

Appendix I

Maritime Archaeology Trust Group Interview

Q1

Danielle Newman: We are going to start by talking about the uniqueness of the maritime context in terms of engagement. Broadly speaking, do you guys feel that that the broadness of access issues, so things like physical, intellectual and cultural, dictate how maritime heritage programming is designed?

Stephen Fisher: Yes (general laughter).

DN: Would you like to expand?

SF: The challenges for maritime archaeology and maritime heritage over every other form of heritage are quite unique and fundamentally difficult. The prime one being the access, and that has to dictate how you construct the provision of access and the programming. Because a lot of the time it's not accessible, unlike on a standard land-based site where you can see it. You can navigate around it in many instances and in a lot of cases it's still there. In maritime that's often completely different and so it has to change fundamentally how you programme and what changes you make, how anything you do is done.

Jasmine Noble-Shelley: The other problem with that is not just on the physical level but also on the intellectual level, it's not really covered in schools or something like that. From just that intellectual access point of view there is less background knowledge, I think. It's not easy for people to just step into it.

SF: And that impacts on people when they are being presented with it, with material or whatever evidence you are giving them, because they are not as informed, as Jasmine says. And so they lack the ability to appreciate things in quite the same way as they would other things that they are more aware of, like modern history. All the children have learned about the Second World War in school, and they are aware and can appreciate that. Stonehenge, those sorts of things. But if they are presented with, and told, that there is archaeology and heritage under the water they don't necessarily appreciate or care. There is a mistaken believe or understanding by the general public that stuff that is underwater is not there anymore and doesn't exist in the same way, that a ship that has been sunk doesn't exist anymore. And it's trying to cross that boundary of people that I think has to dictate how we provide a different form of access.

JNS: I think it means that we put in a lot more background that we might not, otherwise. So, for example, in a lot of our school sessions our opening introduction is ten minutes on, broadly, what is a maritime archaeologist, what is maritime archaeology, what do we do that's different from land archaeology. Obviously it depends on the age level, but we go into what equipment we use and all that sort of technical thing. Which obviously isn't as necessary if we are going a land site, you probably don't need quite so much background.

Jose-Oscar Encuentra: I do not think I can add anything to that! *general laughter*

Q2

DN: Do you believe that access to general maritime heritage is being or could be provided at the same level as terrestrial heritage?

SF: No and no.

JNS: Yeah, I would agree. Simply because the infrastructure for it just isn't there at the moment. Like I said, the background information isn't there in schools, you don't learn as much...it just isn't there.

SF: I think it could be improved, certainly over the level it is currently at, but I don't think...for the reasons we've just outlined, actually, it could ever be on the same level as terrestrial heritage. I think the provision of access issue is too big to deal with. I think even if you overcame the cultural and intellectual issues, and people did start to perceive maritime heritage in a different sort of way, that it's still in existence in some form accessible, the lack of access for the general public would always remain a significant barrier that would prevent maritime heritage being delivered to the same level as terrestrial.

JOE: Well, I don't totally agree with you! I agree that the main difference is the actual access to the site. That means for underwater sites it's quite complicated to have the same access as the terrestrial one. But, it also depends on the budget of the project. The technology today allows you to have the same access, the problem is that the technology is much more expensive in underwater than for terrestrial. In terrestrial, you can have easy and budget access for any type of public. In underwater, you have limited access if you use the same budget. If you increase the budget, you can actually reach the site itself! But it has to be a virtually unlimited budget. So if we are playing by the same rules of budget, I agree. But this doesn't mean that there is a difference between access potential for both, the problem is that the resources you need are not the same. But, technically possible. Yes.

SF: Oscar does have a good point there! Looking down your list of questions, I see you have one on Blue Sky Thinking and mitigating issues and when I saw that my first thought was budget. So yes, if there was an unlimited budget you could probably deliver maritime and underwater heritage at the same level as terrestrial, but I think the budgets you are talking about are so huge....

JOE: Impossible!! *general laughter*

SF: Exactly! The chances in my lifetime of things being equivalent are pretty much nil.

Q3

DN: What do you think is the effect on perception of the public's fascination with treasure hunting?

JNS: I actually think that sometimes it's a good thing.

SF: It's a gateway.

JNS: Exactly. It's a gateway. It draws people in. People come over when we are on the maritime bus and sometimes the first question is "Oh, do you find treasure?". And obviously we explain to them that it's not about the treasure, it's about the heritage, but in a certain respect it does get them to come over. It's not a good thing, overall, but it's a gateway for people who would otherwise not come and see us.

SF: It's a two-edged sword, the whole treasure hunting thing, because something I think that archaeology, particularly maritime archaeology, does itself and injustice by veering away from treasure and this constant need to claim that it's not treasure. "We don't go treasure hunting", "There is no treasure underwater" etc. Whereas on terrestrial, that doesn't seem to be quite the same problem. In fact, there are treasure laws with regard to terrestrial archaeology where things people find can be declared treasure. The word is used quite freely and has a specific definition. They seem to avoid that completely, whereas in maritime archaeology there is this fear that we would then return to the days of pirates and sunken treasure, with galleys of gold and silver. And sometimes I think it's a bit of a pity, because treasure, like we've said, is the gateway that gets many people interested. Particularly children. But also a lot of the stuff that does come up is actually, by definition, treasure. Now, it's not good that you get treasure hunters and that's the same on terrestrial sites, with nighthawking and people just going in. But these are issues that are being confronted and people are entering into a dialogue. Whereas with maritime archaeology, it seems to be a blunt "This is not treasure. Full stop. This is a form a cultural heritage." Whereas, in fact, a lot of stuff that is being brought up by various groups is in fact gold and silver and treasure. Lots of things have been brought up from shipwrecks that meet the definition of treasure. So I think we shouldn't be afraid of using the word and we need to put treasure into the correct context for the public. It's not treasure hunting, but treasure is one of the things that comes up in the other artefacts that come up on a maritime site.

JNS: I think it's also useful because we can use it to broaden the definition of treasure so it's not just coins of whatever. But use it to show people that it's something precious, something rare. Something can be valuable in a physical sense, but also by the knowledge it provides. It's precious because it's a rare resource and if you start with a concept that is known, like treasure, you can then expand into something that is broader and a bit more unknown and explain it in terms that people are a bit more familiar with. So I agree with Stephen that maybe treasure should be used a little more often.

JOE: Well, I'm going to be a bit more philosophical. So I agree with Jasmine in the way that society works, for us the appeal of treasure makes us more approachable. People think that we have treasure and are treasure hunters, because for most of society maritime archaeologists are treasure hunters. Little by little, this is changing but not as fast we would

like. I agree as well, with Steve, that the problem is with that use of the word treasure. At the end, everything comes from the society that we've got and are working with, so it's more appealing...documentary TV with treasure hunters. The adventures and the shipwrecks and they dive and they find gold and that puts people in front of the screen. Until recently, maritime archaeologists have been hidden away in academia, in this different world that is away from other people, with the idea that we are right and they are wrong. Ok, they are wrong, but they are in the real world. In academia we are in our ghetto, when the appealing thing is to be maritime archaeologists and the adventure is to be maritime archaeologists and the science is to be maritime archaeologists. And all of this is good! So we are not using the correct things and the problem is that we were in our comfortable place in academia and we say "Oh no no no, they are wrong" but we let them do things. Society today works with marketing and PR, all these things that sometimes are not good. But people don't care. If something is said on TV a thousand times that's the thing that is true. It doesn't matter what reality is.

Q4

DN: What do you guys believe is the most effective way to change public perception through engagement? Or even, is engagement the best way?

SF: Is there something in particular you think we'd want to change about that perception?

DN: Effectively, I'm looking at what the public's perception is right now, what they come up to you thinking, and how you would go about ensuring that they leave with the messages you want them to leave with. What the most effective way of doing that is.

JNS: I definitely think that engagement is one of the most effective ways, because we are there and because we are face to face with them we can more easily adapt to their preconceptions and questions then, say, something in a museum or on TV. They might come away from a museum or TV show with questions but they can ask us those directly, and if they have a preconception we can work with them to change that based on their needs. If they don't understand something, we can work with them on that. And that's something I don't think they get with more academic interactions with maritime archaeology.

JOE: I agree with that. It's important to go where people are, and to approach them in their own language. Not to expect people to reach an academic level. It's not necessary, and we can explain things in words that they will understand.

Q5

DN: What do you think the most effective way to engage is?

SF: I'm going to be biased to myself (general laughter). I have tended to find that the more formal the engagement the better. If you think of engagement on a scale with formal being lectures, universities, textbooks all the way through to what the Maritime Bus does with unexpected people coming up with no pre-conceptions. And I mean unexpected people

coming up because they are expecting to learn anything! They've come out to attend a fate or something and then they are suddenly confronted with maritime archaeology. They aren't expecting to do that, whereas a student in a lecture hall is hopefully prepped to learn that day. If you think on that scale where you have the full on formal and then the more casual drop in learner I think that closer to the formal end, for me, tend to create more change. Now I'm not saying that the less formal is ineffective in any way, and I'm particularly aware that I've got three people who have run the bus sat across from me, but I think the level of change that you get is very shallow and I could use National Trust terms here. They have pond dipper, for people who are just ever so slightly engaging with something, and then you have the full on diver or swimmer who is super involved. I tend to think that the more formal it is, the most captive an audience you have. The more engagement and change you are likely to get, and that's why I find talks to be particularly successful. And when I go and deliver talks to an audience who has foolishly invited me along to talk, they are the ones I tend to see who have taken the most on board and have changed their views. And that's not just recently, that has been my experience for the last twelve years that I've been delivering education in one form or another.

Q6

DN: Do you think that has to do with the scale of the message, in some ways? That, in fact, if you are trying to get a very basic message across as opposed to a more complex one that the one way is still better?

SF: The more time that you have to deliver a complex message, the better. If it is a very straightforward message then anything can work.

JNS: I agree with you, for the types of audiences that you deal with on a regular basis, but formal talks just don't work so well for children.

SF: I know, I know. And I appreciate that. But I just don't think that children get the same amount of perceptual change regardless of the type of engagement that you do with them. Again, that depends on the subject that you are trying to get across to them.

JNS: It depends on the subject, the environment and the audience. I think that audience is the key thing here, in that there is never going to be one type of engagement that is going to suit every audience. Talks much better suit the adults....

SF: Oh yes, I totally agree!

JNS:....and the kind of stealth education that we do much better suits the children. The bus is much more suited to children because they come on and...

SF: See, I found school workshops better for the PATH project, which I know isn't maritime archaeology, but a 90 minute structured session teaching people about rights of way and how to interpret historic maps worked much better when I used the bus for PATH outreach,

with PATH banners and posters set up on the bus. I could tell people about it, I could show people maps, but that message wasn't really getting across because a) there wasn't time to communicate it and b) I didn't have the captive audience for the 90 minutes. For that particular project, the key aims were a bit more detailed and required a bit more time...

JNS: but your message suits that kind of Engagement. Where are some of the simple messages the type of messages that we would try and get a cross on the bus are things like "what is maritime archaeology"? Or", for example, something like "how many wrecks are out there?" which at work Bitesize messages. When you have a that you were trying to get a cross like on your project versus smaller bite size ones you don't really want to put these into a massive lecture for children. If they are smaller chunks of knowledge, if that makes sense.

JOE: Yes I think both are correct because actually I don't see that as a specific we must choose one kind of way of delivering the activities I think that this is a process and both are right because at the Beginning people don't know absolutely anything and they are not motivated at all it's kind of a "what's that it looks kinda nice" things that you see on the bus. And then you go "so this exists" and they go "oh that's fun". And then in a second Step you go to a school with motivated children who are motivated because they know a bit about what this is about then you can go more deep which is the same with the talks. So I think that that we can't say one activity is deeper than another one but this is a process and it's a process that begins depending on the public. If the public is very engaged with geography or with history than that is going to work with Steve going into the classroom with maps etc. And we are going to be very successful with them because we can start at the middle of the process. But if this middle step hasn't been achieved then we have to start from the beginning and this beginning is with simple things and just to let, to transmit the people that this is interesting. So I think you need to respect this process and how it works.

SF: I'd like to clarify that I wouldn't put children in a lecture Hall. My point is that on the spectrum of formal vs pond dipper, I would put a school workshop and it took for adults on roughly the same level. And I think that you need, from my experience, a degree of formality and things work better. And I think that refers back to using the word treasure and to change the perception of people. The more time in the more captive your audience then the more structured you can do that, be it I talk I've 90 minutes if that's the only 90 minutes you're going to get with people in their lives to understanding what maritime archaeology is. That's enough to convert them.

JNS: It's always going to be a bit different for talks. Talk to your audience wants to be there, they are there to learn as you said. School workshops they are there to learn technically but you always end up with a class of kids that vary so much in their interests and their level of interest. I think we do a good job, when we go into a school, with doing something different. So their attention is focused on that not necessarily because they want to learn about archaeology but because we are something different. So I put talks on one end but schools before it sort of in the middle and then down to pond dippers at the bus. So not necessarily formal and schools at the same level but...

SF: Yeah I would put school workshops somewhere in the middle.

DN: I'll get you guys to draw an illustration to go into my PhD.

SF: There might be blood splatter...

Q7

DN: How do you guys think the messages delivered by public engagement are being perceived?

SF: received or perceived?

DN: perceived first

SF: Oh god. I struggle sometimes to believe that some of the things that I see in terms of archaeology being delivered to the public and I often think that sometimes the public must think we're a bunch of idiots. Sometimes the way archaeology is portrayed is absolutely ridiculous. And I'm thinking, in particular, or something I saw this morning in the Independent on Lawrence of Arabia.

Q8

DN: Leaving aside the media, I'm talking specifically about engagement programs being led by archaeologists and how the messages are being received by activities such as the bus. If you think they're effective? And if the messages you are saying are actually getting through to people.

SF: So the ones we can predict they're working on?

DN: Yeah but you can think broadly of past projects, but this is just your opinion.

JOE: I think the message is delivered but we have to remember that we don't live in a bubble we live in the same world with other messages. So I think what we are saying works well when we were in the bus, but then they return to the real world and go back home and switch on the TV and see an amazing program about treasure hunters which tells them how cool treasure Hunting is. So we have spent an hour maybe 20 minutes with them and with us they went " yes yes it's very important the protection of shipwrecks and it's a pity that our history is getting salvaged" but it's two people talking for 20 minutes to a person. And then when they get to the real world they are being bombarded with all of the cool things and that's a very complicated thing.

JNS: I think as Oscar says we can see the immediate effect right there and then of how it's perceived. I think a lot of feedback that we get is generally very good and people are very interested. In the immediate and short term it goes across very well. But it's almost impossible to gauge what long term effects this has. Sometimes with schools it's a bit easier if we get repeat bookings and that kind of thing. But again, that's difficult to gauge if that's a reflection on us as educators or the subject matter or whatever. So it's really hard to see and a kind of long term changes in the public unless they are especially keen and sometimes

we do. With me talking to a child who is really interested in going into archaeology we can inspire and provide something for them or we have a member of the public that comes back in volunteers with us, that impact that we can see. We can see how they've received our message but otherwise a lot of these are very fleeting interactions. We often don't see the public again because there are lots of people in the world.

Q9

DN: Do you think we are wasting our time?

Everyone: No no no no.

JNS: If we can do any positive impact in just 10 minutes of us showing them something they didn't know before or getting them enthusiastic or letting them hold a hand axe. Even 10 minutes of that is worth doing.

SF: I think like I said if we can have 90 minutes of people's time to actually think about the issues that we put across then we can usually do a sufficient job. Even if that's the only 90 minutes that they ever dedicate to the subject in their entire lives we can usually at least educate them enough for them to form an opinion that is more in line with what we would like them to think. Because either they had the wrong preconceptions or they had no preconceptions all. I think it might be a little bit easier for me to judge how these things are being perceived because I work with adults a lot more. And I don't want to sound big-headed but I get a lot of positive feedback, people come up to me after talks and talk about the things I've told them. I think that's because, certainly for the Forgotten Wrecks Project, my talk is very much intended to talk about a very broad project the first world war at sea and then focus down to our project and our study area. Significance of our project is created by everything I have told them before and people, almost without exception, come away from my talk having learnt a lot. They learn about things that they had never thought about before and appreciate their significance. I get quite a lot of repeat bookings and quite a lot of thanks and praise from the people I've spoken to. Like Oscar, says it's impossible for me to judge what they all do with that information. They probably go off and by their next meeting they have completely forgotten what I have told them about as a collective. But I think as individuals, when I talk to these people as a group and see their faces as I give them certain facts and statistics, even if they don't remember that precise detail I think they will remember what that talk made them think at the time. And that will give them a new attitude even if they don't remember all of the fact that I've bombarded them with. They will hopefully have a different perception, and I think it works in the vast majority of cases. Like I said I work with adults and they are certainly easier to educate are there more likely to remember these things.

Q10

DN: What do you think when you hear the term heritage models?

SF: I usually think of people who have designed certain models for certain projects that they have tried to get everything else to get into. And I think there are too many people who have

too few heritage models that they think that every type of heritage can fit into. So they try and create this best-fit scenario and it doesn't work. Well, it does work some of the time but as with everything you cannot fit every type of heritage into a narrow group of different models.

JNS: I don't know, it's one of these terms that I think. To be honest I've never really heard it before outside of this context and it strikes me as one of those terms that you used to justify things you are doing already.

JOE: I know I should read a lot about this but I don't tell I have no idea.

Q11

DN: Keeping all of this in mind I'm going to change the next question little bit. Do you think there is a place for models in heritage engagement? Theoretical models in particular.

JNS: It depends what theoretical models you are looking at. If you are thinking about models of learning then yes. But not always because I think what you have to be is really flexible. A lot of the time a model isn't really going to cover all of your bases.

JOE: Well I am pretty sure that they are used, but I don't know which ones are current for heritage and which are studied in academia.

Q12

DN: Also what about theory in general? Heritage theory... do you read it or is it something that just passes you by due to the nature of your work?

JOE: Well I have read some at university and so as a basis to build on. But it's true that we don't have time to do these sorts of things.

SF: Most model in theory that I read about nowadays is restricted to military strategy. One thing I do know this reading that though is that there is always an attempt pigeonhole things into various different models and theories and it just doesn't always work because, like I said, you can't always fit every different possibility. I imagine it's the same within heritage models, you just can't fit everything into these different constructs.

DN: It's interesting because it goes back to what you were talking about earlier when we talked about the differences between engagement in the real world and how the real world is messy. And just so you guys remember there are no right or wrong answers for any of these questions. This is just to help establish the difference between the theory and the practice.

JNS: I think that on that note the only theory that I bring into it is much more learning in education theory that I got from my university in my dissertation work. It's not something that I did professionally in that it's not something that comes from my job. My master's made me more interested in it and I would like to try applying some of that more to what's

happening at work. But that's a completely different source and it's not something that's comes from my professional life.

Q13

DN: So what about things like educational theories, things like a pedagogy?

JNS: Yeah so things like mechanisms of learning and why they work and how we can apply that within what we do and the learning environment we provide. Be that a talk or the bus or school session. So where are the actual mechanisms of that and less to do with maritime archaeology. Not even specifically heritage just generally ideas that I'd like to start including more.

Q14

DN: That neatly leads on to how do you go about designing various engagement bits?

SF: I always start with a completely clean slate. I don't necessarily try and construct and new initiatives or education plan from pre-existing ones. I use the subject matter as the guide rather than taking different aspects and forms of education and interpretation and trying to apply them to what I'm teaching. I start with the subject matter first. I know that other people will do it completely the other way around, and will take different ways of engagement and workshop them and put them to the subject matter.

JNS: I think for us it's much more of a brainstorming activity. We have certain set sessions that we used but we also have the ability to create bespoke sessions depending on what people want. When we sit down to decide what we are actually going to include in a particular session it's much more of a free brainstorming activity. We tend to have bookends to the session, but we think and brainstorm about what is going to be in the middle. It's much more open flow of ideas and concepts.

JOE: It's as Jasmine says I cannot add anything else.

SF: I have worked on projects that have been redesigned that I have come into at a later stage that have all of the different forms of education and engagement programmed into them. And in many instances, I can see where ideas have just been recycled and reused and applied to the latest subject matter. I'm not that keen on that a lot of the time because I think sometimes this can end up representing almost hackneyed initiatives. There isn't necessarily anything new being developed. Each different subject matter and each different project represents an opportunity to develop or at least try new ideas or create new ideas for engagement.

JNS: And that creation can be very difficult if you are doing it in isolation, I guess. As a Trust and as individuals without too much interaction or flow between other organisations and other people I suppose...

SF: But a lot of the time that will give you freedom to actually experiment as well if you're not actually constrained by other groups or organisations opinions and input. That is when you have the opportunity to experiment more because you don't have people who are trying to give you those preconceived ideas.

JNS: Yeah I meant more like coming up with the ideas in the first place kind of thing.

Q15

DN: Could you talk to me about how the practicalities of public engagement, specifically things like target audiences funding and staffing. But also things like national interest and national priorities 4 heritage are affecting the aims and delivery of your...

JNS & SF: Massively, massively, massively.

SF: You have that on multiple levels. Right now, we are in the middle of the first world war centenary and so there are hundreds if not thousands of first world war projects being undertaken at the moment. That is where there are lots of opportunities for funding because there are more funding pots specifically for this centenary. And that of course affect what people will come up with as ideas for heritage engagement. They will look at the opportunities that are presented in terms of the funding available. So there are national all the way down to local, for various sized projects. It's funding but it's also, and I hesitate to use the word, the benefits of carrying out this work during the centenary. There is a higher level of public interest partly because of all of these projects but also because of the media and the number of documentaries on TV. It's well known that it's the centenary of the First World War and now is a good time to carry out a project on that subject matter. This is the height of public interest and understanding about the subject. But I think the people who are then trying to create projects and reach the public the funding is also a mass of element to why they are doing the project.

JNS: But the funding filters down doesn't it? To everything from what resources you have available to deliver your session to how many members of staff can go along to it. It affects everything from what projects you do to what you can offer there and then in the session, which can be a problem sometimes.

JOE: The kind of organisation that we are working in, the practicalities affects everything. We work on every detail of this, national interest which affects the funding which filters down to staffing and everything. It changes how we deliver everything.

Q16

DN: I'm quite interested in what you guys think about legacy of projects in the current situation and how you guys think all of these practicalities are affecting legacy. And I know you're not a huge fan of reusing projects, but I know there are often very good projects that due to the nature of funding can't happen again. Some people have said that it's like having to reinvent the wheel every time that you apply for things and I was wondering if you have any thoughts on that idea?

JNS: It can be really difficult because it depends on the project. So the project that spawned the bus has obviously had a massive impact on it's legacy, because even though the project has been finished for years the bus is still being used. It is still a pretty essential resource to us which is great. But perhaps there are other projects that the Trust has done that haven't really had any legacy that I am aware of it all.

SF: The problem is how you define legacy. Because the bus is actually a capital resource that was purchased by the Trust, and the idea of the Engaging New Audiences Project. The legacy of that was that more people in more groups and minorities that would not necessarily engage with maritime archaeology would become engaged. I wouldn't judge the success of that project based on the fact that the bus is still around.

JNS: no no no...

SF:.... But I wonder how you would measure the success of that project now 5 years on? And whether that legacy can indeed even be measured. And like I said it is always a difficult thing because it's hard to see what has been left by a project and sometimes it's almost a shame that the project has finished because there is always the opportunity for it to expand and put the carry on further but every project has to eventually end. What is left as a resource for the public in general is what defines it's legacy. I'm hoping that the Forgotten Wrecks Project, that it's the defining Legacy it's going to be the portal. Because after the project is finished, after the 4 years are done, and all the talks and school sessions and maritime bus visits have been finished the portal will be the one major resource that will still be there. And hopefully we'll show the world all the research that we've done and all the resources that have been developed. How many people will use that? I don't know it might be that it becomes the domain of academics and people who want all of that minute detail on some of the vessels. Whether it becomes a really public resource, that members of the public casually use, only time will tell. And I think it will be hard to gauge that because you need to measure that when the project ends and then 5 years later and then 20 years later.

JNS: I think it's so difficult sometimes because once a project becomes part of a legacy all of the advertisement for it and things like that isn't there anymore. So it just sort of.... When no one is talking about it, tweeting about it, or whatever they are doing to promote it does it just fade into obscurity? What happened to it? This is the thing.

DN: It's quite similar to a wreck isn't it?

JOE: Actually all of the projects have this kind of end with legacy. You start a project and say well what do you propose for legacy? And you design the nice project for legacy but the project is finished. Who is checking it? If the project is finished there is no money for anyone to check anything. The legacy is a thing that you can't evaluate, because you don't have money to pay for someone to evaluate it. And then, if you are going to do this for free that's fine so you can do it in your own time. But in the Trust we work for one project and when that Project has finished and the money is finished you start working for the next project that is paying your salary. So the other project stays there in a kind of limbo. So we

have the legacy and if someone says" oh I have seen this website that's awesome" and you are very happy but actually you can't control or keep a record of this legacy.

SF: It's difficult to define what the legacy actually is. In some ways, Jasmine is right and the bus is a legacy. But it's not the legacy that people would instantly think of. But then if you think of the Olympics, on the grander scale, but still the legacy that they left are all of the sports facilities. And that is a legacy. And sometimes, I suppose, for maritime heritage it can be very difficult to define what the legacy actually is. So if you take a pure maritime archaeology project, could you call the Mary Rose a legacy? The Mary Rose Museum a legacy from the project to raise the ship? It seems very difficult to describe it that way. To call a really cool museum a legacy because it is its own project. But in the sense the actual wreck itself is the legacy, the dream to raise it back in the 80s.

DN: It all gets very meta doesn't it?

Steve: Yeah, it's very difficult to conceive what legacy automatically is and I suppose it will be different for every project but in answer to your question....* general laughter*

Q17

DN: I'm enjoying this conversation so much I'm good asking other question that's not on here. HLF funding lasts for between 2 and 5 years? And I think everyone agrees that they are one of the primary funders of maritime heritage engagement programming. Do you think that the time restraints that they have on projects breeds innovation to create new projects or does it restrict them?

SF: I think a bit of both. I think people have to be innovative to find ways of accessing the funding. But at the same time the limitations that they put on the project design with HLF funding restricts you.

JNS: Yes I agree.

Q18

DN: How do you evaluate your engagement initiatives?

SF: Within the trust and the project that we are currently involved in there is a system of evaluative forms that range from statistical, so looking at the number of volunteers and the number of members of the public engaged with. But then there is also qualitative evaluation which we, well I wouldn't say that there is a set pattern, for us to judge that it is more the results of discussions after the event and how we feel went. I don't think there are easy ways to record that anyway and I'm not sure we would necessarily try.

JNS: We do gauge how that's going on.

SF: It does give you an idea.

Q19

DN: What makes engagement successful?

SF: The warm fuzzy glow you get at the end.

JNS: I think there are two aspects of it. The first aspect is whether it produces any future connections, so maybe something like a repeat booking or potential project or a new volunteer or something concrete like that I suppose. The second thing is how much enjoyment to your audience gets out of it. How you enthuse them. I think that far more qualitative than quantitative.

SF: I can usually gauge it by how I feel at the end of it, based on how well I'm seeing people enjoy the materials that they are being taught about. My remit is mainly talks, but seeing people learn and genuinely be surprised by some of the facts usually as in other than indicator for me to know that the engagement has been successful.

JOE: The evaluation of whether we have been successful or not exists just to evaluate the project, but I think there is a long-term success that we cannot evaluate. Just that we have delivered a project and we have delivered an idea and a taste of maritime archaeology. We have offered as much in-deep knowledge of the project we are delivering as we can. Ok, it has it been successful because we have the feedback but we must think of the long-term results that we cannot see and we cannot evaluate. We don't know if one of the kids that we visit in a school is going to study archaeology because of our visit. I'm pretty sure some of them might. They are going to go home and they are going to tell their parents about protection of maritime heritage. So we can do short term but not long term.

Q20

DN: Do you think that the public is interested in engaging with maritime heritage?

SF: Yes and no.

JNS: I think a lot of the time they discover their interest once we have started talking to them. They don't know they are going to be interested in it and then we start talking and they suddenly realise that this is cool. Well we hope they do anyway.

SF: I think that most of the groups that I talk to become interested because I have come to talk to them about it. They would not necessarily have chosen me themselves I was chosen for them because we are offering funded talks and I was chosen by the meeting secretary. I am just the next person that month who is coming to give them a talk. But I do feel that after I've talked to them and I've given them my presentation they are genuinely interested in the subject matter. And I think there is a difference in interest and willingness. I don't think it is a subject matter that it necessarily appeals to people. If you imagine it as a quiz choice with celebrities, capital cities, sports, and maritime archaeology I think maritime archaeology would be the last one to be chosen because people aren't necessarily you

willing to engage with it but when they do engage with it I think that most of the ones I've dealt with are genuinely interested.

Q21

DN: How do you believe your background has prepared you to help deliver programming?

SF: I think that my background that is outside of heritage has been up tremendous benefit to me, ironically. My formal education was not in anything to do with maritime or historical heritage. I did degree in psychology. My earliest interest history dates back to my GCSEs, I did get an A for that. But I never pursued it academically. I think the background I've had doing teaching in Japan and then working as a National Trust volunteer has sent me up very well. Learning about heritage through that side has been interesting and I think it's meant that I'm able to translate it more simply to the general public. I find that academics don't make the best teachers, necessarily, because they are too deep in their subject to approach it from a completely outsiders point of view. They make assumptions the people will know sufficient knowledge because to them it's basic knowledge. But this is knowledge that people don't necessarily have. It would be very presumptuous of me to assume that people know the exact start and end dates of the Second World War because they don't. But I think that's basic knowledge and that's not as common as you would believe. So I think having approach heritage in the way I have, but also having a background in psychology and education has given me a good idea of how best to engage people with heritage. How to translate it if you will in two ways that are more appealing and accessible for them.

JNS: I think that I've had a little bit more of an academic background I suppose. I did two degrees in archaeology, but I think it's a bit half and half. Because I started with the Trust as a volunteer and then I progressed through a traineeship through the heritage skills scheme and then progressed to the position that I'm in now. So I think the combination of a more informal learning environment at the Trust, learning about an informal method of outreach, compared also what I learnt through University has allowed me to kind of make up my mind a little bit more. I suppose and come to my preferred methods using a little bit of both.

JOE: I think that my experience as a teacher in secondary education and experiences as well in summer camps and schools has really been helpful in understanding the delivery and responsibilities that I have now and the Trust. So dealing with children and young adults and doing activities with the bus. This background has been very useful for me and running these kind of activities.

Q22

DN: What about your background as a diver? Has that helped at all?

JOE: Yes! Because you must explain to them how we work under water. So you can have the theory and that's fine you're totally able to explain to people how it works. But being a diver and being an underwater archaeologist with a lot of projects already delivered, that helps a lot because you can explain to them the feelings of actually being underwater and

you can add this kind of personal experience. To do the things that you are explaining it's very useful.

Q23

DN: How do you think engagement programming has changed since you became involved in it?

JNS: That's a difficult one because every project has a slightly different way of doing it, and I don't think it's necessarily the way engagement programming has changed but the way we approach programming in it as individuals. So not how it is changing but how I am changing.

SF: I would expand on that by saying it's not engagement programming as a whole that's changed but then each individual form of engagement on different projects and the like has its own way of doing it and that is heavily influenced by the people who are doing it. I think it's difficult to say if there is a trend. I would have said that I detected the trend in engagement programming but I would say I have detected a trend in publicity for projects and the way in which they are promoted. But not in the way engagement programming necessarily as a whole, as a theoretical construct across the country, has developed.

JNS: I would say though that there are more trends towards digital obviously. And that is something we are doing at the Trust. I think the publicity is a massive thing as well and really we're looking at micro engagements through social media but also that digital trend of 3D models and also getting a volunteers and students involved in that as well is a massive trend. Certainly I think that maybe I pay more attention to it because that's my area, so I don't know if I'm slightly biased towards what I'm seeing but that's what I think anyway.

SF: Jasmine is quite right. And yes, IT has been a significant development but I was thinking more in the sense of what was put into engagement programming. I see the digital output as that, an output As opposed to the design that goes into it. But yes, you are absolutely right of course there is now a more general trend especially as outputs to have digital output. 3D models and digital engagement on Facebook and things like that.

JNS: It becomes part of the project itself and isn't just an output it's more of a backbone.

SF: It's interesting how in our particular project digital media wasn't very high on the list of the original proposals for our outputs. 3D models weren't part of it.

JNS: But I think when that project was designed the 3D models were really a thing.

DN: The thing is the technology changes and moves by leaps and bounds and every month it seems there are innovative new ways to communicate and engage. It's an interesting thing about when the technology changes midway through your engagement programming. You'll find a new thing.

JNS: I think that's a good thing, because we have the ability to incorporate that which is good. We can work with the newest things and have the flexibility to do that so I guess a lot of other projects might not necessarily be able to just switch.

Q24

DN: What do you believe your role is in heritage management?

SF: For me as an individual the way I see my role in heritage is to inform people and to make it accessible to them. Specifically in heritage management it's to make people understand why something is taking place and why management is necessary. I think a lot of people don't really perceive the organisation of heritage and the importance of it, they don't even think about or comprehend the amount of management that goes into it. In terms of preservation and management of public access. I think my role is very much that of an informer.

JNS: It's quite difficult because my role... I end up doing lots of different things in my role not just the outreach but a lot of the website stuff and Steve and I do a lot of publications. I do things like graphic design and the design, I love exhibition contents and posters. Printed media, I guess, but also digital which is another form of engagement as well. I always find my role there is almost a different department but if I was just sticking to the outreach... Inspire isn't the right word but to get people to connect with it on a level that isn't just academic. To get them to think about it, to be amazed by it, and have some passion for it. Something that is thousands of years old... To inspire that kind of feeling in them. To get them to think about that as well as things on an academic level.

JOE: Actually we can use the word inspire. Because I think people are inspired, young people in particular. To introduce them to heritage, and the idea of taking care of heritage, and to be aware of the importance of Underwater heritage.

Q25

DN: Would you consider yourselves archaeologists or educators? Or historians?

SF: I would have said that I am... That I do elements of all. I am not a primary educator on this project, but I have been on previous projects. I obviously have a background in education, not as extensive as Oscars but, I still worked in formal education for four and a half years. I do do terrestrial archaeology, I am an archaeology consultant for the New Forest Trust. That is an archaeological role. It's not always fieldwork but it's a lot of behind the scenes so I do consider myself an archaeologists within that remit. And obviously a historical researcher for the vast majority of work that I'm doing on this project.

JOE: Well, I'm a maritime archaeologist who tries to engage people with heritage. So yes, education and archaeology are two things that I know about and that I work with. So I am both.

JNS: I don't really know to be honest. I'm an archaeologist by training but I don't really get to use a lot of that in my current role. My current role is much more as an educator so again I don't really know how to defend myself in that way.

Q26

DN: Do you believe that the work you do is for the benefit of archaeology or the public?

SF: It's for the benefit of the public because archaeology should be for the benefit of the public.

JNS: I think that education engagement is for the benefit of the public primarily, but it does benefit archaeology in that without public engagement and without public support archaeology would just be... Dead. You will get new archaeologist coming in, you wouldn't get the funding if the public weren't interested in it. So there is an element of it being for the benefit of Archaeology, but primarily used to educate the public.

JOE: It's the way that Jasmine says, it's public but in maritime archaeology it's very important that we bring things to the public and that they are aware at what maritime archaeology is. Maritime archaeology is going to receive a lot of benefits with people having been engaged with it through our activities. The talks and the activities that we are doing.

SF: It's an interesting question in the way it's phrased because is almost defining a differentiation between archaeology and public engagement. And I think that's slowly becoming an outdated view. I think the people are starting to understand that engagement has to be apart of an archaeological project, and not just tacked on which it has been so far. Especially in the last 10 years but actually in the last 100 years. People hadn't thought of educating people, you just designed the project to go and excavate a certain area and yes we should probably hire someone to go talk to people. And I think that is becoming very old fashioned now, more archaeology is now geared towards public engagement. And I think that's the way it should be because archaeology should be for the benefit of the public. Of all of the sciences and heritage and historical subjects, archaeology is the one that is being done not for the benefit of the people doing the work but for the benefit of society as a whole. This is the study of history to uncover things that were not previously known. It's not something that should be locked up in the heads up a few academics who decided they wanted to investigate that. It is history that is being researched for the benefit of sharing. And I think that's why it appeals to me. I'm going back to one of your earlier questions about my background and where I feel I'm at, my favourite bit is engaging people with it and helping them to understand it. I enjoy it and that's the thing I enjoy the most. I think that psychology might have had something to do with it but also my teaching experience. So that's why I enjoy it and that's why I do it. And that's why I think archaeology is something that should be done for the public. And it's reciprocal, because the work that we do does inspire people to engage in archaeology and brings new young archaeologists and more funding. But I feel that reciprocal and it should be first and foremost that archaeology is done for the public. So the work is being done for archaeology for the public.

JOE: Dissemination has opened a new area for archaeology since, up until now, well until several years ago, archaeology what is fairly simple process. You do the research, you do the survey, you do the excavation, you publish and that's it. And you're very happy because you have your scientific publication and you're very proud of that. But after that came a whole other world of dissemination and public engagement and trying to turn this into activities that people could understand. Now that opens a new world with an archaeology. It's true, the people who were used to do in the whole former process are not usually confident on dealing with dissemination but the new generation of archaeologists are used to the idea that the final publication of a scientific report is not the end it's just the beginning of the dissemination.

Q27

DN: Why do you believe we are engaging with the public? You may feel you have already answered, but do you have anything to add?

JNS: Steve really has a point in that it's a shared heritage it's not just academics and it wouldn't be right for us to hoard everything and we need to share it. So it's almost our duty to share that because otherwise it's very selfish of us.

DN: how do you think we have arrived at this point in heritage engagement?

SF: I think that is a combination of factors and I think it's an evolution in thinking from the past 100 years where archaeology was the domain of academics and people who thought that that the public at large either didn't need it or wouldn't be interested. But I think the evolution in thinking and the arrival of the knowledge that there is a whole world of dissemination that can take place after academic research has been done is essential. But the way that has come about has many different elements as well. Things like the HLF means that the funding is available for a whole range of projects, but there are certain limitations. So you can have money to do your academic project, but you will have to do this amount of public education and engagement. So the HLF has contributed to this new position that we find ourselves in with an increase in the funding requirements. I think also that there has been a change in public perception with things like Time Team and programs like Who Do You Think You Are? These various heritage programmes have people interested in heritage, which they didn't used to be. And again we are coming up to things like the centenary of the First World War and these particular peaks of interest in certain times and subject based upon anniversaries and big events contribute to that. So, it's a combination of things like funding, ideals and the public and the modern world as Jasmine says. I mean social media means that is possible to share information so many different ways that it's now become the norm. And I think that's a good thing because I've said, engagement and education of the masses for want of a better word instead of just academic should be the inbuilt reason behind archaeology in general.

Q28

DN: Moving on to the last series of questions, which are about blue sky thinking. If you could design any public access initiative with no concern over any mitigation so no worries about price location...

SF: Ethics?

DN: ohhhh... That's difficult one isn't it? But yeah, ok. No concern over ethics. What would you design.

SF: I would have signed something that makes maritime archaeology on the seabed accessible to the public. So it would be, returning the Oscars previous idea, something that is not mitigated by money. It would have to be a site that is obviously accessible from the shore somehow. The Solent would be ideal. But literally build a walkway that could bring you to a wreck. The wreck doesn't need to be in a dry environment, but somehow you can actually walk around it underwater. And that would be the best way for people to see what maritime heritage and what maritime archaeology actually is. The Mary Rose is very good, but it's now on dry land. So it's something that's almost been recreated, having been raised from the seabed. I think the by showing people stuff that is on the seabed and has not been destroyed or lost, it is still there, the only way we can do that is to show people that it is actually still on the sea. At the moment we are at a very happy place because we can use 3D models to show what survives on the seabed, but I'm not sure that allowing people to actually see it. I think the lack of physical access to maritime archaeology is the biggest issue. Not that that is the only issue that maritime archaeology faces.

JOE: Unsurprisingly, something similar to what Steve has suggested. You have the underwater site and you organised tours or visits to the site. For divers, for non divers, with no issue about money. We could use mini submarines because this technology exists. So not just visiting the shipwreck but also visiting an archaeological site with archaeologists working on it. Archaeologists are working and several meters about them you have tourists. They don't necessarily interact with the archaeologists and they don't cause problems, the people can learn about the excavation and see how archaeologists underwater work. If it's a Roman site they can see the archaeologists excavating the amphora. It's funny because I think you could actually pay for an excavation by doing this. You just have to think about how you protect the site, but with this you would have the money to protect the site and pay people to stay in the off season. In the end everything is money so if you have the money public engagement underwater is totally possible.

JNS: I would actually go completely the opposite route. I would go for a virtual reality and augmented reality. I think that's the way forward and with our technology, the way technology is heading we have the potential to create amazing virtual experiences and I think there's a lot to be said about the ability to augment what you're seeing. If you saw a wreck on the seafloor you could put signs there and I guess you could also put glasses on people. But if you have a 3D model you can make it do stuff you can spin it around you can create a much more media rich link. You can send people down their own rabbit holes and whatever they want to look at they can. It's a much more rich environment to let people

explore what they are interested in and in a way that they're interested in doing it. So I would have a big VR system like cave or something that's a big room you can just have virtual reality in.

SF: You see for me that doesn't overcome the fundamental restriction for maritime archaeology because if you do use VR you're still making the actual archaeology on the seabed and promoting it as something that's really inaccessible and so you have to use VR as a means to access it. And I realise that my idea is completely insane but if you can actually show archaeology in its natural environment and make it accessible just as terrestrial archaeology is accessible you don't need to create 3D models.

JNS: Not necessarily, but I think that sometimes the problem with that is sometimes... obviously the idea of actually going there see you shipwreck is amazing in itself but for example if I go to a castle or something the archaeology is there and it's in front of me but it doesn't do much for me. I don't get excited or interested in it, it's just a thing that is there. It doesn't do anything and I like stuff that does things.

SF: This is a slight side comment but it's almost like Jasmine is a product of a different generation than Oscar and I. Because you are more interested in the actual virtual technology whereas I feel that I would like people to see the actual technology and site.

DN: Well, thank you all for your time.