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Appendices
1. Executive summary
The Council for British Archaeology (CBA) has the mission ‘archaeology for all’, into which the support of community archaeology across the UK by the CBA logically fits (see CBA 2006a). To this end, this research report has been developed assessing the current state of ‘community archaeology’, and more broadly, voluntary action in archaeology, in the UK. This research programme, and the post of Community Archaeology Support Officer, has been funded by the Headley Trust.

The research presented here has been conducted through questionnaire survey and qualitative interviews with a sample of participants and practitioners, described in more detail in ‘Methodology’ (Section 4), below.

The research aims and objectives included identifying the different outcomes of community archaeology and the current support and training, as well as gaps in that support, that are currently available for the voluntary sector in archaeology.

The executive summary of this report is as follows:

- The CBA found that there are at least 2,030 voluntary groups and societies active in the UK that interact with archaeological heritage in a wide variety of ways. This represents approximately 215,000 individuals.

- Relationships between professional archaeologists and volunteers are in the most part excellent, but there are some regions where problems can be identified. This can sometimes, although not always, be due to a lack of awareness on the part of the professional archaeologist of the existing abilities of volunteers (many of whom bring with them skills from other disciplines). Thus there is a case for the development of training for professional archaeologists to equip them better to work with and support volunteers.

- Groups vary from not very active through to extremely active, although excavation is an activity only in 41% of instances. Other popular activities include recording through photography, attending talks or lectures, lobbying on heritage issues, and fieldwalking.

- Group activities, even level of expertise, are significantly influenced by local conditions, such as relationship with professional archaeologists, legislation, and availability of grants.

- Recent developments, such as the dramatic decline in continuing education departments and the closure/down-sizing of many archaeological organisations, continue to have an impact.

- Good practice literature and guidance exists, but needs signposting centrally.

- Sustainability is a key issue that emerged throughout the research phases, and more research is needed into the means by which
bottom-up, community-led archaeology projects may work to ensure sustainability (of funding, research agenda and governance), and into what the potential role may be for national bodies such as the CBA in supporting these initiatives, especially if initiated by a grant in the first instance.

- There is a need for training, but this varies from area to area, and from group to group. Hence training programmes must be tailored to specific regions or groups, must have an emphasis on practical rather than passive sessions, as well as making increased use of online learning models to enable learners to choose material appropriate to their needs. However, online provision cannot substitute for face-to-face interaction, which is still considered to be of most value.

- There are mixed feelings from groups and practitioners about the nature of training and how formalised this should be. However, a significant number of groups interviewed specifically expressed interest in the development of an accredited programme of training for voluntary groups.

- The Community Archaeology Forum (CAF) – <www.britarch.ac.uk/caf>, needs to be more user-friendly; be more attractive; be mindful of the legislative and procedural differences across the UK, and include more practical advice, particularly on fundraising. More clarity is required that CAF is a free resource available for groups across all of the UK and Crown Dependencies, and not just England and Wales.
2. Introduction

The concept of 'community archaeology' is not new (and see Liddle, in prep., for discussion of its development in Leicestershire in the 1970s). 'Community archaeology' derives largely from a strong tradition of local archaeology societies which has existed since the Nineteenth Century and earlier (Henson in prep.a) and its ideological origins may even stretch back to the time and activities of antiquarians in the Seventeenth Century (Isherwood, 2009, 92-98). Indeed, until the 1970s, archaeology in the UK was almost entirely voluntary. In the past few years the term and phenomenon of 'community archaeology' has arguably been increasingly of interest to researchers (e.g. Dhanjal in prep.; Heyworth et al in prep.; Isherwood 2009; Lee 2009; Simpson 2009; Smith and Waterton 2009;) and to funding bodies (CBA 2006b; TAF 2005).

Its impact is also evidenced in the increase in positions of employment created relating to outreach and education across the archaeological discipline (Aitchison and Edwards 2008, 135). This is fuelled by an apparent growth in public interest in ancient societies, and in archaeology more generally (Morrison 2008, 22).

Furthermore, there have been a number of developments in recent years, which begin to recognise community archaeology as a distinct branch of activity and study in its own right. For example, the CBA launched the Community Archaeology Forum (CAF) website (Fig 1) in 2006, to signpost, celebrate and support the voluntary sector and its activities. This website has already won several awards, but is ready for enhancement, to be informed by the results described in this report and collected throughout the research project.

Conferences have focussed specifically on community archaeology and engagement, such as in London and Manchester, both in 2006, in Exeter, Musselburgh and Newcastle in 2009, and with further conferences planned in Oxford and Folkestone in 2010. In September 2009 the CBA co-organised a day workshop in Leicester with assistance from the Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group (LMAFG) for heritage professionals to network and discuss issues related to community archaeology. The issues raised and discussed on that day inform and contribute to sections of this report, particularly 6.3.2.

A 'speed-networking day for educators and heritage professionals’ organised by Hampshire and Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology
(HWTMA) in Southampton in November 2009, and a similar event planned by the University of Sheffield and partners for 2010, are yet more evidence of the growth of practitioners involved in outreach and community work, and of their desire to share ideas and experiences in appropriate forums.

While precise definitions of what ‘community archaeology’ is are problematic, given its extraordinary scope and variation, a key principle is that involvement of ‘non-professional’ archaeologists and volunteers is encouraged. While in the past, some projects have assumed that preservation and management of archaeological resources on behalf of the public is sufficient (and see Merriman 2004, 3; Carman 2005, 5), focus is increasingly on facilitating active participation in the practice of archaeology by the public (e.g. CBA 2006a).

Some projects that have been described as ‘community archaeology’ may be finite events, supported by a specific period of funding or facilitated by a particular professional contractor or organisation as a stand-alone project, such as the Museum of London’s 2005-6 Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF)-funded community excavation in Shoreditch (Simpson and Williams 2008, 76). In other cases, community archaeology projects have developed into long-term, apparently sustainable activities, engaging many local community members. For the Upper Coquetdale Community Archaeology Project in Northumberland, local residents received training from staff at Northumberland National Park Authority and the University of Durham Archaeological Services, carried out full-scale excavations, surveys and field walking exercises, and even wrote their own funding applications to continue the project (Johnson 2005). It is now regarded as a thriving, sustainable and independent community archaeology group in its own right. In the case of Wilmslow Community Archaeology, there is no ‘official’ facilitator from within professional archaeology guiding or training the group at all, although several of the (voluntary) members of the group work professionally as archaeologists elsewhere. Members of this group described their model as ‘democratic’, a term that has been associated with community archaeology elsewhere (e.g. Faulkner 2009; 2000).

The so-called ‘bottom-up’ approach, where the community itself initiated and leads projects and activities, is a step further on from the tendency of many archaeological contractors to allow open days to excavations, where the public can view the work going on, but engage with the archaeology itself only passively. This also raises the question of whether ‘top-down’ projects, which are developed by professional organisations as projects that include volunteers, can realistically be labelled ‘community archaeology’ at all, or whether they would be better described as ‘archaeological outreach’. However, the research project behind this report deliberately adopted a broad approach to possible definitions and understandings of ‘archaeology’, and of the term ‘community’.

Because of the difficulties, and the deceptiveness, of imposing strict disciplinary boundaries, the study included in its remit any groups that have conducted research into the physical remains of the past, whether or
not they specifically include the term ‘archaeology’ in their group’s name. This included many groups whose primary interest is in specialist areas such as railway heritage, social history and community heritage. Hence, the research project targeted all groups ranging from self-identified ‘community archaeology’ groups and other local societies, including what has been referred to as ‘that mainstay of British archaeological tradition, the society of local amateurs’ (Fry 2007, 21), through to metal detecting clubs and civic societies, encompassing the whole voluntary sector relating to archaeological heritage, whether or not they are currently engaged specifically in active fieldwork.

A report by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) in 2008 into the current state of the paid archaeology sector identified the ‘...need for a comprehensive and comparable study of voluntary participation in archaeology in order to identify potential skills and training issues for this group of individuals’ (Aitchison and Edwards 2008, 14). This further highlights the timely nature of this report and the wider project into which it is incorporated.
3. Aims and Objectives
The following Aims and Objectives are inspired and influenced by the original Community Archaeology Support Officer (CASO) project design. The aims and objectives for this report are listed below, with the aims and objectives for the entire CASO project listed in Appendix 1.

I. To identify the current extent of community archaeology in the UK

a. To establish up-to-date contact details of voluntary groups and societies that are involved in, or have the scope to be involved with, community archaeology

b. To identify, through a sample of interviews and information from within the voluntary sector, the extent to which archaeological organisations, including universities, local authority archaeology services, archaeological contractors and heritage trusts, currently include community archaeology in their remit, and to identify ways in which to support the organisations and staff that wish to be involved in community archaeology

II. To identify the current range of activities carried out through community archaeology

a. To identify, through questionnaire survey, interviews and group observation, the types of activities carried out in community archaeology projects

b. To identify, through questionnaire survey and group visits, which activities groups and organisations involved with archaeological heritage currently do not carry out, but would aspire to do in the future, given appropriate support.

III. To identify what support currently exists for community archaeology projects and practitioners, and what gaps there are in provision

a. To identify and collate the current training, guidance and other relevant material available for community archaeology, from relevant organisations including volunteering organisations (both regional and national), national agencies, heritage trusts, local authorities, archaeological contractors and universities

b. To identify where groups and facilitators are currently accessing support and funding

c. To establish which areas, identified in Aim III, have limited or no support already provided
d. To identify, through questionnaire survey and interviews, ways in which current users and non-users of CAF would like to use the site, and what material and support they feel would be appropriate for CAF to provide.

e. To develop recommendations based on these findings for the CBA and related organisations, including the wider archaeological community.

f. To develop recommendations based on these findings for future research into community archaeology.
4. Methodology
Several different research phases and methodologies were employed.

4.1 Literature review
As mentioned in Section 3, ‘community archaeology’ is increasingly of interest to researchers and to practitioners alike. Hence, there is no shortage of current literature on the subject. Throughout the project, the CASO and colleagues were mindful of keeping up to date with the relevant literature, primarily academic writing and grey literature, in order to apply these sources to the development of this report and to the CBA’s response to and understanding of community archaeology as a whole. While there is no specific ‘Literature Review’ section of the report, sources are referred to as appropriate throughout.

In 1985-6, the CBA’s Adult Education Committee carried out a questionnaire survey of the 408 archaeological groups and societies known at that time. This gleaned some 200 responses representing 190 different societies (nearly a 50% response rate), and led to conclusions that around 100,000 individuals were engaging with archaeology through such groups (British Archaeological News 1987, 29). Some of the questions asked by that survey differ from those asked as part of this report. For example, the structure of groups in terms of membership fees, affiliations and internal sections are not the subject of the 2009 survey analysed in this report, but were looked at by the 1985-6 survey. However, the 1987 report is cross-referenced where appropriate and provides some interesting comparative data.

4.2 Groups search
Time was spent at the beginning of the project to search for existing groups, predominantly through desk-based analysis, using existing information held at the CBA about local groups and societies as a starting point. This was supplemented by web searches, information from others including County Archaeologists, archaeological contractors, CBA regional groups, the National Council for Metal Detecting (NCMD), the Welsh Council for Voluntary Organisations (WCVO) the Civic Society Initiative (formerly the Civic Trust) and other regional umbrella organisations. Each group, whether already known to the CASO or ‘discovered’ through this phase, was contacted by the CASO in order to confirm the correct details of the group, including, in some cases, the correct name. The results of this research phase fed directly into the questionnaire survey phase described in 5.3, and has informed and enhanced the CBA’s own knowledge platform concerning existing groups and societies across the UK.

4.3 Questionnaire survey of groups and societies
Following the Groups Search phase, a questionnaire survey was distributed to all the groups located. Depending on whether groups contacts possessed an email address, an email was sent describing the purpose of the research, and signposting the recipient to the
questionnaire via a web link, or a letter (Appendix 2) and paper version (Appendix 3) were sent via post. A number of organisations assisted with the research by distributing the survey on the CBA’s behalf. For example, Archaeology Scotland included the questionnaire and a cover letter explaining the project in a mailing to their affiliate membership, while the Civic Trust distributed the questionnaire via their email contacts list for civic societies in England, and two online discussion forums – LivingHistory.co.uk for re-enactment and living history groups, and the United Kingdom Detector Net (UKDN) for metal-detector users – kindly permitted posting of the survey to their discussion forums.

The online version of the questionnaire was hosted by SurveyMonkey™, which was used to collate all responses since paper versions of the questionnaire were also added to the online survey. An initial survey deadline of 5 June 2009 was decided. However, this was extended several times due to the continued discovery of more groups and to allow time for umbrella organisations to notify member groups to the survey. In the analysis phase, some of the results were collated from SurveyMonkey and plotted on a UK map using ArcView GIS™, in order to see the distribution of groups responding in certain ways. Unfortunately, maps for the UK Crown Dependencies were not available at the time of analysis, although it is noted here that three responses were received to the survey from groups in the UK Crown Dependencies: two from Guernsey and one from Jersey.

The questions were devised to reflect the project Aims and Objectives (Appendix 1), and were circulated internally within the CBA Secretariat for peer review before being distributed. Despite this, a small number of groups responded negatively to the questionnaire, for example claiming that the response options for Question 7 (‘Please tick any of the following that your group has been involved in over the past 5 years’) did not represent sufficiently the range of activities carried out by the group. This was despite the response option ‘Other’, in which the respondent could list any other activities, but does demonstrate further the diversity of activities carried out by groups, as well as highlighting the limitations that exist in the use of quantitative surveys in such cases. To this end, the research also relied heavily on more in-depth discussions with a range of groups and practitioners, as described below.

4.4 Sample of interviews and visits across the UK
Running concurrent with and slightly after the Questionnaire phase, the CASO arranged visits to a sample of groups, organisations and practitioners across the UK in order to carry out more qualitative research. Many of these were selected via the questionnaire survey, since the final section of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether they or their group would be willing to allow the CASO to visit them as part of the wider research. With 205 groups responding that a visit would be welcome, further criteria were needed to select which groups to visit. It was decided to visit groups that represented a range of factors, including the setting of the group (for example city, town or village) geographical range (groups from all parts of the UK), types of groups (e.g. Young...
Archaeologists’ Club (YAC) Branch, CBA regional group, metal detecting club, local history group, etc.) and any other factors such as period or area of special interest (e.g. Romans, Egyptology, preservation of an industrial site – Fig 2 - and so forth). The selection criteria are listed in Appendix 4.

In addition, a sample of practitioners was also visited or interviewed via telephone. These ranged from local authority archaeologists, practitioners from national organisations such as the National Trust, Northern Ireland Archaeology Forum (NIAF), Cadw and Archaeology Scotland, through to local authority archaeologists, archaeological contractors, and archaeologists attached to charitable trusts and museums such as Heeley City Farm, HWTMA, and the National Museums of Liverpool.

The full list of groups and practitioners visited and consulted can be seen in the Acknowledgements section (Section 8). From 14th of March 2009, the CASO kept a blog <www.britarch.ac.uk/communityblog> which documented with text and images the visits made during this research phase. Only a small number of visits made early on, for example to the Claro Community Archeology Group in Knaresborough, the Arbeia Society and Quinta in South Shields, and to Archaeological Research Consultancy at the University of Sheffield (ARCUS) and Heeley City Farm in Sheffield, are not documented in this manner since the blog had not yet started.

In all cases, the CASO engaged in discussion with group members and practitioners, around the loose themes of current activities, past and present and planned projects, relationships with other groups or professionals, any training needs or current provision, dissemination, and any other issues or concerns that came up. The interviews were deliberately informal and unstructured, so as not to influence the answers of the respondents or to guide them in directions that took them away from the topics that they felt it important to discuss. This meant that a lot of the discussions could be quite varied, but again reinforced the importance of understanding the different issues, challenges, strengths and opportunities associated with voluntary groups and outreach providers across the UK.

4.5 Other information and feedback
In addition to the main research methods listed, the CASO also encouraged general feedback regularly, through CBA Newsletter articles
(nationally and via regional groups), the Community Blog, and other channels. Emails concerning CAF or community archaeology support in general were kept on file and used to inform the results of this report along with the other data collected.

5. Results
This section is divided into three subsections. Section 5.1 is relatively brief, and demonstrates the scale and location of voluntary sector archaeology and heritage groups as identified in the earliest phase of the research. Section 5.2 analyses the results of the questionnaire survey, by presenting the responses to individual survey questions, and then by analysing specific sections of the survey at a regional level. Section 5.3 makes summaries based on the findings of the qualitative data collected during the research visits and from the Community Archaeology Workshop event organised by the CBA in September 2009. It is further subdivided into Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3.

5.1 Result of groups search
Prior to this phase of research, the CBA had a list of 'Regional or Local' groups known to the organisation, which numbered 566. There are now known to be at least 2,030 groups with an interest in archaeological heritage in the UK. This data adds strength to the CBA’s role as a national educational charity, given that it is now even better equipped to signpost interested individuals and others towards existing groups and societies across the country. The CBA can also now be confident that the contact details of many of the groups already known to the Secretariat are much more up to date. Figure 3 shows the total distribution of known groups across the UK.

5.2 Results of survey
Of the 588 responses to the questionnaire survey, 504 were deemed usable. This meant ‘usable’ in the sense that a sufficient number of sections of the survey were filled in to be considered worth analysing, (whereas some had only filled in the first section, for example). In addition, there were some questionnaires that were clearly filled in ‘spoof’ manner. These too were excluded from the final dataset. Of the 504 responses considered viable for analysis, some 459 (91%) had been fully completed. The total number of responses represents approximately 25% of the estimated total of 2,030 groups in the UK. The full results of the survey were tabulated and analysed via software available through the SurveyMonkey™ site <www.surveymonkey.com>, and also applied to regional and national representation using ArcView GIS™ software. Figure 4 shows the distribution across the UK (excluding the UK Crown Dependencies) of all the groups that responded to the survey. For the purposes of this report, key findings from the survey results are presented below. However, the full dataset can be requested for further analysis. Chart 1 shows the frequency of groups from each region.
The total response rate from England as a whole was 359; the total response rate from Wales as a whole was 64; the total response rate from Scotland as a whole was 26, and the total response rate from Northern Ireland as a whole was 14 (all shown below in Chart 2). This gives a total of 466, which is lower than the actual response total of 504, since it does not include groups for which coordinates could not be found (for example if the group was an online community), and does not count ‘duplicate’ responses; in a few cases more than one response was received from different representatives of the same group. These were all included in the survey results below however, as they represent the diversity of viewpoints on certain issues, such as opinions about CAF or perceived training needs.
Chart 1 Bar chart showing frequency of responses from individual groups by region
The high response rate from England reflects the larger geographical area covered, as well as the denser population. The lower response rate from Scotland may reflect the sparser population in much of Scotland, as well as the perception of the CBA as a less relevant organisation in Scotland as compared to Archaeology Scotland, for example (with which the CBA liaises for many activities and matters concerning Scotland). In Northern Ireland the relatively low response rate may also reflect the fact that there is much less of a tradition of local archaeological societies as compared to the rest of the UK.

Figure 5 shows the way in which the UK has been divided into regions. The English regions are based on the traditional CBA regional groups, divisions in other areas based on county or geographical divisions and on feedback from groups visited. For example, groups in North
UK Crown Dependencies (Isle of Man, Bailiwicks of Jersey and Guernsey)

Scottish Highlands and Islands (Argyll (Incl. Islay, Jura and Mull), Inverness-shire (Incl. North and South Uist and part of Lewis), Ross and Cromarty, Caithness, Nairnshire, Sutherland, Shetland, Orkney)

Angus, Aberdeenshire and Moray

Central Scotland (Perthshire, Kinross-shire)

Clyde region of Scotland (Dumbartonshire, Bute (Incl. Arran), Renfrewshire, Ayrshire, Lanarkshire, Stirlingshire)

Borders region of Scotland ( Roxburghshire, Selkirkshire, Berwickshire, East Lothian, Midlothian, West Lothian, Fife, Peebles-shire)

Dumfries and Galloway (Wigtownshire, Kirkudbrightshire, Dumfriesshire)

North Wales (Conwy, Denbighshire, Flintshire, Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd, Wrexham/Wrecsam)

Mid Wales (Geredigion, Powys)

South Wales (Blaenau Gwent, Bridgend, Caerphilly, Cardiff, Carmarthenshire, Merthyr Tydfil, Monmouthshire, Neath Port Talbot, Newport, Pembrokeshire, Rhondda Cynon Taff, Swansea, Torfaen, Vale of Glamorgan)

North of England (Cumbria, County Durham, Northumberland, Teesside, Tyne & Wear)

Yorkshire (Including Humber)

North West England (Cheshire, Greater Manchester, Lancashire, Merseyside)

East Midlands of England (Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Rutland)

West Midlands of England (Hereford, Worcester, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, West Midlands)

East Anglia (Norfolk and Suffolk)

Mid Anglia (Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire)

South Midlands of England (Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire)

London (Greater London)

South East England (Kent, Surrey, Sussex)

Wessex (Dorset, Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Wiltshire)

South West England (Cornwall, Devon, Gloucestershire, Somerset)

Northern Ireland, East (County Antrim, County Down)

Northern Ireland, West (County Londonderry, County Armagh, County Tyrone, County Fermanagh)

Figure 6 Key to colours on map in Figure 5
with many events happening in the South that are too difficult for people living in the North to attend due to the long travel times. Equally, a group in Aberdeenshire observed that Scotland too is a large area and should not be regarded as one ‘region’, as can sometimes happen in UK-wide reports. In Northern Ireland it was observed that groups situated in the West of the country were unlikely to travel to the East (and vice versa), and hence, any future training events or other provision should take place in at least two centres, with one in the West, such as in Strabane or Omagh, rather than training or other events taking place solely in Belfast. Figure 5 is a UK map showing different regions as defined by this research project. The four highest response rates came from Yorkshire, the East Midlands of England, Wessex, and South West England respectively.

Chart 3 Pie Chart demonstrating the types of groups that responded. N=504

The majority of groups that responded were a Historical Society or Club or Archaeology Society or Club. Of the 141 ‘Other’ responses, several patterns emerged, which, with hindsight, possibly should have had their own categories added to the response options. For example, it became apparent that many groups regarded themselves as both archaeological and historical in their nature. A separate analysis of the ‘other’ groups indicated that the two most popular categories chosen were archaeological and historical groups (10), followed by ‘heritage’ groups (8), charitable trusts (8), and sites-specific groups; caring for, researching and/or promoting a specific site, monument or type of monument (8). There were other smaller response categories that indicated yet more types of groups.
with an interest in archaeology, such as natural history, re-enactment, railway heritage, and an online metal detecting community.

4. Year in which group was founded (if known)

Chart 4 Dot graph to show years when groups formed. N=482

Chart 4 indicates the years in which the respondent groups were formed. There are some groups that were formed at a very early stage (e.g. Spalding Gentleman’s Society in 1710 and Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle in 1813), however, the indication is that the majority of groups were formed from the 1960s onwards. This reflects suggestions that in the 1960s and 1970s more ‘amateur’ archaeological groups began to form, perhaps stimulated by the corresponding development of departments of continuing education in universities at that time (Alexander, pers. comm., cited in Thomas 2009, 135). However, with the recent closure of other groups, such as the Scole Archaeological Committee for East Anglia, and the Hare Hatch and Kiln Green Local History Society, both of which disbanded in the 2009, there may be other earlier groups no longer visible due to non-response or because they too closed at some point in the past. The increase in groups being founded in the years after the Second World War, particularly at a local rather than county level, is supported in literature elsewhere (e.g. Henson, in prep.b).

While adding the caveat that certainly some of the responses concerning the formation of groups are acknowledged by the respondents to be estimates, the indication is also that from 2000 onwards there seems to be a high rate of formation of groups. This may be due to the availability of funding sources such as Local Heritage Initiative (LHI) that were available at this time. The increased availability of funding for community-led projects supports the observation by Simpson and Williams (2008, 72)
of the connection between ‘the rise of community archaeology’ and the ‘transformation in the balance of power and financing of British archaeology… …where the focus is placed upon enabling communities rather than preaching to them’.

5. Current number of members (please indicate if an estimate)

Chart 5 Dot graph to show numbers of members per respondent group. N=495

Chart 5 indicates current numbers of members, for the 495 responses that indicated a total or an estimated total. Even though many responses were estimates, the total number of 78,550 can be used to create a mean membership number of 159 per group. If this is multiplied by the total number of groups thought to exist, a possible total is reached of 322,770 individuals. Given that many of the group members encountered during the research visits phase remarked that they or other members belonged to more than one such group, the actual total number of individuals will be lower, and may be estimated, assuming that perhaps one third of individuals belong to more than one voluntary archaeology group. This gives a new total of 215,000 individuals. If this is compared to figures available for the number of professional archaeologists, it is clear that the voluntary sector involved in archaeology by far dwarves the number of paid archaeologists. A report for 2007-08 suggested that there were 6865 members of the archaeological workforce in the UK (Aitchison and Edwards 2008, 11), a figure which has fallen more recently in light of the current recession (Aitchison 2009).

Further research targeting individual group members rather than the groups themselves, could help verify the total scale of voluntary sector
involvement further by establishing what proportion of individuals are likely belong to more than one group. However, more needs to be known about whether the mean figure from this sample truly is indicative of most groups, since the median figure was only 65, indicating a lot of groups with a smaller rather than a higher membership, as illustrated above.

The CBA’s 1985-6 survey of groups and societies indicated an average figure of 222 individual members (British Archaeological News 1987, 29), which would indicate that, while the number of groups has gone up, the average membership number has fallen by 65, suggesting that groups on average now are smaller than 25 years ago.

6. Average age of members (estimate!)
The responses to this question were all estimates. However, taking this into account, the results indicated an average age of 55. This, broadly, confirms anecdotal suggestions that people attached to voluntary groups tend to be closer to retirement age, in no small part due to there often being more free time at this age to devote to voluntary action. That said, the younger ages of some of the groups, particularly the YAC Branches (with a membership age range of 8-16 year olds) indicates that archaeology can and does appeal to all age ranges. Similarly, the average age of civic society members, according to the 14 respondents from this group, came to 48, again slightly below the average but coming from a category of groups that do not only look at the historic environment in their activities. However, this was skewed by one of the groups claiming an average age of 25, while the other civic societies indicated 50 or older. The average of membership of archaeological societies seemed to be the same as the overall average at 55, while average age of membership of historical societies was slightly older, at 60.
7. Please tick any of the following that your group has been involved in over the past five years:

The most popular activity, which was carried out by 91% or 462 of the groups, was having a talk or lecture. This was followed by trips to sites, museums or similar, taking a table at a history fair or similar, and recording through photography. The least popular activity was ‘none of the above’ with just two (0.4%) of responses. The next-least popular activity was marine archaeology, with 11 (2%) of respondents including this as an activity.

Comparing with results from the 1985-6 survey, the provision of talks or lectures to members was the most popular activity then as well, with 174 of the respondents (92%) indicating this has remained popular as an activity. Further published results of the survey indicate that ‘fieldwork/survey programmes’ were carried out by 44% of respondent groups (British Archaeological News 1987, 30). This is comparable to the above figures for fieldwalking (43%) and excavation (41%). The proportion of groups organising trip to sites, museums and similar has seemingly risen from 74% in 1985-6 (British Archaeological News 1987, 30) to 80% in current times.

Cross-tabulating the types of groups with activities carried out indicated that the following were the three most popular activities for each group type:

- Archaeological society or club – Talks or lectures; trips to museums, sites or similar; excavation
- Historical society or club – Talks or lectures; trips to museums, sites or similar; taking a table at a local history fair or similar
- Civic society – Talks or lectures; lobbying for issues concerning heritage, e.g. development plans; social event with no specific theme
- Metal Detecting club or society – Metal detector survey; talks or lectures; finds processing/recording
- YAC Branch – Trips to sites, museums or similar; finds cleaning; talks or lectures
- CBA Regional Group – Talks or lectures; trips to sites, museums or similar; lobbying for issues concerning heritage, e.g. development plans
- Other (Please state) – Talks or lectures; trips to museums, sites or similar; archival research

This indicates further that certain activities (such as talks or lectures) are common to all groups, while more specialised activities, such as excavation or metal detecting survey, are more likely to occur in certain group types more than others.

8. Please tick any of the following that your group has not been involved in over the past five years

![Chart 7 Bar chart showing activities not carried out by groups. N=501](image-url)
9. Please tick any of the following reasons for why some of these activities have not taken place; in addition, there is space below this question to add any extra comments on this issue:

As with the previous questions, respondents were given the option to tick more than one response option if they wished. This was to allow for the fact that in many cases more than one of the suggested reasons might be relevant, and the high number of respondents who also included ‘Other (please specify)’ as a reason, demonstrated that there were more factors still. These ‘other’ reasons included, for example: that such activities were ‘outside our remit’ (Historical research group, North region of England); that some activities were ‘not convenient geographically’ (Archaeological society or club, South Midlands of England), or that ‘the locality is fairly well served by kindred societies offering a variety of specific interests’ (Historical society or club, Mid-Wales).

The most common response was that there was no interest from the group to get involved in some or all of the activities mentioned, representing just over a third of respondents. The next most popular reason given was that the group lacked the expertise or knowledge required, which may be indicative of potential training needs or gaps. Interestingly, the lowest-occurring responses were that the group did not know who to contact about becoming more involved or that the group had made enquiries about becoming more involved but had met with no success in this respect. While it is encouraging that these two reasons, which relate to potential issues concerning relationships and communication with paid archaeologists and organisations were relatively low in frequency, it is nonetheless revealing that at least some groups experience these issues. It cannot be known what percentage of groups contacted did not respond to the questionnaire survey for similar reasons.

The 185 ‘Other (please specify)’ comments were varied, but included comments about specific activities (e.g. that the group was too far from the coast to participate in marine archaeology), as well as general comments that the activities were not appropriate to the group. For example, one respondent commented that, ‘as the Civic Society for the town we are not specifically concerned with the items ticked though
individuals no doubt are’ (Civic Society, South Wales). In another example, the respondent represented an ‘umbrella organisation only. Not active as such’ (Archaeological society or club, UK-wide). Other comments included the issue that there was not enough time available to become involved in all or some of the activities, that there were other groups that worked in these areas in the same locality, or that the membership was not sufficiently active or are too old to wish to have much active participation.

Extra comments:
This section allowed respondents to comment further, if they wished, about their groups’ activities and what the barriers to participation may be, whether it is simply that the group does not see certain activities as part of their programme of work, or it is that there are more problematic concerns at play.

Some 166 respondents (33%) chose to make an extra comment in this section.: 

‘Attempts at working with young people via schools has not been very successful’
(Industrial archaeological society, South West England)

‘They're just "not our thing"’
(Historical society or club, UK-wide, referring to the activities listed in the questionnaire)

‘The few experts we know of are over-stretched. CPAT which covers this area, is a long way away, and although sympathetic, has not done any work near here recently, despite the plethora of sites. The National Park Authority made its Archaeological Officer redundant!!’
(Archaeological society or club, Mid-Wales)

‘The vast majority of members simply wish to attend the monthly talks. Only a few have any interest in active research.’
(Historical society or club, Wessex region of England)

‘The active membership is quite small and we cannot do more in the time we have’
(Historical and Archaeological society, South Midlands of England)

‘I feel that lobbying by a local group must be approached with great care since we preserve good relationships with local landowners and thus gain permission to access their land. Issues such as building permits etc. should be managed by national groups and through the legal framework.’
(Archaeological society or club, East Midlands of England)
10. Please indicate any of the activities that you feel that your group would like to become involved with in the future.

Chart 9 Pie chart showing activities that groups might like to become involved with in the future. N=313

This question helped with understanding where there may be scope for future support in terms of training, or advising on funding and resources. The most popular response was landscape survey with just over a third of respondents indicating this. Landscape survey was followed by geophysical survey (e.g. with magnetometer or resistivity meter), topographical survey, and fieldwalking. This suggests that techniques involving surveying and observation seem to be the most popular options, and would indicate particularly that advice, guidance and facilitation in these areas would be of use for a majority of groups.
11. Which of the following has been produced as a result of your research (tick as many as appropriate)?

![Bar chart showing the means of disseminating research by voluntary groups. N=501](chart10)

The most common form of dissemination, with just over half of respondent groups, was a photographic archive (whether digital or in hard copy), followed by a leaflet or pamphlet, and then a ‘paper’ archive of drawings, excavation records, or similar. The ‘Other’ responses were varied, including newsletters, further details about the content of the books produced, exhibitions, annual reports, publications more than five years ago, and the recording of finds with a Finds Liaison Officer (FLO) from the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS).

In 1985-6, survey results indicated that 74% of groups published their own journal or proceedings, while 44% published other forms of publication, including monographs, excavation reports, leaflets and so forth (British Archaeological News 1987, 30). While the response fields are not directly comparable, it does indicate that publication via journal may have declined. The current survey found that 35% of respondent groups produced journal papers compared to 74% in the 1985-6 survey (British Archaeological News 1987). Another factor affecting this apparent decline may be the inclusion of a wider range of groups, some of which might not produce journals or similar anyway due to their levels of activity and interest in archaeology. Significantly, web-based forms of dissemination were not available in the earlier survey.
Cross-tabulating the ‘none of the above’ responses regarding dissemination, indicated that the majority of these groups were from the ‘Other’ group category (including preservation societies and re-enactment societies). This indicated a reasonable spread of groups, with highest occurrence (apart from ‘Other’ groups) being historical societies or clubs. Only four of the groups indicated that they did disseminate in ‘Other’ ways (one of which stating that they were too new a group to have produced anything yet), hence it would appear that 11% (53) of groups that responded produce no forms of dissemination at all.

Questions 12-22 – Community Archaeology Forum

Questions 12-22 asked respondents about their opinions and experiences of CAF, and looked to find out what could be done in the development of ‘CAF 2.0’ to make it a more accessible and useful website. These questions are not reviewed individually here, as the data pertains more to internal CBA work in redeveloping CAF. However the findings can be summarised briefly.

Only 65 respondents (13%) had visited CAF before, indicating that as a resource it is currently under-used and needs wider promotion, especially following its redevelopment. The majority of users that had added material to CAF themselves found this process very difficult at present. Qualitative responses varied, but many indicated issues such as not feeling that it was a resource for groups outside of England and Wales (as some Scottish and Northern Irish groups suggested in their responses), and that in its current form it was not as useful as it could be. There are
indications from this survey and also from the group and practitioner visits that if CAF was more user-friendly and more visually attractive, more people would use it as a resource. In terms of groups adding their own material in the form of project pages and similar, while some welcomed this as a good opportunity, others pointed out that many groups have their own websites anyway and so would not necessarily feel the need to have a project page on CAF. Others stated that they were already very busy and would not have the time to add material on behalf of their group. Again, simplifying the process will make adding material a quicker procedure and may encourage more to add their own pages – which could be used to signpost to a group’s main website and coexist alongside it, rather than instead of it.

21. If you have never looked at CAF, tick as many reasons below that apply
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The responses to this question indicated that the majority of groups (266, 66%) indicated that, while they had not heard of CAF before responding to the survey, they would consider consulting it in the future. This is encouraging in light of plans to improve CAF and promote it more widely as a resource for groups to utilise, both for accessing advice and guidance, and also for showcasing their own projects through the wiki-based system which enables groups to create their own web pages.
23. Please tick which of the following you have already received training on:

That the highest response rate was for the option ‘None of the above’, possibly reflects the diversity of groups and their interests. For example, some groups may have not had any training in the areas listed in the survey, but may however have had training in other areas or topics not listed. In addition, there is the possibility that many groups (up to over one third) may have had no training at all. The four most common areas of training listed after this, were historical research methods, finds identification, excavation methods and surveying methods. The lowest instance of training was for marine archaeology which most likely reflects geographical circumstances – although other factors such as technical difficulty of marine archaeology, or a lack of knowledge of the legislation affecting maritime archaeology, may also play a role. It may also be significant that few groups had received any training on disseminating research results or writing a project design.
24. Please tick which of the following you think your group **would benefit from** training in:

![Chart 14 Bar chart showing training from which respondents felt their groups would benefit. N=485](chart14)

The highest response was 'None of the above' again, probably reflecting the fact that more than just 'archaeological' groups and societies were questioned. The other response options indicated interest in a range of activities, with historical research methods, landscape survey, advice and guidance on fundraising, finds identification, buildings recording, conservation work, surveying methods and excavation methods all attracting interest from over 20% of groups. A further 77 respondents (15%) gave suggestions of 'Other' training options. These responses included specific themes for training aerial photograph interpretation, volunteer recruitment and GIS and magnetometer result interpretation. There were also further comments, for example that the group was not interested in training at the present time, that there was no spare time for such training, or that the group themselves already organised their own training sessions.
Mapping of the top three response options, shown in Figure 7, (apart from ‘none of the above’, shown in Fig 8), indicates a reasonable distribution of the three most popular training needs. Tabular analysis by region showed that: the greatest demand for landscape survey was in the South East of England (15 respondents); the greatest demand for historical research was in the East Midlands of England (15 respondents), and for fundraising advice the greatest demand was in Yorkshire (15 respondents). These results are influenced partially by the higher response rates in these regions – the fact that lower response rates were found in, for example, Scotland, naturally skews the response rates by region. However, it may also suggest the extent to which groups have training provision already, (for example Scotland has had nation-wide support from Archaeology Scotland’s Adopt-a-Monument scheme and Scotland’s Rural Past, while provision in England generally occurs at a county-wide level and is dependant on the extent to which the Local Authority and other organisations have a remit to engage in community archaeology). However, the type of groups that responded also had an effect. For example, groups in built-up urban areas such as London may experience fewer opportunities to engage in archaeological activity (an assertion supported by anecdotal evidence collected during the research visits phase of the project), and hence may feel that there are thus less training needs if certain activities are not going to be carried out anyway. Cross-tabulating with type of group, respondents ticking the ‘none of the above’ response option were most likely to be historical societies or clubs. Meanwhile, respondents indicating that they wanted advice and guidance on fundraising were most likely to be groups from the ‘Other’ category, with excavation and landscape survey most popular with archaeological societies or groups.
25. We know that many groups have expertise in particular areas and skills. Please tick which of the following you feel your group may be capable of leading training on, for example in the form of a workshop sharing experiences with other local groups:
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Over half of respondents (50%) indicated that they would not feel able to lead training themselves. The next highest response was much lower at only 21% for ‘Other’. This response option revealed a range of possible training themes, such as publishing, setting up a Trust, use of metal detectors in an archaeological project, and post-excavation analyses.

However, many of the responses were not actual themes for training, but rather comments about constraints to doing this, such as insufficient time, experience or having knowledge particular to their region or area of study. Some of the respondents indicated concerns with the question itself, for example the potential difficulty in assessing whether or not groups could indeed lead training based on evidence from this question alone. One respondent pointed out that a group’s perception of their capabilities may conflict with their actual competence.
26. Has your group ever applied for funding before?

Over half of the respondents said that their group had applied for funding before. This indicates that a reasonably high percentage already actively (or have in the past) applied for funding from different sources (discussed below). However, over one third confirmed that they had never applied for funding before. Figure 9 shows the distribution of respondents answering each of the four response options.

Cross-tabulating responses of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with ‘current activities’ (not shown in chart form here), revealed that there was little difference in the most popular activities, although groups that had applied for funding were more likely to have carried out excavations. This perhaps suggests that funding may enable excavation, although further research is needed to verify this. Cross-tabulation with methods of dissemination also indicated very few variations in the types of dissemination by groups, whether they had applied for funding or not. For example, groups that had applied for funding were slightly more likely to produce a leaflet or a pamphlet, perhaps because of funding outcome requirements,
although both sets were almost equally likely to produce a photographic archive. There is a limitation with these cross-tabulations, however, that activities and dissemination outcomes indicated in the responses do not necessarily relate to funded projects – since they may relate to other projects that groups have carried out without funding.

27. If yes, please tick and provide information as appropriate:
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Chart 17 Pie chart showing whether groups applying for funding had been successful.

N=266

This indicated that a high majority of groups that had applied for funding before had experienced success with at least one application. That the two percentages in Chart 17 add up to more than 100% indicates that a number of respondents indicated that they had been both successful and unsuccessful on different occasions. Further information provided by respondents indicated a range of sources that were approached for grants, including local authorities, the CBA (for Challenge Funding), and national heritage government bodies such as Historic Scotland, English Heritage and Cadw. The majority of funding applications included application to, or were solely to HLF, reinforcing the importance of this source to voluntary groups for resourcing community projects.
29. Please tick below which of the following your group has had contact with:

The responses to this question indicated that the type of archaeologist most likely to have contact from local groups and societies was the local authority archaeologist. This is encouraging, since it is highly advisable for groups to keep their local authority archaeologist informed of their work, as well as feeding into the Historic Environment Record (HER) or equivalent. It also reinforces the crucial role that Local Authority (or equivalent) archaeologists play in enabling, advising and guiding the voluntary groups in their area. Only 65 (14%) of groups had no contact with professional archaeologists. If this was cross-tabulated with type of group, the most common group not to have contact with professional archaeologists was Historical Society or Club (42, 65%). This was perhaps not surprising, given that they are perhaps also less likely to take part in specifically ‘archaeological’ activities. Encouragingly, only two of the responding metal detecting clubs reported not to have any contact with archaeologists.
Chart 19 shows the cross-tabulation of groups that reported that they had produced a digital archive as part of their dissemination of their research (total: 102), as compared to the types of archaeologists with which they have contact as a group. The majority of these respondents had contact with a county or local authority archaeologist, while the lowest digital output came from groups with no contact with professional archaeologists at all. This indicates that communication with professional archaeologists may encourage a group to record its data digitally. However, discussions with staff at the Archaeology Data Service (ADS), who are responsible for the Online AccesS to the Index of archaeological investigations (OASIS – and see Section 5.3.1), indicated that very few voluntary groups deposit digital data with OASIS. There are also options to deposit data with the Grey Literature Library and ADS, which also appear under-used by voluntary groups at present. Hence, further questions need to be asked of where the digital archives (and, indeed, other informational outputs) of voluntary groups are being stored. Discovery and Excavation in Scotland (DES, and see http://www.archaeologyscotland.org.uk/?q=node/36), a journal managed by Archaeology Scotland, is also reachable through the ADS, and has had a level of success already in encouraging voluntary groups to record their work, including a section dedicated to Adopt-a-Monument projects.

29. Please provide any additional information or comments about working with professional archaeologists below:

The 120 comments and responses in this field included other types of archaeologists than the ones listed in the question, such as English Heritage, Historic Scotland or Cadw staff, or that some members of the
group itself were working as archaeologists. The Scottish Treasure Trove Unit was mentioned by a Scottish local heritage group and an archaeological/historical society, which is significant since there is no FLO network in Scotland and so implies that there is at least some contact regarding Treasure Trove requirements. In addition, other comments were made regarding the nature of the contact, for example that archaeologists came to give talks to the group sometimes, but that was the extent of the relationship. Other responses further evidenced the range of contact experienced by groups, ranging from comments such as: ‘All were most helpful and good to work with’ (Historical society or club, North region of England), through to: ‘none of the above have replied back?’ (Archaeological society or club, East Midlands of England, sic.). Another more extensive comment was insightful, and reflected some of the feedback given to the CASO in the visiting and interviewing phase of the research about the variation of relationships even within one region:

WE have inconsistent support and advice from professionals - sometimes VERY negative and other times the opposite. We have found that our local hunches have on more than one occasion proved professional advice to be totally wrong! We have most appreciated help from the finds liaison officer(s) and the archaeologist attached to the local museum. HER advice has varied from appalling to very constructive!!! (Archaeological society or club, Yorkshire region of England, sic.)

The final sections of the questionnaire, as well as asking whether groups would potentially welcome a research visit from the CASO, also asked responding groups whether they would like to leave up to date contact details to be featured in the Archaeology Online section of the CBA’s website <www.britarch.ac.uk/archonline>. This was with the acknowledgement that if the group was affiliated to the CBA, was a CBA regional group or YAC branch, their details would already feature. Given that information, a further 324 respondents left details, adding strength to the Archaeology Online resource, and also adding to the groups’ own visibility to potential new members and others searching for information about archaeological groups across the country.

5.3 Results of interviews and visits
Groups and practitioners visited and/or interviewed were from across the UK, and in order to make the most of the available travel budget, were often visited in
‘clusters’, or by way of a ‘round trip’. Figure 10 maps the locations of the groups and practitioners visited, to demonstrate the extent of travel employed for this research. The results of the interviews are analysed thematically, using examples to illustrate the key points that emerged, as well as the extent of regional variation. In discussion of potentially sensitive issues, groups or practitioners are cited anonymously.

5.3.1 Professional archaeologists and organisations
Individuals from 38 organisations, as listed in Appendix 5, including local authorities, charitable trusts, national amenity societies, museums and universities, were visited or consulted via telephone. Various issues were discussed, but a number of key themes emerged:

5.3.1.1 Contact with County Archaeologist (or equivalent) and HER (or equivalent)
As evidenced by the results in the previous section, many groups are in contact with local authority archaeologists and HER Officers. Concern was expressed by several practitioners, however, particularly if attached to local authorities, that there is still an issue with groups carrying out fieldwork of any sort without keeping the County Archaeologist informed. This was important for several reasons, such as making sure that Scheduled Ancient Monuments were not being disturbed without local authorisation, and crucially to ensure that the HER or Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) was kept up to date. Discussions with colleagues that manage OASISiii confirm that at present few voluntary groups upload their research to this resource, although by doing so they would also automatically update the relevant HER or SMR. Hence, more needs to be done by the CBA and partners through advice and guidance, training and other outlets to encourage and facilitate communication and collaboration with local authority archaeologists by groups. However, as noted in Section 5.3.2, there are sometimes difficulties faced by groups even if they have tried to maintain links with their local authority archaeologist.

Some local authorities, such as Leicestershire, Shropshire, Herefordshire and Surrey County Councils, employ dedicated community archaeologists. However, these posts are in the minority, and it was suggested by archaeologists in other local authorities that all counties should have a ‘community archaeologist’ on staff specifically to support community groups and societies, not least in providing staff time and capacity to support funding applications for community archaeology projects, rather than have this function ‘tacked on’ to other roles within the archaeological services and departments.

5.3.1.2 Training needs of voluntary groups
Many of the practitioners consulted confirmed that they were actively providing training for volunteers in archaeology in a variety of ways. For example, HWTMA, at locations in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, has in the past trained young people in diving skills, although there were limitations to the number of people this could be offered to. In
Warwickshire, there is an established programme of training delivered via Warwickshire County Council. In the cases of the TDP in London and SRP at various locations across Scotland, volunteers have been trained throughout the duration of the project and work independently in teams, feeding into a central repository with the data that they collect.

In Scotland, national conferences on community archaeology such as Archaeology Scotland’s conference in Musselburgh in May 2009 (Fig 11) and SRP’s conference in Fort William in November 2009, allowed representatives from groups to present their own projects. These large-scale events over two-day periods, incorporating training workshops and display areas within the main conference programme, allowed groups to share and reflect on their own experiences with each other as well as network with both volunteers and paid archaeologists. This also allowed for a sense of ‘belonging’ to a larger umbrella project, especially for the SRP groups at the Fort William conference, who often made comments such as describing their projects as working in ‘the SRP way’, and observing that they ‘couldn’t have done it without the support of the SRP team’. Groups that had been involved with Archaeology Scotland’s Adopt-a-Monument project made similar observations at the conference in Musselburgh about the support provided by the Adopt-a-Monument Officer. The model of having a dedicated member of staff or team able to visit groups and provide bespoke training sessions and hands-on help and advice seems to be much appreciated by the groups that benefit from it, although it is potentially a cost-heavy model, especially if a large area (such as the whole of Scotland) is covered by the service.

Other practitioners consulted were keen in becoming involved in delivering training and guidance as appropriate, indicating that there is potentially a useful network of would-be instructors for any training programmes that the CBA and other national organisations may be able to implement in the future. The strong local contacts held by many of the practitioners with existing groups in their regions means that there is also a potential communication network to assist in publicising any such training events within specific regions.

Regarding the timing and organisation of training events themselves, different structures were described. Workshops delivered by Jon Kenny, the YAT Community Archaeologist in York, followed a format of an introductory talk in the morning and a practical exercise or site visit in the
afternoon. These training days tended to be advertised only in a limited way, as the sessions were free of charge. Due to demand for training, pre-booking was preferred, in order to make sure that people did not just decide to turn up on the day and overcrowd the venue. Some voluntary group representatives that were interviewed favoured this model of keeping practical activities as a key component of the day. This was because it meant that participants had an opportunity to put what they had been told about in the morning into practice. This had the twofold effect of ensuring that participants genuinely learnt or reinforced a specific skill or activity, and also made the day more interesting.

In terms of organising training workshops at a national level, Ian Harvey at the Civic Society Initiative, formerly the Civic Trust, and soon to be re-launched as Civic Voice, reported that Trust staff had tried several workshop models, particularly in a series of funded ‘Paving the Way’ workshops. These models included running the workshops over an evening, one day, a weekend with overnight stay somewhere, and so forth, so as to see which models were most popular. One of the findings with regard to civic society members, who were the primary audience targeted, was that running an event on a weekday was not necessarily a barrier to attendance, since the majority of the participants were of retirement age and so did not have work commitments to reconcile with attending the workshops. In many cases, a local civic society organised the actual event in terms taking on the room booking, registration, and arranging catering. Meanwhile the Civic Trust kept control of content and brought in trainers. This gave the local civic society a sense of ownership and contribution to the event and facilitated a higher level of networking with the other groups that attended. There was no charge to participants due to the funding arrangements. However, there was an issue of non-attendance at just one of the events, and consideration was given as to whether to write to the civic societies whose members had not turned up in order to request payment, since this had meant that another person was unable to attend in their stead. It also adds an interesting facet to the debate of whether to charge for training events; perhaps even a low fee (assuming that an event is mostly subsidised by grants or other sources) would discourage participants from cancelling their attendance at short notice. The training themes were arranged around feedback from groups but also incorporated presentations and workshops from groups that had ‘good practice’ in certain areas or themes in order to allow them to share their experiences with others.

5.3.1.3 Sustainability
Especially in the case of funded projects, such as Adopt a Monument and SRP in Scotland, and the TDP in London, there is uncertainty of what will happen once the funded phase is over, especially if further funding cannot be secured. Sustainability is sought through the training, and hence empowerment, of the participants, but time will tell whether this translates into continuity. Comparative experiences from DIG Manchester have proven to have mixed results – with some projects apparently going from strength to strength (such as the Mellor Archaeological Trust), while other ‘DIG Manchester groups’, such as MADASH, now face an uncertain future and may lose impetus altogether. However, at the recent SRP
Conference in Fort William, one of the groups, the Strath Avon Survey, were keen to point out that many activities can be carried out with virtually no budget at all provided that the members are enthusiastic (and have lots of cake!). The central (and currently funded) support from the SRP team, including training, must also be a significant boost to their work, nonetheless.

Sustainability is not just a problem for community archaeology groups. The economic downturn during the past year has seen the demise of a number of professional contractors, such as ARCUS in Sheffield and the University of Manchester Archaeological Unit (UMAU). As many of these companies included community archaeology within their work, (although not in all cases and sometimes only to a small extent), there is a knock-on effect for those wishing to become involved voluntarily due to the reduction in opportunities to volunteer within the commercial archaeological sector. There are also significant implications, discussed elsewhere (eg Aitchison 2009) for the levels of employment within archaeology as a whole. One of the archaeological practitioners interviewed felt that the model adopted by YAT, combining significant fieldwork across the city with numerous outreach, educational, and visitor experiences, was a successful one that should be replicated in other major UK cities. Hence, the development of a charitable trust that also carries out commercial archaeological work might be a useful model to replicate, especially if it was less reliant on the buoyancy of the development sector to fund its activities.

5.3.1.4 Training needs of practitioners
In addition to the training needs of volunteers, several practitioners made the point that archaeologists themselves sometimes needed specialist training in how to work with volunteers and voluntary groups. Practitioners in Northern Ireland, for example, emphasised the fact that the notion of ‘community archaeology’ is a much more recent phenomenon there than in the rest of the UK. They suggested that opportunities to learn from and network with more experienced ‘community archaeologists’ from the rest of the UK would be a welcome means of enhancing their own projects and opportunities for engagement.

The issue of training for heritage professionals was emphasised again at a roundtable session titled ‘Down from the ivory tower: archaeology beyond university’ at the European Association of Archaeologists’ annual meeting in September 2009 in Riva del Garda, Italy. It became clear from this session that, not only was voluntary action in archaeology much less prevalent in other parts of Europe than it is in the UK, but also that many specialists felt that there was definitely a skills gap and hence a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunity for archaeologists wishing to work in community archaeology. Given the CBA’s relationship with both the voluntary and the paid sectors of archaeology, it may be that this organisation is ideally positioned to coordinate and deliver training along these lines.
5.3.1.5 Existing guidance
In some regions, local authority archaeologists have produced 'Community Archaeology Handbooks', for example in County Durham (by Deborah Anderson et al, unpublished 2000-05) and in Leicestershire (by Peter Liddle 1985). A new edition of the Leicestershire handbook is about to be published, while in other cases guidance is made available online, such as the West Yorkshire Archaeological Advisory Service’s series of Guidance Notes, currently available via
<www.archaeology.wyjs.org.uk/wyjs-archaeology-guidance-notes.asp>, and signposted via CAF. The University of Exeter, too, has recently made available online at
<http://projects.exeter.ac.uk/xarch/Field_work_manual%5B1%5D.pdf>, a Guide to Archaeological Fieldwork in Devon, produced as an outcome of the XArch project – a series of outreach and participation projects funded by the HLF and the University of Exeter. However, much guidance and documentation is rarely signposted in a centralised place, which indicates that a resource such as CAF could have a key role to play in this area.

Other national organisations also have guidance available. The National Trust, for example, issues guidance for activities such as surveying, which has been passed on to groups such as the Ulster Archaeological Society and the Glenelly Historical Society. However, the observation was made that the guide, produced in England, may appear inappropriate to other areas, such as Northern Ireland, due to the fact that the examples given are of Roman sites. This may be an issue to consider in any future material if it is to be distributed at a UK-wide level, as although the example is only to demonstrate how the techniques described work, they may indeed put some groups off if they do not seem relevant to their own contexts.

There are also some useful models from other sectors which may be applicable to the support of voluntary action within archaeological activities and research. The National Council on Archives employs a dedicated Archive Lottery Advisor, who has a UK-wide remit to provide advice and guidance to both voluntary groups and local archive services about applying for HLF grants. The Archives Lottery Advisory Service, itself sponsored by The National Archives and The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), includes the delivery of free workshops across the country and a facility by which groups and organisations can view successful applications and case studies, and submit their own draft applications for constructive advice and feedback.

5.3.1.6 Successful examples of community archaeology involving organisations and facilitators
Notwithstanding the debate of whether organisation/institution-led projects are archaeological outreach, rather than community archaeology, there are plenty of examples of projects that seem to have worked successfully, many of which are known at least anecdotally to practitioners working at different organisations and institutions. Several projects were singled out as particularly successful or innovative by peers. For example, the outreach work at Heeley City Farm in Sheffield, which has included the experimental construction of an Iron Age building and
several practitioners commented positively on the community excavation of a Victorian terraced house. The integration of contractor-led archaeology with volunteer involvement at Hungate in York, coordinated by YAT, was also regularly cited. Another community archaeology success recently celebrated was the presentation in December 2009 of the Marsh Archaeology Award to Sarah Dhanjal, a research postgraduate student who as well as being a YAC Branch leader, participates in the delivery of community excavations run by voluntary group HADAS in North London, involving pupils from local schools. She was awarded in recognition of her ‘high quality and engaging education work carried out in the UK with people under the age of 18’ (CBA 2009), against a shortlist of six nominated individuals, indicating that there are positive examples of archaeologists working effectively (and, significantly, in a voluntary capacity) with young people.

The delivery and importance of projects working with ‘hard-to-reach’ communities are well documented within the museums and heritage sector (e.g. Martin and Nightingale 2002; Helen Dennison Associates 2003), but there are fewer examples of projects specifically working within archaeology. Some of these rare examples include the work of Gloucester City Council with homeless and vulnerable people (Ainsworth 2009), which is echoed elsewhere by similar work in York by YAT, and by a shorter-term project at Turbo Island in Bristol (Kiddey and Schofield 2009), shown in Figure 12. In addition there have been a series of archaeological field projects in Surrey working with young people at risk of social exclusion, and HWTMA ran a programme in 2008 of diving training for young offenders in Southampton. The fact that staff from both Surrey County Council and HWTMA commented that there had been significant difficulties encountered in these projects, although these had been addressed or adapted to, nonetheless points to the potential challenges faced in engaging with different types of groups.

5.3.1.7 Resources limited or under threat
Lee (2009) has reported on the impact of the closure of continuing education departments in England. The impact of these recent events was echoed in comments from practitioners in archaeology that were consulted for this research project. For example, the closure of the
continuing education department at the University of Manchester has led to the formation of MANCENT (the Manchester Continuing Education Network – <www.mancent.org.uk>). This example is rare, however, and in other areas the continued decrease in continuing education courses, such as at the University of Bangor, has been noted by local groups as a major problem. Many had regarded continuing education courses as extremely useful and one of very few sources where members of local groups could access further training and education to complement their own activities. Furthermore, other groups such as the Association of Certificated Field Archaeologists in Glasgow, continues its longstanding connection to the University of Glasgow’s Department of Adult and Continuing Education (from which courses many of the members of the Association were originally recruited).

In other cases, particular posts with facilitation and training responsibilities, such as the Archaeological Project Manager (Outreach) at Warwickshire County Council, despite delivering interesting and innovative projects, are not core-funded, and hence are only sustainable as long as external project funding can be sourced. With increasing competition for grants, this raises a question of long-term sustainability for at least some of these posts. In the current climate of local authority budget cutbacks, the full impact on archaeological services as a whole in this sector remains to be seen.

This report has already mentioned the issue of the closure of some archaeological contractors and other organisations. In recent years, pressure from the preparations for the 2012 Olympic Games in London has squeezed resources for heritage, putting pressure on continued funding highly-regarded schemes such as PAS (and see Thomas 2009, 311-314 for discussion of this). In some cases within the wider heritage sector, there have also been closures of national organisations. In April 2009 the Civic Trust went into administration, after 52 years of activity. Previously, the Civic Trust had provided training opportunities, a national website including means of contacting civic societies across England, and had managed the Civic Trust Awards and Heritage Open Days. Throughout the remainder of 2009, the Civic Society Initiative has been consulting civic societies across England in order to establish what form the organisation may take in the future (Civic Society Initiative 2009).

Another resource considered to be under threat by some of the professionals consulted, and brought up as an issue at the workshop in Leicester (see Section 5.3.2), was the archaeology itself. Concerns about excavation as a destructive technique, and archaeology as a finite resource, have been noted elsewhere (e.g. Hollowell-Zimmer 2003, 47; Skeates 2000, 62), and is an issue that affects archaeology as a whole. As Oswald (2006, 20) points out, for many community archaeology projects excavation and other invasive techniques are favoured, while ‘the potential for understanding the historic environment through its most accessible and tangible elements – buildings, earthworks, vegetation – is still widely overlooked.’
5.3.1.8 Concerns about community archaeology
A range of other concerns were voiced regarding community archaeology itself. For example, one archaeological contractor commented that there is disillusionment among some professional archaeologists. They felt that, while contractors work hard all the time and rarely gain recognition or credit for their endeavours, ‘community archaeology’ attracts much wider publicity. In addition, another archaeologist from a local authority commented that there was some professional annoyance, even a sense of injustice, that archaeologists have to prepare so much for fieldwork, gaining permissions, dealing with equipment and logistics, and so forth. Meanwhile groups such as metal detecting clubs set up searches on private land with minimal effort but potentially causing a great deal of archaeological damage.

There was also concern from several interviewees, including local authority archaeologists and private consultancy workers, that many voluntary groups wish to excavate more than any other activity. This poses potential difficulties if the groups have not been trained in archaeological excavation methods and hence seriously damage or fail to record adequately, albeit unwittingly, the stratigraphy. Furthermore, many of these excavations take place without consultation of the County Archaeologist or equivalent, meaning that there is no opportunity to advise the groups in acceptable excavation methods (or even alternative, non-invasive methods!), nor is the material recovered reported to the HER or equivalent. Added to this is the continuing pressure of storage space for material from excavations and fieldwalking, which affects all sectors of archaeology, regardless of whether connected to contractors, universities, museums, or volunteers.

5.3.1.9 Barriers to communication
One academic archaeologist suggested that there may be a barrier between paid archaeologists and the voluntary sector especially if groups lacked the confidence to approach professional archaeologists for help or advice. Equally, it is likely that at least some paid archaeologists have preconceptions concerning the nature of the voluntary sector, possibly stemming from particular experiences in the past or from encounters with groups whose practices or methods cause concern to trained archaeologists.

Part of the issue of successful communication between community archaeology groups and paid archaeologists may relate back to the issue of training. While most people working as archaeologists at the present time will have undergone archaeological training, usually at university level, followed by vocational training in the workplace, the skills that they have been taught will not necessarily include so-called ‘soft skills’, such as communication, empathy and other social skills. Significantly, volunteer management is also often overlooked in training. This is reinforced by Selkirk’s (1997, 25) observations of the problems that occur in top-down interactions between ‘professionals’ and ‘amateurs’ in archaeology, where the former ‘often haven’t a clue about management in what is an extremely difficult management situation’. In addition, there is much to be
learned from other parts of the heritage sector already delivering successful outreach services, such as museums and archives.

### 5.3.1.10 Funding: opportunities and threats
Most practitioners consulted by the CASO acknowledged that there were real funding opportunities afforded to archaeological organisations through the money currently available for community archaeology. HWTMA, for example, employ an Education and Outreach team as part of a two-year funded project. In addition to this, HWTMA is often brought into other projects to deliver certain activities or services, where the client’s funding has budgeted for staff time and materials.

In another example, Kevin Cale, a freelance community archaeologist working in North Yorkshire (see [www.communityarchaeology.co.uk](http://www.communityarchaeology.co.uk)), is funded entirely through community-led archaeologists, which through their own grant applications budget for his time as a specialist and facilitator. Many other posts, as mentioned above, are also project-funded, which as already noted carries potential risks to sustainability if funds cannot be obtained. The TDP coordinators noted that, while they had obtained HLF funding for a three-year project, one of the requirements set by the funders was to make the project ultimately sustainable beyond the funding period, which while an understandable aim in theory, will present real challenges to the project (or to any project) in practice.

However, the continued interest of funding organisations such as the HLF in community archaeology projects, and their perception of such projects as an effective means of facilitating ‘participation and learning’ (HLF 2009, 4), suggests that, despite economic pressures on grant schemes themselves, there is scope for continued grant support for community archaeology projects. As speculated in Section 5.2, the continued availability of grants for projects may also continue to contribute to the growth in community archaeology groups.

### 5.3.2 Leicester workshop
On Saturday 12th September 2009, the CBA organised a day workshop and networking event at the Jewry Wall Museum in Leicester (Fig 13), in partnership with the LMAFG. Some 35 participants attended, representing heritage organisations (including PAS, Archaeology Scotland, the National Trust and Dyfed Archaeological Trust), CBA regional groups

![Figure 13 Workshop participants at the Leicester workshop viewing the Roman site at the Jewry Wall Museum](image)
(CBA London and CBA East Midlands), local societies (LMAFG and the Community Landscape and Archaeology Survey Project – CLASP), and staff from the CBA itself. The day consisted of three sessions looking at what community archaeology is, case studies of facilitation, and of specific projects respectively. A fourth session, chaired by Dr Robert Isherwood of Community Archaeology North West, was an open discussion in which certain issues and observations were raised, some of which were also discussed in the earlier sessions. Full details, including the presentations from the day and the session outlines, can be found at <www.britarch.ac.uk/research/community>. The outcomes of the discussions at the workshop in many ways reflected the observations already collected by the CASO during the research phases, but also pointed to some other debates. These are summarised, based on notes taken at the workshop by Dan Hull, Richard Lee and the CASO, as follows:

1. Using the examples from the presentations by Dyfed Archaeological Trust and the National Trust in Northern Ireland, it was pointed out that, in terms of CPD and morale among contracting staff, community engagement was seen as a positive and rewarding element for archaeological professionals. It was agreed by all that for certainly England, the Planning Policy Statement (PPS) is a crucial opportunity for securing the possibility of community involvement in development control contexts for the future. An observation was made about the need for archaeologists to develop ‘community skills’, increasing their abilities to bring together groups from different backgrounds to work together on projects.

2. A number of participants were concerned that groups should be guided towards subjects, sites and techniques appropriate to the region. Linkage to regional research frameworks may be one way of achieving this. Many also commented that increased community-driven fieldwork ran the risk of jeopardising the archaeological resource, both in that excavation and fieldwalking are intrusive, destructive techniques, but also that these kinds of activities generated finds which present a storage challenge. It was felt that guiding groups towards non-invasive subjects and techniques, where appropriate, would really help in minimising this risk.

3. There was general support that standards, along with associated training, would be useful, and that the CBA is the right body, along with the IfA, to provide this. The comment was made that National Occupational Standards offer an appropriate route for accreditation and thus should be linked to any training that may be developed.

4. Many commented that the HLF should be encouraged to consider the importance of both recording and research standards, and of adequate reporting and dissemination of results. It was felt that community benefits, while still important in their own right, do not always match archaeological benefits (in terms of the research or conservational dividend) at present, and that ‘condition of grant’ clauses could be reworked to take account of this.
5. The issue of community involvement in developer-funded archaeology was raised on three occasions. Discussing the paper presented by Justin Hughes which reported on the community element of a developer-funded project at The Butts in Worcester, there was some discussion of the feasibility of such involvement on a more regular basis in the future. Discussed in particular were time constraints – often developer-related work has to be carried out in a short timescale, but will inevitably take longer if there are plans to include volunteers who will probably work more slowly as well as require time to be trained. Hungate in York was also cited as a positive example, and while it was recognised that for many projects the tight timescales, limited space and logistical challenges mean that community involvement is rendered impossible, in many other instances it would be desirable if the developer could be persuaded. In general, there was a clear case for arguing to the developer the longer-term benefits gained through community involvement as compared to the extra cost implications of this.

6. Due to the variation in community archaeology across the UK, it was suggested that the CBA could play a positive role in communicating good practice and signposting good examples so that others can learn from them. In Northern Ireland, for example, it was felt that there was much to be learned from the CBA’s history of engagement in community work. Newly-formed NIAF is keen to develop training for professional archaeologists in community archaeology, so there is scope for liaison and/or partnership with the CBA in developing this.

7. Questions of how to define community archaeology: the assumption is that the community in question is local to the area, but there are some who volunteer at digs all over the country because they enjoy it – is this community archaeology? For example, to what extent is realisation of ‘sense of place’ important to participants and a criterion for ‘community archaeology’? Another participant commented that metal-detector users will often travel a long distance to search an area, and are motivated by other factors, such as the productivity of the site, rather than an emotional connection to a place. But, can this be counted as ‘community archaeology’ in the same sense? Community archaeology aims and objectives are also affected by the current political zeitgeist; ‘social inclusion’ and other agenda.

8. The comment was made again that more should be done to encourage community archaeology groups to communicate about their work and plans with local museums and County Archaeologists, who are essentially the curators for the area.

9. Training for both volunteers and practitioners was considered important, and courses at Birkbeck College were cited as an excellent model for how to deliver training, although rising costs associated with the few existing courses available through continuing education was regarded as an issue. Some local groups, such as HADAS, were running their own courses based on the Birkbeck model but at lower cost, hiring in tutors but only for their own group. CLASP and
Northampton University are also planning accredited modules on Community Archaeology, so a question emerged of whether these types of courses should be standardised at a national level.

5.3.3 Groups and societies

As listed in Section 1 (Acknowledgements), representatives of some 45 groups and societies were visited or consulted via telephone. These represented a range of different groups, from all over the UK in a broad geographical spread that took the CASO as far north as Huntly in Aberdeenshire, as far south as Guernsey (Fig 14), as far west as County Tyrone and as far east as Lincolnshire and Greater London. The breadth of groups visited included a metal detecting club, a civic society, a preservation society attached to an industrial heritage site, historical societies, archaeological societies, a YAC Branch, and CBA regional groups.

The diversity of information offered to the CASO reflected the diversity of the groups consulted, and of their varying challenges, concerns and opportunities. The types of themes addressed revealed the impact of a number of factors affecting groups. These are analysed here in turn, in order to illustrate the types of issues facing groups, with the acknowledgement that there were many more issues and examples that could be included, but in the interests of brevity are not. As with the questionnaire data, however, more details can be requested about the research data.

5.3.3.1 Group structures

Many groups followed what might be regarded as a ‘typical’ structure, in the sense that there is a central core of Committee members that take primary responsibility for the running of the group. In many cases, it was the Committee members who were not only most involved in the organisation of events, such as talks, trips, annual general meetings and social events, but also the most active in archaeological activities such as excavation, fieldwalking and archival research.

In the case of Newark and District Young Archaeologists’ Club (NADYAC), a YAC Branch with a membership made up primarily of young people, the adult volunteers helping to run NADYAC’s monthly events (Fig 15)
commented warmly about the group’s Branch Leader, who was praised for her energy and the time she gave voluntarily to making the group such a success. It was suggested by some of the other volunteers that, if she were ever to leave NADYAC, the Branch would struggle to continue at the same level, due to the amount of energy and dedication that this one individual brought to the group.

However, other groups visited, such as the relatively new Garw Valley Historic Gardens Heritage Trust, still had a central core of active members, but these took the form of trustees rather than Committee members. This was something partially mirrored in the organisation of many of the CBA English regional groups, where some or all of the Committee members were also Trustees due to the charitable status.

5.3.3.2 Group activities
Due to the criteria employed by the research methodology, activities carried out by the groups visited varied. As reflected in the survey results, the most popular activity was the organisation of talks and lectures for the group, usually bringing in speakers from external groups or organisations. However, this was not the case in all instances; the Strathbogie Archaeology Group only carried out fieldwork, mostly shovel-testing and landscape survey, and rarely arranged any group talks or presentations. Festung Guernsey, a special interest group in Guernsey, worked to excavate and restore Second World War Occupation sites, meeting twice a week, but again worked only on-site and rarely convened meetings to receive lectures or presentations. Equally, The Christchurch Antiquarians reported that, since their separation from the Historical Society, they had chosen not to convene regular meetings, due to time constraints.

Hence, there are groups with a specific interest in certain periods or types of heritage, such as Second World War sites (in the case of Festung Guernsey), Roman archaeology (in the case of the Arbeia Society) or industrial heritage – sometimes connected to one specific site as in the case of the Carrickfergus Gasworks Preservation Society.

5.3.3.3 Relationships with archaeologists
Regarding this theme, there were a mixture of points raised, both positive and negative. Among negative issues was the relationship with the County Archaeologist or similar in certain regions. One English group believed that the County Archaeologist and local archaeological contractor had not
listened to their concerns with the same attention as they had the interests of developers in the area. They also reported that attempts to contact some national agencies had proven frustrating, largely due to not knowing who specifically within an organisation to contact for certain issues. Another group in another area of England, also stated that, although they were careful to pass their data on to the local HER, they felt that their efforts were not fully appreciated by HER staff, and that they were somehow 'looked down on' due to their voluntary or 'amateur' status.

Some Scottish groups felt that the structure, with one local authority archaeologist covering several counties in some cases, meant that although they had a good relationship with the local authority archaeologist, the archaeologist’s workload was too great and too geographically demanding to allow them to have regular contact with many groups. This slightly different structure in Scotland (in that there are not County Archaeologists as such, but instead much larger regions are covered), was discussed with practitioners in Scotland as well, and was acknowledged to be an issue in terms of providing local contact and support for voluntary groups at a county-wide level.

The South Lancashire and Cheshire Metal Detecting Club representatives confirmed that certainly some of their members, as metal-detector users, felt a degree of distrust towards archaeologists, often as a result of negative experiences and interactions in previous decades. However, they felt that relationships were improving more recently, most notably through the success of PAS but also through participation of metal-detector users in community archaeology projects. However, it was noted that the club had had to make the initial enquiries in order to be allowed to take part, rather than being approached or invited to be involved in these projects.

More positively, both Claro Community Archaeology Group, who meet in Knaresborough Courthouse Museum, and Ripon Community Archaeology Project, who meet in Copt Hewick Village Hall (Fig 16), commented that Kevin Cale, a freelance community archaeologist working with some 20 groups in North Yorkshire, had considerable community engagement skills.
and was seen by both groups as essential to their work. In Scotland too, the network of support and access to archaeological training and advisors provided by both SRP (through the Royal Commission for Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland – RCAHMS) and the Adopt-a-Monument Scheme (through Archaeology Scotland) were widely praised by group members.

5.3.3.4 Training needs
The training needs were variable among the groups, some of which were more advanced than others in the training and experience that they had accrued to date. For example, both Bath and Camerton Archaeological Society (BACAS) in Somerset and the Archaeology Section of La Société Guernesiaise, had a good range of field skills and regular input from professional archaeologists, with many members already trained and experienced in archaeological processes. Both these groups indicated that they would like training themes to be on specialist topics such as specific pottery analysis or environmental archaeology, but that general and introductory training would be inappropriate to their needs. CLASP, in Northamptonshire, also reported that many of their members had sufficient general experience to identify their own individual training and learning needs, based on their developing interests in specific archaeological topics or methods, rather than on general training themes.

Other groups, such as Festung Guernsey, and also the Lochaber Archaeological Society in Inverness-shire were relatively new and had more extensive training needs looking at fundamental archaeological techniques and skills. This need for introductory-level, practical training was echoed in Northern Ireland at a province-wide level, exacerbated by the difficulties in arranging independent archaeological study by non-professionals due to the stringent legislation concerning excavation there. Equally, the Garw Valley Garden Heritage Trust, based in Mid-Glamorgan, commented that many of the people living in their area, comprising of Bridgend and the surrounding villages, were largely affected by severe social deprivation. Hence, any training aimed at introducing them to, and involving them in, archaeology and heritage, would have to take into account potentially very short attention spans, low literacy levels, and other accessibility issues. Thus training needs are greatly affected by local conditions, both legislative and social, and need to be tailored to a certain extent by region as well as by group.

Another issue that was raised by a number of groups was whether any training to be offered could be accredited. For example, Navenby Archaeological Group (NAG) in Lincolnshire had formed in 2005, and while they currently work with contractors such as Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd, and have close links with Bishops Grosseteste University College Lincoln, they are keen to become more independent in their activities. In order to do this, and to do this with confidence, they felt that accreditation for any training was an important step, particularly if it was effectively ‘endorsed’ by a recognised national organisation such as the CBA. Almost all groups visited specifically stated that training should have an emphasis on hands-on activity – ‘learning by doing’.
With regard to the identification of training needs through the questionnaire survey, members of one group observed that asking voluntary groups to self-identify their training needs through a questionnaire was a problematic research method. This was due to the risk of groups not being fully aware of their own skills gaps, as well as the issue of what one defines as ‘training’ (for example, a number of years of practical experience may be far more valuable and informative than one day in a formal training session).

5.3.3.5 Training locations
In terms of regional centres for training, there was significant feedback from several groups outside of England that it was insufficient to allocate training only at a national level. Instead, centres needed to be located at a regional level. For example, groups in North Wales complained that a lot of conferences and events taking place in South Wales were inaccessible due to the time taken to travel there, with the recommendation that Wales be considered in three ‘sections’, including a Mid-Wales region, in order to make sure that training was reasonably close to a sufficient number of groups. The group consulted in South Wales also confirmed that they too were unlikely to travel outside of their immediate vicinity for training events.

A similar situation came to light in Northern Ireland, where both practitioners and group members informed the CASO that there was a logistical division falling roughly either side of the River Bann, with people located to the west of the river unlikely to travel eastwards, and vice versa. Thus, it would be insufficient to offer training events and sessions only in one centre, such as Belfast.

Feedback from one of the Scottish groups also indicated that Scotland should not be regarded as one single unit by organisations operating there, especially due to the transport limitations to and from certain areas. This was reflected in feedback to SRP staff, in which SRP groups had requested that the venue for their annual conference be varied each year, and take into account the accessibility issues for groups, for example if located in remote parts of the Highlands and Islands. As the Strathbogie Archaeology Group also pointed out, the different areas of Scotland also have significant geographical, geological and archaeological variations, which training and other provision need to take into account since it may impact the content of such training events; a comment that could apply to all regions of the UK.

Even the regional groups of England, as defined historically by the CBA regional group divisions, were seen as problematic in some cases. For example, members of CBA South West observed that the length of their regional group, stretching from Cornwall to Gloucestershire, meant that certain locations within the same regional group area would prove difficult to access for others who, technically, lived in the same ‘region’. The same can be said of CBA North, where difficulties for Cumbrian residents accessing events in the North East, and vice versa, due to the poor public transport links and road networks in some areas, have also been observed. Hence, it may be advisable to notify voluntary groups in
neighbouring regions of forthcoming training events in case they are more accessible. North West locations may be more accessible to certain residents of Cumbria (and vice versa), for example, as may be the case for London-based events in terms of attracting certain participants from neighbouring regional group areas such as CBA South East and parts of CBA Wessex.

5.3.3.6 Continuing Education
Several groups commented on the impact of the loss of Continuing Education departments and courses across the country. The Upper Wharfedale Heritage Group, based in North Yorkshire, revealed that the group’s formation had been due to the wish of participants of Continuing Education archaeology courses that had been offered through the University of Leeds (now no longer available), to continue with their interest in the discipline. With the exception of public lectures at the University of Bradford, it was observed that there was now little provision for people living in the Yorkshire Dales area to access training and classes in archaeology through a university setting. Members of St Asaph Archaeological Society in Denbighshire similarly commented that, while there were still courses available through the University of Bangor, these were in decline, and were no longer accredited courses, which had been preferred by group members. Similar concerns were raised by a senior lecturer at a centre for Continuing Education. He felt that plans to alter many of the courses offered at his institution to unaccredited formats may have a negative impact on the students, many of whom appreciate accreditation as both an indicator of their own achievement and also as a means of demonstrating their proficiency in their chosen area of study. This links with the previous point about the accreditation of voluntary sector training.

5.3.3.7 Other issues and challenges
Some groups also offered insights into particular concerns that they had, often specific to their area or group. The Chair of the Strathbogie Archaeology Group, for example, was particularly concerned by the removal of the availability to access first edition Ordnance Survey maps free of charge from the Ordnance Survey website, and felt that this was a major barrier to research for many groups.

At times, and perhaps due to the voluntary nature of most groups and societies, clashes of personalities and differences in organisational vision can occur. Several groups reported that they had experienced conflicts in the past when significant differences of opinion among the membership had occurred. Sometimes this resulted in some members leaving the group or even being forcibly rejected in a small number of cases where serious conflict had taken place. In a few cases, a schism had developed to the point where a new, separate group was formed in the same area, with often similar goals as the originating group, but with its formation originating from a conflict situation. This type of challenge occurs largely due to strong personalities, or ideological differences, but it may be the case that the CBA can offer guidance on how to mediate such incidents, such as how to build procedures for dealing with conflict situations into
constitutions and other literature. Alternatively the CBA may at least be able to signpost to existing advice in this area, such as that provided by the Charity Commission (2010), available at <http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/charity_requirements_guidance/charity_governance/good_governance/conapp.aspx?>. This ‘statement of approach’ covers how to deal with various stages of a dispute, including resolution methods, mediation and the Charity Commission’s own involvement in extreme cases (and if the organisation is a registered charity), illustrating the types of approaches that can be taken with examples and case studies.

Another potential threat encountered by a small number of the group representatives interviewed was the loss of enthusiasm or energy by members for a project or for the group itself. A small number of groups reported their concerns about failure to enrol new Committee members, and the implications that this had on the long- and medium-term prospects of these groups. One group representative even reported that they were not sure that their group would survive beyond the next few months due to membership apathy. In another instance, a Chair had been appointed largely due to their relatively young age, specifically in an attempt by the Committee to revitalise their group by attracting younger people.

A number of groups commented specifically on the issue of access to land, particularly in terms of securing agreements with landowners. In one instance, funding had been obtained by a group to carry out a geophysical survey revealing features from an earlier period that was previously associated with the site in question. However, one whole field, apparently integral to the understanding of the site, could not be surveyed due to the refusal of the landowner to grant permission. This was despite the relatively non-intrusive nature of geophysical survey methods (as opposed to excavation, field walking or similar) – although even geophysics can be intrusive to stock, crops and privacy of the landowner.

Other groups, particularly (but not only) metal detecting groups, expressed concern at the level of control over agricultural land, such as through Environmental Stewardship Schemes and other initiatives. While such schemes include aims to preserve existing historic and archaeological features and monuments, frustration was felt that this may preclude research from taking place, especially if certain features were under threat from other factors such as natural erosion and illicit activity such as nighthawking (illegal metal detecting). Concerns from national metal detecting bodies such as the NCMD about planned guidance around the management of metal detecting rallies in England are acknowledged here, but are a separate issue being addressed through discussions involving organisations such as PAS, English Heritage and Natural England.

The Forestry Commission was specifically praised for its management plans that took into account the archaeological landscape, particularly in areas of Scotland.
5.3.3.8 Other support needed or suggested
Some group representatives interviewed suggested other, quite specific, ways in which the CBA and other organisations might look to support the voluntary sector in archaeology. Representatives of the Upper Wharfedale Heritage Group, for example, suggested that, as a benefit of becoming affiliate members of the CBA, groups could be offered archaeological equipment at reduced prices, perhaps through a membership discount between the CBA and recognised archaeological equipment traders.

Other more general issues arose especially around the theme of advocacy. For example, there was dissatisfaction expressed with some of the terminology used, with ‘voluntary’ very much preferred over ‘amateur’ when referring to the status of community archaeology participants. Many groups wished for the contribution to archaeological research made by voluntary groups to be celebrated and highlighted more strongly than is currently done, with a number of respondents and informants observing that some organisations still seem dismissive of the voluntary sector, particularly local societies, and the role that they may play. This was echoed not only in the archaeological societies, but with other groups such as civic societies, especially in the context of local authority discussion and lobbying, where frustration could often be felt that representations from amenity and lobbying groups are not necessarily taken seriously by decision-makers.

6. Conclusions
This report has indicated the scale of interest in archaeology within the UK and beyond, by demonstrating the high number of existing archaeological groups and related subject groups, as well as the diversity of activities and interests of those groups. The sheer amount of data collected, through qualitative and quantitative means, is too large to present in full in this report, but forms an important dataset for further analysis, as well as providing an effective resource to assist with informing CBA strategy concerning the voluntary sector.

The much-higher number of groups estimated to be in existence in 2009 as compared to 1985-6 (British Archaeological News 1987) suggests a dramatic growth in the number of groups involved with archaeology. This is supported by Chart 4’s indication of the growth of groups from the late 1990s onwards. The higher total number of groups (more than quadruple the number identified in 1985-6) might also be skewed by the wider range of groups listed by the 2009 survey, but is also affected by the creation of many new groups through more recent funding opportunities. The 1985-6 questionnaire was ‘addressed to societies in the membership of the CBA, its Regional Groups, and County societies’ (British Archaeological News 1987, 29). Meanwhile the 2009 survey included a wider selection of groups, including civic societies, metal detecting clubs and natural history societies.

Some of the observations confirm what many interviewed had noticed in their own experiences, such as the typically older ages of many community archaeology participants, and the fact that a groups’ level of
activity is often dependent on the energies of one or two specific group members, often the Chair or Secretary, in ‘making things happen’. In addition, issues were identified with some (although certainly not all) of the professional archaeologists and organisations, in terms of their effectiveness at engaging positively and constructively with volunteers. In spite of these problematic areas, there are still many very positive examples of successful engagement with different communities. In addition, it was clear that the volunteers involved in and engaging with archaeological heritage were very passionate about their pastime, many of them commenting on the enjoyment, sense of achievement, fulfilment and friendships that they gained from taking part in archaeological activities. However, projects that engage with so-called ‘hard-to-reach’ groups, such as the homeless, or young people at risk of social exclusion, appear to be in the minority themselves.

7. Recommendations
This section is divided into two parts. The first section suggests actions for the CBA and partner organisations in light of the findings of this report. The second set of recommendations point to future research, that would build upon the findings of this report, either as part of a wider project or through academic investigations.

7.1 Recommendations for the CBA and partner organisations:
   a. Investigation should be made into the delivery of community- and volunteer-focused training of archaeological practitioners in order to equip them to become better communicators and facilitators. As much of this can only be learnt by experience, practical training – possibly through placements or internships with organisations demonstrating ‘good practice’ – may be an effective means for delivery. Ideally this should be linked in with a national accreditation scheme such as the National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs).
   
   b. The diversity of training needs of different groups needs to be taken into account in any support that is developed. This includes considering regional variation of needs, as well as the differing levels of expertise between and even within groups. A key issue to address is the understanding of the whole spectrum of archaeological research, so that groups have an awareness of the necessity of, and processes involved, with off-site work such as desk-top research, post-exavation methods and writing up reports. Areas where relatively low response to the survey was experienced, such as Scotland, require further research still in order to gain a clearer picture of particular training needs. This may be achieved through collaborative research projects with Scottish partner organisations such as Archaeology Scotland and RCAHMS.
   
   c. Having made contact with a high proportion of voluntary groups, the CBA should build on this, maintaining positive and reciprocal relationships with community archaeology groups, responding to
the evolving needs of this sector. This should include increasing
the CBA’s level of advocacy for the role and significance of the
voluntary sector within archaeology, for example in encouraging
developer-funded projects to include community archaeology
elements where possible and appropriate. It may also include
enhancing the suite of benefits offered to affiliate members of
the CBA, particularly if they are from the voluntary sector. In
Scotland, there should be further dialogue with Archaeology
Scotland on how to deliver this advocacy appropriately through
complementing the continued work and research by both
organisations in this area.

d. Voluntary archaeology groups should be encouraged to archive
their research with appropriate facilities, such as DES, OASIS
and the ADS, to ensure that, certainly digital information is
stored for posterity. This is in order to maximise the public
benefit of local and voluntary research. Guidance should also
address practical issues concerned with the storage of physical
archives from excavations and other work.

e. The CBA and other organisations should work more closely with
major funding bodies such as the HLF to make sure that
community projects involving archaeological activities build into
their plans, and emphasise the importance of, the provision for
off-site work such as post-excavation, whether this is carried out
by a specialist consultant or the participants themselves.

f. Having held a significant community archaeology workshop
involving many leading community archaeology practitioners,
the momentum of this should be built upon. This can be done
through the development of community archaeology learning
bursaries (a suggestion inspired by discussions at the
community archaeology workshop), but also through continuing
to organise and support regular workshops and networking
events that bring community archaeologists together to discuss
current issues, compare experiences, and identify ways forward.
This will become increasingly significant over the next months
and years, as the impact of financial constraints and cutbacks,
particularly in local authorities, continue to unfold.

g. CAF must be redesigned and enhanced, with particular emphasis
on a number of features for the new version (CAF 2.0):

i. CAF 2.0 must be much more easy to use with clearer
instructions for adding project pages, taking into account
that many potential users will have little experience of
web page development.

ii. CAF 2.0 must be more aesthetically pleasing, with a
greater emphasis on images than is currently the case.
The current CAF is too ‘text-heavy’.

iii. CAF 2.0 must be more clear in its Advice and Guidance
section of whether the advice and guidance listed applies
UK-wide, or just to specific areas, due to legislative
differences in different parts of the UK and their impact on
the types of community archaeology activities that are possible.

iv. CAF 2.0 should increase the number of resources, both that it hosts itself and that it signposts to externally, including exploring the feasibility of reproducing some material from other sources, with appropriate permissions, to avoid the problem of web links to resources becoming invalid when external websites change.

v. CAF 2.0 should have an enhanced section on funding sources, going beyond just listing funding sources to provide additional guidance, such as how application processes work, advice on filling in application forms, and possibly an email advice service similar to that offered by the Archive Lottery Advisory Service.

vi. CAF 2.0 should incorporate, or at least signpost very clearly, the listings for different contacts such as local groups, equipment providers, training providers, archaeological organisations prepared to work with voluntary groups, and archaeological specialists that are prepared to offer advice to groups.

vii. CAF 2.0 should also signpost clearly the appropriate national organisations, their missions, and their contact details.

7.2 Recommendations for future research:
This report has provided an overview of the key findings of the research phase of the Community Archaeology Support Project. However, there is much further research that could be carried out, and further questions that arise. Particularly, it is significant that the number of questions asked and response options gleaned from the questionnaire survey, combined with the potential to map responses using ArcView GIS or similar software, means that a whole variety of queries and cross-tabulations can be run. Further research could potentially add to the dataset if more groups choose to respond to the questionnaire, or similar surveys are carried out in the future to assess any changes. Thus, in light of the data already gathered, and of the potential for future data collection, the following recommendations are made:

a. The survey data, apart from sensitive material such as individuals’ names and addresses, should be made available, on request from the CBA with close monitoring of where and how it is being researched, for external organisations and researchers to consult and query in order to support their own research projects.

b. Further investigation should take place into the destination of community archaeology research results, particularly with
regard to the potential of ADS to archive digital material from voluntary groups.

c. Further research should take place in order to identify a more accurate total population of people involved in archaeology in a voluntary capacity through groups and societies by carrying out a focussed study of individual group members, identifying in particular the likelihood and frequency of memberships to more than one group.

d. Continued monitoring of the voluntary sector should be built into CBA community archaeology support, in order to continue to provide baseline information and a grasp of the nature, location and needs of community archaeology. This should include more specific research into:

   i. social outcomes (what are the wider benefits of involvement for people and communities, in addition to environmental enhancement, new knowledge and understanding etc).

   ii. motivation (what brings individuals into involvement with community archaeology; and what are the barriers).

   iii. drivers (what are the mechanisms that bring a community archaeology group into being? For example, what role, historically, and in the present time, have extra-mural or WEA (Workers’ Educational Association) courses had, as compared to funding programmes such as LHI?

   iv. Success factors (what are the key sustainability factors that keep a group going after an initial project / course/ stimulus has passed).
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NOTES

i This was the case in all instances apart from the data provided from the WCVO due to time constraints. It was also hoped that WCVO data would be relatively up-to-date, although some responses indicated that this was not the case.

ii The UK Crown Dependencies are the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands – comprising of the Bailiwick of Jersey and the Bailiwick of Guernsey (including Guernsey, Sark and Alderney).

iii OASIS at present only operates in most counties in England and Scotland, but not Wales, Northern Ireland or the UK Crown Dependencies.