expected of them in their role and what to expect from their museum lead and SHARE.

## 2.2 Finance

The coordination of the pilot scheme in 2014 was funded jointly through MoL, NMS, SHARE and UCM. The 2015 and 2016 pilots were solely funded by SHARE. Museum visit expenses were covered by participant museums. SHARE’s expenses have included:

* Steering group meetings and refreshments
* Training days, refreshments and handout packs
* Administration time, on average a few hours per week throughout the scheme.

On the whole there were few reported issues around finance. However following evaluation, some museums were unclear around the responsibility to fund their shopper expenses.

## 2.3 Survey

2015 was the first trial run of using Smartsurvey to host the SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme survey. Drawing upon this experience, a number of changes were made to enhance the functionality of the survey making it more user-friendly for 2016.

In 2015 it was noted that there were issues in the Smartsurvey reporting and results sharing features. In 2016 these were overcome through the introduction of an upgrade to the Smartsurvey reporting facility and the implementation of a Sharepoint project group platform for sharing results. Positives from the survey were:

* The 2016 survey doesn’t have to be completed in one go, it can be saved and returned to at a later date.
* Shoppers were able to skip sections which were not relevant to the museum they visited.
* Shopppers had the opportunity to say why they scored museums in a particular way.

However many participants felt the survey was repetitive and long, we are exploring ways to get the same level of detail in the existing survey in a shorter format for shoppers to fill out.

It was also noted that there are variances in ways that Shoppers complete the survey which results in inconsistency.

## 2.4 Scheme Administration

The role of the Mystery Shopping Scheme Coordinator has been essential to the smooth and efficient running of the scheme.

It involved being the first point of contact for all Mystery shoppers and museum leads for the scheme:

* Responsible for contacting leads (and shoppers where appropriate), arranging training, confirming their details and gathering information on distances to travel and conflicts of interest prior to allocating visits.
* Planning a range of visits in tranches throughout the duration of the scheme.
* Developing IT solutions to improve the scheme’s offer to museums.
* Allocate visits to shoppers by listing the allocations using the project management facility of Sharepoint for the Museum Lead to distribute amongst shoppers
* Send out unique link to the survey through Smartsurvey.
* Check for survey return and chase where necessary.
* Run reports from Smartsurvey, removing any personal data relating to the shopper and upload to Sharepoint and share the document with the Museum Lead.
* Put together and administer a SHARE Mystery Shopper Scheme Midterm Evaluation, separately with shoppers and Museum Leads as well as facilitate an Evaluation Day at the Fitzwilliam Museum at the end of the scheme.
* Answer any questions, deal with any enquiries throughout the scheme.
* Prepare and write up a scheme evaluation and recommendations for 2017 and future schemes.

The Scheme Coordinator was flexible, working evenings, weekends, as well as set days in a week and as and when reactively.

In 2015, following scheme evaluation, a recommendation was made to create a facility whereby museums could view feedback from mystery shopping visits to their museum. The Sharepoint was created in order to fulfil this requirement. It enable museums to access data from their mystery shops and to project manage the visits they have been allocated. This was the main point of contact between museum leads and the coordinator.

In 2015 a recommendation that the role of Museum Leads could be expanded to allocating visits amongst their Shoppers was suggested. In 2016, this was implemented, and the scheme saw Museum Leads overseeing the mystery shopping process, allocating visits, ensuring visits are completed and surveys returned on time.

## 2.5 Communication with participant museums

The Scheme Coordinator used a Sharepoint as an interface between SHARE and each museum lead taking part. Many museum leads found the Sharepoint a good way to share the museum allocations with SHARE.

Much communication about the aims and processes involved in talking part in the scheme were given to participants ahead of the scheme commencing. At the training days participants were given handouts with an overview of the scheme, instructions on conducting a mystery shopping visit and a paper copy of the questionnaire that Shoppers would complete in an online format. Participants taking on the responsibility of the Museum Lead role were given instructions for accessing the Sharepoint.

The Sharepoint was developed by the Coordinator with an Analyst Programmer from Norfolk County Council (NCC). The aim was to create a parent site as single platform for the coordinator to contact the museums taking part. This site would be a project management tool, document sharing and storage facility. Each museum would have its own site which was part of and managed by the parent site.

There were no official contracts put in place for museums taking part. The reciprocal nature of the scheme acted as a guarantee for visits to take place, in essence giving a visit to receive one. However there were some issues with this whereby museums were unable to fulfil their obligation with in the timeframe. Having been given allocations and timeslots in advance meant it was difficult to find other museums to swap with because they had already made arrangements with work, travel and or childcare.

## 2.6 Communication with Shoppers

The main difference between the 2015 and 2016 schemes was the enhancement of the Museum Lead role in managing their Shoppers.

The Museum Lead was responsible for day-to-day management of their mystery shopping team. The role included coordinating Mystery Shoppers, allocating visits and being first contact for any Shopper issues and questions.

The Museum Lead role was flexible in that at any time they could refer to the Scheme Coordinator and liaise with their Mystery Shopper or put their Shopper in direct contact with the Scheme Coordinator.

## 2.7 Visit Allocation

A total of 75 visits were allocated by the scheme coordinator. The museum destinations were spread across a five month period which created a timetable of visits over six time slots. Consideration was given to avoid instances occurring where impartiality would be compromised through Shoppers knowing the museum or museum staff or volunteers. Consideration was also given to looking at round trips, quickest travel routes, to ensure that Shoppers could carry out the visit and making sure that Shoppers were able to get to museums. For example taking into consideration if they have access to a car.

In 2015 some Shoppers limited their availability to take part in visits by saying they were only prepared for 25 or 50 mile round trips. Following this, in 2016 the expectation for Shoppers to travel distances around the region and for museums to be anywhere within the SHARE region was clearly conveyed to participants in the training days. However it quickly became clear that one museum had a misunderstanding of the counties which constitute the Eastern region so communicating distance covered by the scheme moving forward is key.

In 2015 some participant Shoppers expressed that they would’ve preferred to have known which museums were in the scheme beforehand. As a result, in 2016, all visits were allocated to museums upfront through the Sharepoint. Museum Leads were then able to distribute the allocations amongst their Mystery Shoppers. With the allocations being distributed upfront this meant it was more difficult to find participants willing to swap visits around.

## 2.8 Results from mystery shops

Participant Shopper responses were captured through completing the survey which they returned through the Smart Survey software. On the whole this process ran smoothly with some limited coordinator intervention:

* The survey system enabled participant Shoppers to save and return to their survey.
* The Coordinator could see when participant Shoppers had viewed and opened their emails with the link attached, so could monitor progress.
* The SHARE Mystery Shopper Scheme survey results page shows the number of surveys received so it is easy for the coordinator to see when new ones are completed.
* In 2015 some Shopper comments were not within acceptable parameters of replies. As a result this was addressed in the 2016 scheme training; and improvements in the quality and clarity, as well as appropriateness of responses were notable.

However some responses were late coming back. This was on the whole due to some participants struggling with a five day turnaround to write up a review of their mystery shopping visit.

# 3. Evaluation

The Coordinator actively welcomed feedback from Shoppers and museum leads throughout the scheme. In addition, there was also an online evaluation survey available for all scheme participants, museum leads and Mystery Shoppers to complete.

An end of scheme evaluation day at the Fitzwilliam Museum was held on Thursday 8th December 2016 which enabled further analysis and focus group research for the final stages of the scheme.

## 3.1 Online Evaluation Survey

The online Evaluation Survey was sent to all mystery shopping participants with an invitation to attend the Evaluation and Thank You Event at the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge on Thursday 8th December 2016. The online survey was available to all participants through a link during November 2016, and it focused on four areas asking for qualitative responses:

Scheme participants were asked:

1. What aspects of the scheme have worked well for you?
2. What benefits to you and your museum have you found in taking part in mystery shopping?
3. What hasn’t worked so well?
4. What has surprised you?

Of 52 participants, 29 completed the survey online. 62.07% of respondents were Mystery Shoppers, 13.79% were museum leads not undertaking visits and 27.59% were museum leads that had undertaken visits.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Overall the feedback from this anonymous survey were positive around the benefits of taking part, for example: *“Great to have such comprehensive and detailed feedback from shoppers”.[[2]](#footnote-2)*

*“The scheme was useful as it encouraged me to see museums from the viewpoint of a visitor. The focus then proved useful in work back at my own museum. I gained useful ideas from seeing how other museums set up exhibitions and also dealt with the issues we face at our own venue. The questions given for me to answer broke down the whole museum experience into things like the ease of travelling to a location and how the welcome was managed and this gave me a more objective look at how we did things.”[[3]](#footnote-3)*

*“Really good to have visitor feedback spread over the whole period the programme was run for.”[[4]](#footnote-4)*

*“The feedback form other museums who have visited us is really useful. It has highlighted some issues we were already aware of, e.g. lack of some signposting to the shop/ Reception.”[[5]](#footnote-5)*

*“Great opportunity to look at what we do and how we do it through ‘new eyes’. Chance for our shoppers to be more aware of customer service – as a new visitor services team, we were able to use this as a form of training, sharing experiences in team meetings.”[[6]](#footnote-6)*

*“We learned a lot about what’s important to us and we can take that on board for our museum too.”[[7]](#footnote-7)*

*“The visits this year have really highlighted the impact and value of the greeting and personal reception on arrival at a museum.”[[8]](#footnote-8)*

*“I…notice[d] an object which might make an interesting ’companion’ to an object we have on display: I informed our keeper about it and she was interested as she had never known of its existence – we may be able to borrow it.”[[9]](#footnote-9)*

*“It has made the team more aware of the impact they can have on visitors.”[[10]](#footnote-10)*

The negatives around the distance of the region, some elements of the questionnaire and the time taken to complete a mystery shop were considered by participants:

“Getting time to type up the form has been hard – have struggled a bit to complete the work in the deadline.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

“The most obvious problem we had with the scheme was the distance we had to travel – across most of the region!”[[12]](#footnote-12)

“Reading the evaluations has been really difficult. It would have been nice to get a percentage score of how the museum did instead of having to go through 80+ excel pages to see how you did.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

## 3.2 Evaluation Day at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge

The Evaluation and Thank you event was an opportunity for participants to reflect on taking part in the scheme. It also offered participants to have an open discussion about the things which worked well and those that didn’t and to reflect on their participation in the scheme and how they felt as a result. Participants were split in to three groups.

Please see attached agenda for the day.[[14]](#footnote-14)

20 participants took part in the focus groups during the Evaluation Day. Each group had around six participants, each given post-it notes and one participant had the role of scribe and the responsibility of reporting back to the whole group at the end of the focus group session.

There were three focus groups, exploring participant experience taking part in the scheme. The groups were randomly created with a mix of Shoppers and Museum Leads.

**Focus Group 1 Administration**

* How did you find the administration?
* Allocation of visits
* Communication with SHARE
* Survey links
* Using Sharepoint

**Focus Group 2 Shopping**

* How did you find the shopping?
* Making the visits
* Completing the survey
* Submitting the data

**Focus Group 3 Data**

* What value did you find in the data?
* Using the data
* Giving feedback to your team[s]
* Improvements

Evaluating participant responses from Focus Group 1, distances travelled were an issue for some museums. For example participants noted that: ‘Allocation did not take account of the recipient location. Some ‘shoppers’ had a very long journey 100 miles!’.[[15]](#footnote-15) The distances travelled were attributed to SHARE’s allocation system.  
Museums in general seemed to like the allocations upfront, however it was reported by a couple of participants that this system was inflexible. Visits were structured within a programme of allocations in a structure which enabled six visits to be carried out, evenly spaced across the scheme. There were a couple of participants who found the structure and reasons for it difficult to understand and they were vocal throughout all focus groups.   
However, some Shoppers felt that museums leads were equally responsible with a participant suggesting that: ‘Leads need to establish with vols [volunteers] how far they will travel’.[[16]](#footnote-16)

There were some participants who felt that the allocations were improved on last year’s scheme and felt they did not travel so far. Participants added that one of the positives was that ‘You don’t want to go somewhere on your own doorstep.’[[17]](#footnote-17) And the allocations enabled this.

*Communication* was interpreted by participants in different ways: For example, some participants remarked that they felt that the size of the region and the structure of allocations were not communicated enough at the beginning of the scheme through the promotional material or on the training day.[[18]](#footnote-18) Some participants were positive about the communication between their museum and SHARE, with an alternative contact being given by the Coordinator so museums always had someone to talk to if they needed.[[19]](#footnote-19) The Sharepoint was the main communication interface between museums and participants and it had a very mixed reception amongst the groups. Some found the site difficult to use as it was blocked by their IT, or it worked differently depending on the versions of Windows.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Receiving links to the survey had been an issue for some participants. Some had wanted the survey over two months ahead of their visit and were surprised when it arrived at the end of the previous allocation period a couple of weeks ahead of their allocation time. Some participants had not realised they were given a copy of the survey questions in their training packs as they remarked that they wanted a copy of the questions to look at.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Evaluating responses from Focus Groups 2, overall it was felt by participants that the survey was too long and repetitive in places.[[22]](#footnote-22) Participants on the whole enjoyed taking part in the scheme and those who took part last year found the scheme much improved in allocation, communication and survey format.[[23]](#footnote-23) Responses from participants in the second focus group highlighted how the scheme was meeting its aims in providing a learning outcomes and building customer service expertise in the region. Notably a number of participants taking part really took on board how important and ‘crucial’ the welcome is when visiting a new museum. Additionally, participants said that they found the experience ‘eye opening’, had discovered ‘new ideas’ and felt their involvement gave a ‘valuable outcome acknowledging different perspectives’.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Evaluating the comments from Focus Groups 3, participants had been making use of the feedback from the survey throughout the scheme. For example at one museum a comment about a sign which was damaged was taken up. The data from the mystery shop is used as evidence to back up requests from the museum to their Local Authority. One participant remarked that their ‘Museum gained as the report was in ‘Manager speak’ – this went down well/ will be useful with external funders’.[[25]](#footnote-25)  
Overall participants felt that comments were more useful that statistical data.[[26]](#footnote-26) Museums were sharing the data from mystery shops with their wider teams with caveats around what was felt to be sensitive, for example from the dates and times of visitor interactions whereby staff could be or were identified.[[27]](#footnote-27)

The reports received from Smartsurvey were felt to be long and raw. Museums were picking sections from the report to feedback to their teams. Some found the charts were ‘obsolete’ and the focus was more, for them, about comments and scores.[[28]](#footnote-28)  
Where there had been some issues with Museums Leads making use of the data through the Excel document, the Coordinator had been creating Word documents which had a different layout. The Word documents were commented on by a couple of Museum Leads that had received them as being better and user friendly.[[29]](#footnote-29)

# Comparing SHARE with Commercial and another Museum Development Mystery Shopping Scheme

Participants at the Evaluation Day had the opportunity to assess the differences between the SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme’s report and a recent Cambridge BID Mystery Shopping report. The Cambridge BID report was shared by the Fitzwilliam Museum and participants were given the opportunity to feedback. On the whole the shorter length of the report was seen as an improvement. Participants also rated the use of colour in the documents which highlighted at a glance things that were positive or negative. Participants also liked the front page which provided an overview of the whole report at a glance.  
The Cambridge BID survey was conducted by a commercial venture: Storecheckers. In comparing the Storecheckers client offer to SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme there are some distinct differences in what the SHARE scheme surveys and what Storecheckers offer clients as bolt-ons to a standard offer.[[30]](#footnote-30)   
  
Additionally following the Evaluation Day some research around other schemes has begun. This research is pertinent to the continued evaluation of the SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme. Currently another Museum Development Organisation is trialling a mystery shopping scheme. However their scheme focuses only on children’s and family activity in museums.[[31]](#footnote-31) Furthermore their Mystery Shoppers are recruited from outside the museum sector, so the reciprocal training value for museum staff is not present in their scheme.

# Recommendations

Following evaluation of the scheme, the following recommendations are highlighted for the consideration of the Steering Group.

1. **Number of visits.** We propose to market the scheme as three visits and should a museum wish they can have more, as long as the number is divisible by three. The anticipation is that this will encourage a greater number of smaller museums to take part in the scheme.
2. **Survey.** We propose to reduce the number of questions by culling 25% of the current questions without compromising the comprehensive feedback the current questionnaire provides to museums. Questions will also be reviewed which may be covered in the Benchmark questionnaire that museums in the region complete. Suggestions from the Steering Group are encouraged and SHARE aims to recruit some volunteers from the 2016 scheme to trial and therefore shape the 2017 survey.
3. **Sharepoint.** The user-friendliness of the interface will be improved to speed up Museum Lead log ins and provide a better service.
4. **Participation agreement.** A Scheme Agreement to be drafted and implemented ahead of the start of the 2017 mystery shopping season which museums will sign to take part in the scheme. The agreement will reiterate the terms and conditions of the scheme given in marketing and training days.
5. **Marketing.** The majority of museums taking part in 2016 were situated across Norfolk, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire. In order to market the 2017 scheme, the Museum Development Officers in each county will be encouraged by SHARE to push the scheme and encourage more museums to take part.

## Appendix 1

**SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme Evaluation Day 2016**

* 11:00am Coffee and Welcome - Introduction to the scheme and aims of the day Sarah Coleman, SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme Coordinator and welcome to Sally Ackroyd, Museum Development Project Officer
* 11:30 am Running the Scheme: New ways of working and opportunities for change. Sarah Coleman, SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme Coordinator, Linda Dobbs, Welwyn Hatfield Museum Service and Jane Felstead, Fitzwilliam Museum
* 11:45am Focus Groups 1. How did you find the administration?

Allocation of visits

Communication with SHARE

Survey links

Using Sharepoint

* 12:15pm Comfort Break
* 12:25pm Focus Groups 2. How did you find the shopping?

Making the visits

Completing the survey

Submitting the data

* 1:00 pm Lunch
* 1:45pm Focus Groups 3. What value did you find in the data?

Using the data

Giving feedback to your team[s]

Improvements

* 2:15 pm Looking forward to 2016: How do we make this scheme more effective?
* 2:45 pm Thank you and closing thoughts
* 3:00 pm Mince Pies and mulled wine and an opportunity to view the special exhibition

1. Smartsurvey analytics taken from the SHARE Mystery Shopping Scheme 2016 Evaluation Survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Response re: What aspects of the scheme have worked well, from a Museum Lead not undertaking shopping visits. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Response from a mystery shopper in relation to question 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Response from a Museum Lead undertaking shopping visits in relation to question 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Response from a Museum Lead not undertaking shopping visits in relation to question 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Response from a mystery shopper in relation to question 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Response from a Museum Lead undertaking shopping visits in relation to question 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Response from a mystery shopper in relation to question 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Response from a Museum Lead undertaking shopping visits in relation to question 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Response from a Museum Lead undertaking shopping visits in relation to question 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Please see Appendix 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. A participant response during Focus Group 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. A participant response during Focus Group 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. A participant’s response during Focus Group 1 in relation to others comments around distances and museum allocation. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Taken from feedback gathered across three groups exploring the questions raised through Focus Group 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Taken from feedback gathered across three groups exploring the questions raised through Focus Group 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. A participant’s response during Focus Group 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Taken from feedback gathered across three groups exploring the questions raised through Focus Group 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Taken from participant feedback across three groups exploring the questions raised through Focus Group 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. For further information please see: http://www.storecheckers.co.uk/mystery-shopping-service.html [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. For further information please see: http://mdem.org.uk/support-grants/development-programmes/engaging-children-young-people/mystery-shopper-programme/#.WKMR3W-LTIU [↑](#footnote-ref-31)