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Outline of research

- Literature review
- Group contact
- Questionnaire survey of groups and societies
- Interviews with practitioners and facilitators
- Interviews and observation of sample of groups and societies
• 461 complete survey responses
  – 583 responses altogether
• Approx. 25% response rate
• 61 interviews and visits to groups and practitioners
Please indicate any of the following that your group has been involved in over the past five years:

- Talks or lectures
- Trips to sites, museums or similar
- Taking a table at a local history fair or similar
- Recording through photography
- Archival research
- Hosting or organising exhibitions
- Social event with no specific theme, e.g. dinner, party, etc.
- Fieldwalking
- Excavation
- Lobbying for issues concerning heritage, e.g. development plans
- Finds processing/recording
- Literature research
- Finds cleaning
- Buildings recording
- Working with young people
- Geophysical survey (e.g. with magnetometer or resistivity meter)
- Other (please specify)
- Living History events (attending or hosting)
- Conservation work (whether on a site, building, landscape, feature or...)
- Landscape survey
- Metal detector survey
- Topographical survey
- Marine archaeology
- None of the above
Please indicate which of the following has been produced as a result of your group’s research?

- 28.8% (158) - An unpublished archaeological report
- 34.7% (184) - A published journal paper
- 24.5% (130) - A book summarising your research
- 12.1% (64) - A full monograph
- 45.0% (239) - An article or research paper in a journal
- 25.8% (137) - A project website including academic software
- 20.2% (107) - Archaeological or geological survey drawings, digital, or in hard copy
- 49.2% (261) - Archaeological, geological, or in hard copy
- 31.5% (167) - A physical archive
- 33.1% (176) - Other data
- 12.2% (65) - A dataset
- 28.2% (150) - An annotated bibliography

Total respondents: 715
Please indicate which of the following your group has had contact with:

- 44.8% (223) Archaeologist
- 38.8% (193) Archaeologist within a Historic Environment Record (HER) office
- 32.7% (163) Archaeologist attached to a university
- 34.7% (173) Archaeologist attached to a museum
- 24.7% (123) Archaeologist attached to a private consultancy firm
- 24.5% (124) Archaeologist attached to a professional contractor
- 24.7% (123) County/local authority archaeologist
- 19.1% (95) Dedicated Community Archaeologist
- 13.3% (69) Finds Liaison Officer (Portable Antiquities Scheme)
- We have never had any interaction with professional archaeologists
- Other (please specify)
Implications for Community Archaeology Forum

Have you ever visited CAF before?

- 86.6% (453) Yes - go to Question 2
- 13.4% (70) No - go to Question 10
How would you describe your experience of adding material to CAF?

- **42.9% (3)**: I found it very easy to add material to CAF
- **28.6% (2)**: I found it reasonably easy to add material to CAF
- **28.6% (2)**: I found it reasonably difficult to add material to CAF
- **I found it very difficult to add material to CAF**
Tentative conclusions

• Community Archaeology is diverse, energetic and, importantly, growing.

• Groups vary from ‘traditional-style’ societies that are not very active (enjoying lectures and days out) through to extremely active, although excavation is not always the primary objective.

• The data-collection exercise identified more groups, clubs and societies interacting with archaeology than previously listed by CBA; positive impact for TORC and other resources.

• Group activities, and even their level of expertise, can be significantly influenced by local conditions, such as relationships with professional archaeologists, legislation and availability of grants and funding.

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

• Good practice literature and guidance exists, but needs to be signposted more clearly and centrally.

• There is a need for training, but this varies from area to area. Hence, focused analysis is required to identify where training sessions should run, and what their themes should be.

• Accredited or non-accredited? Mixed feelings from groups and practitioners about the nature of training and how formalised this should be. Whose role to carry out the accreditation? Should there be a nationally-recognised qualification connected with Community Archaeology?

• CAF redevelopment 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 on fundraising (among other things!).

• Relationships between professional archaeologists and volunteers are in the most part excellent, but there are some regions where issues can be identified.