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This report accompanies a dataset of interview transcripts made public through the University of Sydney Library eScholarship Repository in 2015. The data were produced for my research project Mediated Messages: Archaeology, Communication and Digital Technology (Colley 2013, Colley 2015, in preparation). The data may be freely used by others with appropriate citation and acknowledgement of my work in creating the resource.

My research investigates philosophical and ethical questions raised by using digital communication technology in archaeology and cultural heritage practice. In 2011 I interviewed thirty Australian-based archaeologists and cultural heritage professionals about their use of digital technology and their communication with groups including professional peers; journalists; public relations practitioners; heritage organisations; businesses; Indigenous community members and members of the wider public with interests in archaeology and history (e.g. ‘amateur’ and ‘hobby’ archaeologists, students, tourists and visitors to archaeological sites and projects). Communication technology impacts significantly on peoples’ attitudes towards archaeology and cultural heritage in ways that have social, political and economic implications. Studying this process informs us about the changing role of the past in the present and about social values associated with archaeology.

Appendix 1 lists the interview survey questions. Here I document my survey methodology and present key data which are too lengthy or otherwise unsuitable for peer-reviewed publications about the project. Participant anonymity was imposed by the University of Sydney human ethics committee and as a condition of a seed-funding grant I was awarded by the University of Sydney, Faculty of Arts Research Support Scheme in 2010. I have edited the interview transcripts (e.g. by deleting names and generalising geographical locations and other details) to remove anything that might identify individuals, projects or organisations. Participants have been given code numbers preceded by ‘11’ to indicate the 2011 survey date (11-01, 11-02 etc.).

Survey design and participant recruitment
The survey asked professional archaeologists about their own communication. Participants were recruited through advertisements posted on email lists and moderated online forums of the main four Australian archaeology associations and professional societies (Australian Archaeological Association, Society for Australasian Historical Archaeology, Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists and Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology). A survey form was designed, trialled through test interviews and sent to participants. It consisted of 37 tick box, short answer and open-ended questions about work, workplaces, communication, digital technology use and interactions with media professionals (e.g. print and broadcast journalists, television and radio producers, graphic and website designers) and public relations and marketing.
practitioners (Appendix 1). I personally interviewed each participant face to face or by phone for between 0.5 to 1.5 hours, except for participant 11-29 who was interviewed by a research assistant. I noted down answers on the survey form during the interviews which were also audio recorded and I later transcribed the audio recordings into Microsoft Word. Interviews with participants 11-01 and 11-29 could only be partly transcribed due to technical problems.

**Issues raised by the survey and methodology**
Qualifications in archaeology or heritage were not considered before selecting participants. Interviews revealed significant variation in peoples’ professional background and experience and a few mainly discussed their voluntary role as leaders of community archaeology and heritage projects rather than paid professional work or university research. Archaeology is not universally accredited, notions of ‘professionalism’ vary with context and this can effect communication and technology use.

The survey form guided each interview but there was scope for follow on questions and discussion. This approach is common in narrative inquiry research (Goodfellow 1998). Problems with the form became apparent during interviews and subsequent data analysis. Where questions could have been asked in a more logical sequence the answers are being regrouped for analysis (Colley, in preparation). People sometimes gave better answers to a specific question elsewhere in their interview so some data will be been moved and collated for future analysis. Omissions and poorly designed questions became apparent when discussing e.g. self-assessed digital competency, funding, groups involved in communication, and the thematic focus of peoples’ archaeology and heritage projects. Better information about people’s work history, current work status, autonomy and contribution to workplace policy and decision making was needed, given the importance of workplace to the study. For example, junior staff or new arrivals often had limited knowledge about wider communication and technology use where they worked, especially in larger organisations. When asked about the frequency of their work-related communication, twenty four (80%) survey participants said they communicated about archaeology at work ‘Frequently’ or ‘Often’ (Q.11). Five (17%) said ‘Sometimes’. One person explained how they communicated intensively with the public, archaeology students, journalists and local government officials each year for a National Archaeology Week event. More carefully designed questions were needed to collect better quality information about intensity of communication, togetherness and separation important to community building (Wenger et. al. 2009:56-7).

This was a pilot study and only 30 people could be interviewed. Some quantitative data can be extracted but the sample is usually too small for reliable quantitative analysis. The strength of the data lies in deeper and nuanced understanding provided by comments and conversations. Survey questions were broad and answers present a range of complicated and inter-related issues. Several people gave similar or comparable answers to some questions but other interesting cases and examples were only raised by one or two respondents. This means that some interview data is thicker or thinner and uneven in scope. The analytical challenge is to identify and assess the significance of apparent wider
patterns, ‘contrary cases’ (cf. Higgs and Cant 1998:5) and one-off remarks and comments. This is being done by contextualising the survey results using case studies and other surveys discussed in scholarly literature and by applying my experience and knowledge of archaeology, heritage practice and digital technology projects. Because I am also a professional archaeologist with direct experience of many of the circumstances discussed by survey participants, the study methodology also had elements of ethnography (c.f. Filippucci 2009) and influenced the way I approached data collecting and analysis. I also knew some participants personally or was familiar with their work and occasionally asked leading questions. People challenged what I said or raised entirely new things so I am confident that my questioning did not unduly distort the replies. Interviews with people I did not know also developed into wide-ranging discussion and opened up new avenues of inquiry.

A common challenge to interview-based research of this kind is how to interpret or ‘read’ answers that are not literally expressed. People’s tone of voice and delivery often provided cues to underlying and hidden meaning. Face to face interviews provided more cues from body language and facial expression. Use of humour and irony (Simpson and Mayr 2010:77-80) often indicated that people meant the opposite or something different to their spoken words. The degree to which someone considered something important, incidental or trivial also often had to be ‘read’ or interpreted from the context. I therefore noted laughter, hesitation (and lack of hesitation) and vocal emphasis in my transcripts and I made a full transcription of every word spoken during each interview, including my questions and comments. While listening and re-listening to the audio recordings, transcribing and re-reading transcripts for analysis I also noted comments I felt required interpretation. This process provided additional insights and information.

Some respondents had worked for over 40 years in the industry and their experiences and understanding of e.g. university tutoring or interactions with film makers and television producers in the 1970s and 1980s were not directly comparable with more recent and current practice given workplace, technological, social and economic change. However such historical perspectives were useful for documenting change through time and discussing remediation. Change since 2011 when the survey was conducted is also inevitable given the rapid pace of technology development. Some technologies and products not covered by the survey are being discussed in the analysis to be published elsewhere.

Workplaces were assumed to be the key structuring factor for communication and technology use by professional archaeologists. While true and obvious at one level, workplaces do not explain everything. Many people had several jobs, workplaces and work roles and were also involved in communicating about archaeology (with and without technology) outside work. Motivations, methods and content of communication were often separate, different or opposed to the requirements or expectations of employers and workplaces. The survey form only asked people to name one work organization and job role. Where people mentioned several this was recorded in the interview. Some people with
multiple jobs and work roles chose to focus on one, but others discussed their experiences across different work contexts or outside work and in previous employment and positions. This added depth and new information to the survey results while sometimes making it harder to classify relationships between workplaces and communication.

Gender and age of participants
Sixteen (53%) of the survey participants were male and 14 (47%) were female. The survey did not ask about age but many people said they thought age was relevant to technology use and social media. From other interview content and publicly available information it was estimated that 6 (20%) of respondents were 21-34 years old, 12 (40%) were aged 35-50 and 12 (40%) were over 50.

Teaching and communication background
Do you have any formal training or qualifications in teaching or communication (Q.13)? How much other experience of teaching or training do you have (Q.14)? These open-ended questions aimed to contextualise answers to other survey questions and to examine any obvious relationship between peoples’ educational qualifications, teaching or training experience and their aptitude for and attitude to communication. Question 14 only asked about teaching and training but three people also mentioned media and communication experience (as an ex-professional journalist, a media officer for a professional heritage association and in community radio). The data are variable, the sample very small and the questions could have been better designed. Eighteen (60%) of respondents had no formal teaching or communication qualifications. The rest had very variable qualifications and training (Table 1). Twenty one people (70%) reported significant or some experience of teaching or training others in archaeology and heritage. Nine (30%) had minimal or no experience.

Table 1. Do you have any formal training any formal training or qualifications in teaching or communication (Q.13)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Qualifications &amp; Training in Teaching or Communication</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or professional qualifications with communication component (e.g. counselling, nursing, photography, graphic design)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Postgraduate Qualifications in Education (Grad. Cert., MA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short communication skills courses (e.g. negotiation, community engagement, train the trainer)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short courses in media engagement (e.g. press releases, managing media interviews)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University PG Qualifications in Marketing and Communication (MBA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixteen people (53%) had delivered some university teaching, including five experienced university lecturers, yet only two of this group had teacher training or qualifications. Compulsory teacher training in higher education is a recent development in many countries (e.g. Mytum 2012) and research is regarded by many as more prestigious and rewarding:
"I have [qualifications] in [university] teaching. They make us do that in the USA. It wasn’t by choice. Teaching in general? Yes – oh gosh – fifteen years of teaching sadly enough (laughs).” (11-07, University Researcher and Contract Lecturer)

"I was a university lecturer for two years. A rather ill-fated career..." (11-27, Museum Researcher)

Ten survey respondents had taught volunteers, students and recent graduates in fieldwork and professional methods via vocational and in-service training programmes and internships. Six had delivered schools and public education programmes through museums and other organisations.

"I train other people on digs all the time because only [X] and I are really skilled. The others are younger ... working as archaeologists but I have to get them to do what I want them to do so they’re really training all the time." (11-08, Heritage Consultant)

"I was an Education Officer for two years at ... [a museum in the UK]. But that doesn’t really carry over into what I do now. It was more just what I did when I was ... there as digging holes paid so badly.” (11-03, Heritage Consultant)

Opinions about the value of training in communication and ‘train the trainer’ offered by employers was mixed:

"When I... [worked at X] I did a number of communication and negotiation training courses. [My current employer] has done some things but not at a great depth. [X] was much more focused on training at that level ... I’m sure I’ll do more.” (11-26, Heritage Consultant)

"No. You know – the lame courses public servants go on – ‘Effective Communication’ or ‘Influencing People’ (laughs). No. I’ve got no formal training. (SC: So you’ve done short courses when you worked inside government?). Yes but they are very tangential to that. But you could say that.” (11-19, Heritage Consultant)

Work and workplaces
Where do you work and what kind of work do you do (Q.1)? Which category best describes your main employer or work organisation (Q.2)? (Table 2). The total number of people listed exceeds 30 because some had multiple jobs or were also archaeology research students or volunteers in addition to paid work. Work roles and the types of organisations involved represented a good cross-section of those typical of Australian archaeology more generally (Ulm et. al. 2013) despite the small sample size.

Table 2. Workplaces and work roles of respondents (n=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Funding Model</th>
<th>Work Roles</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Consultancy Company</td>
<td>Private Business</td>
<td>e.g. Director, Co-Director, Principle, Senior Heritage Consultant, Field Archaeologist, Sub-Consultant, Independent Consultant etc.</td>
<td>Employee, Self-employed contractor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Government Funded</td>
<td>e.g. Lecturer (Research &amp; Teaching), Research Fellow, Project Officer, Research Student, Honorary Research Associate</td>
<td>Employee, Research Student, Volunteer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organisation</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Private Non-Profit Organisation</td>
<td>e.g. President, Newsletter Editor, Fieldwork Director etc.</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum, Property</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Government-funded and Public-Private Funded</td>
<td>Senior Collections Manager, Researcher, Archaeologist</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately how many people regularly or normally work for the organisation (Q.3)? In an average year approximately how many (or what percent) of staff or employees in your organisation are directly involved in work that involves archaeology (Q.4)? What size is your work organisation compared to others with a similar role in Australia (Q.5)? (Table 3).

The size, complexity and core business of different organisations is directly relevant to communication and digital technology use (Colley, in preparation). The size (measured by numbers of staff) of organisations where archaeologists worked varied from one person small businesses to major national and international organisations with thousands of employees. Archaeology and heritage work was only ‘core business’ in small and medium-sized organisations. In all larger organisations archaeologists were in a small minority. The information in Table 3 is only approximate. People employed by large organisations did not always know how many others worked there or what everyone did. In reply to later questions, some sole traders and small consultancy companies said they occasionally hired external staff for e.g. IT support or graphic design work. Such figures are excluded from Table 3. The numbers involved in project-based work (as staff, external contractors or volunteers) varied over time. The size of organisations (estimated by participants) could also have been measured in additional ways (e.g. annual turnover, profits or how many offices, states and offices they operated) but it was impractical to collect such information for the survey.

Table 3. Approximate number of employees of organisations in survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>No. surveyed</th>
<th>Av. staff p.a.</th>
<th>% archaeologists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Heritage Consultancy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Community Heritage Organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Community Heritage Organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-50 (varies over time)</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Heritage Consultancy Company</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>80-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Heritage Consultancy Company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c.20</td>
<td>80-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land or Heritage Management Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100s</td>
<td>1-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/Heritage Property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70-200</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Company</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100s - 1000s</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Land Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c.100</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Community Organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000s</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Environmental Consultancy Company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000+</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000s</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main focus of work?
Which of the following areas is your organisation (Q.9) and are you personally (Q.10) involved with to a significant extent (Research, Education, Heritage Conservation, Heritage Management, Travel or Tourism Industry, Entertainment, Recreation, Other (explain))?
Results from Q.9 and Q.10 were not very insightful. The questions were asked early in the survey, required ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ answers and prompted minimal comments. The sample size was too small to reflect all categories of activities across all organisations. Other survey questions provided better quality information about the work focus of individuals and organisations in relation to communication and technology use. In Table 4 information about organisations and individuals has been combined and results for ‘heritage conservation’ and ‘heritage management’ are both presented under ‘Cultural Heritage Management’. The two categories overlap and respondents found the question confusing. Types of organisation are taken from Q1.

Table 4. Main focus of work organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>CHM</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>TRA</th>
<th>REC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Consultancy Company</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Heritage Organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum, Heritage Property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Company</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land or Heritage Management Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Land Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: CHM (Cultural Heritage Management), RES (Research), EDU (Education), TRA (Travel and Tourism), REC (Recreation and Entertainment).

All respondents, except one who worked for a private educational organisation, said that they or their organisation were involved with cultural heritage management (CHM) and research (RES) to a significant extent. Answers for recreation and entertainment (REC) seem to reflect people’s perceptions of their work rather than activities involved. For example, all four volunteers working for different community heritage organisations said they did research, but none categorised any of their activities as recreation or entertainment, even though they later described running archaeological fieldwork projects and tours of local heritage places aimed at amateurs, enthusiasts and members of the wider public. In contrast, professional employees who did similar did categorise these as recreation and entertainment as well as travel and tourism and education. No one employed at a university said their work concerned recreation and entertainment or travel and tourism either. Perhaps a category called public or community engagement would have provided different results.

If your work does not involve teaching or communicating archaeology in an educational context yourself, does your organisation employ educational specialists, teachers or trainers to help you communicate archaeology with others (Q15)?

This question was considered ‘not applicable’ by 13 people (43.33%) whose own jobs involved a major teaching or communication component, or who worked for small organisations with few staff or where education was not something the organisation did. The question could have been better phrased. Several
organisations did employ education and training specialists but few of them focused on archaeology.

Three of the seven people who replied said 'Yes' to this question worked for a museum or heritage property and one worked for a large government heritage agency. Such organisations typically have education divisions and specialist staff to run public and schools education programmes, including in archaeology.

"We have an Education Officer [...] who handles a range of educational activities. They are currently looking at how [our site] can assist in training teachers in terms of the national curriculum. That's a very active part of the organization. There's also been an educational focus for some [of our other fieldwork-based programmes] designed by the educational specialist and run jointly with our archaeologists. [SC: Are they aimed at university and/or school students?]. [Programme X] was targeted at undergraduates and designed and run entirely by archaeologists. There was also a public archaeology programme and a children's archaeology programme jointly planned and run with the educational specialist." (11-02, Archaeologist, Heritage Property).

"We've got an Education Coordinator but that's not particularly training about archaeology but about the collections in general. All museums I've worked with or in have an education department or an education team. Obviously a big part of our role is to educate the public and a big part of the public for us and most museums is school children and younger people. So we couldn't do generally without education staff." (11-23, Collections Manager, Museum).

"In this museum the education officers are primarily focused on quite formal schools programmes. Schools can either come in and have contact with our education section or they can come in and do a structured programme. Our schools section is written through a collaboration with an education publisher. It's pretty Mickey Mouse stuff but it's aimed at primary school kids." (11-27, Researcher, Museum).

One respondent sometimes worked for an organisation that trains maritime archaeologists and provides public information about maritime heritage.

"We run maritime training courses - that's mostly the teaching part - between four and six weekends per year. Other communicating is often going to information evenings and doing lectures or public talks to dive clubs, historical societies and universities etc. And doing an e-newsletter and writing newsletter pieces and articles as well. So that's not an attempt at academic stuff. It's just about us getting our message out hoping that if people understand what these things are then they will value them and care for them. So a lot of the newsletter articles etc. is more general rather than technical or archaeological." (11-13, Cultural Heritage Manager, State Government Heritage Agency).

Other organisations also employed educational specialists to run training programmes relevant to company business:

"The company has its own academy to provide project management training and also on the job training." (11-26, Heritage Consultant, International Environmental Management Company).

"Not in archaeology. We do offer an archaeology training programme for Aboriginal people and as part of that [my employer] would support me doing a Cert IV or whatever those training qualifications are [though I've not yet done this]." (11-11, Cultural Heritage Manager, Mining Company).
Of the ten (30%) people who said ‘No’ to this question, two also said their organisation employed training and education specialists but not for archaeology:

"No. The culture heritage [division] within [my organisation] is pretty much the front line staff for cultural heritage management. We do have different offices who carry our different functions. One of our officers based in [Y] does do cultural heritage training for the rest of the unit and for other [company] staff but they would train them in cultural heritage management issues and [company] policies and procedures not in archaeology as such.” (11-04, Cultural Heritage Officer, Utility Company).

"No. We’ve got somebody else who works with us as the interpretation person who does tour guide training and stuff like that and he’s done work with Aboriginal groups to help them but I don’t know.” (11-06, Employee, Small to Medium Sized Heritage Consultancy Company).

**Thematic focus of archaeology and heritage projects**

The survey did not initially enquire about the regional, temporal or thematic focus of people’s work (e.g. Australian Aboriginal, colonial historical, industrial, maritime or other types of archaeology and heritage in or outside Australia). It became apparent that this information was important, so a question was included in later interviews. Many respondents had already volunteered relevant information in their interviews and missing data were obtained from company or individual websites. 21 people were primarily involved in Australian Aboriginal archaeology (mainly pre-AD 1788 prehistory), 19 people did Australian historical and industrial archaeology (mainly colonial settler sites and heritage places dated after AD 1788), three were involved in Australian maritime archaeology and four worked outside Australia on other types of heritage and archaeology. Several respondents did multiple types of archaeology and heritage.

**Workplace location**

Communication technologies potentially disrupt notions of place, space and physical location and locations (of workplaces, heritage places and people) are important to this study. The survey used the Australian state or territory to categorise location in this question.

*Q6. In which (Australian) state or territory is your main workplace located (New South Wales (NSW), Victoria (VIC), Australian Capital Territory (ACT), Queensland (QLD), South Australia (SA), Tasmania (TAS), Western Australia (WA), Northern Territory (NT) or Other (explain))?* Despite the small sample, at least one respondent was located in every major Australian state or territory. One person lived in New Zealand and some people travelled regularly overseas and/or between several states or territories. Most participants worked out of New South Wales (11, 37%) followed by Queensland (5, 18%), the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) (4, 13%), Western Australia (3, 10%), the Northern Territory (2, 7%), South Australia (2, 7%) and one each in Victoria and Tasmania. Ulm et al (2013) provide more detailed information and discussion about the relative distribution of archaeologists and related heritage practitioners across Australian states and territories.

*Where are you people you regularly communicate with about archaeology physically located (NSW, VIC, ACT, QLD, SA, TAS, WA, NT, Outside Australia, Don’t know)*
(Q.7)? If you regularly communicate about archaeology for your work with people outside Australia where are these people mainly located (Q.8)?

People did not always know the state, territory or country location of others they corresponded with online. One blogger noted they could be “Anywhere”. Twelve (40%) of respondents said they only ever communicated with other people who were physically located in Australia. As most survey respondents worked in cultural heritage management and on Australian archaeological projects this result might be expected. Eighteen people communicated internationally with people mainly located in North America, the UK and Europe, China, southeast Asia and a few other places (Colley 2013, Table 3). Some people lived and worked in one physical location but did fieldwork or collaborated with others located significant distances away including in other countries:

“Well the museum is based in [state X] but it [has some national focus] and … I work across [Australia] myself. The museum also works internationally … with exhibitions. We send stuff to [country X] .. our principal relations are with [Asia] at the moment in terms of international relations.” (11-27, Museum Researcher)

“I communicate with people around the world. But I also communicate [by phone] with X in State A, Y in State B, and I have Z … staying overnight from (a nearby state). SC: And [the state where you are located?] I communicate with colleagues [here] – A, B, C and so forth – but I avoid working in [this state].” (11-15, Heritage Consultant)

Australian cultural heritage management is primarily a state or territory responsibility. Some archaeological communication practice depends on the specifics of heritage regimes in each jurisdiction which vary. Other ways of thinking about location are important to this research. Communication and digital technology use might be very different for e.g. mining-related field survey of Indigenous places in a remote area by ‘Fly In Fly Out’ consultants compared to large open-area excavations of early colonial settlement sites in the central business district of a major city with public programmes and numerous ‘passers-by’.

“SC: Where do you live and operate? Are you in a small town … a rural or … urban area? We live on an acreage property … [near an urbanised coastal area]. SC: I should probably [have asked] where people live and how easy it is to get to be part of a community. Yes I was thinking of [heritage consultant X]. They’re way out at [Y] and that’s a very small community and they all know what everyone else is up to.” (11-17, Heritage Consultant).

Further information:
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Appendix 1. Archaeology, heritage discourses and emerging digital technologies. 2011 Interview Survey Questions.

01. Where do you work? What kind of work do you do?
02. Which category best describes your main employer or work organisation (Government, Private Business, Other explain)?
03. Approximately how many people regularly or normally work for the organisation (1-5, 6-20, 20-100, 100-500, Over 500, Other, Don’t know)?
04. In an average year approximately how many (or what percent) of staff/employees in your organisation are directly involved in work that involves archaeology?
05. What size is your work organisation compared to others with a similar role in Australia (Small, Medium, Large, Very Large, Other explain)?
06. In which state or territory is your main workplace located (NSW, VIC, ACT, QLD, SA, TAS, WA, NT, Other explain)?
07. Where are people you regularly communicate with about archaeology physically located (NSW, VIC, ACT, QLD, SA, TAS, WA, NT, Outside Australia, Don’t know)?
08. If you regularly communicate about archaeology for your work with people outside Australia where are these people mainly located?
09. Which of the following area is your organisation involved with to a significant extent (research, education, heritage conservation, heritage management, travel or tourism industry, entertainment, recreation, Other explain)?
10. Which are you personally involved with in your work to a significant extent (research, education, heritage conservation, heritage management, travel or tourism industry, entertainment, recreation, Other explain)?
11. Typically how often does your work involve communicating with people about archaeology (Frequently, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Other explain)?
12. In your work, do you or your organisation rely on media professionals (e.g. public relations & marketing professionals, media officers) to assist you communicate with people outside your organisation about archaeology? Explain briefly?
13. Do you have any formal training or qualifications in teaching or communication? Explain?
14. How much other experience of teaching or training do you have?
15. If your work does not involve teaching or communicating archaeology in an educational context yourself, does your organisation employ educational specialists, teachers or trainers to help you communicate archaeology with others? Explain briefly.
16. Have you been directly involved with professional journalists or media companies (e.g. national or commercial TV, radio, newspapers, magazines) in your work? Briefly explain?
17. Give an example of a positive experience of working with such media professionals?
18. Explain any significant challenges or difficulties you encountered?
19. To what extent does your organisation seek out people to communicate with, or do people approach the organisation?
20. If different from above, to what extent do you seek out people to communicate with, or do people approach you?
21. In broad terms, why are you and/or your organisation involved in communicating archaeology?
22. (For either your own work or that of the organisation) what kinds of content or information about archaeology are involved (generally)?
23. In your own work do you ever communicate about archaeology with any of the following? Tick any that apply.

| school students as part of formal school activities | university students for a degree programme (including research degrees)
| professionals undertaking training courses or programs | TAFE or other higher-education students as part of formal study
| adults enrolled in non-vocational continuing education courses | others enrolled as students or learners in a formal course or programme of study
| tourists as part of an organised trip or tour | independent travellers or tourists
| members of Indigenous or Aboriginal community organisations | members of community organisations (not specifically Indigenous or Aboriginal)
| volunteers | other members of the general public
| special interest groups (collectors, amateur archaeologists, archaeology societies etc.) | people who follow or believe in 'alternative' or 'unorthodox' archaeologies
| land or property owners (excluding Indigenous or Aboriginal traditional owners) | Indigenous or Aboriginal traditional owners (of land or cultural property)
| large development or resource extraction companies/organisations and their employees or contractors | medium or small development or resource extraction organisations/companies or private developers and their employees or contractors
| tourism and travel organisations /businesses | other arts or cultural organisations/ businesses
| archaeologists working in universities | archaeologists working in museums
| archaeologists working for government heritage organisations or as heritage managers in other government organisations | archaeological consultants or consultancy companies
| archaeologists working in other organisations and businesses | other professionals (e.g. architects, historians, heritage managers, scientists, lawyers, teachers)
| other private organisations | other government organisations
| Other (specify) | |

24. What kinds or groups of people do you normally or most frequently communicate with about archaeology in your work?
25. Thinking about different kinds of communication in your work, can you describe circumstances where you are the expert and your role is to educate others who know less than you about archaeology?
26. Can you describe circumstances where you communicate with other experts or professionals with similar or complementary levels of knowledge about archaeology, where the aim is to reach shared understanding?
27. Can you describe circumstances where communication involves participants with very different levels of expertise or knowledge about archaeology, and where your expertise is not fully acknowledged, understood or accepted by others?
28. How do you judge the effectiveness of your own communication(s) about archaeology? For example, how do you know that the message or information you wish to convey has been understood by the audience(s)? What does 'successful communication' mean to you?
29. If different to your own practice, how does your organisation judge the effectiveness of its communication about archaeology?
30. Explain how you use digital technologies at work to communicate archaeology? What kinds of software applications or equipment do you use and for what kinds of tasks?
31. If you need to share data or information with others what kinds of software applications or equipment do you use for what kinds of tasks?
32. Do you use social media sites (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn, blogs, wikis) as part of your work? Any comment (which ones, why, why not?).
33. What do you like about using computers & digital technologies in your work?
34. What are some challenges in using computers & digital technologies in your work?
35. How do you rate your competency in using computers & digital technologies in your work (Excellent, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Other explain)?
36. How do you obtain support or assistance with computers & digital technologies for work?
37. Anything else you would like to add? Any comments on the survey questions?