

1 11-30
2
3 Researcher, part-time university lecturer, public education professional
4
5 1. I do [several] jobs. So I do some academic work at a number of different
6 universities teaching and research. I also work for a [private tourism company
7 running adult and school educational tours outside Australia].
8
9 2. I guess it's the travel [work] but I also work for the universities. [SC So
10 government and private business].
11
12 3. The travel agency would be between [X and Y] people so not too big and of
13 course the universities are vast . (SC over 500 or something)
14
15 4. Mostly a small minority (SC - of archaeologists within the overall
16 organisations). I'm not straight forward.
17
18 5. Unis are large and the travel agency I would say is small.
19
20 6. State X
21
22 7. Well they're in Australia but they're also in [Europe] and England and America.
23 In Australia – I guess it used to be [a different state from where I'm based] but
24 not so much now. Mostly [my home state X].
25
26 8. See above.
27
28 9. Research, education, travel, tourism, a little entertainment and recreation. [SC:
29 Would you say your work in the organisation overlaps with those categories?] I
30 guess if we talk about [a major research consultancy project] I was involved in
31 heritage conservation and management and I've just had an article published so
32 I'm actively involved in that. Travel – travel or tourism, research and education.
33 It's just about everything.
34
35 11. Frequently. Definitely.
36
37 12. Well at University X there's a media office but I find the media comes to me. I
38 don't generally. Occasionally they'll send people to me but generally I get
39 requests. [SC: But your communication with the public is not mediated through a
40 public relations?] No it isn't. I'm a free agent.
41
42 13. No.
43
44 14. Of teaching I have a vast amount of experience of teaching that goes back
45 more than 20 years. And training – as in training other people – the same.
46
47 15. n/a
48

49 16. Yes. Well it happens a lot because the work I do [involves areas of
50 archaeology and cultural heritage] that are of perennial interest to the general
51 public. So I get approached by the media and my research is sometimes
52 considered to be of great interest to the media.

53
54 17. Well the positive. Each medium is slightly different. So I guess doing radio
55 interviews in a studio is often very good because you - they prepare a lot. You
56 often talk to the producer for a long time before hand so they often have a very
57 good idea about you and the kind of stories you can tell. And they will frame the
58 programme, especially if it's like for an hour, they will frame the programme
59 around your experiences and stories you have shared with the producer. So it's
60 very straight forward. It's like a good conversation and you have enough time to
61 expand on issues and because it's live to air they can't edit it - so it is what you
62 say which is good and bad, but it means that you can't be misrepresented unless
63 you misrepresent yourself. So I think that is always positive. I do think it is worth
64 mentioning the different media as they are different. So television is a much
65 more complicated medium because you have no editorial control generally and
66 they tend to edit you a lot more because it's very unusual to do live to air
67 interviews and it doesn't happen but. I've only ever done that once. Generally it's
68 for a documentary or for a news programme. And for the news they want sound
69 bites and if you aren't experienced or trained in giving sound bites your message
70 can get very mashed up so that can be really problematic. I had a very positive
71 experience working with the ABC at the (X site in Australia). [A popular science
72 show] came and they were very open - they were very aware of the sensitivity of
73 the project we were doing and they worked closely with the [state heritage
74 management agency] and we were asked to make sure that nothing bad went to
75 air, that we were allowed to see it beforehand and they were a kind of joy to
76 work with because they were interested and took a fairly intelligent approach to
77 the project. So I think that's quite important. So I think with all media it depends
78 on the individual you are working with. And also print media. Again you don't
79 have any editorial control and you don't - and it usually depends on. I have
80 worked with journalists e.g. [Journalist X] who lets you see the copy before it
81 goes to press. And if there's anything really shocking that can be removed. So
82 they're my positive experiences. [SC: This questionnaire is very broad - which I
83 realise. And the experience of the people I have interviewed is very variable. But
84 there have been a few people - you're probably one of the more experienced
85 with the media - and several people have said they have worked well with
86 particular journalists from particular organisations like you've said. And
87 someone else who also has a lot of experience was telling me they would only
88 work with one particular journalist because from experience..] You get trust and
89 it's true. That's how this particular journalist I've worked with operates - they
90 would develop a relationship with individuals and their idea was that you could
91 keep going to them. And the payback was that you would give them exclusive
92 access to anything that you did that was important. It's actually a two-way street
93 so that if they develop a relationship that is based on trust and that trust is
94 upheld then they will reap the benefits because you will give them exclusive
95 rights to anything and that can be embargoed so they can often get world
96 exclusive - well it depends on what you are doing. Yes I've certainly had very
97 positive experiences. So the people who aren't very good are usually the ones

98 who work on the wire. Well it's just about – they don't care – they are never
99 going to talk to you again.
100
101 18 – See below.
102
103 19. Both. I get approached but also the university likes to see work in the media
104 as it communicates but also sells the product. [SC: There are cases in archaeology
105 and heritage that some people are working inside an agency where their main
106 job in communicating with the public is to get a message out which is “Don't
107 destroy a site” or something whereas in other cases in a university or something
108 or where you work – it's very different.]. They just want to show the world that
109 stuff's happening and it's interesting.
110
111 21. Okay. Well the organisations they want.. I mean it's very sad... Why do I
112 communicate archaeology? Because I don't see the point in doing research if you
113 are not going to share it. And I think there's a small amount of that in the
114 organisations that I have worked for and that I work for currently. So certainly
115 for [a major heritage and research organisation I've previously worked with]
116 they want to share. Because they are government funded they want to share the
117 knowledge that they collect and share the stories because then people feel they
118 are getting some value for their money that's being spent. I think there's a bit of
119 that with the university and the university also has this unfortunate approach
120 where they want to be branded and they want to be seen as this good place to
121 come to or where there's dynamic research happening or something. So having
122 people in the media is a way of selling their product. Working for the travel
123 agency they want to show that the people who are doing their programmes have
124 some intellectual street-cred and so the more of a public profile they have, the
125 better the company looks because they sell themselves on the academic
126 standards of the staff.
127
128
129 18. Did you want a bit more on the problems of dealing with the media? [SC: Yes.
130 Depends on how much time you've got.] Because the media is really complex.
131 [SC: I'm sure it is..]. I was going to say with television there is often a conflict of
132 interest – strangely – because you might want to give a message out – but they've
133 got a story they want to tell. So if you're working like I just did with a
134 documentary team they already have a script and you are an actor – basically –
135 in that script. They don't want you to deviate from what they've written. It
136 doesn't really matter what you've found or what you've got to say and that can
137 be a really serious problem because you might not want to tell the story they
138 want to tell. It can lead to conflict and that can actually lead to the way you are
139 presented in the media that they'll cut you either to look stupid or they'll just cut
140 you out. And certainly in radio too – if you are doing a live to air radio interview
141 especially not in a studio but by phone, if you say something that they don't like
142 they'll cut you off. [SC: I'm not surprised – but thinking about that – what is your
143 role as an academic or specialist – if they've already written the script? Who has
144 written the script? And you said you are an actor – so ..]. You are – they direct
145 you. They'll ask you questions and they will keep on asking you the same
146 questions until you give an answer that they want. And it's really they will wear

147 you down if you are not very experienced. When I was talking to a colleague who
148 has done a lot of stuff with documentaries and he is very experienced and he is
149 quite good at not doing what he is told. But if you aren't (like) the presenter you
150 are not in a position to argue like that. You don't have editorial control. If you are
151 not very experienced you find yourself saying things that are exactly the
152 opposite to what you believe or your work will be presented, because you don't
153 control the editing process, your work can be presented to be diametrically the
154 opposite of what you would normally have said. So you're not.. so you actually
155 find yourself communicating a message that you don't believe in at all. That
156 could be the message you don't want to give. So you could naively become
157 involved with a project believing you are doing good and you are sharing
158 knowledge and suddenly you are saying something quite different. So I think
159 they are the really big pitfalls and I think one of the biggest pitfalls is that we are
160 not trained to deal with it. And you usually don't find out about it until you see it
161 on television. [SC: This is a huge topic... I think as academics – and with changes
162 in the media and with new technologies – I think these things are becoming
163 much more apparent as the media landscape shifts. Before the only way to get
164 yourself on a moving image in public has been to work with a professional and
165 now the whole thing is shifting so much..]. You can potentially. I wonder how
166 many people – apart from the one person we were talking about the other day –
167 how many people do put themselves out there? Most people are either – you
168 know if they're our age – they might not think of it or they're too busy – but the
169 potential is there to spread your own message. But my experience of smart
170 audiences – as I get them on the trips – is that they will watch documentaries
171 that I consider to be rubbish and they'll take it in as gospel which I find really
172 interesting. I think it's still that thing – if it's on TV and especially if it's got the
173 monika of the BBC or something it's true..

174

175 23. See sheet.

176

177 24. Schools, university students and interested adults – like adult education and
178 includes the travel and I do general lectures. I do a lot of outreach I guess.

179

180 25. That's often the case. That's very common. I do it with school kids. I teach at
181 uni. On my trips I do that with adults so I suppose that would be the majority of
182 my communication.

183

184 26. Yes of course. So any project I'm working on or when you are at a conference
185 or. fieldwork, conferences, I'm doing collaborations with others so...

186

187 27. Yes. I've had a lot of that experience with [a major Australian research and
188 consultancy project] [11-30 explains background and issues]. [SC: So other
189 professionals would not accept your expertise?]. Yes and they tried publicly to
190 question it – but that's a personal problem I think. [SC: That is the case and I
191 think it's also partly because archaeology is not an accredited profession and
192 people can disagree with each other. If you were all registered as professionals
193 they couldn't dismiss your knowledge like that]. With a PhD in that area you
194 would have thought that would count as accreditation surely? [SC: I'm not sure. I
195 think there's an issue if you were a lawyer or a medical doctor there's a broader

196 professional body that's accrediting you.]. I'd say generally with my [expertise in
197 Topics A and B] I don't get questioned. I'm usually accepted. However with the
198 [Project X] stuff which is historical archaeology that is much more problematic
199 for a large number of people and professionals in other fields – especially with
200 Project X. [Some people] see themselves as scientists [and] they can't see the
201 scientific value of historical archaeology. They can't see the point of it. And they
202 can't see why you would be studying stuff that is that recent. And I'd say that it
203 often isn't accepted in the knowledge – everything – every level there is
204 questioning and non-acceptance and so I really do want to make that point. So
205 generally I would say I'm accepted in my field with [Topics A and B] so I don't
206 think anyone really questions me on that. However, with historical archaeology
207 with my experience [...] there's quite a lot of disbelief, questioning, questioning
208 whether it's valid on any level and I think that there's actually something that's
209 almost – there an almost – how can you say? – there's some level of nastiness
210 sometimes because I've been on projects where we've had funding and some of
211 the people in the other sciences feel that archaeology is not a real discipline. That
212 historical archaeology is not a real discipline and that we shouldn't have the
213 funding. [SC: Just on that – that's a very specific context. Do you think that the
214 objection to the archaeology is about archaeology per se or would people
215 disagree with studying history and the past in general? I mean do they think that
216 [studying] history is not important? The human history? Or – do you know what
217 I mean?]. I think they accept the history – I know this is quite specific but it's
218 been – there's been genuine antagonism and I've experienced it a lot –
219 particularly more with professionals than others. But a lot of people – and you
220 know I've done heritage travel – so I've dealt with a wide audience – there's
221 some sort of disbelief that it's a valid subject. And one of the arguments is that
222 well it is historically so well-documented why would you look at the
223 archaeology? [SC: So it's about – that's quite a common publicly stated
224 perception about Australian archaeology..]. You're always having to defend it.
225 [For example I was involved on a similar project] where there was open hostility
226 and people constantly questioning – especially the heritage architect –
227 questioning why... [SC: Heritage architect? [Laughs..]]. It's always heritage
228 architects. I don't know why. They don't like it and they think that we're just
229 interested in bits of peeling tile paper or something. They don't see the big
230 issues. They don't understand what the value is. They think it's a waste of
231 resources. [SC: I think there's so many different arguments under that. I think it's
232 a bit of a side issue..] I have [frequently] had to defend [doing] archaeology [in
233 certain types of my projects]. [SC: But there is a problem about historical
234 archaeology in Australia with heritage architects and some of that is because the
235 vast majority of historical archaeology is done by consultants in the industry and
236 many heritage architects work in the industry. And some [develop a distorted
237 and negative opinion of historical archaeology more generally] from their
238 contact with some sub-standard historical archaeology consultancy projects
239 conducted by some archaeologists who are poorly trained, cut-corners and can
240 get away with low quality work due to the circumstances of the industry]. I think
241 that's one element of it. I think another one is that people see – and I suppose
242 Project X is a special case – as it's so expensive and it's a waste of resources that
243 maybe could be spent on something better because they perceive there is
244 nothing that archaeology can add to the historical knowledge. But they see the

245 history as very important [especially for heritage places that to some people
246 have come to be regarded as 'sacred' to Australian history and national identity].
247 [SC: Exactly and the architecture or standing physical remains are seen as
248 obviously important. I think we should move on as that's really a side issue but
249 it's an interesting one as if you are trying to communicate archaeology where
250 you are talking to the converted or people accept your expertise – that's a
251 different challenge to if you are not accepted or in a public forum. I've had that
252 with people [I've already interviewed] working in the industry with mining
253 companies or working with Aboriginal people.]. Yes and they think that it's a
254 waste of time. As an antidote to that [I was involved in making an educational
255 video about one of those places] and that was actually quite powerful [in
256 changing some people's opinions about the value of archaeology].
257

258 28. Well [Project Z] would be a good one as that's such a challenge. And I guess
259 it's getting people who are visiting [place X] [not to cause damage to heritage
260 items by not understanding or valuing their significance]. So I guess by the level
261 of compliance when they start to see what the value of it is – then you have
262 communicated effectively. And I guess when I was working at [place Y where
263 there was a lot of potential misunderstanding and possible hostility to an
264 important historical place being excavated ahead of a major development
265 project] and I got to meet some [community stakeholders] and I explained what I
266 was doing and why. And I guess the nicest response I got was [from some people
267 who had a strong personal and family connection with the place and who felt
268 strongly about the history]. They said 'When we were asked to approve this
269 [work on the place] we felt we couldn't fight against [such a big development
270 company] so we didn't object but we really weren't very happy. But now we see
271 what you are doing we feel quite good about it. So I guess they would be a few
272 measures. It's a bit hard to tell really.
273

274 29. Well – I guess it's student evaluations and with the travel it's evaluations.
275

276 30. Well we did [an online distance learning course] so I've used it as a teaching
277 tool and also worked with [a government department] to develop an interactive
278 online database of [heritage information] which was designed to communicate
279 with the general public, people doing research, students if they were interested
280 and also as a heritage management tool.
281

282 31. Well of course having the database is very easy – you just share the URL. I
283 know that with Y (research colleague) we use Dropbox a lot. And USB sticks or
284 email attachments – they'd be the main [laughs]. And I do share information a
285 lot. You know publications are usually sent by email.
286

287 32. Not really but I told you I do follow this one blog. And I have got the capacity
288 to submit the information – I've just never taken it up. [SC: Any comments? Why
289 don't you use social media?] I guess because I deal so much with students I'm a
290 bit leery about using Facebook. I've heard of LinkedIn but I've no idea how to use
291 it [laughs]. I keep getting people asking me to be linked up with them and I'm
292 actually clueless. I can't remember my password and I signed in years ago and I
293 get those useless messages all the time about 'So and so is now connected with

294 so and so'. I don't know who they are and I don't care [laughs] in the main
295 headlines and I wonder why I'm there. And I did once – I was invited to join [a
296 customised social media site for a big project I was working on] and I found I was
297 getting – it would send me emails saying 'Someone wants to talk to you' on this
298 site. And you'd have to log in – it would take hours – and you would discover it
299 was some student wanting you to help them with their research or something –
300 it was very time consuming and irritating so I actually started ignoring it and I
301 think I must have fallen off it . So I haven't done it for years. So that's the reason I
302 don't do that.

303

304 33. Well most of my colleagues are on the other side of the planet so I can
305 communicate with them no matter where I am. I can communicate with my
306 colleagues all the time. It means I can conduct research and share information
307 across the globe which is fantastic.

308

309 34. Things fall over all the time. You put stuff onto this database and it falls off.
310 Somebody resets it and it disappears. You scan things and they are supposed to
311 go into bibliographies and somebody switches them off or they fall off. Having
312 them maintained is always a problem. If the person who sets it up goes to
313 another organisation then it can fall over. You need people who are constantly
314 interested. In fact that site – that web page – the person who has been most
315 interested in keeping it going has just retired from [the government department]
316 and it will be very interesting to see if it is still there in six months. So I think the
317 problem with a database or an interactive site is you need someone to constantly
318 maintain it whereas with a book you publish it and it's there. I mean the copies
319 can disappear but potentially it's physically there. I think with things that are
320 online there's a potential to lose them if there's no one looking after them and I
321 guess that's something that really hasn't been addressed because a lot of these
322 things are still quite new.

323

324 35. Depends on the stuff – I guess average.

325

326 36. IT support at the uni and friends with more knowledge than me. Which is –
327 should probably be the other way round.