

INTRODUCTION

Opening a Dialog

Bringing Archaeology to the Public

Katherine M. Erdman



The Challenge(s) Facing Archaeology

It is a challenging time to be an archaeologist. The world's collective archaeological heritage is threatened on multiple fronts by both anthropogenic and natural causes (Pace 2012), many of which seem beyond our ability to aid or influence. Necessities for human survival, such as infrastructure development or agriculture, pose threats to the preservation of archaeological materials. As areas of the world continue to experience rapid periods of urbanization or develop their infrastructure to meet the needs of their citizens, as seen in Palestine or Turkey, more cultural and archaeological heritage sites are at risk for destruction from new construction projects (Al-Houdalieh and Sauders 2009; Özdoğan 2013). With limited real estate available, it is hard to justify preserving plots of land with unusable ruins when residents need housing and services. Agricultural cultivation contributes to soil loss and is likely only to increase damage to sites in coming years with the development of new technologies and more efficient machinery (Wilkinson et al. 2006). Even unchecked invasive species, such as feral pigs in Florida, are known to disrupt undiscovered sites by causing soil disturbance and subsequent erosion while burrowing (Engeman et al. 2013).

Black-market sales, economic disparities, and war affect the security and preservation of sites globally (Brodie, Doole, and Renfrew 2001; Proulx 2013). Wealthy collectors of antiquities continue to drive the illicit market and prey upon people in economically depressed or

war-torn areas, such as Afghanistan or across Central and South America, who have turned to looting in order to survive and provide for their families (Mackenzie 2011, 134; Campbell 2013, 120; Matsuda 1998). Digging fortifications, combat, occupation, and other side effects of violent conflicts have destroyed or damaged over seven hundred archaeological and cultural heritage sites across Syria and Iraq illustrating the effects of modern war on the past (Danti 2015). We may hear about only some of these events because they make it into mainstream media, but the loss of archaeological sites, artifacts, and the knowledge they stand to share, is a worldwide problem (e.g., Chippindale and Gill 2000; Davis 2011; Goddard 2011; K. L. Smith 2005).

Additionally, climate and environmental changes are increasingly affecting the dignity of sites around the world. Countries rich with ice, such as Norway, are now centers for “ice melt archaeology” with rates of thaw that do not allow archaeologists to keep up with documenting, gathering, and preserving the quantities of artifacts being revealed (Curry 2014). Such situations represent significant losses of knowledge since many of the artifacts are organic, such as textiles, and would normally not have been preserved in the first place. Coastal and underwater sites are similarly affected by changes in climate and environment. Increased rates of erosion and the decline of protective aquatic vegetation (Milner 2012), increases in damaging storms and ocean acidity (Wright 2016), and increased flooding and ground instability (Bickler, Clough, and Macready 2013) all affect the preservation of artifacts and known and yet unrecorded archaeological sites.

Many of these issues are rooted in complex regional or nation-specific social, political, historic, and economic systems (Contreras 2010; Davis 2011; Matsuda 1998; K. L. Smith 2005; Wright 2016); meaning there is no cure-all solution. There is, however, one challenge not listed above which we can address—the lack of understanding of our discipline. Who among us has not been mistaken for a paleontologist at some point (Moe, Chapter 8), or has had questions about keeping the “treasure” we find (Ducady, Chapter 6)? There is a fundamental misunderstanding amongst much of the public about what archaeologists do, how we do it, and why. We cannot begin to address the importance of archaeological context, preservation and stewardship, and the value of archaeology as a lens through which to see the world if we do not first clearly communicate the basics of the discipline and the role of professionals in it. By laying a strong foundation in archaeology education at a young age, and then fostering it over time, we will begin to see ripples of change as they affect some of the more complex threats to our collective heritage, for, as Franklin and Moe observe, “An ar-

chaeologically literate citizenry concerns itself with saving the past for the future. It understands that history matters and, more importantly, that everybody's history matters" (2012, 570).

Opening a Dialog with Public Audiences Is Worth the Effort

There are many reasons why we must open engaging and educational dialogs with the public. I focus here on two points: archaeology is a valuable tool for understanding the world and learning about other disciplines, and we need allies.

The Value of Archaeology

The public deserves to have a clear grasp of what archaeology is and why it is worth preserving. Archaeology appeals to many of us because we recognize the deep perspective it offers in understanding the role past events and relationships play in shaping the social and political realities of the present (Little 2012). As Little and Shackel (2014) have shown, archaeology can be a tool for social justice and peacebuilding by bringing together multiple histories and narratives; it can unite people and transcend boundaries. It is a way of teaching cultural sensitivity and fosters cross-cultural empathy (L. Messenger, Chapter 4).

In addition to the value inherent within the discipline itself, it is also special because it is one of the few that can unite social science, humanities, the hard sciences, environmental studies, and technology (Yezzi-Woodley et al., Chapter 2; Reetz, Haury-Artz, and Gorsh, Chapter 3). For this reason, archaeology illustrates the value of interdisciplinary approaches to solving multifaceted problems, working across perceived boundaries, and the application of skills in other contexts.

Archaeology possesses fascinating and unique values and capabilities that are readily apparent to those exposed to the field and, consequently, become something worth saving and protecting. When the significance of archaeology is recognized by those outside of the discipline, we can begin to create archaeology allies. It is at this point that we can tackle some of the other problems, such as the looting and illicit trade of antiquities, which threaten sites and materials. If people see that objects are more than their monetary worth or items of prestige, we can begin to make progress in the protection of the past. As Campbell observes, "By challenging collectors' desire for status symbols, a culture change would prevent the trafficking from the top down . . . Educating the public about the quantitative and qualitative impact

of antiquities trafficking should help promote a culture change” (2013, 137–38). But to promote change, even in one area, we have to ensure the public understands and appreciates what archaeology is and what is at stake.

Strength in Numbers

If there is any chance for preserving the past for future generations to come, it will require teamwork and the collective skills and passion of both professionals and nonprofessionals. Through meaningful and engaging educational experiences where participants can both learn and construct knowledge, the value of archaeology and its ability to enrich one’s understanding of the world becomes evident and meaningful (Franklin and Moe 2012, 569). When something is meaningful, a person is more likely to fight for it; this is how we build stewardship allies.

The term “stewardship” has been problematic at times in archaeological discourse (L. Smith and Waterton 2012, 157; Jeppson 2012, 592–93), and is necessary to clarify what we mean by it in this volume. Pace describes stewardship as “the care and prudent use of something or resources entrusted to one’s care . . . to care means to look after and provide for; to entrust means to confide the care or responsibility over something or a task outside one’s ownership. Entrustment therefore implies guardianship” (2012, 290). The contributors to this volume maintain a similar understanding. When discussing stewards or stewardship, we are referring to the collective responsibility and effort by professionals and nonprofessionals to maintain and conserve existing archaeological sites and materials for all peoples so that we may continue to learn and expand our knowledge of human experiences in the past. As guardians, not owners, of these resources, we are ensuring that generations to come have the opportunity to contribute their voices and experiences to develop a more inclusive understanding of human history.

To build stewardship networks to help us with this undertaking, we should appeal to the young and old alike. Developing a love of, or at least a respect for, archaeology at a young age will ensure we have allies for the future. Fostering an interest in older generations now will help us work toward more immediate preservation impacts, such as legislation to protect sites, voting for lawmakers who support heritage initiatives, or volunteers and donors to help with research. Creating allies of all ages can have positive effects when it comes to the protecting archaeological resources. Such solutions are not easy quick-fixes with instant results, but ones that, if implemented now, will have lasting

effects for generations to come, and, as a result, will help us to more profoundly tackle some of the other challenges facing archaeological heritage.

Opening a Dialog Requires Engagement and Communication

In recent years, archaeologists have emphasized the importance of communicating our research to the public, how to do so effectively, and broader concerns for the future of archaeology (Corbishley 2014; Gransard-Desmond 2015; Harding 2007; Jameson and Baugher 2007; Little and Shackel 2014; Thomas and Lea 2014; Tully 2007; Watkins 2006). More than ever, there are seemingly endless options for dispersing information. To foster archaeological literacy successfully, it is necessary to outline the desired outcome of the educational outreach project, identify the learning objectives necessary to meet that outcome, and then determine the most appropriate method for executing it. There are three broad categories of communication available to archaeologists: traditional media, which includes print, audio, and visual forms; online digital content; and interpersonal or interactive learning experiences. Each has its strengths and weaknesses as venues for archaeological education, and it is critical to consider aspects of accuracy, access, and effectiveness.

Traditional Media

While grouped here as traditional media, print and audio/visual media have their own strengths and weaknesses for communicating archaeological information to non-specialist audiences.

Print media, which includes books, newspapers, and magazines, has been the preferred venue for disseminating archaeological research since the discipline's founding (Harding 2007). These are often viewed as the most credible sources of accurate information because they typically undergo extensive editing or peer review. However, while accurate at the time of publication, information can sometimes become outdated within a decade as new research changes our understanding of sites and cultures, as well as our theories for interpreting the past. Updated editions, if even produced, may take years to appear on the market.

The digitization of traditional media, both print and audio/visual, has made both forms more accessible than ever before. Printed materi-

als remain physically available through bookstores, subscriptions, and libraries; however, electronic versions and digital subscriptions offer access anywhere and at any time. There are no limits or restrictions to sharing the information contained in physical books; they can be repeatedly accessed and easily distributed to others. Professional journals are the least publicly accessible print medium as they require hefty subscription fees. With the rise in popularity of sites like Academia.edu and ResearchGate, and a desire by researchers to share their work, even articles published in specialized journals are now accessible.

Books and other publications are effective for sharing varying degrees of knowledge. A short newspaper article offers highlights; a magazine, such as *Archaeology* or *National Geographic*, offers a more contextualized account of a site, artifact, or culture; and a book or professional journal may address a specific topic more in-depth. In each of these presentations, the reader can engage the material at their own pace offering them time to reflect on what they read, if desired. While in some ways reading is considered passive information transmission, since the reader is simply receiving it, books can spark more intensive active learning and lead to the pursuit of additional knowledge in other forms. However, print media transmit larger quantities of information and in greater detail, and can just as easily overwhelm and bore the reader by taking on a “telling,” rather than “showing” approach to the past.

There is significant variation in the accuracy of audio and visual media (radio, film, and television). The BBC and British Museum’s co-produced radio series *A History of the World in 100 Objects* (BBC 2010), for example, is well-researched and presents facts drawn directly from the objects to educate and inspire audiences. Other programs, such as *American Diggers* or *Ancient Aliens*, are sensationalized, viewership-driven productions that care nothing for actual archaeological methods or interpretations; the goal is entertainment, not accuracy or education (Pagán 2015). Despite the failings of some programs, others, such as PBS’s *NOVA*, continue to present quality educational programs in engaging ways that often highlight some of the latest discoveries made by archaeologists and physical anthropologists (e.g., National Geographic Television and PBS’s co-produced *NOVA* special, “Dawn of Humanity,” which presented the *Homo naledi* discovery shortly after the professional publication appeared).

Audio and visual media, unlike print, are likely to reach a much greater audience (Pagán 2015). Traditionally, these media were limited to scheduled air dates and times, and for some, required paying for a cable subscription, thus limiting audiences to those who could afford both the time and money to watch them. Online distribution, however,

is changing how people access these programs. Digital access to some programs may still require a subscription, such as through Netflix or Hulu, but others can be streamed directly from the producer's website or can be found on sites like YouTube. While online distribution means seemingly unlimited access for viewers, in some ways, the audience will likely be limited to those who have internet access and are actively searching for archaeology programs, whereas a cable viewer may stumble across one while casually channel surfing.

Listening to or viewing a program has the potential to spark greater interest in a subject because it is often presented in an engaging or entertaining manner (Carnes 1996, 9). Visual presentations of the past, in particular, make it easier for the audience to understand and connect; they literally show, rather than describes as print does, how scholars see past cultures and lifestyles. Even though the images presented are not directly tangible, they offer a physical point of reference for audiences who may not be familiar with archaeology. Such programs can be valuable, but like print media, they often represent a form of passive learning. Viewers and listeners receive information but have little time to reflect on it or must wait until the end of the program to do so. It may also be harder to follow up on certain details since it is unlikely that citations or additional information are offered, unless perhaps on a program website.

Online Digital Content

Digital content, i.e., those designed exclusively for the internet or as apps, have characteristics of both print and audio/visual media and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The greatest feature of digital media is accessibility. With a few key taps in a search browser, *anyone* interested in learning more about archaeology or a more specific aspect of it can find a plethora of multimedia resources. This content is also available *anywhere* one can access the internet—at home, the library, or on smartphones.

Professional archaeologists now have a relatively inexpensive and readily available method for bringing large audiences into archaeological discourse. Through excavation or research websites, professional blogs, social media, and online op-ed pieces, archaeologists can more easily share their accurate, up-to-date research in ways that will appeal to a variety of audiences. And unlike traditional media, digital media can be amended and easily updated as new information becomes available. Other platforms, such as GlobalXplorer, involve the public directly in the protection of sites from looting and further destruction

while sharing educational materials about the archaeology of a particular country. Archaeology-specific news websites, websites with interactive artifact collections or 3D reconstructions of sites, podcasts of university lectures or archaeology-focused shows, videos on ArchaeologyChannel.org and other video platforms, apps such as Archaeology News, and educational games such as Dig Ventures, offer additional ways for professionals to maintain a dialog with the public and for someone to explore and learn more about archaeology.

Accessibility is also highly problematic. People untrained in archaeological methods and analysis can produce their own information or interpretations that may be wildly inaccurate or deliberately untruthful to further a specific agenda, and can easily be disguised in ways that are not apparent to other non-specialists. Sensational headlines, click bait, and “alternative facts” can spread across social media, like Facebook or Twitter, before professionals have time to respond. In some ways, even professional blogs or sites have the potential to be problematic if they represent only one opinion or side of a debate.

The incredible diversity found within digital media makes them effective teaching tools because they appeal to different styles of learning. As with print media, some forms of digital media, such as blogs or websites sharing large quantities of written information, represent passive learning in that the reader is receiving information, but not necessarily engaging or responding to it beyond the “comments” section. In other cases, online platforms may support active learning by offering space for the audience to interact with information or engage in discussions with others. Archaeology organizations using Facebook can easily share upcoming events or new research allowing for the public to respond and engage with professional organizations by “liking,” commenting, or asking questions below the post (Huvila 2013, 28). Similarly, “ask-an-expert” type sessions on Reddit also offer the opportunity for the public to open a literal dialog with archaeologists. Websites with 3D models of artifacts and sites are also more likely to appeal to those who prefer active learning. The opportunity to look at the physical properties of ancient materials, to turn it in one’s digital-hands, provides a powerful, more direct connection to the ancient world. Such connections with materials and professionals working with the past makes history come alive in a way traditional media is often unable to accomplish.

Interpersonal Approaches

Interacting directly with non-specialists through public lectures, museum and outreach programs, community education, community ar-

chaeology projects, etc., are examples of interpersonal approaches to archaeological education. Such programs disseminate current knowledge directly from an institution or professional to their audience, or offer the opportunity for the public to generate knowledge themselves. Events focused on knowledge-sharing are likely to disseminate well-researched information or information coming directly from an experienced professional in the field. The opportunity for continued participation through additional classes, distributed materials, hands-on workshops, or an online platform may also be available.

While providing accurate and contemporary information to diverse audiences, access to such programs may be limited. Not every town or city has an archaeologist, museum, or university to share information with the public or involve them in research. Having to travel to attend such events or, if available, having to pay for them, limits who can attend public talks, exhibitions, or projects. Even in cases where these are available, information about such types of programs may not be disseminated well or reach all members of the public who may be interested in attending.

Even though access may be a challenge, interpersonal approaches offer highly effective, active learning (White, Chapter 1). Unlike traditional media, and sometimes digital media, which reflect one-sided communication with viewers as passive recipients of information, interpersonal communication is dynamic. Interactions happen immediately and directly; no interface is needed to engage a professional. Real-time dialog is possible making the interaction more meaningful and constructive, especially if a participant has specific questions about the field or subject at hand. As White notes, for people to truly connect with history, they want to see it and touch it. Like artifacts or sites themselves, archaeologists represent a tangible link to the past because we are more connected to it than most; we experience it and work with it regularly. Our profession is unusual and exciting to the public and by engaging with us directly, in a way, they experience it too and connect with the past in more fulfilling and meaningful ways.

Traditional media, digital media, and interpersonal approaches each have strengths and weaknesses for opening dialogs about the past. In addition to access, accuracy, and effectiveness, there are other factors to consider, such as learning goals and the primary audience. The contributors to this volume primarily engage the public through interpersonal approaches in both formal and informal educational settings, however, digital media is increasingly playing a more integrated or supplementary role in their work. Employing a variety of commu-

nication methods ensures we reach diverse audiences and appeal to different types of learners.

Objectives of this Book

Across the United States and abroad, archaeologists have developed dozens of educational archaeology programs that incorporate interpersonal approaches with traditional and online media to inspire and communicate with nonprofessionals, such as the Peabody Museum's high school archaeology service learning program (Randall and Taylor 2016) or the STEAM-based professional development program out of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (Ng-He and Makdisi 2016). Many of these were established after years of hard work perfecting learning objectives and the delivery of knowledge. Instead of trying to reinvent the wheel in archaeology education, we should start communicating with one another, learning from the other's contributions, and evaluating the effectiveness of our work (Franklin and Moe 2012, 568). Building on our collective successes or modifying them for one's own local educational programming is not uninventive or thoughtless; in fact, it is just the opposite. Like any other archaeological project, you do your background research, learn the established methods, and then implement them responsibly to ensure success in your own work. So much of archaeology overlaps at its roots that we can use the same framework and modify it for our individual regions, areas of study, or learning objectives; this offers a huge advantage as half of the work is completed already.

To ensure your success as you undertake public outreach to promote archaeology and heritage preservation, the contributions from this volume's authors include the following objectives.

Objective One: Inspiration and Getting Started

We hope after reading this book that you are inspired to get involved with existing programs in your community, or if educational archaeology programs are lacking, that you will consider opening a dialog in some manner. This undertaking does not have to be difficult; please, learn from these contributors' decades of combined experience. There is a desire from all ages to learn about archaeology; the subsequent chapters begin with K–12 education and end with senior learners to ensure all educational levels are addressed. Reaching out

to even one demographic will have positive effects in the community and archaeology broadly. While some of the chapters represent specific case studies, the general outline and principles employed can be applied in different communities or countries using local, available resources.

Objective Two: Promote Sustainable Practices

The creation of the new *Journal of Archaeology and Education* indicates that there are many archaeologists interested in working within their communities and wish to succeed in their efforts. The examples presented in this volume focus on sustainable efforts for outreach and education. Contributors utilize existing resources, such as historic places or community education programs (Reetz et al., Chapter 3; Erdman, Chapter 7); construct their programs to fit within established educational practices, such as Common Core in K–12 education or university research assignments (White, Chapter 1; Yezzi-Woodley et al., Chapter 2; L. Messenger, Chapter 4); and look to the future of archaeology and education by discussing best practices or the role of digital archaeology (P. Messenger, Chapter 5; Ducady, Chapter 6; Moe, Chapter 8; Reeves Eyre and Ellison, Chapter 9). By working with existing resources, rather than starting from scratch, we hope that our readers will be able to build and maintain successful programs that do not diminish over time due to lack of funding or support.

Objective Three: Demonstrate How Engagement Efforts Will Lead to Archaeological Stewardship

Engaging educational experiences lead to an accurate and profound understanding of archaeology and many of the subtopics or other disciplines from which it draws—and we have the data to prove it. Several authors present survey data gathered from learners spanning all ages before and after their educational experiences or interactions with archaeologists and sites (Reetz et al., Chapter 3; L. Messenger, Chapter 4; Ducady, Chapter 6; Erdman, Chapter 7). While some responses illustrate room for improvement, most show positive views and a better understanding of archaeology and what heritage means for them and their communities following such programs. These data hint that such interest and acquired knowledge have the potential to develop into a sense of stewardship if fostered and maintained over time.

Develop, Foster, and Maintain for the Future

Meaningful interactions with our collective past should begin at a young age and be encouraged throughout one's life. To do this, we must make archaeology as accessible and vital to the public as other core disciplines since it introduces a new lens through which to see the world. Our methods for engaging the public must target specific audiences in intrinsically meaningful ways that bring archaeology into their everyday lives; it is here that a personal connection and passion for the past can develop. It is not enough to introduce archaeology and then hope for its advocacy, instead, the public must have opportunities to continue their archaeological curiosity and expand their foundational knowledge, which is accomplished by introducing more complicated archaeological and anthropological issues, such as who owns the past or how do we include multiple narratives when interpreting the past. The subtitle of this volume includes “developing” and “fostering,” both of which reflect our overall approach—introduce archaeology as part of early childhood education and sustain a lifelong interest through formal and informal learning experiences.

Our holistic approach to archaeology education ensures we can maintain a steady dialog with all ages, one that emphasizes and reinforces the importance of archaeological heritage and its preservation. Additionally, we can nurture the interests of current and subsequent generations for whom the value of archaeology will be inherent and, therefore, should always be protected. We are reaching people who might not normally come into contact with archaeology, particularly after K–12 education, or may never have learned about archaeology. Developing and fostering that passion is how we will create stewards of archaeology and natural allies to help us preserve the past for generations to come.

This volume focuses on introducing all ages of the public to the fundamentals of archaeology and sustaining an interest over time. While we recognize the importance and significant contributions of informal settings to public engagement and education, our examples come from primarily formal or structured learning environments. Rather than creating completely new outreach programs from the ground up, which requires greater expense and resources, many of the contributors to this volume work within established education systems to reach the public. This has multiple advantages. For example, incorporating archaeology into K–12 Common Core curricula ensures it reaches every school-age child, as well as teachers and many parents, resulting in a very broad impact. Partnering with historical societies offers uni-

versity students practical experience in heritage management. Working with community education programs offers vast resources, such as advertising and administrative support. Digitizing and publishing large quantities of archaeological data through online databases has the potential for global reach. Additionally, working within established systems is a naturally symbiotic relationship and one that encourages partnership, i.e., strength in numbers. Whether engaging an elementary classroom or partnering with local historical societies, such interactions promote a sense of community and cooperation where one side brings the expertise and the other provides an audience or participants.

There are several critical points addressed within that make this book indispensable for those interested in doing archaeology education. Not everybody learns the same, especially when we consider factors such as age, motivation to learn, language barriers, access, background interests, or learning environment. Each chapter in this volume accounts for such factors and presents models or suggestions for achieving best results. Secondly, our discipline does not exist in a vacuum; we should not teach it as such. Many of our contributors take an interdisciplinary approach to presenting archaeology and incorporate diverse voices from the community, which in turn, makes it accessible to audiences of all ages who can connect information and experiences to things they already know. Finally, we show how new programs can get started as well as how we can maintain and keep improving established, well-oiled machines. The latter is achieved by evaluating our teaching methods and measuring how and what the public learns from engaging with archaeologists both locally and abroad.

Organization of the Volume

The subsequent chapters of the text are organized into three parts to reflect our approach: develop, foster, and maintain for the future. Part I, “Inspiring and Developing an Interest in the Past,” focuses on how we can spark an interest in archaeology amongst members of the public. Our examples focus primarily on K–12 and undergraduate formal learning situations. This is not to say a passion for archaeology cannot develop outside of these parameters, but rather, these offer direct and wide-reaching approaches for targeting our youngest demographic. Several themes stand out: the need for integrating archaeology education into existing teaching requirements, the impact of experiential learning, and the benefit of fostering empathy.

White (Chapter 1) sets the stage for K–12 classroom learning and how to ensure it is effective: work it into Common Core, or other standards, and make it come alive through relatable historical connections and hands-on activities. Yezzi-Woodley et al. (Chapter 2) present their successful application of effective learning, including how to work with teachers to implement archaeology education in the classroom and its value for students and teachers as a discipline that unites science and social studies. Reetz, Haury-Artz, and Gorsh (Chapter 3) foster an experiential approach to learning by pairing archaeology with environmental education and bring in Native voices to promote the connection between archaeological heritage and descendant communities. L. Messenger (Chapter 4) outlines an undergraduate research and creative writing project that promotes cross-cultural empathy as well as a better understanding of the complexity and challenges archaeologists face when interpreting the past.

Part II, “Fostering a Deeper Respect for Archaeological Heritage,” explores how we can maintain and encourage a continued interest in the archaeological past and its future. Chapters in this section contain a mix of formal and informal educational experiences, aimed at adult audiences, that build on a basic understanding of archaeology by addressing more complicated issues such as ownership of the past, listening to the public’s opinions about archaeology, and protection for future generations.

P. Messenger (Chapter 5), describes a collaborative effort to create a new Heritage Management graduate-level degree that will train a new generation of interdisciplinary scholars to engage with the public and ensure inclusive presentations and interpretations of the past. Ducady (Chapter 6) shares how archaeologists working in Belize include the public in their research and conversations about the past, and how Belizeans think about their heritage and the richness of the archaeological record in their country according to quantitative and qualitative data collected in a recent survey. Erdman (Chapter 7) suggests how archaeologists can utilize existing public education programs, such as community education or lifelong learning programs, to open a dialog with adults and senior learners who are interested in archaeology and the protection of world heritage.

Part III, “The Future of Archaeology, Education, and Preservation,” looks at how to move forward with our efforts to educate and engage the public about archaeology. Moe (Chapter 8) reflects on lessons learned from over thirty years as an archaeology educator, shows the compatibility of archaeology education and Common Core standards, and outlines what the next generation of educators must do to be successful in

the future. Reeves Eyre and Ellison (Chapter 9) present the value digital archaeology can offer preservation efforts, as well as how it serves as an educational tool to reach audiences in new and interactive ways.

Katherine M. Erdman, PhD, Visiting Scholar, University of Minnesota.

References

- Al-Houdalieh, Salah H., and Robert R. Souders. 2009. "Building Destruction: The Consequences of Rising Urbanization on Cultural Heritage in the Ramallah Province." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 16: 1–23. doi:10.1017/S0940739109090043.
- BBC. 2010. "A History of the World in 100 Objects." *BBC Radio 4*. Accessed 23 May 2016. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00nrtf5>.
- Bickler, Simon, Rod Clough, and Sarah Macready. 2013. "The Impact of Climate Change on the Archaeology of New Zealand's Coastline: A Case Study from the Whangarei District." *Science for Conservation* 322: 1–54. Accessed 24 September 2017. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/30676296.pdf>.
- Brodie, Neil, Jennifer Doole, and Colin Renfrew, eds. 2001. *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: The Destruction of the World's Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Campbell, Peter B. 2013. "The Illicit Antiquities Trade as a Transnational Criminal Network: Characterizing and Anticipating Trafficking of Cultural Heritage." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 20: 113–53. doi:10.1017/S0940739113000015.
- Carnes, Mark C. 1996. *Past Imperfect: History According to the Movies*. New York: H. Holt.
- Chippindale, Christopher, and David W. J. Gill. 2000. "Material Consequences of Contemporary Classical Collecting." *American Journal of Archaeology* 104(3): 463–511. doi: 10.2307/507226.
- Contreras, Daniel A. 2010. "Huaqueros and Remote Sensing Imagery: Assessing Looting Damage in the Virú Valley, Peru." *Antiquity* 84(324): 544–55. http://works.bepress.com/daniel_contreras/10/.
- Corbishley, Mike. 2014. *Pinning down the Past: Archaeology, Heritage, and Education Today*. Woodbridge, England: The Boydell Press.
- Curry, Andrew. 2014. "Racing the Thaw." *Science* 346(6206): 157–59. doi: 10.1126/science.346.6206.157.
- Danti, Michael D. 2015. "Ground-Based Observations of Cultural Heritage Incidents." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 78(3): 132–41. doi:10.1080/0143659042000231965.
- Davis, Tess. 2011. "Supply and Demand: Exposing the Illicit Trade in Cambodian Antiquities through a Study of Sotheby's Auction House." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 56(2): 155–74. doi:10.1007/s10611-011-9321-6.
- Engeman, Richard M., Kathy J. Couturier, Rodney K. Felix Jr., and Michael L. Avery. 2013. "Feral Swine Disturbance at Important Archaeological Sites."

- Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 20(6): 4093–98. doi:10.1007/s11356-012-1367-1.
- Franklin, M. Elaine, and Jeanne M. Moe. 2012. “A Vision for Archaeological Literacy.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by Robin Skeates, Carol McDavid, and John Carman, 566–80. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237821.013.0030.
- Goddard, Jennifer. 2011. “Anticipated Impact of the 2009 Four Corners Raid and Arrests.” *Crime, Law and Social Change* 56: 175–88. doi:10.1007/s10611-011-9322-5.
- Gransard-Desmond, Jean-Olivier. 2015. “Science Educators: Bridging the Gap between the Scientific Community and Society.” *World Archaeology* 47(2): 299–316. doi:10.1080/00438243.2015.1020964.
- Harding, Anthony. 2007. “Communication in Archaeology.” *European Journal of Archaeology* 10(2–3): 119–33. doi:10.1177/1461957108095980.
- Huvila, Isto. 2013. “Engagement Has Its Consequences: The Emergence of the Representations of Archaeology in Social Media.” *Archäologische Informationen* 36(April): 21–30. doi: 10.11588/ai.2013.0.
- Jameson, John H., and Sherene Baugher, eds. 2007. *Past Meets Present: Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Jeppson, Patrice L. 2012. “Public Archaeology and the US Culture Wars.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by Robin Skeates, Carol McDavid, and John Carman, 581–602. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237821.013.0031.
- Little, Barbara J. 2012. “Public Benefits of Public Archaeology.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by Robin Skeates, Carol McDavid, and John Carman, 395–413. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237821.013.0021.
- Little, Barbara J., and Paul A. Shackel. 2014. *Archaeology, Heritage, and Civic Engagement: Working Toward the Public Good*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Mackenzie, Simon. 2011. “Illicit Deals in Cultural Objects as Crimes of the Powerful.” *Crime, Law and Social Change* 56(2): 133–53. doi:10.1007/s10611-011-9317-2.
- Matsuda, David. 1998. “The Ethics of Archaeology, Subsistence Digging, and Artifact Looting in Latin America: Point, Muted Counterpoint.” *International Journal of Cultural Property* 7(1): 87–97. doi: 10.1017/S0940739198770080.
- Milner, Nicky. 2012. “Destructive Events and the Impact of Climate Change on Stone Age Coastal Archaeology in North West Europe: Past, Present and Future.” *Journal of Coastal Conservation* 16(2): 223–31. doi:10.1007/s11852-012-0207-2.
- Ng-He, Carol, and Leila Makdisi. 2016. “Public Education and Outreach.” *Oriental Institute 2015–2016 Annual Report. Public Education and Outreach: Volunteers*. Accessed 14 October 2017. https://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/oi.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/shared/docs/ar/11-20/15-16/ar2016_Public_Education.pdf.

- Özdoğan, Mehmet. 2013. "Dilemma in the Archaeology of Large Scale Development Projects: A View from Turkey." *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 23(1): 1–8. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/pia.444>.
- Pace, Anthony. 2012. "From Heritage to Stewardship: Defining the Sustainable Care of Archaeological Places." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by Robin Skeates, Carol McDavid, and John Carman, 275–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237821.013.0015.
- Pagán, Eduardo. 2015. "Digging for Ratings Gold: American Digger and the Challenge of Sustainability for Cable TV." *The SAA Archaeological Record* 15(2): 12–17.
- Proulx, Blythe Bowman. 2013. "Archaeological Site Looting in 'Glocal' Perspective: Nature, Scope, and Frequency." *American Journal of Archaeology* 117(1): 111–25. doi:10.3764/aja.117.1.0111.
- Randall, Lindsay, and Marla Taylor. 2016. "Uncommon Engagement: Integrating Archaeology into High School Education." Paper presented at the 81st Annual Society for American Archaeology Conference, Orlando, FL, 7 April 2016.
- Smith, Kimbra L. 2005. "Looting and the Politics of Archaeological Knowledge in Northern Peru." *Ethnos* 70(2): 149–70. doi:10.1080/00141840500141139.
- Smith, Laurajane, and Emma Waterton. 2012. "Constrained by Common-sense: The Authorized Heritage Discourse in Contemporary Debates." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by Robin Skeates, Carol McDavid, and John Carman, 153–71. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199237821.013.0009.
- Thomas, Suzie, and Joanne Lea. 2014. *Public Participation in Archaeology*. Woodbridge, England: Boydell & Brewer.
- Tully, Gemma. 2007. "Community Archaeology: General Methods and Standards of Practice." *Public Archaeology* 6(3): 155–87. doi:10.1179/175355307X243645.
- Watkins, Joe E. 2006. "Communicating Archaeology: Words to the Wise." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 6(1): 100–18. doi:10.1177/1469605306060569.
- Wilkinson, Keith, Andrew Tyler, Donald Davidson, and Ian Grieve. 2006. "Quantifying the Threat to Archaeological Sites from the Erosion of Cultivated Soil." *Antiquity* 80: 658–70. <http://antiquity.ac.uk/ant/080/309/Default.htm>.
- Wright, Jeneva. 2016. "Maritime Archaeology and Climate Change: An Invitation." *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 11(3): 255–70. doi:10.1007/s11457-016-9164-5.