

How can the Heritage Fund be more inclusive of under-represented groups?

Context

The National Lottery Heritage Fund commissioned independent researchers from The Social Investment Consultancy as part of its Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Review.

The National Lottery Heritage Fund commissioned independent researchers from The Social Investment Consultancy as part of its Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Review.

The research took place between December 2020 and March 2021. During this time, 38 interviews were conducted and data was gathered through an online survey completed by 82 grantees identified as organisations working with and/or for under-represented groups. Due to time constraints, the research focused on grantees based in England only.

The recommendations outlined feed into [The Heritage Fund's EDI Review](#), which covers all areas of the organisation's operation:

- investment
- governance
- culture
- workforce

The research

The research explored how The Heritage Fund can be more inclusive of organisations working with and/or for under-represented groups, including race and ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, age and socio-economic background.

Research focus

- how grantees perceive The Heritage Fund and its role
- how grantees perceive heritage and whether differences create barriers
- what The Heritage Fund could do to become more inclusive
- a stronger focus on strategy rather than process

Research objectives

- meaningful and honest insights

- understanding external perceptions
- actionable recommendations
- placing grantee voices at the centre

Research parameters

Timeline

Preparation took place between November and December 2020, with interviews and surveys conducted between January and February 2021.

Research focus groups

The research focused on groups historically under-represented in The Heritage Fund's portfolio: race and ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, socio-economic background and young people.

Sampling for interviews

- links to under-represented groups
- smaller organisations for non-CRF programmes
- random sampling for Culture Recovery Fund organisations

To identify organisations working with people from low socio-economic backgrounds, organisations were selected from the ten most deprived areas using the [Indices of Multiple Deprivation](#).

Sampling for survey

Survey respondents were selected using the same criteria as interview participants. Due to response rates, interview participants were also invited to complete the survey.

Research limitations

Selection bias

Despite attempts to mitigate bias through sampling, it is likely that organisations with more positive experiences were over-represented.

Sampling issues

Data limitations prevented a clear distinction between organisations led by under-represented groups and those working with them.

Lived experience

Only five interviewees had lived experience of under-represented groups, limiting the ability to represent direct community perspectives.

Interview sample

Total interviewees: 38

Group	Number	Percentage
Youth	12	33%
Socio-economic background	10	26%
LGBT+	5	13%
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic	4	10%
Disability	4	10%

Survey sample

Total respondents: 82

User group	Number	Percentage
Other (women, elderly, mixed groups)	22	27%
Low socio-economic background	21	26%
Disabled people	18	22%
Young people	12	15%

[Back to top](#)

[Next Findings](#)