

‘Number Please? Working with the Enfield Exchange’: co-production and a collaboration between a local and a national museum

Authors: Hilary Geoghegan (h.geoghegan@reading.ac.uk), University of Reading, UK. Kathleen McIlvenna (kathleen.mcilvenna@postgrad.sas.ac.uk), Institute of Historical Research, University of London, UK. Merel van der Vaart (m.j.vandervaart@uva.nl), Allard Pierson Museum, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Abstract

In 1960 the Science Museum (UK) acquired a section of the last manual telephone exchange of Greater London as a marker of communications technology progress. More than 50 years later, this section of the telephone exchange was temporarily returned to the community of Enfield, the village where it was once used. The Enfield Exchange project was a collaboration between this national museum, the local Enfield heritage services and the heritage department of a national telecommunications company (BT) in order to collect local and personal histories around a historic technological object. Through an exhibition and events this project forged connections between a local and a national museum, the history of communications and personal stories, and between a national museum object and a local community. The project informed the current display of the section of the Enfield exchange as part of the Science Museum’s permanent ‘Information Age’ gallery.

A. Prologue

The fifth of October 1960 marked a milestone in the history of telecommunications in Britain. The last manual telephone exchange in the Greater London area was unplugged and replaced by a new automatic exchange, ultimately altering how calls would be answered and connected in the North London Borough of Enfield forever. The manual telephone exchange had first opened in the mid-1920s, when Enfield was still a town yet to be absorbed into the London sprawl. It was operated by 16 telephonists. These women (as they nearly always were women – popularly known as the ‘hello girls’) were responsible for transferring calls to, from, and within Enfield. They were the voice at the end of the line with the familiar and polite question “Number Please?” However, after nearly forty years the manual exchange switchboard was dismantled, its operators silenced and the staff were redeployed. Yet, this was not the end of the line for the exchange and a section was acquired by the Science Museum for posterity.

From that day in 1960 one section of the manual telephone switchboard started a new life as a museum object in the UK’s national museum for science, technology, engineering and medicine, where it was catalogued, stored and conserved. It seemed unlikely that it would ever be displayed outside the Science Museum’s site in South Kensington. Yet, on a sunny May morning in 2012, the section of manual telephone switchboard was delivered to the Enfield Museum Service. This temporary repatriation to Enfield was part of a collaborative project between the Science Museum, the Enfield Museum Service and Enfield Local Studies, and BT Heritage Group. The project had two goals. First, it was hoped that moving the object out of the national museum setting would unearth different stories and contexts that could inform and enhance existing understanding of the exchange. How would local historians and people interpret and engage with an object of telecommunications history? Second, Science Museum staff was keen to find people with a personal connection to the object. Oral histories of women telephone operators between the mid-1920s and 1960 were the principal desired output. Given the likely age of those operators and technicians (some almost 90 years old), as well as local people with memories of the exchange, there was a sense of urgency surrounding this aim. Furthermore, as this project was part of the research and content development plans for the Museum’s new permanent communications gallery, Information Age, due to open in 2014 it was apparent that this really was a race against time. The project team was formed in early February 2012 and on the first of June the exhibition ‘Number Please? Working with the Enfield Exchange’ opened at Enfield Museum Service.

A. Introduction

The Enfield Exchange project relied on co-production on two levels: first between national and local museums; and second between museum professionals and local retired telephonists and enthusiasts. The exhibition was planned to run for six months with a number of community events in order to engage and inform the local community of the exchange's presence and its local significance. It was also hoped that these events would help to pinpoint and cultivate particular audiences including local history groups, local residents, telecommunications enthusiasts and those who worked at or remembered the Enfield Exchange. For the Science Museum this collaboration was a novel departure. In this article, we reveal some of the ways in which these relationships were brokered and how the collaborative project team worked to push the boundaries of these relationships.

The project team consisted of three organisations with differing backgrounds and specialisms: the Science Museum; BT (previously British Telecom) Heritage Group; and Enfield Museum Service alongside Enfield Local Studies, both part of the local authority. The project was led and coordinated by the Science Museum, a national institution with a remit to 'explain the history and future of science and technology to the public at large' (Morris 2010), it now owned the switchboard and had gained funding for the project through the Arts and Humanities Research Council in the UK (AHRC). As the exchange is significant in the history of telecommunications, BT Heritage was able to contribute further historical context, as well as provide contacts in the modern day telecommunications industry and among specialist enthusiast networks across London and the rest of the UK. The local institutions, the Enfield Museum Service and Enfield Local Studies, were able to provide a gateway to Enfield communities, including, it was hoped, local history societies. The archives held by Local Studies were valuable for providing a local historical context and the Museum Service had access to space in which to host the manual telephone switchboard and its accompanying temporary exhibition.

Like many of the objects in its collection, the Science Museum had acquired the Enfield switchboard as an example of universal stories about progress in communication technology, as well as changes in communication itself. Now, more than fifty years later, the Science Museum was looking for the unique dimension of the local, often lost in national museums and therefore felt it crucial to bring the switchboard back to Enfield for the duration of the project. As the Enfield switchboard was manoeuvred through the doors of the Dugdale Centre, a community building where Enfield Museum Service is based, it shook off the aura of South Kensington, where several of the UK's national museums are based, and its generic national identity. Like a visiting former local it was hoped that old friends would stop by and want to catch up. With the importance of place and relationships central to the project it is no coincidence then that the research fellow selected to work on this project was a cultural geographer. In the next section, we consider how the project was formulated and how it contributes to existing museum practice and thought in this area of co-production.

A. Co-production

The Enfield project fell under the remit of the Science Museum's Research and Public History Department, specifically their co-production and public history programme. It is important to outline here the roots of this Department in order to highlight the new community of practice emerging around this project. In October 2010 the Science Museum launched its Public History of Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine (PHoSTEM) project with a three-day workshop, bringing together an international audience of science museum, co-production and public history experts. The aim of the workshop was to discuss how science museums could engage their audiences with the history of STEM subjects, with an emphasis on public history and co-production. Speakers included Emma Bryant from the Wallace Collection (London), Jaime Kopke, founder of the Denver Community Museum, and Alexandra Kim from Historic Royal Palaces (London) (Boon 2011). This event was a first step towards the formation of the Science Museum Research and Public History Department. Since its inception, it has worked with enthusiasts to co-curate an exhibition looking at the history of electronic music (Boon, van der Vaart & Price 2014) and supported various community groups interested in the Museum's historic collections, for example through the AHRC funded All Our Stories project. As such, the Department is part of a long tradition of audience engagement and co-creation at the Science Museum (Boon, van der Vaart & Price 2014). This work by the Research

and Public History Department also inspired the AHRC funded PHoSTEM network, in which the Department is working together with the Institute for the Public Understanding of the Past at the University of York and the Centre for the History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Leeds. This network was established to explore issues of public history and public culture related specifically to the history of science and history of science collections. It was through the Enfield project and their collaboration with a local museum that Science Museum staff were introduced to co-production, as well as leaving the comfort of South Kensington's display spaces for the first time.

The loan of an object or objects however, is not a new way of museum partnership or collaboration. The Glasgow Open Museum, for example, has been loaning objects to local community groups since 1989 and offers over 4,000 objects for groups to create their own exhibitions or displays [1]. The British Museum, on the other hand, actively facilitates object loans to local museums in the UK through various schemes, from the temporary loan of a single item, to developing Partnership Galleries in collaboration with local museums [2]. These partnerships are intended to be mutually beneficial by sharing skills and expertise, and in the case of the York Museums Trust, the British Museum have borrowed objects to display in London [3]. These two examples show that where the Glasgow Museum, a local museum, can strengthen its position within a local community directly through co-production and providing access to its collections, the bigger, but national, British Museum reaches local audiences across the UK through collaborations with local museums. These different approaches might be explained by the fact that it can be easier for smaller museums to become 'embedded in their local communities' as pointed out in Bernadette Lynch's report for the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, *Whose Cake is it Anyway?* (Lynch 2009). Indeed, one could wonder how a national museum should identify local communities. For many national museums this aim of becoming embedded has meant increasing the number of opportunities for participation and collaborative projects with a wide range of audiences. The British Museum's 'Talking Objects' initiative, 'an object-based engagement programme connecting participants with museum collections and curators' [4], is an example of a national museum collaborating with local audiences on various levels. First, it works with groups of young people, local to the museum. Second, it supports and advises museums across the UK on how to engage their local audiences with their own collections. 'Talking Objects' is part of a larger project called People & Place that aims 'to link the experiences and identities of young people and their surroundings with a personal investigation of the past and its impact on the present' [5]. From these projects, place can be regarded as significant in terms of adding context and meaning when interpreting an object. While this has been used for co-creation, the Enfield Exchange project wanted to achieve something different.

B National objects with local stories

Instead of co-creation, the Enfield Exchange project aimed to turn the large, bulky manual telephone switchboard into a social object. Referencing engineer and sociologist Jyri Engeström, Nina Simon explores the potential of social objects in museum space. She describes how objects can be both intrinsically social, for example because they relate to a visitor's personal experience or memory, and how they can be made more social. Three possible ways in which objects can be made more social, according to Simon, are to ask visitors questions, to provide live interpretation and to use provocative presentation techniques (Simon 2010). In the case of the Enfield switchboard, project staff hoped that by bringing the object back to its 'community of origin', it would draw out those who had worked on it or in a similar exchange, together with those interested in local history to find out how this object related to Enfield. The display of the exchange was not so much provocative, but it was designed to provoke memories of working in a telephone exchange and on a switchboard. The project was developed to be a contributory, using the object to facilitate the acquisition of oral histories for a new gallery and develop new relationships with Enfield local history societies to explore how local historians would interpret a piece of technology. Visitors were asked to share their memories and experiences in various ways. Through its presence and carefully designed events, which in a way functioned as live interpretation, visitors participated in a variety of ways from demonstrating how the object was used to telling their stories to family members, friends and other interested members of the public.

Gathering oral histories about the working lives of those employed on the switchboard was an underlying aim of the project, and this in itself presents some interesting angles. Museums have worked as part of oral history projects for many years, and likewise oral history projects have been popular in community-focused projects. The value in these projects has often been regarded as accessing an otherwise forgotten or invisible history. Groups like the Popular Memory Group developed in the 1980s championed the use of oral history to document history from the point of view of women, working classes and ethnic minorities. This has also been demonstrated with reference to a museum setting in Anna Green's article 'Returning History to the Community' published in 1997. This paper discussed an oral history project recording the memories of the residents of the railway workers' community in Frankston Johnston, New Zealand that resulted in an exhibition at the Waikato Museum of Art and History. This project not only highlighted the potential power of exhibiting oral history, but also emphasised the perceived urgency in conducting the project before these histories 'were irretrievably lost with the dispersion of old residents and the death of the last generation to live in the community during its railway heyday' (Green 1997). Such an urgency was also felt in the Enfield project.

Today community oral history programmes are still popular and used to uncover working class histories. Recent projects include the Heritage Lottery Fund financed project, 'Working Lives of the Thames Gateway' and the 'Britain at Work' project that has also received support from the Trade Union Council. The Enfield Exchange project fits into this model of relocating the voice of the worker, as well as a growing scholarship of oral history in the history of science and technology. By contrast, the British Library facilitates the Oral History of British Science project that focuses on prominent figures in this field. Yet, as Indira Chowdhury's work on oral histories of science in Postcolonial India shows, the work of the laboratory assistant, kitchen staff and microscope attendants can often be forgotten when collecting oral histories and by forgetting them we potentially lose microhistories of the everyday that could give new views of the past (Chowdhury 2013). Through the oral histories of telephone operators the project hoped to be able to develop our understanding of the everyday history of the manual telephone exchange, and perhaps uncover an untold history or gain inspiration for a captivating exhibition.

A. The Project: What did we do?

In this section we outline how the project team worked collectively and individually to fulfil the project brief, focusing in particular on: collection and display; engagement; and collaboration.

B. Collection and Display

In May 2012 the section of switchboard was delivered to Enfield and fitted into a special display structure. Alongside the switchboard, several objects were exhibited to represent working life in the telephone exchange. A special telephone operator's pencil with adaptor for dialling was acquired by the Science Museum for the exhibition and proved to be very popular. An example of the operator's headset was on display and used during some of the reminiscence sessions. With the help of Dave Shawyer, BT Heritage Curator, three telephone operator chairs were sourced and included in the exhibition. Their display emphasised the fact, not necessarily obvious at first sight, that three operators worked closely, side-by-side in front of the switchboard section exhibited. Handbags purchased at a local thriftstore were hung from the back of the seats, to gesture to the social context of the switchboard. This display of the switchboard, chairs and handbags mimicked photographs of the Enfield exchange, taken by a Science Museum photographer in 1960, two days before the exchange went out of use. These photographs featuring many of operators working in the switch room were viewed by the project team as a valuable resource to provoke memories and, they hoped, stories. A similar technique had been used by Enfield Museum Service in a previous temporary exhibition on the Second World War which had prompted many local stories and reminiscences of the period. The photographs were reproduced on three large banners which also gave basic text about the scope of the exhibition and mounted on display frames lent by Enfield Museum Service, in order to have as great a visual impact as possible.

Other objects and archival materials accessible to visitors were the result of collaborative research between the Science Museum and Enfield Museum Service and Enfield Local Studies. Objects included two telephones of the dial-less type likely to have been in use in the town from the mid-1920s to the end of manual switching in 1960. One was a pedestal (candlestick) telephone and the other a later desk telephone. Each was fitted with a facsimile dial-centre label showing an Enfield number in the exact style used between the 1930s and the 1950s. A small office switchboard was selected from Enfield Museum's collection to show the contrast in scale between a public telephone exchange and a private branch exchange. The showcases used were lent for the purpose by Enfield Museums Service. The exhibition was intended principally for a general audience and the graphic panels and other texts were drafted accordingly. The main aim of the exhibition was not to transfer information, but to invite local residents to share their memories and stories of the exchange. This was reflected by the exhibition's message document, for which the top-level message read: 'Together with the people in Enfield, the Science Museum wants to explore the history of the local telephone exchange, capturing stories from those who worked there and the experiences of telephone users'. (Liffen, Boon & van der Vaart 2012) However, it was felt that detailed information about the call connections should be available to those with a particular interest, and a double-sided A4 leaflet was prepared by the Science Museum's Curator of Communications for free distribution, entitled 'How the Enfield switchboard worked'. Copies were placed in a suitable dispenser at the front of the switchboard display structure.

B. Engagement

A number of methods were used with the intention of facilitating engagement of local and enthusiast audiences. Some were more successful than others, with the physical exhibition and choreographed events proving to be the most successful. From the outset the Science Museum made attempts to connect with local history societies and groups. Enfield Museum Service and Enfield Local Studies have very good relationships with a number of these groups, but it soon became clear that the project would have to go forward without the participation of the local history societies. This did not appear to be a result of the historical subject matter the Science Museum wanted to explore or because of any aversion to working with technological objects. It was, in fact, a matter of logistics. These societies worked almost a year in advance and the time constraints on the Enfield Exchange project, partly due to funding and pressures for content for a new exhibition meant there was little time to build a relationship with these organisations and fit into their programmes of activities.

Consequently the project focused on its invitation for contributions. Social media and blogs are often championed by museums as a tool for co-production, and there are many success stories. The project team felt that the audience for switchboard might not necessarily be online, but it was thought that the possibilities of an online presence were worth exploring. The online presence was developed by the Science Museum's Research and Public History Department, including a project blog and a Facebook page. The blog was to be an online space where people could find up-to-date information about the project, the events programme and the exhibition. Secondly, it was designed as a space for the team to document their experiences. As well as pictures and reports of the various activities, it contained a series of historic photographs of the exchange and switchboard. In this way it aimed to offer people who wouldn't be able to attend the exhibition or events the opportunity to engage with the project online, for example by commenting on blog posts or images. In addition, it provided a platform for the Science Museum to showcase an exhibition it had developed outside the South Kensington site, something the Museum's own website did not provide at the time. Therefore, the main purpose of the blog was not so much to advertise the project to a wide audience, as to engage a local audience of people interested in, or related to, Enfield's telecommunications history. The web address of the blog was included on one of the exhibition banners and in the leaflet that was available in the exhibition.

A Facebook account was created because some of the site's functionalities seemed useful tools for the project. In particular the timeline was used to provide a chronology of the life of the Enfield Telephone exchange in general and more specifically the section of the manual exchange switchboard that became part of the Science Museum's collection. This timeline feature could also be accessed by people who didn't have a Facebook account, although it's unclear whether these audiences knew that

access was possible. Blog posts were also automatically advertised on Facebook. Social media can be an excellent tool for encouraging and facilitating participation, and had worked particularly well in the Science Museum's 'Oramics to Electronica' project, which was aimed at electronic musicians, many of whom are active social media users (Boon, van der Vaart & Price 2014). Nevertheless the project team's initial feelings, that the desired audience of former telephonists and engineers would not necessarily be familiar with the use of social media, appeared to be fulfilled as engagement online was limited. Interestingly, analysis of the blog's use did show that almost 93% of visitors to the blog came from the UK, with 57% coming from the Greater London area. This seems to imply that it could indeed be possible to reach a local audience through a web presence, despite the international nature of the internet. The online presence had provided some potentially useful tools, such as the Facebook timeline, and could have been valuable if the project had explored an inter-generational aspect, however, given the projects time constraints and specific aims to source oral histories the benefits were minimal.

As described before, the main aim of the exhibition was to encourage those with memories/reminiscences of working with exchanges to share their stories. A variety of methods were available: people could leave comments on the blog and Facebook page; or contact the research team via email or mail. The exhibition leaflet also encouraged former telephonists, engineers and telephone users to share their stories, containing several questions about working at the exchange and telephone use. These questions could be answered on the leaflet and the leaflet could be dropped in a response box. The leaflet also included post and email addresses through which the research team could be contacted. Though this provided a physical and secure method of contact, its success was also limited as it was difficult to follow up the messages left. However, the opportunities for face-to-face interaction between staff, locals and enthusiasts proved to be the most effective – offering real-time, often co-produced interpretation. Consequently the events organised for the summer of 2012 were the main focus of participation.

There were six free events, coordinated by Hilary Geoghegan, cultural geographer, on behalf of the Science Museum. These included three free curator-led tours of the 'Number Please?' exhibition (18th June, 27th June, 18th July 2012) held in the Dugdale Centre and a research event held in the local archives and co-hosted by Enfield Local Studies (27th June 2012). A matinee and cream tea saw the theatre and lobby of the Dugdale Centre used to screen 90 minutes of film followed by a cream tea and an opportunity to reminisce about telephones and working exchanges (18th July 2012). Finally, there was a guided walk of Enfield Town's telecommunications history (27th July 2013). These events were attended by over 100 members of the public and proved to be the best opportunity for museum staff and local residents to meet and share their stories. The matinee and cream tea provided a comfortable space for attendees to reminisce about work on the switchboard and in telephone exchanges more generally and were fruitful in encouraging women to offer their oral histories.

B. Collaboration

Though much of the project was led by the Science Museum, collaboration with other institutions was integral to its success. These collaborations included logistical matters such as BT Heritage's assistance in sourcing the telephonists' chairs and Enfield Museum Service providing space and spare display cases. The significance of the local has been discussed but the use of space within the location is worth expanding further. Like many local museums Enfield Museum Service is located within a shared public space; this is known locally as the Dugdale Centre. This space includes a theatre, a café and meeting rooms as well as the Museum's temporary and permanent exhibition spaces and the Local Studies reading rooms and archive. The 'Number Please?' exhibition was set up in a freely accessible exhibition space adjacent to the café in the Dugdale Centre's lobby. The theatre, café and meeting rooms are run separately from the Museum and consequently the Museum Service and Local Studies teams acted as facilitators between the Science Museum and the Dugdale Centre in discussions over the use of the space. The staff on the front desk of the theatre, and in the café, were also the frontline staff for visitors to the 'Number Please?' exhibition, as museum staff are located elsewhere. Every effort was consequently made by Enfield Museum Service staff and Science Museum staff to keep the Dugdale Centre informed of the project, and their staff were very helpful in

providing ways for the public to leave thoughts through a makeshift comments book and providing a table and comments box for the leaflets produced by the Science Museum. The Local Studies offices and archives were also based in the Dugdale Centre and this space was used for one of the events, connecting the archives upstairs with the objects and documents on display downstairs.

Collaboration also provided networks to audiences that the Science Museum may not have been able to reach otherwise. Publicity was gained through BT's employee and pensioner magazine 'BT Today' (circulation over 100,000), as well as BT Heritage's Connected Earth Facebook and Twitter channels and blog. Working with the press team at the London Borough of Enfield and Enfield Museum Service's connections to other publications, the exhibition and events were publicised in a number of local publications and Hilary Geoghegan and John Liffen (Communications Curator) were interviewed and photographed.

For the local Enfield institutions this type of project would not have been possible without the Science Museum's involvement. The teams in the Museum Service and Local Studies are very small and neither has staff dedicated to outreach, education or community work. Events hosted by the Museum tend to focus on families and are consequently held during school holidays in February and October. Therefore it was an exciting opportunity to host events aimed at an older audience the Museum is generally unable to cater for. As a local museum, exhibitions and collections are often developed with the local community in mind; it is often the older members of the community who donate or loan objects. Yet, traditionally, if events could be organised, museums have focused on their learning offer, looking to schools and families, particularly since the arrival of the Kids in Museums campaign, which launched in the UK in 2003. Providing an offer to older audiences is a growing area for museum learning and engagement departments [6], but this can be difficult for already constrained local services. It also allowed Local Studies to use archives and encourage research into an area not widely used, and the research day was useful also for demonstrating the facilities on offer to potentially new audiences. Furthermore, it was an opportunity for Enfield Museum Service to raise its profile within the community by not only having an object from an national museum on display alongside objects from its own collection, but whilst a new temporary exhibition, 'Our Sporting Life' was being prepared and launched and increase community awareness of the museum space. This was particularly important as the museum had moved to the Dugdale Centre in 2011 from Forty Hall, and many residents still believe the museum to be located there.

A. Conclusion

The unique collaboration between the Science Museum, BT Heritage and the Enfield Museum Service and Local Studies was in itself a valuable outcome. The project was mutually beneficial and those involved had a positive experience. This type of project was unprecedented for the Science Museum and it has laid the groundwork for consideration of future projects, while at the time it was also part of a bigger effort to incorporate various types of co-created content in the 'Information Age' gallery (Bunning et al. 2015). The legacy of the project for Enfield Museum was almost immediately realised where the relationships developed during the project and the documentation that had been completed led to loans for the next temporary exhibition, 'Water Water Everywhere: 400 years of the New River'.

The project was also successful in generating participation in the events. Over the course of this project, we have engaged with over 100 members of the public at events, not including visitors to the exhibition itself, as well as the numerous others who read about the Enfield Exchange project in the local press, BT's employee and pensioner magazine *BT Today*, BT Heritage's Connected Earth Facebook and Twitter channels, blog and Facebook account. The project engaged 15 former members of staff from the Enfield Telephone Exchange, as part of a total of approximately 40 members of telephone exchange staff in London and beyond.

Though one of the aims for the Science Museum, to engage and work with local societies, had not been realised, another aim, to find oral history participants was successful. Five former telephone operators from Enfield were identified as potential oral history participants. Three declined due to ill

health. However, two of them, Jean Singleton and Joyce Barnard, were interviewed on 6th September 2012. Two former telephone operators from Enfield and the London area attended a one-off reminiscence event on 19th September 2012 to share their stories and memories of life in the telephone exchange. Both participants, Patsy Fraulo, operator at Enfield, and Paula Bowman, operator at Faraday House, were informally interviewed by Hilary Geoghegan and Jen Kavanagh, Audience Engagement Manager at the Science Museum. These oral histories informed the display of the Enfield switchboard as part of the new permanent 'Information Age' gallery. Some of the stories, told by the telephonists themselves, can be heard in the exhibition.

This project has positively challenged Science Museum practice in three areas. First, it has given direction to existing discussions about establishing a dedicated oral history collection. The acquisition of this small number of oral histories has pushed the discussion beyond the theoretical. Questions are now being asked about storage, management and access to these collections, as well as potential costs. Second, the project has opened up new ways of working across Science Museum departments, resulting in new types of exhibition making practices. Finally, the project introduced new and interesting ways of thinking about objects in the Science Museum's collection. It encouraged discussion about the value of different types of stories, such as factual information or personal narratives, as well as the possibility of adding non-curatorial narratives to object records.

In conclusion, through the physical relocation of a piece of the national collection into a local setting, Science Museum staff was able to find new interpretations of this object. The manual telephone exchange is a large and rather imposing object, but through carefully designed display, fortunate location and well thought-out events this became a social object. Complemented with handling objects from the local Enfield Museum Service, as well as research from the Science Museum's Curator of Communications and hands-on demonstrations from former operators, this object facilitated intergenerational conversations. These conversations alongside the oral histories collected for the Science Museum's new gallery could be called a heritage exchange.

End notes

[1] More information about this project can be found on the museum's website, accessed on 8 February, 2016: <http://www.glasgowlife.org.uk/museums/about-glasgow-museums/open-museum/about-the-Open%20Museum/Pages/home.aspx>

[2] More information about the British Museum's UK loan activities can be found on the museum's website, accessed on 8 February 2016:

http://www.britishmuseum.org/about_us/tours_and_loans/uk_loans_and_tours.aspx

[3] Treasurers of Medieval York, the first time one of the partner museums have exhibited at the British Museum rather than the other way round, and took place whilst the Yorkshire Museum was undergoing some major refurbishment.

http://www.britishmuseum.org/about_us/tours_and_loans/uk_loans_and_tours/partnership_loan.aspx (23 November 2013 16:30)

[4]

http://www.britishmuseum.org/about_us/community_collaborations/partnerships/talking_objects.aspx (7 February, 2016)

[5] People & Place: Exploring local and global histories, <http://www.peopleandplace.org.uk/> (29 November 2013 12:20)

[6] A good example of the growing interest in providing for older people is the NIACE report 'Building a society for all ages: Benefits from older people from learning in museums, libraries and archives' from 2009. accessed on 7 February, 2016:

http://shop.niace.org.uk/media/catalog/product/f/i/file_3_21.pdf

References

Boon, T. 2011. Co-curation and the Public History of Science and Technology. *Curator the Museum Journal*. 54 (4): 383-387.

Boon, T., M.J. van der Vaart and K. Price. 2014. Oramics to Electronica: Investigating lay understandings of the history of technology through a participatory project. *Science Museum Group Journal*. 2. Doi: <http://doi.crossref.org/10.15180/140206>

Bunning, K., J. Kavanagh, K. McSweeney and Prof. R. Sandell. 2015. Embedding Plurality: exploring participatory practice in the development of a new permanent gallery'. *Science Museum Group Journal*. 3. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15180/150305>

Chowdhury, I. 2013. A Historian among Scientists: Reflections on Archiving the History of Science in Postcolonial India. *The History of Science Society*. 104 (2): 371-380.

Green, A. 1997. Returning History to the Community: Oral History in a Museum Setting. *The Oral History Review*. 24 (2): 53-72.

Liffen, J., T. Boon and M.J. van der Vaart. Messages for 'Number Please? Working with the Enfield exchange' (unpublished).

Lynch, B. 2009. *Whose Cake is it Anyway?: A collaborative investigation into engagement and participation in 12 museums and galleries in the UK*. <http://www.phf.org.uk/page.asp?id=1417> (29 November 2013 12:00)

Morris, P. J. T. (ed.). 2010. *Science for the Nation: Perspectives on the History of the Science Museum*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

Popular Memory Group. 2006. Popular Memory: Theory, politics and method. *The Oral History Reader*, R. Perks and A. Thomson, eds., 43-53. London: Routledge.

<http://www.hidden-histories.org.uk/workingLives/index.html> (9 March 2014)

<http://www.unionhistory.info/workerswar/index.php> (9 March 2014)

<http://www.bl.uk/historyofscience> (9 March 2014)