Unit 2 Rebranding:  
Fieldwork Questions Preparation

According to Mr Nevill, there are 4 possible rebranding questions:

1. Describe the fieldwork and research you would undertake to investigate if an area was in need of rebranding (general).
2. Describe the fieldwork and research you undertook to assess the success of a rebranding scheme (in named area).
3. Describe the methods you used to present the results of your fieldwork and research into rebranding.
4. Describe the results and conclusions of your fieldwork and research to investigate the success of rebranding (in a named area).

The questions from the last 4 exam series...

**January 2013:**  
“Describe the results of your fieldwork and research to investigate the success of rebranding schemes”

**June 2013:**  
“Describe the fieldwork and research you undertook to investigate why the area needed rebranding”

**June 2014:**  
“Describe how you analysed and presented the results of your fieldwork and research into rebranding scheme”

**June 2015:**  
“Describe the results and conclusions of your fieldwork and research to investigate the need for rebranding”
Potential Question 1 (Investigate Need for rebranding) - Could be conditional or past tense so adapt response as needed. - CONDITIONAL TENSE WITH NO NAMED PLACE

To investigate the need for rebranding, we would plan and execute a fieldwork trip to collect primary data and research different sources of information to collect secondary data, which we would then analyse as ‘rebrand need’ indicators to conclude whether an area was in need of rebranding (or not).

While there in the field, we would conduct:

- **EQS (Environmental Quality Services)** - we would score the quality of the local environment on different categories such as litter, traffic noise, green space and vegetation. Low EQS score would imply an area in need of rebranding.
- **Pedestrian Counts** - we would count people walking past us in a particular location over multiple 5 min periods then calculate a mean. Low pedestrian count would imply an area in need of rebranding as it would show low economic activity and an undesirable/unsafe public environment. (Indicates area popularity/reputation)
- **Dereliction Survey** - where we would walk around the area in a 1km grid and mark on the road map any buildings derelict or vacant. High dereliction would imply an area in need of rebranding as it would indicate an area of economic and social deprivation, where rebranding would be needed to clean up the area, re-image the area’s reputation and boost the economic activity.
- **Public and Business Questionnaires** - where we would approach and ask questions to members of the public to gain qualitative public/consumer data on the images and perceptions people hold of the area, and ask business owners questions to gauge the business activity in the area and how successful businesses are (levels of demand). We would ask open questions to gauge more accurate (representative) responses e.g. “Use 3 words to describe the area”, to which words with negative meanings and connotations would imply a need for re-imaging / wider rebranding.

We would then conduct research on an area to collect secondary data which would indicate a need for an area to rebrand or not. We would research:

- **Crime data from [www.police.uk](http://www.police.uk)** - which would show crime levels from records taken by the police for the area. High levels of Crime would indicate that an area was in need of rebranding as it would imply that the crime in the area was driven by economic and social deprivation in the area, which would also cause the area to have a negative public image.
- **Census data from the NOS (National Office for Statistics)** - which would give us insight into the geo-demographic data behind the population of the area over time. If between 2001 and 2011, average incomes, employment, and qualifications of residents has decreased, then this would indicate an area in need of rebranding.
- **Local media (e.g. Newspapers, Blogs and Forums)** - which we would analyse to obtain qualitative data from locals/outsiders about their perceptions of the area. Negative perceptions and media coverage would imply an area in need of rebranding.
Potential Question 2 (Investigate Success of rebranding) - Could be conditional or past tense so adapt response as needed. PAST TENSE WITH NAMED LEEDS RIVERSIDE AREA

SAME AS WITH QUESTION 1 EXCEPT FOR ON ‘SUCCESS’ OF REBRANDING RATHER THAN THE ‘NEED’ FOR REBRANDING...

To investigate the success of a rebranding scheme at Leeds Riverside, we planned and executed a fieldwork trip to collect primary data and researched different sources of information to collect secondary data, which we then analysed as ‘rebrand success’ indicators with respect to unrebranded areas and initial rebranding aims to conclude whether an area was in need of rebranding (or not).

We conducted fieldwork in Leeds Riverside, the area of the former Leeds Docklands, just South-East of the CBD. While there in the field, we conducted:

- **EQS (Environmental Quality Services)** - we scored the quality of the local environment on different categories such as litter, traffic noise, green space and vegetation. The high EQS score implied Leeds Riverside had successful rebranding.
- **Pedestrian Counts** - counted people walking past us in a particular location over multiple 5 min periods then calculated a mean. Low pedestrian counts implied Leeds Riverside had unsuccessful rebranding as it showed high economic activity and an undesirable/unsafe public environment. (Indicates area popularity/reputation).
- **Dereliction Survey** - where we walked around the area in a 1km grid and marked on the road map any buildings derelict or vacant. The high dereliction implied Leeds Riverside was in need of further rebranding (unsuccessful initial rebranding) as it indicated an area of economic and social deprivation, where further rebranding would be needed to clean up the area, re-image the area’s reputation and boost the economic activity.
- **Public and Business Questionnaires** - where we approached and asked questions to members of the public to gain qualitative public/consumer data on the images and perceptions people hold of the area, and asked business owners questions to gauge the business activity in the area and how successful businesses are (levels of demand). We asked open questions to gauge more accurate (representative) responses e.g. “Use 3 words to describe the area”, to which words with positive meanings and connotations would imply a successful rebrand.

We then conducted research on Leeds Riverside to collect secondary data which would indicate the success of rebranding in Leeds Riverside. We researched:

- **Crime data from www.police.uk** - which showed crime levels from records taken by the police for Riverside. High levels of Crime indicated that Leeds Riverside had unsuccessful rebranding as it implied that the crime in the area was driven by socioeconomic deprivation in the area, which would mean a failure of initial rebranding.
- **Census data from the NOS (National Office for Statistics)** - which give us insight into the geo-demographic data behind the population of Leeds Riverside over time. As between 2001 and 2011 the average incomes, employment, and qualifications of residents had decreased, then this would indicate an area with unsuccessful rebranding.
- **Local media (e.g. Newspapers, Blogs and Forums)** - which we analysed to obtain qualitative data from locals/outsiders about their perceptions of the area. The negative perceptions and media coverage would implied an area with unsuccessful rebranding.
Potential Question 3 (Presentation)

PRESENTATION
During our fieldwork and research into a rebranded area (Leeds Riverside) we collected a range of both quantitative and qualitative data about the rebranding which we can present in a variety of formats, some more suitable than others. Quantitative data can be graphed whereas while qualitative data can also be graphed, it is presented more accurately when documented by a descriptive account.

QUANTITATIVE DATA

- Graph the age range from public questionnaires using a bar chart (to show demographic of population and whether rebranding has hit target market) as it is quantitative data.
- Use a pie chart to for the ‘Why you are here?’ responses from public questionnaires (to show proportion of total reasons (relative popularity of options)), as it is quantitative data taken from a total number of types.
- I would construct a sphere of influence map to visualise the spatially apparent responses to the ‘Where have you come from?’ from the public questionnaires. Also construct one before the rebranding from secondary survey data and compare to two using a GIS.
- I would present my data from the pedestrian counts in a Pedestrian Proportion Map, which shows the foot count comparing Leeds Riverside to the CBD spatially.
- I would use an opinion line to present the 1-10 ratings from the public questionnaires.
- I would present the data from the Dereliction Survey as a Choropleth Map to show the badly affected areas spatially

QUALITATIVE DATA

For my qualitative data, which is harder to graph, I would instead present it by writing out a descriptive paragraph account of the outcomes of people from the questionnaires. I would write up my place check based on my fieldwork notes.
Potential Question 4 (Results and Conclusions)

We conducted an investigation into rebranding at Leeds Riverside with both primary data collection from fieldwork and secondary data from research, to assess whether the rebranding has been successful or not. The £250m rebrand of the Riverside, which opened in 2007, had 5 principle aims:

1. To facilitate economic growth of tertiary industries.
2. To develop Leeds as a centre for art and culture at a regional and national level.
3. To improve retail opportunities.
4. To improve the environment and public spaces.
5. To improve safety within the city centre (and build on it's existing reputation of being a 'violence free' city centre as a child friendly city)

If the rebranding was to be judged as a success, it would have to satisfy indicators for each of these initial aims.

The first aim was to boost the local economy by facilitating the economic growth of tertiary industries in the area. Evidence supported the obvious failure in this aim. The very low mean pedestrian count of 6 people in a 5 min period over 3 trials implies low economic demand/activity in the area, and all businesses surveyed agreed with this, categorising the level of business they received as 'moderate' - poor considering the area had had a £250m rebrand. Our dereliction survey showed high levels of dereliction and retail space vacancy, which was supported by our place check findings. Secondary research showed that the flagship economic development Alea Casino closed in March 2013, which goes to amplifies the low levels of economic activity the region is receiving - even the flagship developments fail.

The second aim was to develop Leeds as a centre for arts and culture at a regional and national level. Our primary data from fieldwork indicated that the rebrand was successful in this aim, with place check observations showing good levels of Art and Culture in Leeds Riverside, with the Royal Armouries Museum, locally placed sculptures and artistic glass street placings. Additionally, all people surveyed in the CBD recognised pictures of the Armouries Museum, implying it had a strong regional recognition amongst the public. Contrastingly, secondary research showed that the government-funded Royal Armories Museum had lower annual tourist visitor numbers than the city council-funded Leeds City Museum, which implied that the rebranded Leeds Riverside area had failed to gain national recognition. While the latter evidence could've been more because of location rather than rebranding, the overwhelming evidence from our research was that the Riverside hadn't succeeded in this aim.

The third aim was to improve retail opportunities in Leeds Riverside. In our survey for members of the public, only 25% of the people asked agreed that the area provides good retail opportunities, not high considering the area it was conducted in, Clarence Dock, was designed to be a rival retail space to the CBD high street. Further to this, our dereliction survey showed
high levels of spare retail space, with 7 large spare retail units in a 1km radius. Secondary research on the local news website ‘leeds-list.com’ showed that leading retail stores Joy, Aspecto and All Saints came to Clarence Dock in 2007 but have all moved away since. These results indicate very strongly that the rebrand has failed in it’s third aim to improve retail opportunities.

The fourth aim was to improve the Riverside environment and to provide public spaces. We conducted two Environmental Quality Surveys, one using researched historical images of the area before the rebranding and a second using observations in the field after the 2007 rebrand. On a scale from -32 to 32, the quality of the environment had improved from -16 in the 1980s to +5 in 2016, strongly indicating the rebrand has been successful in this aim. In addition, a place check of litter in Clarence Dock, an area of the rebranded Riverside, showed very low levels of litter, and 75% of the public asked felt the local public space had improved. Research from www.police.uk figures showed crime had decreased since the 2007 rebrand.

The final, fifth aim was to improve the safety of the Leeds Riverside area. Our evidence showed that this aim had been successful, with 100% of residents and business owners surveyed agreeing or strongly agreeing that they felt safe in Leeds Riverside.

Overall it is clear that only the fourth and fifth aims have been satisfied, and that while the area may have improved in it’s environmental quality and safety, the rebrand has thoroughly failed to bring the economic rejuvenation that underpinned the vision, and ultimately the success, of the development. Therefore, I deemed the rebranding at Leeds Riverside to have been a failure and be in requirement of further rebranding in order to become an attractive area without economic, social and environmental problems, as has begun with the re-imaging of the Riverside as ‘Leeds South Dock’, a project led by Alliance London and Leeds City Council since 2015.
PAST PAPER FOCUS (January 2013, June 2013, June 2014 and June 2015)

Tips from examining assessment materials:

- Focus on the question set ONLY otherwise your answer will be self-penalising. Adapt responses. Highlight key question focus words in the question to ensure answers are specific to the question set. Focuses responses score well.
- Cover all aspects of the question e.g. fieldwork AND research or analysis AND presentation.
- No answer is too basic. Simple direct answers are better than complex indirect answers.
- Give answers a distinct sense of place and mention specific rebranding schemes.
- Describe research before fieldwork as a marker for expectations and then subsequently comment on the fieldwork in light of the research result expectations. Use research as a pre-investigation to select areas and support fieldwork findings.
- If you are well prepared, answer all elements of the question, get the focus of the question right and just GO FOR IT you will be successful in getting above 10/15 marks.

January 2013

“Describe the results of your fieldwork and research to investigate the success of rebranding schemes” (15 marks)

January 2013 Question for 4)c)....

Mark scheme ideas:

Level 4 response description (13-15/15 mark band):
Structured account which describes a range of fieldwork and research results in detail; shows food use of own / group fieldwork, with good use of terminology. Clear linkage to the success of rebranding schemes in a named area(s). Written language errors are rare. [Must include both fieldwork and research to gain over 10 marks]

For fieldwork and research data, for real named places, present the data in either a statistical or descriptive manner for quantitative or qualitative data respectively and include comments on reliability and evaluation. Presentation credited if in the minority and if relevant to results.

June 2013
“Describe the fieldwork and research you undertook to investigate why the area needed rebranding” (15 marks)

June 2013 Question for 4)b)....

Mark scheme ideas:

*Level 4 response description (13-15/15 mark band):*
Detailed description of a balanced range of fieldwork and research techniques with clear links to the need for rebranding in a named area. Good use of terminology. Shows good use of own / group fieldwork. Written language errors are rare. Appropriate use of geographical terminology. [Must include both fieldwork and research to gain over 10 marks]

Credit candidates who provide a real context for the fieldwork e.g. named locations / schemes and comparison with other contexts / places with/without rebranding. Credit reference to sampling approaches and a discussion of any ways in which particular sites or areas were selected (e.g. mention of use of stratified sampling).

Fieldwork *(primary data collection) ALL EXPLAINED*
- EQS - Multiple Environmental Quality Surveys
- Surveys / Questionnaires for public / businesses
- Dereliction / vandalism survey
- Place checks (inc. field sketches)

Research *(secondary data collection) ALL EXPLAINED*
- Socio-economic data e.g. Crime rates, house prices etc.
- Geo-demographic data e.g. average age, type of retail outlets etc.
- Census data from 2011/2001 (especially for Leeds Docklands)
- Online Blogs/Forums with local resident opinions (secondary qualitative data)

*June 2014*
“Describe how you analysed and presented the results of your fieldwork and research ingo rebranding scheme” (15 marks)

June 2014 Question for 4)b)....

Mark scheme ideas:

Level 4 response description (13-15/15 mark band):
A detailed description of both the analysis and presentation of a range of fieldwork and research techniques that focusses on rebranding; with good use of terminology. Clear linkage to a named scheme(s); structured account; written language errors are rare. [Must include both fieldwork and research to gain over 10 marks]

Analysis
● Basic data processing e.g. working out percentages.
● Commenting on data / trends / patterns.
● Photograph analysis and annotation.
● Simple statistical analysis methods for quantitative data.
● More complex statistical analysis e.g. Standard Deviation
● More descriptive analysing methods e.g. Precising interviews

Presentation
● Choice of presentation method will be largely influenced by data type e.g. quantitative data => line, scatter, histogram graphs, whereas qualitative data => Descriptive narrative techniques / presentations.
● Data can be spatially represented e.g. sphere of influence / choropleth maps.
● Visual presentations e.g. PowerPoint presentations, Oral presentations.

June 2015

“Describe the results and conclusions of your fieldwork and research to investigate the need for rebranding” (15 marks)
June 2015 Question for 4)b)....

Mark scheme ideas:

Level 4 response description (13-15/15 mark band):
A detailed description of both the results and conclusions of a range of fieldwork and research techniques that focusses on the need for rebranding; shows good use of own / group fieldwork, with good use of terminology; structured account; written language errors are rare. [Must include results/conclusions from both fieldwork and research to gain over 10 marks]

Answers which fail to focus on the topic, need for rebanding, and instead focus on the methods of rebranding or the success of rebranding will tend to be self-penalising.

Results
Data relating to real places will be used in strong responses. Also credit analysis: using a range of simple statistics may also be appropriate e.g. mode, median, mean, IQR e.g. for Census Data. Other ways of analysing data may be more descriptive or qualitative.

Conclusions
Provides a summary of the data: patterns, trends and anomalies as revealed through the analysis of the range of data e.g. functional change, photos, interviews. Makes overall judgement on their fieldwork and results. Credit any acknowledgement that results may be partial and tentative.