The role of meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement in contributing to the sustainability of heritage sites and institutions: case studies from Çatalhöyük, Turkey, and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, Saudi Arabia

Beliz Burcu Tecirli

University College London
PhD Thesis
I, Beliz Burcu Tecirli confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.
Acknowledgements

A owe a very grateful thank you to my PhD advisors Tim Williams and Dr. Karen Wright for their patience and support throughout my research. Their intellectual guidance and bold approach has strengthened my research aims and its results, making my work ever more meaningful. I am also truly indebted to Greg Noakes, my colleague and friend who reviewed countless versions of my thesis write-ups, offered insightful ideas, and motivated me during moments of doubt. Then there is my wonderful family who believed in me and supported my work throughout this research study.
Abstract

Cultural heritage institutions face challenges related to long-term sustainability. Efforts to remain relevant, attract support, and maintain an appropriate public profile may come at the expense of mission-critical activities such as exploration, preservation, documentation, interpretation, or display of resources. Failure to ensure long-term viability threatens on-going activities if not the very existence of the institution, while distraction from the core mission can result in marginalization or irrelevance.

However, there are potentially significant benefits from effective stakeholder engagement. This thesis analyses meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement and its role in the sustainability of cultural heritage, and poses the following question: What is the role of meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement in contributing to the sustainability of heritage sites and centres?

The study draws upon two case studies: Çatalhöyük, a Neolithic archaeological site in Turkey; and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, a new multi-component arts, knowledge and cultural facility in Saudi Arabia. The research data reveal they share many challenges and opportunities related to stakeholder engagement and overall sustainability. The case study methodology addresses the complex issues posed by the research question, while field research includes semi-structured participant interviews and non-intrusive participant observation. This field research is set within a wider context complemented through a study of existing literature.

The thesis also posits a new model of stakeholder engagement. Its first four elements are diagnostic: defining the mission, mapping stakeholders, delineating regulatory constraints and channels, and considering the socio-economic ecosystem. The second set of four elements is prescriptive, framing a stakeholder engagement strategy and forming the foundation for engagement activities. The new model ensures effective and sustainable engagement whereby conversations with stakeholders are fully informed by a wider range of considerations, including the social, economic, regulatory, environmental and
spatial ecosystem, and the framework of power relationships that govern that ecosystem. It is hoped this Four Plus Four Model could be implemented elsewhere, pressure tested with on-the-ground findings, and used as the basis for comparative studies and the sharing of best practices globally.
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Chapter One: Introduction

This chapter presents the background to the research (Section 1), defines the need for the research (Section 2), sets the research questions (Section 3), and lays out the thesis structure (Section 4).

1 Background

Archaeological sites and projects, and cultural institutions or centres, such as museums, and repositories of knowledge like libraries and archives, must compete for stakeholder attention against more pressing issues such as public health, human rights and justice, and the environment (Pyburn 2003, 2004, 2007; Sabloff 2008). Although cultural heritage management may not always be met by the public with a sense of urgency and importance (Worts 2004, 2006; Pyburn 2008, 2009), the financial viability of archaeological sites and cultural institutions are highly dependent upon their relevance to stakeholders within both the local community and the wider society. There is a vicious cycle at work: the long-term sustainability of a site, project or institution requires funding and other resources; these resources are only forthcoming if key stakeholders support the mission, goals and objectives of the site or institution; and support is only forthcoming if the site or institution is demonstrably relevant to the stakeholder. Archaeological sites and cultural institutions are therefore under increasing pressure to make the necessary adjustments to better reflect the full breadth of society within their walls — adding stresses to institutions that already feel understaffed, underfunded and underappreciated (Worts 1998, 2001, 2003, 2004).

The term “Archaeological Site” here refers to archaeological excavation projects — including the knowledge generated and disseminated by the research, and archaeological sites that are operated for the purpose of preservation/conservation, research and/or visitation. The terms “Cultural Centres”, and “Cultural Institutions”, refer to an organisation, building or complex that promotes culture and arts, generates knowledge through their
activities, collections, and other resources, and undertakes life-long learning activities. Examples of these include a museum, library, art academy, theatre etc., (See Chapter Two, Section 5 for a definition of the key terms used within this thesis).

Archaeological sites and cultural centres both face challenges in terms of the long-term sustainability of their programmes, facilities, infrastructure and resources, particularly in an environment of constrained public finances, expanding visitor attractions and entertainment options, and a growing trend toward online content and experiences. For cultural knowledge institutions, the need to remain relevant, to attract support from key constituencies, and to maintain an appropriate public profile, can all come at the expense of the ability to deliver mission-critical activities, whether these are preservation, exploration, documentation, interpretation, or the display of their resources. There are risks: failure to ensure long-term viability of a site or institution clearly represents a threat to on-going work and activities, if not the very existence of the site or facility in question; while distraction from an institution’s core mission can result in marginalization or irrelevance, particularly in relation to peer institutions.

Set against this context, there are potentially significant benefits to be gained through the closer integration of a well-managed programme of stakeholder engagement and participation as part of the efforts to ensure the long-term sustainability of both archaeological sites and cultural institutions. Potential benefits might include augmented financial support (either from individual and corporate donors, or public funding), a greater sense of ownership and pride among key external stakeholders, a better understanding among stakeholder communities of the goals, missions and operations of archaeological sites and cultural institutions, and greater relevance to and alignment with community concerns, priorities and aspirations. A synergistic relationship between stakeholder engagement and sustainability could potentially help a site or institution remain a significant actor and a relevant voice in society over the long-term, contributing to the welfare, development and intellectual life of the community.
As traced in Chapter Two, twenty-first century culture and heritage practitioners engage in dialogues and actions with a diversity of professionals and laymen and communities regarding the meaning, value, and management of the heritage resource, because participatory planning is now generally accepted as an essential element in the management of archaeological sites. And, the survival of cultural heritage institutions is therefore intimately connected to their ability to capture and celebrate the value of knowledge forthcoming from various stakeholder communities, in part by ensuring the relevance of their activities and offerings to these communities. In most cases, these communities outlast the researchers, curators and practitioners, meaning the cultural and historical record and artefacts will rest in their hands. For example, when it comes to the archaeological resource, expressing its value in terms that local stakeholders understand and appreciate is essential for the physical preservation of the site and its protection from encroachment, with the additional understanding that others outside the local community may operate using a very different value system and their views and perspectives must also be valued and validated. Warren et al. (1995,) underscore the need to systematically capture this knowledge through observation of living traditions — necessitating active engagement with the community — as this corpus of knowledge is rarely codified in written documents. As a result, traditional knowledge, or more generally, intangible cultural heritage are now regarded as significant features in development that is overall culturally and environmentally sensitive (Kleymeyer 1994).

“Stakeholder Engagement” and “Stakeholder Participation” can be described as a voluntary act that follows when stakeholders become aware of the value of participatory action, and are thereby motivated to become involved (See Chapter Two, Section 5 for a definition of the key terms used within this thesis). Archaeologists and culture and knowledge institution practitioners are increasingly trying to restructure social relations by engaging various stakeholder groups in participatory planning and management so as to ensure the long-term protection and operation of the cultural heritage resource and its activities. Accomplishing sustainable solutions requires the participation of all
relevant stakeholders, all the way from the bottom-up to top-down. Oftentimes individuals or institutions who have a stake or interest in a site or project, or its specific programs or activities, do not have any power or influence to shape discussions and actions, yet their perspectives could potentially fuel anti-heritage discourse that leads to action (Cooper 2009).

### 2 The Need for the Research

Over the last few decades, this dynamic between cultural heritage practitioners and the public has resulted in the development of a wide range of strategies and approaches to the management of political, economic, educational, and tourism capacities at both archaeological sites and cultural institutions. Along the way, a diversity of issues, competing and contrasting interests, and hard ethical decisions have been raised and addressed (these are explored in detail within Chapter Two, Sections 2 and 3).

Furthermore, in parallel to the increase in initiatives for public engagement, mechanisms, frameworks and models for enabling and sustaining public participation have also witnessed a growth (these are discussed in detail within Chapter Two, Section 4); the very existence of a myriad of models perhaps implies ambiguity and an overall in-decisiveness regarding how stakeholder participation be enacted to ensure sustainability (Rowe and Frewer 2005, 252). If engaging stakeholders were a simple and well-understood practice, then surely one model, or one set of models, might serve its meaningful and effective achievement, yet engagement and participation is undertaken in many ways, in various contexts, and with multiple players, processes and goals. This then requires a model that prescribes how to enable effective and meaningful participation in any particular situation (ibid).

The requirement to engage stakeholders in activities where decisions are made is not limited to the cultural heritage field alone. Many stakeholder participation models have been created and activated within various fields of inquiry (as described in Chapter Two, Section 4), whereby the various
degrees of participation are informed by varying degrees of empowerment. There is still little evidence of a model that demonstrates links to sustainability, or one that is universal to all situations (as further emphasized in Chapter Two, Section 4).

There is an assumption in the literature that the larger the number of stakeholders who are engaged, and the greater the depth of their engagement, the more sustainable an initiative, site or facility will be (as discussed in Section 2.2, and Chapter Two, Sections 2 and 4). That greater engagement leads to enhanced sustainability would seem to be an intuitive conclusion — and yet the empirical evidence of such a conclusion remains limited. This is in part a function of the relative novelty of stakeholder engagement and participation practices in the cultural heritage management space: there simply has not been enough time that has passed since the engagement process to conclusively validate theories and hypotheses about the effect of stakeholder engagement and participation on the long-term sustainability of cultural heritage institutions and programmes. Therefore, there remains a significant gap within the literature in regards to understanding the dynamic relationship between stakeholder engagement and sustainable preservation, protection, interpretation and promotion of archaeological sites and cultural centres or more simply, the sustainable development of archaeological sites and cultural centres.

2.1 What is Sustainability and Sustainable Development?

The modern notion of the term “Sustainability” dates back approximately three decades to a mandate agreed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature in 1969 (Holdgate 1999, 108). The mandate highlighted “the perpetuation and enhancement of the living world – man’s natural environment – and the natural resources on which all living things depend” and described managing “…air, water, soils, minerals, and living species
including man, so as to achieve the highest sustainable quality of life” (*ibid*, 108).

Sustainability was also a principal theme of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972, and in the ensuing decades it has become a guiding principle within global politics (*ibid*). Although many descriptions of sustainable development and sustainability exist today, a definition used commonly with reference to the concept of sustainable development, is that cited in the World Commission on Environment and Development (also known as the Brundtland Commission), “Our Common Future” (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, 43): “sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

The World Commission on Environment and Development was created under a patronage of the United Nations, to identify global sustainability problems, identify solutions to these challenges, and unite the international community in the pursuit of shared sustainability goals (Lee *et al.* 2000). Tasked with this role, in 1987 the Commission published its findings, arguing that economic and social well-being cannot be improved with measures that destroy the environment, and underscoring the importance of protecting the natural resource base and the environment (*ibid*). Intergenerational solidarity also featured as a crucial factor within the report, whereby all development must take into account its impact on the opportunities for future generations (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987).

The definition provided by the World Commission on Environment and Development encompasses the “three pillars” of environmental, social and economic sustainability (*ibid*). According to this concept, development is deemed to be sustainable only if the fulfilment of needs related to each of the three pillars is not compromised when the satisfaction levels of at least one of the pillars increases (*ibid*). Nowadays, the concept of sustainability is used extensively in a variety of industries and arenas.
Those who support sustainability emphasize how the concept draws attention to environmental degradation and loss as a consequence of development. Over the past three decades, the finite nature of resources (Meadows et al. 1972; Weitzman 1999), and the debilitating effects of pollution (Bryson 1971; Holdren 1971; Sawyer 1972), have featured as the fundamental arguments for sustainability. More recently, these positions have focused on climate change generated by industrial development (Weart 2003; Chaisson 2008; Archer 2009). Proponents of the three pillars (environmental, social and economic sustainability) state that upholding these will ultimately benefit all communities and all interests.

This outlook is key to deliberations regarding the developing world where social equity and economic development (including enhanced living standards) have equal weighting with environmental concerns. There is the notion that developing countries can by-pass development that is polluting, driven in part by the concept of resource scarcity (such as peak minerals and insufficient fresh water), which dictates the use of more clean and efficient technologies. Pro-sustainability supporters also tend to emphasize the sense of intergenerational justice that is offered by the term sustainability, making it inherently future generations oriented and in favour of the less fortunate — “communities” who otherwise have little or no voice in the conversation about development and sustainability. For example, Redclift (1987, 35) posits that "unless poor people are involved in meeting their aspirations, development can never be sustainable"; this position echoes the World Commission on Environment and Development report’s statement that the "overriding priority should be given...(to) the concept of ‘need,' in particular the essential needs of the world's poor" (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, 43).

There are a number of critiques regarding “sustainability”, and perhaps the most widely made critique concerns the ambiguity of the notion. According to Sachs (1997, 71-82), it is the linkage of the term “sustainable” to “development” that has led to an ambivalence and irrelevance in meaning. Within the concept of “sustainable development”, the locus of sustainability
has shifted from nature to development, or in other words, from natural yields to growth (Sachs 2002, 150-162). This in turn frames “development” as the object of concern rather than the environment or particular ecosystems and traditional ways of life, and rather than development, “nature” becomes the critical area to be managed and mitigated. Hove (2004, 48), argues that the concept of sustainable development “has become more of a catch-phrase than a revolution of thought, and employing its use has simply fuelled the interests of advocates of exponential economic growth, undermining environmental reforms.”

A moral standpoint to be considered here is that sustainability upholds the status quo, which is anathema to those who advocate for change. Brink (1991, 72), therefore advises that “(sustainability) requires a political choice, which must be continuously adjusted as a result of new knowledge, changing social requirements, or unforeseen developments in the economic and ecological system.”

There is also a complex issue regarding qualifying and quantifying if sustainability has been realized. Can completely objective measures of sustainability be devised? Some scholars and practitioners have attempted to deliver a set of measurable indicators. Kuik and Verbruggen (1991, 1) propose “that environmental indicators can be defined as quantitative descriptors of changes in either anthropogenic environmental pressure or in the state of the environment…(These would include) pressure indicators, (such as) measurements of human-induced changes in ecosystems”, and effect indicators that are quantifications of the negative effects that changes in environmental quality have on human health or welfare — as well as on the planet — over time (ibid). For the latter, Opshoor and Reijnders (1991, 8) suggest “one could monitor environmental effects by looking at qualities and sizes of populations, niche size, or biotypes.”

Today, there is a myriad of metrics to measure sustainability in environmental, social and economic spheres; these metrics are applied in a variety of situations and are ever-evolving. Some observers have voiced concerns that
such metrics, and their operational definitions, fall short in prioritizing human needs. Elkington (2002, 2008) therefore advises that we must raise our collective vision from technologies and business models (although these are essential) to societal and civilizational transformation.

2.2 Sustainability, Sustainable Development and Cultural Heritage

Cultural heritage has been a soft-spoken participant in the mainstream debate on sustainable development (Hawkes 2001; Magness-Gardiner 2004; Link 2006), despite its significance to societies and its tremendous conceivable role in adding to socio-economic and environmental ambitions. “Sustainable development” in not directly referred to within the World Heritage Convention, adopted in 1972 (Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972). However, Articles 4 and 5 acknowledge that “States Parties have the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage”, and “to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes” (ibid, Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention, respectively). This language extends the coverage of the Convention beyond the sites included in its List of World Heritage, to cover wider sustainable development strategies.

As far as global declarations go, at the 26th Session in Budapest, 2002, the World Heritage Committee adopted the “Budapest Declaration on World Heritage” – a declaration that enshrined the necessity “to ensure an appropriate and equitable balance between conservation, sustainability and development, so that World Heritage properties can be protected through appropriate activities contributing to the social and economic development and the quality of life of our communities” (Budapest Declaration on World Heritage, 1972). In 2005, the concept of sustainable development found
inclusion within the introduction to the World Heritage Committee’s Operational Guidelines: “The protection and conservation of the natural and cultural heritage are a significant contribution to sustainable development”, and they “may support a variety of on-going and proposed uses that are ecologically and culturally sustainable” (Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage, 2005).

The “Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the Convention, 2012-2022”, approved by the 18th General Assembly (Paris, 2011) within its “Vision for 2022”, requires that the World Heritage Convention “contribute to the sustainable development of the world’s communities and cultures” (World Heritage 18 GA, 2011), further stating that “(h)eritage protection and conservation considers present and future environmental, societal and economic needs”, which must be realized through “connecting conservation to communities” (ibid). Within a wider outlook, such progress is a way of integrating culture within the international sustainable development agenda and promoting the cultural heritage space as a piloting space where new methods to sustainable development may become activated and realized.

Notwithstanding these developments, “contributing to sustainable development is not an explicit policy in the framework of the implementation of the Convention,...(given that the current procedures and guidelines for implementation) do not include specific recommendations, checks and controls that would enable governments to fully harness the potential of World Heritage for sustainable development on one hand, (or) to ensure that their heritage conservation and management policies and programmes are aligned with broader sustainable development goals, on the other” (World Heritage and Sustainable Development, 2016). Opportunities could therefore easily remain unrealized when undertaking the Convention unless the responsible teams translate the Convention guidelines into concrete sustainable development gains. Furthermore, the Convention does not put forth tangible frameworks or models for cultural heritage management that directly support larger social, economic and environmental sustainability goals (ibid).
A conference that has attempted to promote tangible frameworks or models for cultural heritage management, in order to directly support larger social, economic and environmental sustainability goals, is the 2012 “Archaeology and Economic Development” conference held at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London (Gould and Burtenshaw, 2014).

The conference, which brought together archaeology practitioners with developer, economists, and investors, highlighted the increasing contemporary demands for the meaningful use of heritage as a resource for economic and social development - these demands are prompted by local communities, governments, or archaeologists themselves (ibid).

Within the context of economic development, archaeologically rich land, and its army of archaeologists ready to protect that land, could be viewed as an obstacle for commercial development. Similarly, any commercial uses of heritage, could enrage cultural practitioners on the grounds that commodification destroys authenticity (ibid). Such views of the contentious relationship between archaeology and development are much debated, however less debated is the potential positive contribution that heritage, when viewed as economic assets, may make to communities. The 2012 conference made some headway in this area by tackling questions like: how do we balance economic and cultural values? How do we conceptualize and measure these resources as economic assets? How should projects be managed practically to deliver sustainable economic benefits? What is the role of archaeologists in this effort and what ethical concerns should they have foremost in mind? (Gould and Burtenshaw, 2014, 3-4).

The proceedings of the conference produced four key takeaways:

1. An acknowledgement that heritage is viewed and valued differently by different users of heritage, and therefore, the motivations for sustainability (including its timeframes) also vary in alignment to the value that each stakeholder group wishes to sustain;
2. The value of heritage is also articulated differently by different users of heritage, for example, developers express financial metrics while cultural heritage practitioners refer to concepts that are not easily quantifiable such as the artistic, educational, spiritual, etc., values of heritage. To reconcile the differing understandings of value, heritage practitioners and organizations must seek methods and models to quantify social and cultural values in order to convince policy-makers and funders of their significance for sustainability (Bewley and Maeer 2014; Coben 2014; Gangloff 2014).

3. Future archaeological training must address the current deficiency in the theoretical and ethical foundations and the practical understanding of the economic value of archaeology (as an economic asset) and its place in economic development, and the overall relationship dynamics that exist between cultural and economic values (Gould and Burtenshaw, 2014, 7-8).

4. There is an urgent need for the archaeology profession to develop new models that better anticipate the requirements and agendas of its stakeholder audiences, that provide quantitative and statistical data about the socio-economic impact of archaeology, and that provide the conceptual framework and communication methods in which data must be presented to be meaningful to different audiences (ibid).

Across the cultural heritage field, practitioners have come forth with various frameworks, models and mechanisms for the sustainability of the cultural heritage resource, and attempted to better define the role that managing this resource can play in larger human- and environment-based issues of sustainable development; these frameworks are captured in Chapter Two, Section 4.

The majority of these practices highlight a necessity for aligning cultural heritage goals with the larger eco-system of societal and environment values that form the sustainable development theory, and hence attempt to drive
stakeholder participation in the development, management and preservation of archaeological sites and cultural centres. An intellectual, and universally applicable framework that integrates the issues of stakeholder engagement, positive socio-economic impact, and sustainability is yet to be articulated for archaeological sites and cultural centres.

Cultural heritage practitioners must embrace sustainable development and its positive benefits otherwise conceptual and practical isolation may threaten to further exacerbate a number of fissures, dislocations and lacunae that are already present in the management of cultural heritage, as outlined in Chapter Two, Section 3.

**Research Questions**

A) What is the role of meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement, in contributing to the sustainability of heritage sites and centres? B) How does it provide for the sustainability of sites and centres?

A1) What are the essential elements in the meaningful and effective engagement of key stakeholders within archaeological sites and cultural centres?

A2) How are these essential elements best created and activated?

A3) In a global context, is there an intellectually grounded, activity-based framework for enhancing both stakeholder engagement and the long-term sustainability of archaeological sites and cultural centres?

B4) What is the presumed relationship between stakeholder engagement and the sustainability of a site/ cultural centre?

**Thesis Structure**

The next Chapter explores the theoretical background to meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement and participation as an enabler to the sustainability of archaeological sites, knowledge and culture institutions, and
their associated activities, and environments. The chapter will also provide analyses of the various models for stakeholder participation noted in the academic discourse, both within the social sciences and other disciplines, and an analysis of the various factors that facilitate and impede stakeholder participation in the management of archaeological sites and cultural institutions. The chapter will conclude with a discussion on the meanings of key terms (such as “stakeholder”, “engagement”, and “participation” etc.,) that are used throughout this thesis.

Chapter Three defines the methods used for the research. These were selected to gather not only a wide range of views and opinions from diverse stakeholders, but also to allow for “deep dives” into areas of particular relevance to the research questions.

Chapter Four presents the data collected from the research methods described in Chapter Three. The data shed light on the key mechanisms for stakeholder participation and the effectiveness of these activities for the long-term sustainability of sites and knowledge and culture institutions, and their activities, environments and stakeholders.

Chapter Five sets forth the analyses drawn from the data presented in Chapter Four, and draws conclusions regarding the universality of frameworks and models that enable meaningful and effective stakeholder participation and to their contribution to long-term sustainability.

The research is concluded in Chapters Six and Seven, which lay the foundations for a stakeholder engagement model that is built for sustainability, meaningful engagement and capture of information and perspectives, the integration of stakeholder views into the work of the cultural heritage entity, and a systematic approach to the issues and drivers behind stakeholder engagement. The model is designed to be applicable to any cultural or archaeological projects or institutions, regardless of size, location, mission, or area of responsibility. The model is drawn primarily from the investigation and analysis of the data presented in Chapter Four, while also building upon a
wide array of academic studies, models, and methodologies that are described in Chapter Two.
Chapter Two: Theoretical Context

1 Introduction

This chapter will explore the theoretical background to meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement and participation as an enabler to the sustainability of archaeological sites and knowledge and culture institutions, their activities, and environments (Section 2). The chapter will also discuss the various factors that impede stakeholder participation in the management of archaeological sites and cultural institutions (Section 3), and will provide analyses of the various models for stakeholder participation noted in the academic discourse (Section 4), both within the social sciences and other disciplines. The chapter will close with a definition of key terms used within the thesis (Section 5), and a brief summary of the chapter’s findings (Section 6).

2 A History of Stakeholder Engagement and Participation in the Cultural Heritage Field

As with all disciplines, archaeology developed through a mix of discoveries that occurred from within the discipline, and by those prompted by external events and technological discoveries. To understand the history of meaningful and effective engagement of stakeholders in the practice of archaeology, the literature points to three major ethical concerns that have matured the discipline and have brought together the practitioners of archaeology with other stakeholders. These are notably, 1) the treatment of human remains; in recent decades, heritage practitioners sought collaboration with and have competed with indigenous communities regarding the guardianship and management of excavated human remains; 2) the ownership of heritage sites and artefacts; the controversial debates regarding to whom heritage objects
belong—the global human society, the descendants, metal-detectors, collectors, and heritage practitioners etc.; and, 3) the preservation of heritage sites for future generations; should archaeological sites remain as they are, become developed, or be conserved for the next generations of heritage practitioners? Furthermore, who should be entitled to their management? These debates of ethic regarding the handling of human remains, the custody of heritage sites and artefacts, and the role of the upcoming generations of heritage practitioners, are partly driven by an establishment of the scientific role of archaeological practice in the twentieth century.

The practice of archaeology dates back to the 19th century. Since then, the practice has developed and debated a number of theoretical approaches to the undertaking of archaeological practice. Early archaeologists approached the heritage landscape with Culture History Theory, which strived to explain why cultures changed and adapted. From the last century onward archaeologists focused on the continuation of past societies with those of the present day.

In the sixties, technological advances brought about the beginnings of a “New Archaeology”- with American archaeologists such as Kent Flannery and Lewis Binford leading the way (Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990; Trigger 2007). They promoted more "scientific" and "anthropological" methods, championing quantitative approaches to research, and using statistical analysis (ibid). Unlike their predecessors, they viewed culture as a set of behavioural processes and traditions and this later derived the term, “Processual Archaeology” (Clarke 1973, 47).

In the eighties, a Post-Modern movement took shape; driven by the British archaeologists Michael Shanks, Christopher Tilley, Daniel Miller and Ian Hodder. This movement became know as “Post-Processual Archaeology”, and has fathered many sub-disciplines as well as borrowing from others (Hodder 1991, 30-41). Post-Processual archaeologists question Processualism's applications of scientific objectivity, and emphasize a more self-critical theoretical reflexivity (Hodder 1986). A practice critiqued by Processualists for not having scientific accuracy and consistency (ibid).
Practitioners of Post-Processual archaeology argue that the past is merely a text with no objective reality, and is therefore to be interpreted intuitively. In other words, the Post-Processual model holds that not only do culturally informed perspectives and interpretations of an archaeological resource offer an important and complementary view, but that all interpretations of the artefacts and archaeological record are culturally informed. This is perhaps best explained by Hodder (2010, 12), who notes that, “archaeology is destructive”; it destroys the relationship between objects and contexts in the process of excavation. This separation of discovery from interpretation limits the potential for later reinterpretation and checking of data. Thus a better approach is to bring forward interpretation to the moment of discovery (ibid) – “the approach also allows a wider range of interested groups to participate in the process of data interpretation at the critical and non-reversible moment of excavation” (ibid, 12). This serves to some extent to level the playing field between expert, amateur and concerned layperson, in that all categories are subject to cultural bias and blindness to some degree, with no group able to claim ownership of the “objective truth” of the research findings (ibid). The advocates of Post-Processual archaeology do uphold the need for professional archaeological practices, such as research and data collection informed by the scientific method and empirical proofs that are nevertheless invested with interpretation (Croucher 2005, 612).

During the nineties, the importance of civic engagement in the practice of archaeology, and in particular, the re-addressing of questions of ownership (such as who ought to determine archaeological sites, who ought to interpret the past, and who ought to benefit from archaeological research findings?) were perhaps most boldly emphasized by the passing of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) by the United States of America (USA) Congress (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990). This Act addressed the contradictory situation where American Indians made great efforts to prevent archaeological excavation of sites once inhabited by their ancestors, while American archaeologists strived to continue their studies at these sites for the advancement of scientific knowledge.
NAGPRA aimed to resolve a compromise by limiting the right of research institutions to possess human remains, and further allowed some Native Americans to remove ancestors’ remains and burial belongings from collections archived and/ or displayed within cultural institutions (Silverman 2011, 152). There are many high profile confrontations regarding the appropriate treatment of human remains that have led to the passing of NAGPRA, but perhaps the most notable of these is the Kennewick Man; a 9,300-year-old skeleton discovered in the mid-nineties in a riverbank located a short distance from the town of Kennewick in Washington State (Owsley and Jantz 2014). Several Native American communities have claimed Kennewick Man as their ancestor through NAGPRA (ibid). What NAGPRA demonstrated, most publicly, is that scientific research does not take precedence over the dead, and the “ancestors” of the dead. This is of particular significance for communities who view the past as cyclic, whereby disturbing the past will negatively impact the present.

Archaeological thought in regard to understanding the diverse interpretations that various groups could imprint on archaeological remains, have also been influenced by the developments within the discipline of anthropology. The sub-fields of “Ethno-science” and “Ethno-history”, within anthropology, have evolved from the 1960s onwards (Sturtevant 1964; Harris 1968), to specifically understand “…the system of knowledge and cognition typical of a given culture…to put it another way a culture itself amounts to the sum of a given society’s folk classifications, all of that society’s ethno-science, its particular ways of classifying its material and social universe” (Sturtevant 1964, 99-100).

With time, ethno-science has taken on a set of new meanings and has pioneered new methodologies, based on both criticisms and new discoveries in the field, although it nevertheless continues to concern itself with methods that capture the ways of thought and self-expression which make up cultural knowledge. Similarly, ethno-history, described by Fenton (1966, 75) as ”the critical use of ethnological concepts and materials in the examination and use of historical source material”, has as its fundamental source people’s own
sense of how events are played out, the means in which cultural heritage is shaped, and their methods of culturally constructing the past (Shcieffelin 1985, 3). Simmons (1988, 10) described his understanding of ethno-history as "a form of cultural biography that draws upon as many kinds of testimony as possible over as long a time period as the sources allow."

The contributions of members of the public to the disciplines of ethno-science and ethno-history are fundamental. It should perhaps be noted here that the active and voluntary participation of citizens in scientific research dates to a few centuries ago – a phenomenon referred to by Miller-Rushing et al. as “Citizen Science” (2012, 285-290). For example, there is no doubt that members of the public have greatly contributed to current knowledge on ecology and to historical datasets and museum collections. Nature enthusiasts have long been associated with the practice of citizen science, and one of the more intriguing examples of such a dataset involves members of the Cayuga Bird Club in Ithaca, New York, who have been documenting the arrival dates of migratory birds since 1903 (ibid, 285-290). While their goal is simply to form a record of sightings and arrival dates, their observations have formed historical data for ecologists interested in analysing bird migration patterns in reference to climate change (Butler 2003 in Miller-Rushing et al., 2012, 285-290). Ecologists are increasingly using the lesser-known datasets, formed by members of the public, to understand long-term changes in the environment and potential solutions to these changes (see Covet 2008, Bonney et al. 2009a, 2009b; Silvertown 2009, Niven et al. 2009; Sauer and Link 2011).

Thus, cases like the Kennewick Man are not completely representative of the relationship between practitioners and other stakeholder groups throughout history. The more recent decades of literature on this subject highlights cases where ethnic, cultural or social groups — that is, the objects of research rather than the researchers themselves — have sought to assume a leading role in archaeological studies (Thorley 2002; Smith and Wobst 2005; Smith and Waterton 2010). For example, the Monacan tribe, in Virginia, USA, requested that a facial reconstruction be done on some human remains that were
repatriated (Hantman 2004, 19-34). In arranging to have this done, Hantman (2004) was able to both help the Monacan in their request for recognition and engage in the scientific study of the remains, which previously had been denied.

It is fair to say that the largest shifts in the centre of gravity from expert/academic to amateur/public, and the contentions over the heritage resource, were motivated by the empowerment movements of the mid-1980s and 90s that witnessed the increasing significance of self-identification among many relatively powerless and voiceless communities and subcultures like the American Indians (George 2008, 1660-1669). This era brought about new interpretations of rights, ethics, and the notion of accountability which all inspired great changes in the policies and practices of scientists.

A good example to reflect on these changes is the dramatic evolvement of “American Historical Archaeology” in the 1980s into a holistic discipline informed by the reflective assessment and critique of society (Leone et al. 1987). American historical archaeology previously had focused largely on elites and in supporting a dominant narrative, and was rather unconcerned with issues of race, class, gender, minorities, personhood, power, and inequality (ibid). As a sign of this phenomenon, at many sites interest shifted from white plantation owners to African-American subalterns (Leone et al. 1987; Leone and Potter 1988; Ferguson 1992; Handler and Gable 1997; Shackel 2000, 2001; Cuddy 2005; Fennell 2007). This focus now dominates the field and has expanded to attend to all of America’s minority or materially less-visible peoples and communities (McGuire 1982; Yamin 2001; Costello 2004; Maniery 2004; Wall et al. 2004).

One of the most long-standing examples of this is the 40 years of archaeology at Weeksville, an impoverished African-American neighbourhood of Brooklyn, New York, which has helped to “trigger diverse memories, recollections, and re-interpretations of a nineteenth-century historic space as a way for people to understand, connect to, and address contemporary conditions and concerns, and to reclaim their space” (Scott 2009 in Silverman 2011, 152). Further well-known examples are the campaigns for the strong African-American presence
in the African Burial Ground project in New York City and at Howard University in Washington, D.C., and the University of Virginia’s archaeological excavation of a free black site in Charlottesville (Harrington 1993; Blakey 1998; Leeds 1994; La Rocha 1997). Such research have brought to the forefront, the realization that cultural heritage management is a social practice occurring in the present with tangible implications for contemporary societies and cultures, even if much of it appears to be derived from the past.

Public inclusion in archaeology became an especially recognized endeavour of value in the mid-1990s, when it was codified in Principle 4 of the 1996 “Principles of Ethics of the Society for American Archaeology”, which stated that archaeologists should “communicate archaeological interpretations of the past. Many publics exist for archaeology including… cultural groups who find in the archaeological record important aspects of their cultural heritage” (Principles of Ethics of the Society for American Archaeology 1996, Principle 4).

It is worth noting here the term “Public Archaeology”, which was coined by McGimsey (1972, 5), and became very popular 20 years prior to the Principle 4 of the 1996 Principles of Ethics of the Society for American Archaeology, in the mid 1970s. While McGimsey used the term inclusively to express the argument that there is no such thing as “private archaeology” (King 1983, 143), because archaeology is generally practiced with reference to projects that change land use and hence may have broad effects on social and cultural systems (ibid, 157), as well as patterns of economic development and resource use. In the 1970s and 80s, the term was used more restrictively to mean “Conservation Archaeology”, “Contract Archaeology”, “Cultural Resource Management”, and “Historic Preservation” (ibid, 144).

A decade later, McGimsey (1984) offered greater clarity regarding the various understandings of public archaeology; he argued that public archaeology could range from general public support of legislation that benefits the discipline to more inclusive stewardship of specific sites, and on to active participation by non-experts in archaeological projects in any of a variety of ways. In other words, as emphasized by McDavid (2011, 74), public
archaeology is any endeavour in which archaeologists interact with the public, and any research that examines or analyses the public dimensions of doing archaeology.

Jameson (1994, 17) has argued that such public engagement is an “ethical imperative”, going so far as to state that unless archaeologists “communicate effectively with the general public, all else is wasted effort”. Archaeologists must therefore “make the past accessible...[and] empower people to participate in a critical evaluation of the pasts that are represented to them” (ibid, 17). Tully (2007, 155) calls this dialogue and concern for community inclusion, “Community Archaeology,” emphasizing that it “seeks to diversify the voices involved in the interpretation of the past”. One of the most rewarding aspects of such a dialogue is that communities may raise questions about the past that archaeologists might not even have contemplated, thereby leading them “to see archaeological remains in a new light and think in new ways about how the past informs the present” (Marshall 2002, 18).

Archaeologists are therefore “political actors” and must be conscious of the social ramifications of archaeological practice and risk some “danger” of distraction or loss of control/authority, rather than not to think about the contemporary context at all. As a result, archaeologists may conceive of their work and activities not as doing research for the community, but rather as social science executed with the community, underscoring the centrality of the issues of “knowledge for whom and knowledge for what” (Elliot and Williams 2008, 2). Elliot and Williams (2008, 2) argue for a move away from “the debate on ‘lay knowledge’ and ‘scientific expertise’ and propose that a concept of ‘civic intelligence’ provides a mechanism to resolve the tension between these”.

Taken to the next logical level, archaeology always impacts communities in one way or another, so it’s best for archaeologists to focus the force of that effect (Shackel 2008 pers.com in Silverman 2011, 156). Shackel and Chambers (2004) advocate public participation in archaeology as “Applied Archaeology”, drawing the term from the well-established field of Applied Anthropology. As defined by the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), practitioners of Applied Anthropology seek “the integration of anthropological
perspectives and methods in solving human problems throughout the world [so as] to advocate for fair and just public policy based upon sound research” (SfAA 1999 in Silverman 2011, 156). Applied anthropologists are therefore concerned with problems of cultural diversity, ethnicity, gender, class, and imbalances in resources and rights, among other topics (Silverman 2011, 156).

A good demonstration of this is Flatman et al.’s (2012, 65-76) work in Baltimore, USA, where a historically white working class population in the neighbourhood of Hampden, with the assistance of archaeologists, sought to recover and assert its history and identity. Their history was being erased through the gentrification of Hampden that concentrates only on building facades, and where interior space is re-interpreted as middle class through conversion to a sanitized story of a tourist mill town. Flatman et al. (2012, 65-76) advocate “Activist Archaeology”, i.e., community development, empowerment and social action underwritten by the actual archaeological recovery of history, which demonstrates the prior existence of a healthy, hardworking, community-spirited neighbourhood. Colwell-Chanthaphonh (2007, 29) agrees that archaeology must embrace applied problems and endeavour to produce solutions that will truly empower and benefit communities, such as improving resource claims, improving agricultural technology, and furthering economic development.

A high profile illustration of an archaeological project striving to empower people is the public education performed within Colonial Williamsburg, a large living history museum in south-eastern Virginia, USA, that interprets early American life. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation operates the museum, and public education in archaeology is developed and sustained through field schools, learning weeks/weekends, volunteer participation, and special and regular public programs at the Department of Archaeological Research (Edwards-Ingram 2014, 9-35). The archaeological staff regularly interact with site visitors and are involved in interpreter and other staff training programs to ensure that the African American experience and other areas of archaeology are presented in the interpretation of history (ibid, 9-35). Colonial Williamsburg
has increased its efforts to include African Americans as staff members and as visitors (ibid). Excavating African American sites and interpreting the African American past has been part of the Foundation’s archaeological and public education activities for some time; for instance, in the late 1980s the Foundation’s archaeologists conducted studies of the Bush-Everard property, a domestic site from the colonial period that lies within the Historic Area (ibid). An integral element in this study, featuring several field schools, was the investigation of African American archaeological remains, including the excavations of the 19th century African American house site (ibid). In 1991, public archaeology in the form of Learning Weeks was conducted at the Carter’s Grove Slave Quarter, on a nearby plantation owned by the Foundation (ibid). As the Colonial Williamsburg website notes, “During the 18th century, half of Williamsburg’s population was black. The lives of the enslaved and free people in this Virginia capital are presented in re-enactments and programs throughout the Historic Area” (Colonial Williamsburg, 2016).

Yet is should be noted that the current multicultural, inclusive approach to community engagement and education is a result, at least in part, to criticism levelled at what was seen as an elitist approach to history and the archaeological record that prevailed for many decades at the Colonial Williamsburg site. Writing in 1989, Leon and Piatt (1989, 78) argued that “the average visitor still need not confront fully the reality of slavery in Williamsburg’s past…the living history format would probably impede the presentation and discussion of certain subjects…[while] music, religion, and other aspects of slave culture, as well as daily work routines, would remain easiest to show to visitors…The Williamsburg experience suggests, therefore that it is easiest for a living-history museum to improve its historical presentation and incorporate recent scholarship when change does not require fundamental alterations in the museum or in its image as a non-threatening, entertaining destination for tourists”. It is, perhaps, to Colonial Williamsburg's credit that the institution did in fact make changes to its public programming and its archaeological research strategies as a result of such critiques, though as Leon and Piatt (1989, 78) note, “unless half of
Williamsburg’s presentation focuses on the lives of blacks, the institution will continue to present an under represented picture of the 1780s community”.

The dynamic toward greater participation, where researchers interact meaningfully with the descendants of the societies they are studying and all other stakeholders impacted by their studies, has also shaped the world of knowledge and cultural institutions, such as museums, libraries, galleries (Mead 1983; Karp et al. 1992; Sullivan 1994; Schouten 1998; Gurian 1999; McLean 1999). These cultural spaces seek to engage with community members on issues ranging from donations and resource support to the curation of programs, the staging of special events and galas, youth education and school visitation programs, and decisions over the development and management of collections and content. Silverman (2011) explains how her peers, Nash, Colwell-Chanthaphonh, and Holen are concerned with native peoples of the USA but from the perspective of a progressive museum philosophy that seeks to bring stakeholders into manifold aspects of the professional world of research. These curators have created the “Indigenous Inclusiveness Initiative” and the “Collections Synthesis Project” at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science (ibid, 152-166). Among their goals are to resituate Native Americans from being objects of nature to societies that engaged nature through cultural practices; use the museum collections to generate respect, reciprocity, justice and dialogue between native and non-native stakeholders; promote beneficence and stewardship; make accessible the objects held for the public good so that they truly serve the public; and include Native American perspectives and voices at the museum so that indigenous cultural treasures can be appreciated from every perspective – aesthetic, historical, and cultural (ibid). The museum is also promoting exposure of Native American youth to science careers, including a science scholarship program (ibid).

Within the cultural heritage space, the scale and scope of recent publications dedicated to stakeholder participation, engagement, and empowerment attest to the range and global extent of the practice within the field (for example, see Holt 1983; Hunt and Seitel 1985; Hall 1993; Bray, 1996; Peters 1996; Swidler et al. 1997; Israel et al. 1998; Bartu 2000; Buchli and Lucas 2001; Clarke

Similarly, an increased reference to the values, perspectives, and opinions of the general public is apparent in all other fields of endeavour, such as healthcare, transportation, and environment (Roberts et al. 1999; Martin and Boaz 2000; Owens 2000). In fact, since the 1990s and early 2000s, an international move toward increased participation of the public in the decision-making of policy-setting bodies is apparent. This is attested by a profusion of terms and frames of reference, some of which has been captured nicely by Davis (2014, 2): Collaborative Governance (Newman et al. 2004; Ansell and Gash 2007); User and Community Co-production (Bovaird 2007); Citizen Participation (Arnstein 1969; Irvin and Stansbury 2004; Stewart 2007; Vigoda-Gadot and Mizrahi 2007); Public Participation (Daley 2008; Fung 2006; Martin 2008; Newman et al. 2004; Wang and Montgomery 2007); Participatory Management (Warner 1997); Partnership (Arnstein 1969; Vigoda, 2002); Civic Engagement (Cooper et al. 2006); Public Engagement (Horner et al. 2006); and Stakeholder Engagement (Greenwood 2007).

This general development, which can be traced to the codification and promulgation of both human rights and freedom of information legislation, has fuelled a significant shift in power relations towards the individual and the community in terms of service provision, accountability and transparency in all fields of endeavour. This has been bolstered by the availability of immediate information via Internet channels to individuals and society at large. The possibilities the Internet has generated for the design and delivery of user-generated content, has driven a transfer of power with rapid and far-reaching changes in the relationships among organisations, regulators, resource providers, communities and individuals. No longer can the production of scientific knowledge be accountable simply to an ideology that justifies the
authority of the expert; rather, it must also be accountable to the non-experts affected by the practice.

The role of citizens in advancing scientific knowledge, has received debate throughout history and continues to do so, sometimes pitting indigenous knowledge against specialized expertise, and creating tension between varying agendas, interests and conceptions of authenticity. One continues to find the potential for tension between the professional or “authoritative” curator or librarian who strives to adhere to discipline best practice and to respond to new and emerging trends within the cultural heritage industry, and the layperson from the community or the individuals and institutions who provide critical funding, who may operate by a very different set of criteria, and for whom a “successful” program or initiative may look very different than the curator’s conception. Sometimes, the results desired by a community may actually run counter to the profession’s ethics or an archaeological site or cultural centre’s sustainable development aims.

This is the conundrum discussed by Gallivan et al. (2011, 153-192) in their nuanced consideration of how native communities in Virginia attempted to gain federal recognition for their tribe by strategically deploying an argument of essentialism, which runs counter to anthropology’s constructivist notions of social identity. Archaeological excavation and its associated historical research were able to demonstrate that Werowocomoco had been the capital of the Powhatan chiefdom at the time the Jamestown colony was founded in the early 17th century (ibid). But after more than 400 years of mistreatment by Anglo American society (including violence, dispossession, and shifting power dynamics) it was impossible for the Powhatan descendants to demonstrate their historical and political continuity from contact times to the present, as required by USA law for legal recognition as a tribe (a group with a continuous history linked by blood ties to an ancestral community that resides in a narrowly-defined region) (ibid).

Similarly, within a museum context, Silverman (2011, 158) refers to an incident that involved funding for a very expensive gala dinner that a museum traditionally hosted for the Native American community; when the museum
sought to redirect the funds from the event toward an investment in educational programs, the Native American community objected, since for them the four-hour gala dinner was a very significant social occasion and community-building event. The conflict between differing priorities and agendas, and cultural values reflect different ways of building and strengthening the community.

Similar to the cases described by Gallivan et al. (2011) and Silverman (2011), within recent publications governing archaeological field practices and those governing cultural and knowledge institution best practices, there continues to be a number of challenges — or more explicitly, “disconnects” or “dissonances” — noted as realities that divorce and alienate stakeholders from cultural heritage management projects and practices, and similarly separate the cultural heritage practitioners and key governing management teams from the knowledge, tradition, insights and nuanced understandings that these stakeholder communities could bring to archaeological sites or cultural centres and to their sustainable preservation, protection, interpretation and promotion. These dissonances are discussed in Section 3.

3 Dissonances in Cultural Heritage

Ethnographic examples of community-based notions of cultural heritage practices has expanded the awareness of the researcher and practitioner to the complexities of stakeholder roles and responsibilities governing this field (as noted in Hamilakis and Duke 2007; Hollowell and Nicholas 2008), and the consequential disconnects and dissonances that occur if these obligations and responsibilities are not met. Addressed here are landscape dissonance, temporal dissonance, linguistic dissonance, and self-dissonance.

3.1 Landscape Dissonance

“Landscape Dissonance” as termed by Strouila and Sutton (2009, 124), describes the social disconnection felt by local communities toward archaeological sites within their locality. This disconnection is in some ways
similar to how European travellers of the 17th century onward experienced and depicted ancient sites: as being divorced from the modern living landscape (Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009).

Stroulia and Sutton (2009) argue that archaeological sites leave many of those who live near them indifferent, confused, or resentful. Even the sites proclaimed as the birthplace of Western civilization may hold little meaning for those living nearby (Sutton 1997, 2000), and in fact may serve as a source of resentment when tourists enjoy the site then depart with little or no engagement with local residents.

A similar resentment is that of the archaeological looter – those locals who illegally dig archaeological sites for artefacts to supply the growing antiquities market. Years of excavations in the Near East have trained a capable workforce of labourers who loot when not working for the excavation teams (see Pollock and Bernbeck 2005). When archaeological zones are fenced-off to protect them from looters, and other distrustful activities, or to simply create an internally harmonious island of antiquity, the past represented by the archaeological zone is in turn cut-off from the surrounding landscape, which can hinder the learning about the complexity of that past and how it has moved into the present (Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009).

Similarly, the practice of removing the areas between the present and the desired period of the past - as illustrated in the cleansing of all post-classical traces from the Athenian Acropolis (McNeal 1991; Hamilakis 2002) – deprives the local communities of their contribution to the creation of the modern landscape and, ultimately, their power in the production of the site; hence site production becomes dissociated from site consumption.

It must be noted here that the concept of alienation must not assume that just because one lives near a site an individual must have some special relation, or meaningful connection to that site. Locality, which is a solid index of identity or an emotional experience of heritage (Smith 2005; Smith and Waterton 2009), implies uniqueness and authenticity, two precious qualities in high demand in our current globalized and alienated society (Toloupa 2010). Both are problematic notions: there is a tendency to assume locality, place and
belonging as essential to existence — but this is by no means necessarily the case. Fixing people in place is yet another issue, as it assumes a degree of passivity and complacency on the part of communities and societies. Through effective interaction and personal contact, locality becomes a lived and intimate experience of a place, an embodied sensation of doing (ibid). This renders locality a powerful instrument of indoctrination, far more important than material authenticity: a place where archaeological sites and objects and exhibits or performances on display are not just what they are, they are what they mean; they become agents (ibid).

Stroulia and Sutton (2009) argue that “site fencing” not only occurs when sites are constructed by the cleansing of elements not perceived as part of their presented historical reality, but also wherever there is little encouragement to learn about the present. Disconnection occurs when ethnographic findings about the more recent periods are not integrated into the main arguments of an archaeology project, thus depriving the findings of the project from insights that can be derived from modern practices, social structures, or indigenous knowledge (ibid). Stroulia and Sutton (ibid) further argue that this disconnection can diminish the power of an archaeological site (or institution), based on the concept that an archaeological site (or a knowledge and cultural facility) is a socially constructed and contested arena of power. Gaventa and Barratt (2010), and Gaventa and Tandon (2010) describe our current society as an information society where knowledge is a powerful tool and those who produce knowledge gain power, in what he calls the political economy of knowledge. In this sense, archaeological and cultural interpretations are both produced by and also reproduce power relations (Hodder 1998, 2002; Renfrew 2000; Joyce 2002).

On another level, the “fencing” of cultural sites, objects, interpretations, and practices is created by the overarching governance rules and regulations determined by distant governmental departments. As Herzfeld (2009) describes, when Cretan villagers find small artefacts in their fields, they recognize these objects as “ancient” and therefore “valuable”, yet they also immediately recognize the potential risk of being associated with them. If, for example, they are caught selling the objects, they risk punishment at the
hands of the antiquities authorities, thus creating tension between a desire to connect to the ancient past and the dislike of its bureaucratic state guardians, the “archaeologists” (*ibid*). In this sense, “pride in antiquity vies with both avarice for financial gain and fear of retribution from a state” (Herzfeld 2009, 113).

The control of who benefits from research or cultural commodification can often limit access, usability, or the reproduction of cultural information (Herle 2003; Hollowell and Nicholas 2008). For instance, within official and professional circles, Western archaeology has often promoted its ethic of “stewardship”, whereby the practice of archaeology is the preferred method to understand the past; hence archaeologists have the authority to do so on behalf of everyone, both of which lack the requisite professional expertise and the imprimatur of the Academy (see Lynott 2003; Zimmerman *et al.* 2003). Although this is challenged by an increasing discourse of “engagement” and “participation”, as noted in Section 2, this discourse focuses predominantly on the material and tangible parts of “official” archaeology and the “archaeological record” (Hamilakis 2007a, 2007b). This may include the repatriation of archaeological artefacts, conservation practices, the business of illicit antiquities, or management of cultural heritage sites, without practicable recognition that communities may hold a unique connection to the tangible and intangible past, and their own ideas and practices of heritage management and its regulation (Hollowell and Nicholas 2009). Legal mechanisms often provide fixed definitions of cultural association and property, which result in “totalizing legal strategies” that are generally not compatible with community-based approaches (Brown 2004, 60), and are furthermore very difficult to change via the kind of bottom-up approaches of public engagement and participation. For example, the United States of America law defines a Native American tribe as “a group with a continuous history linked by blood ties to an ancestral community that resides in narrowly-defined region” (Silverman 2011, 157), yet while archaeologists were able to demonstrate that after more than 400 years of hostility and persecution by the dominant Anglo power structure (first as an English colony, then as part of the United States of America) it remains impossible for the Powhatan
descendants to demonstrate continuous presence in the region (ibid). Thus it is the legal requirement itself that is perhaps flawed, based on scholarly reconstruction of the social development of the Powhatan peoples and the distortion of colonial documentary sources depicting and describing Native American life in 1607 (ibid).

Stakeholder-based projects, within both archaeological sites and cultural knowledge institutions, too often promote the notion that stakeholder communities can take control of their cultural and intellectual heritage, with some external assistance, without providing a systematic and critical assessment of the overall heritage governance structure (e.g., the legal and administrative framework, the hierarchy of power, and political, economic and social dynamics at all levels) within which this reclamation of control is to be sustainably managed. While the ideal circumstance is one in which the cultural heritage practitioner responds to a community request for guidance in how the community members might develop a research project or museum exhibition that jointly meets their historical and economic or social needs, this is a rare reality. One inspirational example of such a case is the community-led archaeological project to reclaim a past almost forgotten, in Katuruka Village, northwest Tanzania. The initiative was prompted, in the absence of external guidance, by a village-self-realization of how much of the past was forgotten, and the impact this was having on the daily lives of all the villagers (see Schmidt 1990). The greater majority of collaborations flow from the initiatives of the professionals themselves, who according to their individual interactional styles, will vary in the space and degree of control they give to collaborators to develop joint goals. For example, the “Indigenous Inclusiveness Initiative” and the “Collections Synthesis Project” at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, as noted in Section 2, promotes the exposure of Native American youth to science careers, including a science scholarship program (ibid). Silverman (2011, 152-166) notes that opening the museum, inviting in native people, and directing them toward careers in science and archaeology is a top-down endeavour. Whereas a museum’s full commitment to stakeholder engagement ought to mean allowing the various
stakeholder communities to decide what programs and activities best serve them.

Brown (2004, 60) suggests that context-specific negotiations are more appropriate and effective for resolving cultural heritage management issues as opposed to legal mechanisms, in that there are unique cultural heritage items or forms of expression that are being addressed, and they must be approached on their own terms. From this perspective, therefore, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to cultural heritage --it would be a height of arrogance for any researcher, curator or director to suggest that he or she has crafted a “master key” to unlock every stakeholder engagement scenario. It is similar to morals and ethical teachings: every culture has stories that inculcate values such as respect for elders, the sanctity of life or the need to preserve the natural environment, but these “universal truths” are couched in stories, fables and narratives that draw upon culturally specific characters, terminologies and points of reference. It is a case of the universal expressed in the terms of the particular. Brown’s (2004, 60) argument is interesting to note in the context of developing stakeholder participation models that could be universally applied. These models are discussed in Section 4.

Finally, landscape dissonance is sometimes inadvertently perpetuated by otherwise sound site management and fieldwork practices, which are often controlled by outsiders who enjoy a disproportionate level of access to resources and decision-making — and who are often not bound by regulatory or programmatic requirements to engage with stakeholders at other, less-advantaged levels of decision making and influence. Stroulia & Sutton (2009) characterize field practices that lead to landscape dissonance, which are more widespread than is often recognized.

Research projects nearly always involve an outside group of experts temporarily residing in a community, something that inherently creates an awareness of difference. Although a new group moving into an existing community would normally be met with various mechanisms for social integration, this rarely happens for archaeological projects (ibid). For example, dissonance occurs when attempts at sociability occur too little and too late,
such as the postponing of a get-together with the local community until the end of the archaeological field season (*ibid*), or when archaeologists insist on involving local communities, where members of the local community fear state interventionism. In this case, engagement can actually lead to perceived negative fallout for locals.

Stroulia & Sutton (*ibid*) state that from the perspective of many local residents, the control of the site is given over to “outsiders” who function separately from the community in which they reside: living separately, speaking another language (or jargon), and rarely engaging in the kind of negotiation and networking other new residents would normally pursue. Even the most remote village is used to newcomers, yet cultural heritage practitioners do not participate in the normal processes of integration (*ibid*).

### 3.2 Temporal Dissonance

Time and temporality are perceived in distinctive and different ways -- from the linear, sequential, chronometric time, to time as the coexistence of past and present (Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009). Historical consciousness is often calibrated to an official calendar (Hertzfeld 1991, 2001, 2004), yet family histories such as those that emerge from the practice of dowering daughters, harvesting seasons, etc., can disrupt the official history (Herzfeld 1991). Such local temporalities that conflict with official ideology are often lost as they become, for example, persuaded by funds from tourism that the official chronology simply pays better (*ibid*).

Holtorf and Piccini (2009) put forward “Archaeological Ethnography” as a field technique to create a space where these diverse understandings of essential concepts such as “time” can coexist and come into dialogue with each other. They argue that an archaeological research focused only on the continuing presence of the past, or multiple meanings of the past, is still organized primarily around the interests of archaeologists and feeds the disconnection that has alienated so many communities from the sites around them. To pave the way for community collaboration, Holtorf and Piccini (2009) argue that
archaeological research, through an archaeological ethnography model, could develop human relationships and capture various perspectives in addition to adding to the progress of knowledge. The practice of archaeological ethnography is explored in further detail in Section 4.2.

Central to any conception of time are the material objects, things and artefacts, but also landscapes and their sensuous and sensory properties. This leads one to ask: where does the site begin or end, not just in terms of physical space, as discussed in Section 3.1, but in “meaningful” time?”

Schmidt (1990) shares stories that people tell about rivers, hills, and dips between hills, in an auto-ethnographic set of experiences illustrating an organic initiative by residents of a village to undertake a heritage restoration and revitalization project in north-western Tanzania (also noted in Section 3.1). Such stories are emotional and evoke the deepest cultural sentiments, infusing daily life with a deeper sense of belonging, and indeed of history (Field 1996 in Schimidt 1990). In some ways, the very landscape itself becomes a kind of “natural archive”, where trees, rocks, streams and other landscape features carry a “code” of history, real or fantasized.

A case that vividly demonstrates the close connection between landscape dissonance and temporal dissonance is that of the Opoa Valley in Eastern Polynesia. During the setting of boundaries for the Marae Taputapuatea site for the purpose of World Heritage Site nomination, it became apparent that in the absence of detailed knowledge regarding the cultural values of the surrounding landscape, it was not possible to define appropriate boundaries for the World Heritage Site or to develop a management plan that would protect these values in accordance with the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Smith 2003). Despite there being an enormous wealth of ethno-historic evidence about the Marae itself, little has been recorded of the wider cultural landscape of the Opoa Valley (ibid). To address this, research utilizing previous and current archaeological surveys of the valley was carried out and provided substantive evidence of a landscape constructed by past communities who maintained the great Marae Taputapuatea (ibid). For the local community the importance of this research in providing evidence in support of the World Heritage nomination became
secondary to a production of local knowledge about the lives of their ancestors that had been lost over more than a century of French colonial rule (ibid).

This case highlights how the approaches to which communities remember the landscape present a unique interpretation of material remains, thereby forging a communal history of place and social cohesion that cannot be overlooked by researchers (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009; Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009). Articulating and embracing such cultural relevance is a powerful tool in creating a deeper sense of ownership of the site among local inhabitants; if the future sustainability of the heritage site is threatened, there are now a host of local allies who recognize — and indeed identify with — the significance of the site beyond simple academic considerations. Kreps (2003) argues for this sense of collaboration for museums and other cultural centres too, whereby public participation cultivates a “sense of ownership” and inspires the belief in people that they own a “stake” in its activities, and that cultural centres are increasingly viewed as useful tools for community development and the promotion of cultural conservation.

3.3 Linguistic Dissonance

Terms like “Cultural Resource Management” and “Cultural Property” are commonly used within the heritage industry. They point to the use, commodity value and ownership of both tangible and intangible heritage (Hamilakis 2007a, 2007b; Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009). Such terms place the control and regulation of the past, its products and processes within the framework of Western property law and also subordinate to nationalist or ethnic notions of “culture” and “heritage” (Smith 2004). Smith et al. (2003) refer to this situation as “colonial estrangement”. The attention to the intangible aspects of cultural objects and practices, without which tangible cultural “properties” would arguably have minimal meaning, further emphasize how the concepts of “culture” and “cultural property” manage to determine boundaries around things that cannot truly be bounded (Brown 2004).
The languages used in cultural heritage management practices shape both our conceptualizations of the past and the social relations of power in contemporary society. For example, we may consider the scientific practice of naming people and places — a practice embedded in the colonial period, with regard to the practice in Middle Eastern archaeology of using typology categories to describe ancient societies (as further discussed in Chapter Three, Sections 2.3 and 2.4). More specifically, a “term” could have very different interpretations for various stakeholders; take for example the term “Anasazi”; amongst the archaeologists working in the Indian communities of Arizona and New Mexico, the word Anasazi is used to describe farmers residing in the northern American Southwest between 300 - 1500 CE, who are linked to the modern day Pueblo communities of Arizona (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009). Widdison (1991) points out that the word “Anasazi” invokes a very different interpretation for the modern Puebloan, who considers the word a scientific creation that separates the Puebloan from the connections of the past. As the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard is widely said to have argued, “When you label me, you negate me.” The primary ethical challenge here is respect for alternative ways of evaluating and understanding the past, so that cultural heritage practitioners today must become aware of how the use of their language is understood by different stakeholder groups, and of the potentially destructive power of linguistic categorization (Watkins 2006).

Collaboration is at base conversation - a flexible interchange about stakeholder needs and perspectives until mutual goals take shape (Meskell 1998, 2005), and if language is power, then progressing forward to a common language is an important way of advancing toward a shared authority. Ultimately, the degree of understanding is related to the amount of effort that is applied, but also to the quality of that effort (Pyburn 2000), so all collaborators must be aware of the inclusive and exclusive nature of language, and the way that language has the potential to be divisive and to deceive (Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006). There will always be inequities in access to professional expertise, local knowledge, and financial and other resources. While it is hard to imagine a case where the researcher
or cultural professional will not be seen as an authoritative expert in a particular discipline, or where local stakeholders will not have a stronger sense of community values and views than the outsider (which may lead them to question the validity of the professional discipline or cultural activity itself), the degree of trust and mutual respect which a shared language engenders are universal: it is impossible to imagine a context in which meaningful stakeholder engagement and integration can take place in the absence of a shared understanding of language, terminology, objectives and methodologies.

3.4 Self-Dissonance

Just as the divisions and disconnects that characterize any community can be studied, so might the separations or dissonances inherent in the way cultural heritage professionals view their own position. All researchers are products of culture, history and individual experience; thus their interests and ability to see problems and envision solutions or explanations are embedded in their own contexts, which are personal, local, and global at the same time (Lal 1996; Pyburn 2009). These are the many bounds that posit the researcher in respect to his/her study subjects: gender, political or religious views, etc. Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos (2009) state that instead of viewing these potential sources of “self-dissonance” as limiting, they ought to facilitate understanding for the practitioner, not as a privileged observer but instead as an ethical subject. A constant self-reflexivity admits that in most contexts the practitioners need the people they are studying more than they need the practitioners (Handler 2008 in *ibid*). Only by overcoming such “self-dissonance” can the researcher begin to enter into the world of his or her subjects, relate to local stakeholder communities on something approaching their own terms, and begin to appreciate what may be very different values associated with cultural heritage resources. The challenge here may be to persuade collaborators with various perspectives to be more reflexive, and thus more self-critical, about their interest in cultural heritage (Pyburn 2009).
To that end, Shankland (1999a, 1999b, 2005) encourages archaeologists to live amongst the community that the archaeologists are trying to engage rather than being isolated in houses dedicated to the excavators. Learning the language and social codes of the local community, and sharing not only world views and community/ family experiences, but also dinners and stories, does wonders for building empathy and trust (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006), and avoiding the landscape dissonance that is discussed in Section 3.1. This approach is not always possible due to the availability of resources and accommodation, cultural restrictions on access to certain spaces or individuals, and other factors; again, this is a case where the desirability to connect is universal, but the specific method in which those connections are made is highly contextual.

Such direct engagement with contemporary communities compels researchers to acknowledge and navigate the current politics, ethics, and practices of their discipline (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009). In some ways this is a kind of total ethnography, where the practitioners must endeavour to familiarize themselves with the complex worlds of the communities they are researching, and not only the community’s connection with the material past. This is so that the connections between the perspectives toward the past and those for various other material/non-material things are not lost to a study focusing primarily on the material or that focusing on the past. To do this, where living within the community is not possible, the researcher is required to relinquish, at least partially, the comfort of academic study and enter an area of methodological and ethical improvisation dictated by what may be considered an existential experience which may transform the practitioner in ways not easily predictable (Pyburn 2007, 2008). While Pyburn (2007) states that this has to be worked out in each individual context and that the balance will not always be the same, there are stakeholder participation models that have been developed which attempt to universalize the stakeholder engagement and participation approach for all contexts.

4 Stakeholder Participation Models for Cultural Heritage
The dissonances described above emphasize the need for the inclusion of a range of perspectives and voices, in any cultural heritage management undertaking. This section assesses the various models, as noted within current literature, which promote stakeholder participation for the cultural heritage field (Sections 4.1 to 4.4), and further assesses the stakeholder participation models that have originated from a variety of disciplines (Section 4.5).

4.1 Polyphony

By adopting a “polyphonic” approach to research and engagement methodologies, and incorporating a wide range of voices and perspectives into one’s study, cultural heritage managers begin to overcome the various disconnects or dissonances that otherwise hamper and limit their full understanding of their subjects, or undermine the relevance of their programs and offerings. Failure to include multiple voices and interests results in a less than complete view of the cultural resource, not unlike a photograph bleached by the sun — the outlines are distinct, but the rich colours have disappeared. In addition, the failure to engage stakeholder communities — on their own terms — deprives the cultural resource site or project of valuable allies and proponents for long-term sustainability. Within sites that are valuable to communities, stakeholders have concerns that go beyond issues regarding the limited input they have in heritage management decisions: they are concerned with the inability of archaeology, museums, exhibition and performance spaces, and archives, overall, to protect these sites or the knowledge that is derived from them in culturally sensitive methods (Dowdall and Parrish 2003).

To remedy this, Cooper (2009) advises the study of the area of discourse in relation to the cultural resource management process, arguing that heritage assets will regularly be mismanaged unless particular attention is given to how cultural resource management advice is constructed and communicated within the context of competing discourses. Strategies being used by stakeholder communities as part of their own discourse are as important to
the work of cultural heritage practitioners as studying scholarly discourse (*ibid*). A good example of what Cooper (2009) is advocating are the establishment of community museums that are managed by the communities themselves. These institutions can be utilised to develop employment and capacity building, lifelong learning, academic study, and function as communal places for the display, preservation, and archiving of heritage material (Fuller 1992; Kelly and Gordon 2002). Kreps (1998) emphasizes that forming collections and caring for objects is not simply a Western practice – almost every culture retains material from the past, associate value to them, and in some cases have formed sophisticated methods for archiving, displaying and caring for them. Tully (2009) adds that Community Museology is gaining momentum and ought to be considered an important element of schemes for the management of cultural heritage objects as well as the knowledge associated with these objects. Phillips (2001, 2003) notes that the impact of such collaborative interpretation and presentation on audiences requires further study.

The inherently political and economic nature of cultural heritage management strategies, practices and investments is made clear in the case of Mexico, where the trend for the (bottom-up) creation of community museums derives from the fact that from the sixteenth century onward, the objects associated with power and value for the country’s indigenous and mestizo peoples have been taken into custody and controlled by foreign invaders, clerics, collectors, and/or archaeologists. These local community museums have proven to be a way for communities to interpret and reiterate their identities via topics highly relevant to them, as they conceive, create, fund and man the museums (Hoobler 2006, 443-444). These museums are also a source of income in the form of entrance ticket fees, yet perhaps more notably for these locals; they ensure an opportunity to keep the archaeological material within the community (*ibid*). Many of the museums were founded for the same reason: after a major archaeological find was made in an area, there was resistance among the local population to the idea that, as per normal procedure, the objects excavated would be sent away to the national museum in Mexico City for study and analysis, never to return to the community (*ibid*). Furthermore,
an earlier program to encourage the creation of community museums in Mexico had featured a top-down leadership management which left community members feeling like they were on the outside looking in rather than the other way around (ibid). With the newer “bottom-up” approach, archaeological remains are seen as the physical manifestations of an indigenous past that these communities actively strive to preserve and protect (ibid).

Another example comes from Washington, USA; Ozette is a late prehistoric/early historic whaling village located at Neah Bay on the northwestern tip of the state of Washington; a huge excavation programme ran continuously from 1970 to 1981 and was visited by up to 60,000 people each year. This vast enterprise was initiated by the local Makah community, which continued to exercise control and provide direction throughout the project (Samuels and Daugherty 1991, 18). From its inception, the Ozette Archaeological Project considered cooperation with the goals of the Makah Indian Nation an important part of the project (ibid). Making these archaeological excavations understandable and relevant to the present generation of Makah was an initial goal, so that the Makah themselves could control the stabilization procedures and storage/accession systems after excavations were completed (ibid). These needs culminated in the construction of the Makah Cultural and Research Center, containing a museum and other facilities, which opened in 1979 (ibid).

One of the first archaeological research projects that attempted to achieve a polyphonic understanding of the archaeological record was the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project, under the direction of Ian Hodder (1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2007, 2008). Bartu-Candan, and David Shankland are two ethnographers who mapped the various local and global diverse publics that take an active interest in the Çatalhöyük archaeological site, located in Konya city, Turkey, and its legacy (Bartu-Candan 2005, 2007; Bartu et al. 2007; and Shankland 1999a, 1999b, 2005).

Shankland’s (2005) work is essentially a focus on scientific analysis rather than community involvement, and therefore stands as an anthropological
study of archaeology/community relations and a collection of local stories about the site implicitly juxtaposed to “scientific” archaeological knowledge (Tully 2009). It provided a coherent map of the various stakeholders with an interest in the history of Çatalhöyük. It did not extend to exploring the power relationships and conflicts or confluences of interests among the various actors. In other words, it did not engage with the political economy of archaeological practice. Whereas, it is the understanding of political economy that demonstrates the material expressions and effects of power inequalities, and guides the exploration of the asymmetrical impact the archaeological project has upon different social and economic groups (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009), as highlighted in Sections 3.1 to 3.3.

By contrast, Bartu’s (2000) research identified “multiple sites” where different kinds of knowledge about the site are produced and consumed, and how the very existence of different perceptions, interests and agendas affected the archaeological process itself. In other words, Shankland’s (2005) study could be compared to a still photograph of conditions at a moment in time, while Bartu’s (2000) work is more like a moving picture, capturing dynamic relationships as they evolve over time and through practice. Bartu-Candan’s (2005) view of “multiple sites” significantly expanded standing concepts of the “site” from a localized, defined space, to a dispersed, socially constructed and contested arena of power, practice and knowledge. Once these “multiple sites” have been identified, the question then becomes a matter of selecting the appropriate, most effective tool(s) to connect with stakeholder groups, to solicit their authentic views, perspectives, and action, and then to make appropriate use of the information and data that have been collected and assessed.

Bartu (2000) encouraged local women, residing in the villages near to Çatalhöyük, to offer their own site tours to the visitors of Çatalhöyük. These tours told, “the story of the mounds… mostly through the plants on them, and even the routes the women chose . . . were mainly determined by the location of certain plants on the mounds” (ibid, 106). The tours may have encouraged visitors/ tourists to look outward from the site, as well as inward. These
women also participated in the creation of an exhibition in the onsite Visitor Center, by providing their own interpretation of the historical use of vegetation and herbs collected on the site. In 2001, a group of men and women from the villages were paid to contribute to discussions about the interpretation of the site based on the most recent analytical results that were shared with them by the specialists; the discussions were later transcribed in publication texts (Hodder 2002, 177). Hodder (2002, 177) notes that the topic to which they could most effectively contribute was the practices of living in central Anatolian environment. These were one-off programs driven primarily by the desire to capture local knowledge, rather than to establish a structured engagement mechanism for the local stakeholder group.

For a polyphonic approach to work, Hodder (2002, 175-177), recommends negotiating research questions with the various stakeholder groups who hold an interest in the cultural heritage resource: for the case of Çatalhöyük, these could be the questions posed by the local politicians regarding the lineage of the Çatalhöyük inhabitants to the modern day peoples of the Anatolian plain; questions posed by European politicians that visit the site regarding the historical linkages of Turkey to Europe; questions posed by the international feminist/mother goddess groups regarding the role of women in prehistory; questions posed by the locals regarding land use in prehistory and the significance of the Konya plain as a location of choice for early settlers; and questions posed by artists regarding the prehistoric “art” at Çatalhöyük, its significance in history, and the inspiration it provides for contemporary creativity (ibid). Hodder (ibid) explains that archaeologists have an ethical responsibility to ask questions about the past that resonate with stakeholder communities, but that this also involves the archaeologists taking a stance with regard to how the data can be used to support arguments that are made by the interested parties (ibid).

For instance, he (ibid) notes that when the ambassador of the European Union visited the site, the ambassador made speeches to the press regarding the fact that there was no boundary between Europe and Asia at the time of the Çatalhöyük civilization. He referred to the evidence discussed with the Çatalhöyük project team for the existence of cultural contacts between central
Anatolia and south-eastern Europe in the Neolithic period, taking from this “proof” of his view that “originally” Turkey was indeed part of Europe (ibid). This is in rather stark contrast to the local politicians’ views, and while the research team pointed out that based on current evidence, there are difficulties with the notion of a large-scale spread of Indo-Europeans associated with agriculture, the ambassador had already assessed the evidence through his own contemporary political lenses (ibid).

Understanding, accommodating and navigating amongst these various stakeholder agendas, and inequities and inequalities in interpretation and in decision making power, is very important if a polyphonic approach is to work; particularly as some groups will not be able to position themselves in the conversation on their own.

4.2 Archaeological Ethnography

Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos (2009) promote “Archaeological Ethnography” as the means to enable the fundamental political-reflexive research that will capture the various, and at times conflicting, economic, political and other interests that the material past and heritage production generate, by exploring aspects such as land ownership and rights, agriculture, cultural tourism, the heritage industry, and so on.

The term Archaeological Ethnography was used as early as the 1970s (Watson 1979, 1999), and is often used today to describe work that either is conducted within the paradigm of ethno-archaeology or that goes beyond ethno-archaeological tradition to address issues through ethnography and ethno-history (e.g. Robin and Rothchild 2002; Forbes 2007). Generally, ethnographic methodologies are conducted to achieve a stronger commitment to present day situations that centre archaeology and its primary stakeholders — the role of the State, an acknowledgment of archaeology’s political embeddedness, and possibilities for participation (Meskell 2005).

Meskell (2005) draws a sharp line between ethno-archaeology and archaeological ethnography; where traditional “ethno-archaeology” studies
modern societies to understand past human behaviours, “archaeological ethnography” focuses on the ways in which archaeology works in the world. Ethno-archaeological research, where present-day agricultural societies are studied to understand patterns of land use in prehistory, has in fact come to validate contemporary practices in their own right, and in so doing has produced intimate portraits of rural life that until now had escaped academic research (see for example Halstead 1998). Equally, ethnography as part of conventional archaeological projects has often incorporated archival and ethno-historical research to address specific questions (for e.g., Castaneda and Matthews 2008; Stroulia and Sutton 2009). Archaeological ethnography, on the other hand, is not simply the reintroduction of ethnography into archaeological projects, nor is it born by simply mixing archaeological and ethnographic-anthropological practices; rather it is a hybrid and holistic anthropology that is improvisational and context-dependent (Meskell 2005). It is a study of the conversations and transactions between archaeologists and other groups which traces the impact of various archaeological actions and the views that each side holds of the other, and identifies the moments of performance and group interaction in which these views are enacted. This definition of archaeological ethnography emphasizes the anthropological dimensions of archaeology — how the interpretations of the past are intrinsically contemporary human pursuits. In this regard, Meskell (ibid) exposes the many “community collaboration” projects featured in the literature as often empty rhetoric, built on reciprocity and deep awareness of mutual benefits rather than objective research.

According to Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos (2009), archaeological ethnography is a trans-disciplinary and trans-cultural space that enables practitioners and a diversity of publics to participate to reveal the existence of alternative practices and engagements with the material past. These “spaces” are not simply locales for “public outreach” and “knowledge transfer”, as is often the case with public archaeology; instead, they are seen as arenas for dialogue that may lead to the collaborative production of new knowledge and understanding (ibid). Within this space, the distinction between past and present, between diverse publics and researchers of equally diverse
backgrounds, and between modernist and alternative archaeologies are downplayed (ibid). The shift from practice to space offers possibilities for multiple coexistences in an on-going conversation (ibid), echoing the desire for polyphony. Hamilakis (2007a) and Hollowell and Nicholas (2008) believe that waves of ethnographies that are designed to capture the discourses and practices involving the past that existed prior to the emergence of modernist archaeology have the potential to transform the currently dominant top-down perspectives found in the field of heritage management. Alternative engagements by various stakeholder groups with the material past will exist, in parallel or in dialogue with, and sometimes in opposition to, official modernist archaeology (Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2009).

Many archaeologists and other cultural heritage practitioners may be reluctant to extend themselves so far beyond their research question or the focus of their archaeological or exhibition research, in part because they may feel they lack the professional experience and expertise to engage in such ethnographical or anthropological pursuits. Such conversations and engagements are — almost by definition — messy, and may entangle the professional outsider in local issues of economic development, political decision making, land usage, or cultural practices and mores — all at the potential expense of focus and funding that could be directed toward the cultural project itself. There are also the potential unintended consequences from such stakeholder engagement: if a community group is asked its opinion of how a site should be excavated or which artefacts should be displayed in a museum, and how it ought to be interpreted, that group may decide it has a right to weigh in on the composition of the local government council, on the way a town’s budget is allocated, or whether a building permit should be issued for a new business. This new assertiveness may not find favour with local or regional authorities, which may in turn decide to withhold permits from the archaeological team for the following season, on grounds that the researchers have been “meddling” in local politics.
Given the complexities of relationships, for those researchers untrained in ethnography, when aspiring “to understand how the value of the past is calibrated across a wide social spectrum” (Meskell 2005, 82), they may wish to follow a more structured stakeholder participation model, such as those noted in Sections 4.1 to 4.4, to develop ethnographically sensitive and ethical relationships with members of stakeholder communities, and navigate what may become treacherous waters.

4.3 Participatory Action Research

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is a well-established emancipatory methodology that brings together principles of both Action Research (Freire 1972), and participatory research (Whyte 1981), and promotes reciprocal and collaborative practices that have been employed in various industries, from healthcare to environment (for e.g., Castellanet and Jordan 2002; Moser et al. 2002; O’Neill 2003; Minkler and Wallerstein 2003). All formulations of PAR, as applied and evolved on an on-going basis within different sectors, have in common the idea that research must be undertaken with people and not on or for people (Chevalier and Buckles 2013). The current literature regarding PAR contribute many new tools and conceptual foundations to this longstanding practice, such as the diagram illustrating three key elements of PAR, as expressed by Chevalier and Buckles (2013, 35) (Figure 1).
PAR is structured to ensure that project outcomes are not determined in advance; this means that the perspectives and objectives of researchers and curators, even when they are supported by political and economic power, will not always prevail (Pyburn 2009). Wadsworth (1998) notes that PAR involves all relevant parties joining together to actively examine current action, which they experience as challenging, in order to change or enhance the action.

Some of the critical questions that PAR tackles through the designing of its research are: Whose research is it? Who owns it? Whose objectives does it serve? Who will benefit? Who designs the study? Who will undertake the study? Who will compose the study and how are the results to be disseminated? (Smith 2000). Within cultural heritage projects, these questions are used to ground cultural heritage management in ethics and practices as agreed by the stakeholder groups, one that offers a means by which they may be empowered to articulate and put forth their own principles of heritage law and heritage management (Hollowell and Nicholas 2008). This carries over to considerations regarding the appropriation and commodification of cultural identity, past and present; as Langford (1983, 4) memorably stated, “If we
Aborigines can’t control our own heritage, what the hell can we control?” Therefore each and every research study begin with the issues and of the community and designed and undertaken by, with, and for them.

The implementation of PAR within an archaeological landscape is best illustrated by the detailed literature available from the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project, where for over six years, a Visualisation Team of approximately 10 people have been undertaking PAR (Perry et al. 2013, 2014). The team was originally led by Stephanie Moser, a Professor at the University of Southampton in the United Kingdom who also demonstrated PAR at the Quseir Community Project in Egypt (see Tully 2009), and is now formed by the University of York, the University of Southampton, and a Turkish university, Ege University, who work together with the onsite specialists, local workers, and visitors, to generate new exhibitions, way-finding designs, and outreach programs through consultation (ibid). The aim of the team is to involve all relevant parties in actively examining together the current undertakings at the site in regards to its physical and conceptual accessibility to visitors, and thus enhance the visitor experience through continuous improvements. This work is carried out within a two to three week window every annual field season. The key initiatives undertaken by the Visualisation Team to date include the “Yapi Kredi-Sponsored Exhibition for the European Association of Archaeologists Meeting”, which took place between 10th to 14th September in 2014, and the “Visitor Research” study.

The Yapi Kredi-Sponsored Exhibition was designed to convey, through community-themed panels and a digital slideshow of images, the local and non-specialist involvement at the Çatalhöyük archaeological site over time. The focus was on the Çatalhöyük archaeological project team of past and present. Through a “behind the scenes” view of the site, such as the lab processes, the excavations, and community contribution in the form of labourers, cooks, etc., the Visualisation Team wanted to dissolve the mysteries of the archaeology project as well as presenting the contribution played by various stakeholders (ibid). As demonstrated by this project, PAR documents the multiplicity of values a place or an object holds for people who have cared for it in the past, and in the present. This can be understood
through the integration of all available layers of knowledge and values associated with a place, such as the linkage of archival information, oral histories, information of land-use activities etc., with archaeological data.

With regard to the Visitor Research, the Visualisation Team have been undertaking interviews with the Çatalhöyük site’s three site guards to capture their thoughts and suggestions regarding the effectiveness of annual additions and modifications that the Visualisation Team have been making to the interpretative programme onsite (Perry et al. 2013, 290-300). At Çatalhöyük, the site guards are the primary custodians of the pre-historic archaeological site and its visitor centre, as well as being the most knowledgeable observers of visitor behaviours at the site, and its patterns and trends. Through these interviews, the Visualization Team would also capture the guards’ suggestions for future changes that respond to the changing trends in visitor desires and behaviours; this process is repeated annually (ibid, 290-300). Alongside the interviews with the site guards, from 2009 onward, the Visualisation Team have been undertaking a programme of observations, interviews, questionnaires, and consultation with key site workers, tourists, and locals to capture the recommendations of these stakeholders for developing better visitor experiences (ibid). For example, a member of the Visualisation Team would make their presence known to a visiting tour group and would then tour the site with the group, noting movements, questions asked of the guide or the site guards, and any other significant interactions during the site experience (ibid). The team member would note special interest areas such as the everyday details of life at Çatalhöyük thousands of years ago, or the specialist excavation techniques, chart these (see Figure 2,) and plan to expand upon the interpretative materials related to such topics within both the visitor’s centre and onsite (ibid).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/statement from visitor(s)</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned in observation script</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday life at Çatalhöyük</td>
<td>iiiiiii (8)</td>
<td>Asked if there was a river nearby, how did people carry water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall paintings and dwelling interiors at Çatalhöyük</td>
<td>iiiiiii (7)</td>
<td>Asked if the colour of the art had meaning, said it reminded him of blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current excavation at Çatalhöyük</td>
<td>iiiiii (6)</td>
<td>They wanted to know the date of each layer and how separate layers could be identified; interest in archaeologists working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>iiiii (4)</td>
<td>Visitors aware of the placing of skeletons under the floors of houses→ wanted to know more precise information (where? how? how many?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolism, belief and social structure at Çatalhöyük</td>
<td>iii (3)</td>
<td>Asked about religion, and if there was symbolism in houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and trade at Çatalhöyük</td>
<td>ii (2)</td>
<td>Visitors asked questions relating to industry/ trade/wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about landscape and area</td>
<td>i (1)</td>
<td>Distance from site to particular mountains and other notable features in the landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. A record of the frequency and topic of queries posed by visitors to the Çatalhöyük site in July 2014 (Perry et al. 2014, Table 17.1).

The Visualisation Team have also been working with the site guards to develop a more systematic and digitized method of recording visitor demographics to ensure the availability of reliable data for future analysis. Çatalhöyük’s site guards are responsible for building this data, and have been recording visitor attendance since 2002. Until now, these recordings have been undertaken by hand in several notebooks, and not always in a consistent way (ibid). For example, at least one page of entries (36 lines of data) from August 2010 has been ripped out of the record books, which skews
the visitor data (ibid). Elsewhere, the visitor numbers have been inflated by using bus capacity to estimate the size of tour groups (ibid).

For PAR, empowering and building the capacity of the stakeholder groups are essential elements that ensure these stakeholders contribute to the project as strong partners, equipped with the tools they need. Another good example of this is the Moriori Cultural Database Project; Hollowell and Nicholas (2009) conducted ethnographic interviews with 22 individuals, and small group discussions with elders and other knowledgeable community members to capture the alienating factors of archaeology – revealing the local disapproval of the inappropriate terminology used (because it disassociated the human element from sites), to local desires to strategically recommend reforms to Canadian heritage law. Much of the work involved members of the study team travelling the land with Moriori elders to map the places associated with their narratives (ibid). This combined collective information would then be presented to inform heritage management as well as land and resource management decisions from a Moriori standpoint.

It must be noted here that PAR suggests a notion that stakeholder communities can take control of their cultural and intellectual heritage, with some external assistance, often without providing a systematic and critical assessment of the overall heritage governance structure (e.g., the legal and administrative framework, the hierarchy of power, and political, economic and social dynamics at all levels) within which this reclamation of control is to be sustainably managed. Conversations with stakeholders will not always be smooth as they take place on contested ground, created by past appropriations and separations, and sometimes are informed by a legacy of outright conflict. Time will always be needed for confronting difficult issues, developing trust, and participating in the relationship-building that is required of those who are committed to the communities. In this way, PAR takes as a given the desirability of incorporating “bottom up” views and perspectives — potentially at the expense of the effective implementation or internal coherence of the research project in question, given that even the final objectives of the research are amorphous. In other words, if everyone gets a
say on every issue, how are decisions reached and enforced? How often are these decisions revisited, and are they subject to revocation once the popular will turns? How can stakeholder views be balanced against the goals and objectives of state authorities, for example, given the inequities in decision making power that exist between the two groups? All of these questions represent a challenge for PAR, which is often promoted as a short-term alternative to research conducted over a long term. To that, the relationship between the practices of PAR and the sustainability of a project, resource, or is social and economic benefits is not as yet clearly demonstrated within the cultural heritage field.

4.4 Community-Based Participatory Research

Similar to PAR, the Community-based Participatory Research (CBPR) model provides a methodology for engaging descendent and local communities as partners in cultural heritage research. They are community-driven, feature research that is developed together with members of a community to address interests and needs identified together, and are conducted relying on community core values (Atalay 2010). The participatory nature of CBPR projects, in which community members are included from the outset, presumes that the likelihood of long-term interest and engagement in the process and outcome is more probable than in a traditional researcher-driven approach (ibid). According to Minkler and Wallerstein (2003), CBPR is a collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the undertaking of the research process and ensures the recognition of the unique strengths and qualities that each brings.

Case studies of CBPR application can be found in women’s studies (Maguire 1987), anthropology (Tax 1958), environmental management (Fortmann 2008), and healthcare (Minkler & Wallerstein 2008), among other disciplines and industry. CBPR projects require sustained effort, firstly to identify those with whom it is appropriate to work in each community – be it political leadership, culturally appropriate decision-makers or a community-based organization – and to then work collaboratively to identify “community”
concerns and develop the cultural heritage project. The project begins with a research topic of significance to the community, with the fundamental aim of combining knowledge and action for positive social development. Such “needs-led” studies involve a negotiation of research practices that enable capacity building for the local communities and ensure the sharing of the research findings with all the participating stakeholders (Atalay 2010).

Community capacity building within CBPR projects is a key feature that distinguishes the approach from other community-led research. Increasing people’s knowledge of their own cultural heritage may be the initial platform, yet added to this will be enhanced research literacy and community development skills that can then be applied to other situations outside the realm of cultural heritage. Israel et al. (1998, 179) call this “an empowering process that attends to social inequalities”. Capacity building is necessary to develop, within the local communities, an effective, knowledgeable and insightful research partner. It is this search that allows CBPR to reveal the marked power imbalances between cultural heritage practitioners and local residents, yet the process is often time and labour intensive (Atalay 2010). It is worth noting here that the capacity building is reciprocal: ideally, the CBPR project would help the research team members develop and enhance their community engagement skills, which can then be utilized to progress other mutually beneficial collaborative projects in other communities and locales.

There is perhaps a problem here in the discrepancy between the CBPR discourse about participatory development — the cultural heritage research discourse and the issue of local communities as alienated and lacking power — and the expectation or assumption that the “local people” will participate. Also “research” and the position of the “researcher” creates conditions of resource availability, knowledge, authority and value that communities previously were perhaps unaware of, but which immediately become manifest; in other words, one must first study one’s own involvement and role in creating and assigning heritage value (as explored in Section 3.4).

Researchers engaged in CBPR must be prepared for a significant time investment to increase their knowledge regarding the “community”, and
community concerns and knowledge, and local and regional politics (Pyburn 2009). This is often not so easily done; part of the challenge is that these communities are often not organized around issues of cultural heritage or knowledge, so the structures relating to cultural heritage with which to initiate a collaborative partnership do not always exist (Atalay 2010).

Cooke and Kothari (2001) argue that both CBPR and PAR promote partnerships that are often less democratic than they are reported to be, because the power base and benefits still tend to be skewed towards the outside researcher. Collaboration between multiple stakeholder groups, regardless of how sensitive and careful each party is to the others’ perspectives and realities, will unescapably be troubled with contentions. Varying cultural objectives and priorities are challenging, and even more so when combined with time and resource limitations (see Swindler et al. 1997), it is not surprising that acceptance and flexibility will be discussed more than once (Field et al. 2000; Fienup-Riordan 1999; Herle 2000; McDavid 1997; Shankland 1996). Pyburn (2009) notes that the repercussions of action-oriented participatory projects can be positive, negative or neutral, but most of the time any research programme has some positive, some negative and some neutral effects all at the same time.

The CBPR project undertaken at the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project has aimed to integrate the previously ad hoc efforts at stakeholder engagement, into a coherent, quantitative and qualitative research program conducted over a period of several years, and involving a number of community outreach and engagement initiatives. The program, founded and led by community archaeologist Professor Sonya Atalay, was conducted during the field seasons, and focused on engaging the populations of the five villages nearest to the site. The objectives of the project was to partner with the local community (who would later inherit and drive the project), to include the views of the local communities in the development of the archaeological research strategies and the development of the site itself, inclusive of all its products. The CBPR project employed various tools to engage with the local communities, including:
• Development and dissemination of educational material to increase the archaeological and scientific literacy of the locals, including; comic strips, town hall meetings, guided site tours, theatre plays, and annual festival bringing together all the villagers (Atalay 2006, 2007, 2010).

• Identification of key stakeholders via conversations with the locals geared toward influential members of the villages who could act as spokespeople, third-party endorsers, and later, owners of the CBPR project (ibid).

• Integration of locals into the Çatalhöyük team via an internship program tailored also to provide these individuals with marketable business skills (ibid).

• Surveys to capture local community perspectives regarding their relation to the site, the research project, and the research team.

These surveys that were undertaken by the CBPR project team within the five nearby villages, involved visits to local homes, making the process a powerful relationship-building tool. During these oral surveys (some of which were undertaken with me in the position of the translator) the majority of the local residents revealed that they had not yet had any significant role in the management of the site. When a man from a local village is asked by Atalay to talk about archaeology and its impact on his community, his response is: “We aren’t like you archaeologists; we don’t talk about Çatalhöyük, we live it.” (Atalay 2010, 418). Atalay (2010) highlights the word “yabancı” (foreigner), which is often used by the local residents to indicate the “foreign” archaeologists (even Turkish archaeologists), whose high level of education and economic security is viewed in sharp contrast to their own. Interestingly, the majority of those surveyed agreed that a team recruited from Çumra town and Küçükköy village (the two communities nearest to Çatalhöyük) would be the rightful partners, and later owners of the CBPR project. Fuelled by this
proposal, Atalay (2010) recruited two young women from Küçükköy village as interns who could be trained and, when ready, would inherit the CBPR project. The two girls soon quit due to family pressures; most likely played out by the concerns of the villagers regarding the mixed cultural and mixed gender environment of the Çatalhöyük site offices at which the young women were interning. The CBPR project has been discontinued at the site since 2010.

4.5 Seeking a Universal Participation Model

The participatory models of cultural heritage management have been noted within this Chapter as Polyphony, Archaeological Ethnography, Participatory Action Research, and Community-Based Participatory Research. These may vary as to the relative emphases given to different aspects of stakeholder engagement and/or cultural heritage management practices. Some of the earliest examples of stakeholder participation models, from various disciplines, offer a categorization of stakeholder participation based on collaboration objectives. For example, Strand et al. (2003) identify three central features common across an inclusive model of professional work:

1) The notion of a collaborative initiative between academic researcher and community members;

2) The democratization of knowledge through the validation of multiple sources of knowledge and the use of multiple systems research and its presentation;

3) The underlying objective of social action for achieving social change and social justice — an objective that may not be directly tied to the research aim of a given site, project or institution.

Here, collaborative knowledge production is challenged by two related questions: “Knowledge for whom? Knowledge for what?” (Elliot and Williams
Arnstein (1969, 216-224) noted the following four categories of stakeholder collaboration:

- “Information level”, in which stakeholders are told that knowledge about them will be used in a decision making process;

- “Consultation level”, whereby information and knowledge is solicited from stakeholders, albeit in a one-way process;

- “Dialogue level”, which involves an iterative and interactive process between the stakeholders and the researcher, and in which stakeholders are able to provide comments on and even suggest changes to the research model; and,

- “Co-design level”, where stakeholders and researchers work together to scope the research project and determine together the methodologies of data collection, analysis and presentation.

Similarly, Rosener (1975, 256), offers a useful checklist of stakeholder participation mechanisms and their characteristics, such as “solicit impacted groups”, “disseminate information”, “resolve conflict”, and “facilitate advocacy” among others. He also lists 39 different techniques ranging from structured procedures such as “task forces”, “workshops”, and “citizen referenda”, to broader concepts, such as “public information programs”, and “citizen employment” (ibid, 256). Rosener (1975) does not identify in which contexts to use a particular mechanism, nor does he recommend using any particular mechanism or technique over another.

Glass (1979, 180-189) proposes five alternative participation objectives: “information exchange”, “education”, “support building”, “supplemental decision making”, and “representational input”. He goes on to note four stakeholder participation “technique categories” to support the participation objectives. The techniques are based on structural characteristics: unstructured, structured, active process, and passive process.
Nelkin and Pollak (1979, 55-64) categorize stakeholder participation techniques by their definitions of public acceptability, such as “lack of confidence”, “alienation”, and “adequate information”; each technique would counter one of these realities of stakeholder acceptability.

Biggs (1989, 1-4) outlines four “modes” of participatory research, whereby control over the research project is increasingly ceded by researchers to relevant stakeholders, until both parties have an equal say in the shape the project will take:

1) Contractual;
2) Consultative;
3) Collaborative, and;
4) Collegiate.

While the categorizations recommended by Arnstein (1969), Rosener (1975), Glass (1979), Nilkin and Pollak (1979), and Biggs (1989), to name a few, capture the degree to which stakeholder communities are involved in a project, and although these classifications have some merit in simplifying the participation problem into a number of types – on the basis of objectives, structure or function – and associate certain mechanisms with each, they fall short in explicitly addressing the following three areas:

1) The makeup or profile of the stakeholders with whom engagement is sought.

How large is the stakeholder universe, and how diverse? Are stakeholders from different groups or backgrounds engaged in homogeneous groups (e.g., working-class, Spanish-speaking males aged 18-35 living in a single or in groupings that represent a “diagonal slice” (from top to bottom and side to side) of the overall stakeholder population (for example, males and females of various social classes, ethnic backgrounds and ages drawn from across the city)?
2) The diverse range of expectations of various stakeholders.

The degree to which stakeholders wish to be engaged may vary widely, "with some keen on being involved in decision making, some unwilling to share responsibility for future outcomes, some wishing to prevent the process from coming up with undesirable options, some seeking recognition of their own knowledge, some taking the opportunity to interact with other specific participants, and others being merely curious about what is happening" (Barreteau et al. 2010). Failure to identify, recognize and manage such expectations can have real-world negative consequences, as disappointed stakeholders are more likely to decline future invitations to engage in similar participatory initiatives: the greater the disappointment, the more likely it will be associated with participatory efforts in general.

3) The specific approach or model for collaboration.

The categorization of the degree to which stakeholders are engaged does not presuppose any particular method of engagement and integration, nor does it claim to provide any insights into the efficacy of one model over another.

Rowe and Frewer (2005, 284) offer three different activities within the domain of public engagement:

1. "Public communication";
2. "Public consultation", and;
3. "Public participation".

The three concepts are differentiated according to the nature and flow of information between the researcher and public participants. According to such an information flow model, Rowe and Frewer (2005, 284), claim that the effectiveness of the exercise may be determined according to the efficiency with which full and relevant information is elicited from all appropriate sources, transferred to (processed by) all appropriate recipients, and combined (when this is required).
Similarly, Barecca et al. (2011) outline a continuum of stakeholder participation involving various stakeholders, degrees of intensity, goals, and techniques that develop an organizational strategy (or a “participation-planning matrix”) around stakeholder needs, expectations and desires. They note the most intensive form of engagement, where the stakeholder is a partner who is empowered to negotiate, as the moment when the “organization implements what stakeholders decide” (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. A participation-planning matrix (Barrecca et al. 2011).

Given the sheer number of mechanisms available for activating stakeholder participation, and also some degree of confusion as to what each does and does not entail and how each mechanism differs from the others, the literature does not claim any significant theory regarding what mechanism should be used in what circumstance to enable the effective engagement and participation of stakeholders. Rowe and Frewer (2005, 256-258) provide a sound demonstration of the confusing plethora of terms used in the stakeholder engagement domain via a chart covering several pages of commonly used terms, and note that dissimilar mechanisms have in the past been published or described using the same term; and that similar mechanisms have been described using different terms - both these problems
stress the necessity of clear mechanism definition and an associated typology.

There are a number of challenges to developing an explicit methodological structure that could be universally applied. One such challenge is the diverse range of contexts in which such stakeholder engagement is practised, and their confidential nature (Rosoff 1998; Peers and Brown 2003). There is also the need for a flexible mechanism that accommodates the reality that stakeholder communities are constructed and therefore are eternally open to negotiation (Kreps 2003; Tully 2009). Understanding these challenges is key to developing participation mechanisms that offer sustainable management practices that effectively and consistently meet these challenges. Hence, a stakeholder participation model must make seemingly foreign practices more compatible with all local settings, and thus more acceptable to local communities (Kreps 2003), as well as the full range of stakeholders. Beritelli et al. (2007) speak of the need to define and develop universal rules and mechanisms that put together all of the actors involved at both institutional and business levels, to define a successful and competitive system which can deliver an effective strategy of development at all levels of the process. When translated into the cultural heritage sphere, the most fundamental motivation for making heritage management a more inclusive, participatory process is rooted in the acknowledgement that good governance efforts are greatly enhanced and sustained by the fair and equal participation of key stakeholders. Within the cultural heritage space, there is still little evidence of a stakeholder engagement and participation model that demonstrates links to sustainability and one that is also universal to all situations.

5 Definition of Key Terms

Definitions of terminology are important to understanding the research questions in this thesis. Therefore Sections 5.1 to 5.12, articulate the key terms that are expressed throughout the thesis.
5.1 Archaeological Site

The terms “Archaeological Site” and “Archaeological Project” here refer to archaeological excavation projects and archaeological sites that are operated for the purpose of preservation/conservation, research and/or visitation. The terms include the knowledge and other products generated and disseminated by the research and/or project.

5.2 Cultural Centre

The terms “Cultural Centre”, “Cultural Institution”, “Cultural Knowledge Institution” and “Knowledge Institution” here, all refer to an organisation, building or complex that promotes culture and arts, generates knowledge through their activities, collections, and other resources, and undertakes lifelong learning activities. Examples of these include a museum, library, art academy, theatre etc.

5.3 Cultural Heritage

The literature for the term “Cultural Heritage” is visited in Section 2. This term, and similarly, the term “Cultural Resource” can be summarized as the body of tangible and intangible culture and natural heritage (Hall and McArthur 2002), which is unique and irreplaceable, and which requires stewardship, curation and/or management to be preserved, conserved, interpreted, reinterpreted and built upon. In this study, it specifically refers to the archaeological site and its archaeological features; the knowledge and interpretation that stems from the site and the archaeological resource; the contents and collections of knowledge and cultural spaces like museums, libraries and galleries; the programs, events and knowledge offerings that take place in these spaces; and the community traditions and cultural norms that underpin the production of knowledge, historical narratives, arts and literature.
5.4 Community

Community studies have served as an important unit of ethnographic analysis since the inception of social research. Anthropological interest in community studies developed as small communities came to be perceived as “samples” of the larger society in which they were embedded (Kolb and Snead 1997, 610). Archaeological approaches to the study of local communities have gained popularity over the last decade as researchers have begun to study the mechanics of small-scale social units. “Community” remains a poorly defined concept and definitions can vary widely. Because of the complexity and specificity of community identity and functionality, problems of definition and scale have plagued the archaeological study of community organization and limited the application of archaeological data to large theoretical questions of change in social systems (ibid, 609).

Recent literature on the Hohokam of southern Arizona, for instance, describes “irrigation communities” (Doyel 1980), “platform mound communities” (Gregory and Nials 1985), and “ballcourt communities” (Wilcox and Sternberg 1983), each distinct from the others. Within the anthropological literature, Hollingshead (1948, 145) identifies three ways to define community:

1) As a form of group solidarity, cohesion and action around common and diverse interests;

2) As a geographic area with spatial limits;

3) A socio-geographic structure which combines the ideas embodied in 1 and 2, above.

The definition adopted by Murdock (1972, 225 in Kolb and Snead 1997, 610) describes the community as “the number of people who normally reside in a face-to-face association”. This definition is both too encompassing and too restrictive (Kolb and Snead 1997, 610). Gallaher and Padfield (1980, 1 in Kolb
and Snead 1997, 610) define community as “a social unit existing for a purpose at a particular place”.

This thesis refers to “Community” as a unit of human society that is intermediate between biologically constituted modes of organization (such as the nuclear or extended family) and larger-scale social networks (e.g. government frameworks like city, province, region or nation; organizational membership in a company, political party or interest group; or affiliation based on ethnic, tribal, linguistic or religious identity), and while all members of society belong to at least one community, most belong to numerous groupings.

5.5 Local Community

Community affiliation for any given individual may be the result of either self-identity or external classification, or some combination of the two: for example, community membership through ideology or interest may be more self-defined and subjective (and more transitory), while membership using biological, geographic or demographic definitions is likely to be more objective. Within the literature, two types of spatial communities tend to emerge. The first consist of people who live locally, either on or in proximity to a site. Such communities are defined in the present and are largely concerned with these individuals’ relationship to their place of residence. The second kind of community consists of descendants and includes those who can or choose to trace descent from the people who once lived at or near the site (Harrison 2001; George 2008). These community groups are defined by their relationship to the past and to other people. For example, McDavid’s (2002) work on the Levi Jordan Plantation Site is concerned with a descendant community: many of the African-American people it includes are geographically and/or culturally remote from the site and from the archaeological work carried out, yet still constitute a viable stakeholder community. In practice, these two types of communities frequently overlap. This thesis refers to “Local Community” as a community defined in purely
spatial terms, those who enjoy a geographic proximity to a site, project or institution.

5.6 Stakeholder Community

While the terms “Community” and “Local Community”, can imply a sense of cohesion and solidarity created through a common interest or a shared locale (Gilroy 1987; Forbes 1996), most communities are multifaceted and experience internal differentiation and disputes, making participation as a cohesive group difficult to achieve (Kreps 2003). Hall (1990) notes that this cohesion is created and artificial as opposed to organic and authentic, thus rendering the concepts of community and locality as imagined theoretical constructs (Gilroy 1987; Urry 1995). It is of utmost importance then that communities are individually determined according to the context of each research project (Tully 2009), and dissenting voices that challenge an imagined homogeneity must receive inclusion where they occur (Glazier 2003). As a result, the identification of “Stakeholder Communities” has increased in scope and complexity over time. From an original concept of “stakeholder” as an individual or institution with a direct claim on the cultural resource or material in question, today’s “stakeholder” could include descendant communities; local people impacted by the growth, development and operations of a site or facility; scholars in adjacent disciplines that nevertheless lie beyond cultural heritage management functions; state actors; business and commercial concerns; donors and other providers of resources; and even the entire global community, given that the cultural heritage and traditions of any given society, no matter how remote, are nevertheless part of our universal human patrimony. Philips and Freeman (2010) provide a thorough review of the wide literature available on stakeholders.

The terms “Stakeholder”, “Stakeholder Community” and also “Stakeholder Group”, in the context of this study is defined as anyone and everyone who has an interest in the content or subject matter of an archaeological sites or cultural institutions, or who is impacted — either positively or negatively — by their presence, operation and activities (as discussed in Section 2). This is further
broadened by potential stakeholders, as some individuals or organisations may be unaware that they have a stake in these sites or institutions, and therefore may not be in a position to recognize and act on those interests.

5.7 Primary and Secondary Stakeholders

Within this study, the term “Primary Stakeholders” refer to those stakeholders who make available the access and financial, logistical and operational resources necessary for continued activities to sustain the heritage resource. Whereas the term “Secondary Stakeholders”, refer to those stakeholders who are engaged with the heritage resource yet, unlike the primary stakeholders, they generally lack the “lifeline” relevance or the physical proximity to the heritage resource. These two stakeholder definitions are further explored in Chapter Four, Section Two.

5.8 Engagement

Within the context of this study, “engagement” may be as basic as creating awareness of the site or institution, and illuminating the stakeholder’s relationship to it. Without some demonstrated relevance or linkage between the institution and the individual, there is no basis for further activity or dialogue, and as such awareness is a prerequisite for higher, more valuable forms of interchange. These could take the form of co-curation or collaborative excavation projects, the iterative development of research questions that take account of stakeholder community interests, the joint development of programs or event schedules, the inclusion of community voices in content or displays, or the accession and inclusion of local knowledge and practices (e.g., the utilization of ethnographic data to make sense of the archaeological record, or the demonstration of linkages between “great” and “little” artistic and musical traditions, involving folk and autodidactic art works). It is also important to note that engagement generally takes place through a combination of formal channels and settings, and informal interactions — some of which are purely serendipitous in nature, and defy prior planning and programming. It is vital for cultural heritage professionals, administrators and practitioners to recognize and leverage these informal
exchanges, as they can be extremely powerful and memorable for the individual stakeholder.

5.9 Participation

The World Bank Learning Group on “participatory development” defines “Participation” as “a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them” (The World Bank 1996). Huvila (2008) argues that the notion of participation is built into any human interaction with information. As noted in Section 2, in the cultural heritage space, there is also a notion that institutional visitors or users have a right to privileged engagement in that institution’s programs, offerings, operation and governance. For example, libraries traditionally viewed librarians as providers of information and users as recipients, although more recent discussions emphasize the need to involve users in the library in a more profound and bidirectional manner (see Gutsche 2012; Kretzmann and Rans 2005). Similarly, museums have traditionally been more product-oriented, and interested primarily with user satisfaction with the institution’s objects, displays and exhibitions, though there has been a growing emphasis on providing experiences that are co-developed with the users, or entirely developed by the users (Huvila 2008).

The term “participation”, within this study, refers to the active involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making processes of an archaeological site or cultural centre. It is also important to note that participation generally takes place through a combination of formal channels and settings, and informal interactions — some of which are purely serendipitous in nature, and defy prior planning and programming. Section 4, noted the various formal channels and also models of participation.
5.10 Stakeholder Engagement and Stakeholder Participation

The terms “Stakeholder Engagement”, and “Stakeholder Participation”, mean a broad, inclusive and continuous process of interaction that takes place between an organization and those potentially impacted by that organization, which encompasses a range of activities and approaches, and spans the entire life of a project or organization (e.g., a museum, an archaeological site team, an art gallery, etc.), from initial concept, through construction and operations, and on to divestment or decommissioning. As a result, within this study, stakeholder engagement and stakeholder participation are umbrella concepts encompassing a variety of activities and interactions over the life of an organization or a single project (Barreca et al. 2011).

5.11 Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement

This is essentially a qualitative and quantitative measure of the engagement of stakeholders. Meaningful stakeholder engagement is based upon relevance and interest, both in terms of the site or institution reaching out to members of the community whose opinions, decisions and actions have the potential to impact the project or facility, and the individual stakeholder articulating the relevance of the site or institution in his or her world view. Engagement is only meaningful for stakeholders when it is relevant to their values, priorities and desires.

5.12 Effective

The question of “Effective” engagement is best answered in terms of tangible action, measurable impact or demonstrable change in opinion that results from exchange or interaction — whether on the part of the archaeological site or the cultural heritage institution, or the stakeholder himself/herself. In other words, an interaction or engagement that does not result in or pave the way for impact on the ground cannot be considered effective. The desired “impact” is one that is negotiated and agreed upon by the stakeholders, and its achievement is the ultimate measurement of the effectiveness in satisfying
needs and desires of the various stakeholder groups, and where needed, reconciling differing desires or interests. As a result, stakeholder engagement that is “effective” can be defined as that which is meaningful and impactful. Also, effective engagement builds the means to evaluate the sustainability of any approaches/actions adopted.

5.13 Sustainability

The literature regarding the term “sustainability” has been captured in Chapter One, Sections 2.1 and 2.2, and can be broadly described as the indefinite endurance of systems and processes. Within this research, “sustainability” refers to the following areas:

1) The continuity of research, activities, productions and programmes of an archaeological site or cultural institution, as well as the on-going operation and maintenance of its associated buildings, structures, infrastructure and equipment. Sustainability is generally a function of resource availability; talent attraction, retention and development; an active portfolio of relevant programmes and activities; and a well-defined sense of the mission of the team or organization and the criteria by which it is to be assessed and evaluated. Meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement has a role to play in shaping all of these factors — a fact that underscores the importance of community engagement in the cultural heritage field.

2) The preservation of the accumulated knowledge, experience and expertise of the organization or team (both formal and informal), and the conservation and curatorship of materials, artistic and cultural traditions, artefacts, handicrafts, artworks, manuscripts, and other cultural treasures.

3) The preservation of the accumulated knowledge, experience and expertise of the stakeholder communities, as well as the on-going activity and preservation of their values, lifestyle, and associated resources.

By its nature, sustainability is forward looking, as it is concerned with future events, and implies a delicate balance between preservation and development,
and between continuity and change, as discussed in Chapter One, Sections 2.1 and 2.2. This balance is arguably best set with the active engagement of a wide range of stakeholders, to create a sense of ownership and thus a stake in the protection of the site or institution, as well as to access a broad spectrum of viewpoints, knowledge and interests to negotiate what ought to be sustained.

5.14 Dissonance

The term “Dissonance” refers to the various realities that divorce (disconnect) and alienate (disassociate) stakeholders from cultural heritage management projects and practices.

6 Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed the existing literature on stakeholder engagement and participation models, and their practice within the cultural heritage field. It also maintained that academic discourse is in and of itself insufficient; actual stakeholder engagement and integration requires real-world decisions, sometimes uncomfortable conversations and negotiations, and a reordering of power relationships as they actually exist, not as the cultural professional may wish them to be. The chapter further highlighted that within the cultural heritage space, there is little evidence of a stakeholder engagement and participation model that demonstrates links to sustainability and one that is also universal to all situations. The next chapter articulates the research methodology that was undertaken for this thesis.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

1 Introduction

This chapter defines the methods used for the research. These were selected to gather not only a wide range of views and opinions, from diverse stakeholders, but also to allow for “deep dives” into areas of particular relevance to the research questions (Sections 2 and 3). The chapter also discusses the vital issue of self-reflection and the role it played in identifying and isolating my own personal biases (Section 2.6.3), which is the first step in highlighting areas where my individual history, background and worldview may have coloured my research findings.

1.1 Research Methodologies: Selection of Approaches

The selection of methodologies for my research was prompted by the set of questions I needed to answer. I explored the stakeholder engagement methods that already have been put into practice in the heritage space. By evaluating current literature, I learned from their experiences and the obstacles or challenges that stood in the way of meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement. These were examples, and not case studies, as I did not explore them in detail, but rather, I drew observations of good (and bad) practice from previous projects. There was a potentially large body of literature to review. Analysing every possible example where engagement has been attempted, while comprehensive, would not be the most efficient approach. Therefore, I set criteria for the examples that I was seeking in the comparative literature. The criteria and the methodology for the literature review are detailed in Section 3.

While the literature review helped me understand the role of stakeholder engagement in sustainability, and to identify the other ingredients in or contributors to sustainability, I also wanted to examine, and drill down into, more detailed examples to pressure test and validate the findings drawn from the literature review as well as to explore research question A3, the availability of a viable and valid universal approach to effective and
meaningful stakeholder engagement and the sustainability of archaeological sites and cultural centres.

Existing literature can seldom provide a complex picture of stakeholders, actors, etc., or the holistic approaches, with complex factors impacting on relationships and decision-making; I therefore identified suitable case studies for a more detailed study. My criteria for the case study selection, the significance of the chosen case studies, and the context of the selected case studies are described in Section 2.1. This answers why I chose these case studies. How I approached the case studies, or more specifically, the methodology I used, follows in Section 2.6, where I detail the semi-structured participant interviews and the non-intrusive participant observations I undertook at each of the selected case study sites.

Although I detail the opportunities and constraints related to each of the approaches I have implemented for this research, such as the case studies, literature review, non-intrusive participant observation, and semi-structured interviews, it is worth noting that throughout this study my guiding principle has been that the optimum method of research practice is one that is accurate, efficient, and respectful of the objects and subjects of my study, and as further detailed in Sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.2, I have endeavoured to remain true to that ideal.

2 Case Studies

I believe case studies are among the best ways of addressing the complex issues posed by the research question, and of relating them to other sites, institutions, cultures and regions studied by other scholars. In my own professional development, I have found case studies to be the most impactful way of articulating large concepts at a working level and of chronicling the application of theories and hypotheses in actual practice.
The case study method is considered a kind of qualitative analysis (Goode 1962), and has had wide use in fields beyond social research, according to Yin (1994, 10): “a case study is a research method involving an up-close, in-depth, and detailed examination of a subject of study (the case), as well as its related contextual conditions”. Case studies have experienced a long and mixed journey in the history of social sciences. Platt (2007, 100) highlights that it “is a term that has been used in a variety of ways, not all of them clear, and some of them mutually inconsistent”. Platt (2007, 111) defines a case study as “…an in-depth, multi-faceted investigation, using qualitative research methods, of a single phenomenon. The study is conducted in great detail and often relies on the use of several data sources”. Yin (1994, 1-10) posits that the case study method qualifies as a serious research tool. He argues that "In general, case studies are the preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (Yin 1994, 1).

Typically, a case study uses multiple data sources including two or more of the following: direct detailed observations, interviews, and documents. Case studies are nevertheless “open to the interpretation of the research context and can be both a major category distinguishing complete alternative research styles, and a passing description meaning no more than that the study is of a single case” (Platt 2007, 101).

Case studies are also considered valuable in research because case studies enable practitioners to evaluate data with in-depth analysis. Case studies can be a practical solution when a large sample population is difficult to attain, and in this way case studies can be an appropriate alternative to quantitative or qualitative research. They also present data from real-life situations, and provide a better understanding of the detailed behaviours of the topics of interest.

Case studies are not without their flaws. One of the main drawbacks to utilizing case studies is in regards to external vs. internal validity. When
undertaking case studies, unlike the controlled environment of an experiment in a lab, the practitioner often does not have control over certain variables and events within case studies. Therefore, the researcher undertaking the case study method needs to contend with the understanding that their data may not be entirely applicable to similar cases, given the unique situations, conditions and context being assessed and studied. As a rule of thumb, what the case study gains in internal validity, it loses in external validity.

External validity reflects whether or not findings can be generalized beyond the case or cases used for the study; the more variations in places, people, and procedures a case study can withstand and still yield the same results, the more external validity it holds. Practices such as cross-case examination and within-case examination, along with a thorough literature review, can support external validity. Reliability refers to the stability, accuracy, and precision of measurement and therefore, an exemplary case study design would assure that the methods used are thoroughly documented and can be repeated with the same results being produced over and over again.

Quantitative data also have advantages and disadvantages; a major advantage is that it is numerous and is generally easily defined and understood. Furthermore, the results are objective as long as they are accurately obtained, meaning that if the quantitative finding is the result of a sufficiently large sample, this result can be generally applied and it is scientific (for e.g., the demographic makeup of one major city could be extrapolated for other major cities in the same country or region in terms of variables like gender proportions, age distribution, or nutrition levels). Another significant advantage is that quantitative data is considered to be reliable. This means that if a researcher repeats his or her research following the same process, he or she will find the same results. A major disadvantage of this kind of data is that they are narrow and time-bound, and without a proper benchmark are of limited use in tracking changes over time or projecting future developments. In other words, quantitative data represent a reality without providing any explanation for the result, and in some ways furnish a snapshot of the condition or symptoms and not the real issue or underlying causes.
There are also strengths and weaknesses associated with qualitative data. A major advantage is that they produce more in-depth, comprehensive and context-specific information. Qualitative data emphasize the importance of looking at variables in the natural setting in which they are found, and also provide a voice to the subjects of a study rather than simply classifying them according to the definitions of the researcher’s own construction. Production of qualitative data generally involves the collection and assessment of subjective information and participant observation to describe the natural setting, the subjects of study, and the variables under consideration, as well as the interaction of different variables in context. One of the main drawbacks of this kind of data is that the very subjectivity of the inquiry creates challenges in confirming the reliability and validity of the approaches and information. Detecting and preventing researcher-induced bias is a challenge. Its scope is also limited due to the in-depth, comprehensive data-gathering approaches required: these are time- and resource-expensive in nature, which may preclude the study of significantly large populations or time periods.

While the academic literature on stakeholder engagement and participation is large (and continually expanding), a detailed understanding of the issues that colour the relationships between cultural heritage practitioners and the stakeholders with which they interact is best gained through an examination of specific case studies. That is where the theoretical intersects with the practical, and where neat academic models sometimes founder on the cold, hard realities of real world power relationships and time and resource constraints. In this way, the examination of stakeholder engagement and integration at specific case studies has shed light on these complex issues.

2.1 Case Study Selection Criteria

When considering which case studies to look at as part of this study, my selection criteria were as follows:
• Case study sites that are active and can provide me access to their site, project, or centre to undertake fieldwork, and access to their stakeholders for consultation purposes;

• Case studies within which I have had privileged access and first-hand experience, to draw from this experience;

• Case studies that are diverse – with different contexts and types of heritage; because every site and project is different, with specific issues, dynamics, people, stakeholder interests etc., and I wished to identify and understand common themes and trends within this diversity to assess the degree to which stakeholder engagement practices play a role in sustainability, and whether a universal framework of practice is possible;

• To offer opportunities for critical reflection, case studies that are long-lived and with a large scale of stakeholder engagement and participation strategies employed, and for comparison purposes, those that are new and therefore uninfluenced by a history of previous stakeholder engagement and participation practices.

Based on this criteria, I undertook a case study involving a site that has a long, well-documented and substantial history of stakeholder engagement practices: the archaeological site of Çatalhöyük, a Neolithic site in the central Turkish province of Konya, which in 2012 was granted World Heritage Site status by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Within this case study, I not only evaluated the available literature to gain an understanding of the past experiences at Çatalhöyük, but I also undertook my own on-site, field interviews and observations of stakeholder engagement practices and challenges to understand them from different perspectives and in daily action.

I also took on another case study: The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture (Cultural Center), a multi-component arts, culture and knowledge institution currently being built by the Saudi Arabian Oil Company (Saudi Aramco) in the
Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. The Cultural Center undertaking is very different in nature and purpose from the first case study, which helped in testing the broader applicability of theories and practices related to stakeholder engagement and its contribution to the sustainability of a cultural centre/site, allowed for interaction with a much more diverse set of stakeholders operating in a thoroughly different context, and enabled me to assess the relationship between stakeholder engagement and sustainability using two distinct institutions or projects; which directly responds to research question A3:

A3) in a global context, is there an intellectually grounded, activity-based framework for enhancing both stakeholder engagement and the long-term sustainability of sites and institutions?

Drawing on data from the interviews and direct observation performed at each of the case study sites, as well as the data derived from the literature reviews, I developed a model for stakeholder engagement that practices and promotes sustainability (Chapter Six, Section 2). This model was inspired by the apparent absence of a universal model for stakeholder engagement and participation that promotes the sustainability of archaeological sites and cultural centres, as highlighted in Chapter Two, Section 4.

It is important to note that while there are vast differences between an archaeological site in the steppes of Central Anatolia and a modern, still-under-construction, arts and culture centre taking shape in the deserts of Saudi Arabia. The adherence to a uniform portfolio of research methods provides a high — and necessary — degree of continuity between the two cases. People are people, and their reactions to “new,” “foreign,” “different” and even “challenging” entities in the midst of their societies and communities (which themselves exhibit a relatively high degree of internal coherence and consistency) follow very similar lines, ranging from enthusiastic acceptance to unbridled rejection — with a fairly significant degree of willing obliviousness in between. Therefore, the choice and utilisation of the two case studies help to connect what would appear to be two very different initiatives, and to demonstrate that even two such contrasting entities (ancient vs. modern, Turkish vs. Saudi, archaeological vs. contemporary
art and knowledge, etc.) raise similar issues related to stakeholder engagement, must navigate similar courses to arrive at sustainable growth, and provoke remarkably similar reactions from stakeholder groups, whether they are participants in these initiatives, members of local communities impacted by these entities, representatives of state power and influence, or other key stakeholders that shape and are in turn shaped by these cultural heritage sites and programs.

2.2 Why These Two Case Studies Are Significant

These two case studies were selected for two primary reasons: access and wider significance. The first stems from a practical concern of being able to understand with a high degree of accuracy and specificity the objectives, operations, governance, personnel, resources, history, and social, economic and spatial impacts of the case study’s institution or initiative, as well as its network of interactions and interdependencies; to have the access required to observe and interview stakeholder audiences, including members of the staff and the leadership of the institutions under study; and to have a physical presence on-site for a period of time sufficient to allow for familiarization, investigation and analysis. Furthermore, “insider” status allows for a less conspicuous presence for the purpose of direct data gathering by non-intrusive observation and for a higher degree of trust and familiarity for semi-structured interviews, which would ideally result in fuller and more candid responses and a more natural conversation about issues related to stakeholder engagement and sustainability. At a more pedestrian or logistical level, there are also hurdles such as visa requirements, site access authorization and credentials, language and social customs, and housing and transportation necessities that needed to be overcome in order for research to be conducted in an effective and efficient manner.

I enjoyed such access at both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture. My personal engagement with the Çatalhöyük research team, my presence on-site during several field seasons (2007, 2008, 2010 and 2011), and my work as a translator supporting community engagement initiatives provided me with privileged access to internal documents and studies, as well as an opportunity to discuss those materials with my colleagues and external
stakeholders. This was particularly valuable when it came to governmental regulations or other documents whose meaning is ambiguous, as my connection with Çatalhöyük allowed me to discuss these documents with governmental officials at various levels and in various sectors, and question them to gain a deeper understanding of these primary sources. Since I was also engaged in the preparation of materials for the UNESCO World Heritage Site application pertaining to community engagement practices, I read widely in the various legal, programmatic and regulatory documentation related to the Çatalhöyük site.

I have worked at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture since January 2013. In my position, I have a Center-wide function that involves close interactions with key individuals in the Cultural Center and elsewhere in Saudi Aramco, with thought leaders in the Kingdom and the region, and with current and prospective institutional partners domestically and internationally. I was also able to position myself at various events and locations to undertake observational research and make contact with potential subjects for semi-structured interviews. As a result, I am well aware of the Cultural Center’s value proposition for its many stakeholder groups, its programs and offerings, and its plans for future development.

As an active participant in the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project and as an employee of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, I have an on-going ethical duty to protect confidential and proprietary information, and I recognize that I also have a professional and personal stake in both institutions’ successful development. This status, coupled with the inevitable issues of cultural perspective and bias, “insider” versus “other”, “professional/academic expert” versus “layman”, and of course “participant” versus “observer”, makes the issue of self-reflexivity (examined in Section 2.6.3) particularly germane to this study.

But aside from these issues of access, Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture represent compelling case studies that provide insight into developments in the cultural heritage space in the Near East, Middle East and Gulf regions, including the use of cultural heritage as a
source of national pride and identity and as a way for relevant decision-making authorities at various levels to exert control over cultural heritage governance in a top-down fashion — a dynamic that has clear implications for bottom-up oriented practices of stakeholder engagement.

Both sites are located within what is generally termed the Near East or Middle East region, which is composed primarily of Anatolia (or Asia Minor), Mesopotamia, the Arabian Peninsula, the Iranian landmass, the Levant, and sometimes Egypt, the Caucasus, and/or the Balkans, depending on the definition. Use of the term “Near East” predates that of the “Middle East” and has fallen out of general use, though “Near East” has been retained in several social science disciplines, including archaeology and ancient history. It should be noted that both of these terms — as well as the “Far East” — are less a specific geographic region (where a term like “southwest Asia” is more descriptive) than a cultural construct drawn from a particularly European perspective, since after all these regions have to be “East” of some reference point.

The region has a long history of archaeological practice, a relatively more recent experience of major cultural heritage institutions, and a number of logistical difficulties often associated with access to cultural sites (e.g., visas and permits, geographical expanse and isolation, cultural mores, and the ideological importance and political utilisation of history). It is also a region with its own cultural and civilizational context, and although I am of Turkish origin and am currently a resident of Saudi Arabia, my upbringing, the formation of my system of personal values and my education took place in the United Kingdom. Therefore, I cannot be considered a “native” of either site, and as is captured within the various sections “Archaeologies of the Middle East: Critical Perspectives” (Pollock and Bernbeck 2005), it is no longer acceptable to teach the archaeology of communities across the globe without acknowledging the political consequences of undertaking work in foreign countries and the responsibilities archaeologists must incur by disseminating information on other people’s pasts. The same point can and should be applied to cultural heritage specialists of any particular discipline (e.g., sociologists, anthropologists, or
library scientists and museum curators) working in regional and cultural settings that are not their own. Therefore, the fact that I enjoy privileged access and have a personal career/educational connection to these two different “foreign” case studies also represents an intriguing methodological challenge associated with collecting and assessing research data and materials: to what degree do I represent the “Other” in each case study, even if I am a “familiar face”?

Aside from their shared geographic region, the fact that these two case studies are situated in two dynamic, predominantly Muslim, Middle Eastern developing nations makes this study even more compelling. Despite their clear differences (system of government, ethnic and demographic profile, size of population), there is much that links Turkey and Saudi Arabia, including strong economic growth, young populations, rapid and widespread infrastructure development (with attendant risks for cultural heritage sites), an outsize role on the global and regional political and economic stages, and questions over the relative importance of cultural heritage activities and institutions in light of pressing economic and social needs, including education, healthcare and job creation. There is also a lack of indigenously produced research and literature on cultural heritage tied to stakeholder issues in both countries; to date, the Turkish and Saudi voices on these topics are few and far between (see Section 2.3).

### 2.3 Contextualizing the Case-studies

Archaeology is not new to the region. Numerous archaeological expeditions led by European scholars were conducted in the lands of the Ottoman Empire during the 19th and early 20th centuries (Newton 1862; Schliemann 1880; Adler 1900; Korte and Korte 1904; Hogarth 1908; Schulte 1963). The eastern origins of Anatolian archaeology lie in the early study of the Bible (Ceram 1956, 22-45; Mellink 1966, 113-115). Because of the geographical setting, Asia Minor formed the backdrop of much of the New Testament, and biblical scholars developed a keen interest in it travelling across the land and describing it in detail. In the west, Anatolian archaeology was grounded in a longstanding interest in classical studies (Mellink 1966, 111-113).
Yet scholars initially viewed the contemporary societies of the Near East as peripheral to both biblical and classical studies, with little discussion of the native culture into which these two academic traditions had been planted (Hopkins 2000, 207). The discovery of Hattusa in the 1890s, the Hittite capital in central Turkey, had a substantial impact, and proved to be a watershed in the archaeology of both Anatolia and the wider Near East. Located on the central Anatolian plateau at the site of Boğazkale, Hattusa was a native city of monumental proportions, while the Hittites had been documented as an indigenous Anatolian culture that was once a major world power. This provided Anatolian archaeology with a central focus and led to the active participation of Turkish archaeologists, who quickly adopted the Hittites with a sense of national pride and whose leadership fashioned Anatolian studies into an independent field of research. Around the turn of the century, Ottoman officials also carried out several excavations as part of the westernization process underway in the rapidly faltering empire (Özdoğan 1998, 111-112; Osman and Reinach 1892 in Tanyeri-Erdemir 2006, 382). That said, the production of archaeological knowledge was an elite occupation in the Ottoman context, with no focus on “adapting archaeology to local needs” (Özdoğan 1998, 113). In other words, while the Ottoman archaeologists themselves may have been Turkish and their work may have been driven in part by nationalistic considerations, their disciplinary priorities, methods and assumptions were consistent with the colonial approach to archaeology and the archaeological record.

In contrast, the archaeology adopted by the Turkish Republic (1923) from the outset had the clear socio-political agenda of creating a new national identity rooted in secularism. The metaphor used by the republican intellectual Selahattin Kandemir (1933, 3 in Tanyeri-Erdemir 2006, 382) in the introduction of his book Etiler (Hittites), is particularly telling: “(a) tree that doesn’t have its roots deep in the soil cannot grow. The root of national power is national identity. What creates national identity is national history”. In addition, the practice of archaeology in Turkey helped to demonstrate that
Turkey was a modern nation that could make its own contributions to international scholarship.

Like any new discipline, Anatolian archaeology has suffered through a period of growing pains and remains in a state of maturation. In past years, divergent approaches among the principal investigators of various Anatolian projects often resulted in a disparity between expectations and results. Recent efforts by the Turkish museum authorities to coordinate excavation efforts more effectively have served to moderate inconsistencies among various international projects. Renewed excavations by the British at Çatalhöyük (Hodder 1996), the Germans at Troy (Korfmann 1997), along with the efforts of Japanese excavators at Kaman Kalehöyük (Omura 2003) represent three dramatic examples of archaeological projects that — despite their somewhat different methodologies — are moving toward more precise interpretations by successfully implementing new technologies and broad multidisciplinary strategies (Gorny 2000, 2-3).

Turkey has made a significant commitment to both the development of its professional archaeological cadres and their integration into important archaeological research efforts. Local (that is, Turkish) archaeologists must by law participate in research projects in the country, generally in association with teams from foreign universities or institutions. This not only provides a much-needed local perspective on the work, which may in part allay frictions with indigenous communities and individuals, but also helps Turkish archaeologists and students of archaeology develop professionally through collaboration with their foreign peers. As such, these partnerships are mutually beneficial for the specific parties involved, but at a larger scale they also help connect Turkish archaeology with the global practice, including through joint publications. At the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project, this commitment to collaborative partnerships has found expression with the publication (in both Turkish and English languages) of the annual Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project Archive Reports, by members of the research team (Çatalhöyük Research Project Archive Report 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015).
At the same time, there is an internal discussion within Turkish archaeological and academic circles about the relative level of engagement of local universities, in comparison with major universities and institutions in the metropolises of Ankara and Istanbul. There is no systematic or standard approach to determining the relative mix of local versus national university participation, which at times results in a mismatch of expectations among institutions and individual practitioners.

Turning to the Arabian Gulf, while there is relatively plentiful coverage of the historical underpinnings of archaeology in the Near and Middle East by Pollock and Bernbeck (2005), including some of the most recent innovative, inclusive projects in archaeology and local participation such as the Quseir community project (Steele 2005) in Egypt, generally there is little comprehensive coverage of archaeological undertakings in the Gulf region in general, and in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in particular.

The initial archaeological activities in Saudi Arabia were conducted mostly by foreign participants (notably Winnett and Reed 1970; Dayton and Harding 1968, 1969, 1971) and demonstrated the need for controlled and systematic approach to the Kingdom’s archaeology. To satisfy this need, the Deputy Ministry of Antiquities and Museums initiated a “comprehensive archaeological survey” in 1976 (see Adams et al. 1977; Ingraham et al. 1981). The aim was to document the archaeological remains of the entire Kingdom. The survey so far has discovered around 4000 sites. To supplement this comprehensive survey additional, more specialized studies were carried out, such as a survey of ancient trade and pilgrimage routes, an ancient mining survey (Hester et al. 1984), and a rock art and epigraphy survey (Kabawi et al. 1989). Large scale excavation, following on from the more specialized surveys, took place in Madain Salih, Tayma, and Dumat Al-Jandal in the north; Thaj and the Dhahran tomb fields in the Eastern Province, the Neolithic site of Thumamah in the central region, and Ukhdud and Sihi in the southern region (Al-Ansary et al. 2002). Many of the results of the surveys and excavations are published in *Atlal*, the annual journal of Saudi Arabian archaeology (*ibid*).
Selected foreign research teams have been allowed to undertake work in Saudi Arabia, including research teams from the Smithsonian Institution, Harvard University, Southwest Texas University, the University of Missouri, the University of California, the Institute of Archaeology in London, and the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) in France. The expeditions have been ad hoc and relatively few in number (Pollock 2006, 70-71). Saudi Arabian archaeology reveals the continuous presence of man in the Arabian Peninsula from the beginning of the Palaeolithic period to the present day, covering a period of one million years (Al-Rashid 2005, 207-214).

To regulate and oversee archaeological projects and related undertakings in the Kingdom, the Department of Antiquities was established in 1962 under the umbrella of the Ministry of Education, and a royal decree was issued in 2003 to annex the Deputy Ministry of Antiquities and Museums to the Supreme Commission for Tourism and National Heritage (ibid), formerly know as the Saudi Commission for Tourism and Antiquities. The aim is to enhance the activities of archaeology and develop some of the nation’s archaeological sites for tourism, thus bringing archaeology and tourism under one governmental organization. Over the years, the Saudi government launched and maintained a program of research, restoration, conservation and preservation of monuments. As well as the establishment of a nationwide network of museums dedicated to the history of the Arabian Peninsula, including the conservation and display of archaeological artefacts. Local museums are located in areas of historical interest such as Tayma, al-Ula, Dumat al-Jandal, Hofuf, Najran, and Jazan, while regional museums have been established in Jiddah, Ta’if, Ha’il, and Dammam. A national museum for the Kingdom was established in 1999 in the capital, Riyadh. The museum consists of nine galleries representing all the chronological epochs of the Arabian Peninsula, and is part of the King Abdulaziz Historical District, which covers 18 hectares near the city centre (ibid). The current rapid development and expansion of towns and cities in the Kingdom threaten to disturb many archaeological sites; to protect them, the Deputy Ministry of Antiquities and
Museums launched a program of fencing those sites located near towns and cities, and during the late 1990s some 200 sites were fenced with 300,000 meters of fencing (ibid).

Despite these developments and the continuing evolution of archaeology in the region, foreign archaeologists working in the Near East have been accused of reluctance in shaking off their traditional worldview and embracing a social archaeology of inclusivity – it is difficult to conceive of contemporary archaeologists working in foreign lands without interacting with local populations about the interpretation of their past, but it occurs. The volume by Pollock and Bernbeck (2005) reminds us of both the perils inherent in such narrow-minded actions and the promise of an inclusive, progressive, self-reflective archaeology for the region: “Archaeology is never innocent, and its evocation in the news is always part of a larger story and a larger agenda with which the archaeologists will do well to engage” (ibid, 92).

Some of this reluctance appears to stem from professional considerations and the traditional biases of the academy. In many cases, for research to be taken seriously in Near Eastern archaeology, it must first be clearly situated within the accepted/existing intellectual framework, which is itself drawn from a firm chronological and typological classification of excavated material; accurate dating is seen as essential (Bar-Yosef 1998, xiv). The significance of Near Eastern archaeological sites is thereby amplified by the discipline’s “ability to pinpoint them with some precision within the fixed chronological framework” (Matthews 2003, 64-65), even at the expense of a more nuanced understanding of individual sites and the distinctive cultures and civilizations that produced them.

A prime example of this dynamic at work is the traditional approaches to Çayönü Tepesi in Southeast Turkey, which has a “skull building” dating from the mid-ninth millennium to the mid-seventh millennium BC, and is well known for housing secondary burials of over 450 persons (Croucher 2005, 611-12). Until the recent publications by Özdoğan and Özdoğan (1998), relatively little work had been undertaken to investigate specific aspects of the archaeological evidence there; rather, studies have focused on a general overview of Çayönü
Tepesi, searching for similarities and patterns in the material between this and other sites (e.g., Verhoeven 2002 in Croucher 2005, 614).

Dowson (2001, 316-317) argues that the unrelenting focus on chronology in archaeological interpretation is a consequence of the dominance of masculine ideals and values in archaeology. The discipline has been established, controlled and dominated by white, heterosexual males whose values are continuously perpetuated in the discipline, and therefore “every interpretation of the past is always already heteronormative, in terms of both its content and its methodology” (Dowson 2001, 316). Croucher (2005, 612-13) argues that this situation can be challenged through a bottom-up approach to the past, using interpretations that concern themselves with small-scale patterns and narratives; this could be especially fruitful for Near Eastern archaeology given the wealth of source material and artefacts available and the relative dearth of investigation, assessment and analysis performed in these small-scale, highly specific and highly context-referenced aspects of the archaeological record.

The 2000s have seen a large expansion in the cultural sector in the Middle East as clearly evidenced by the large number of iconic museum and library spaces that have been or are being created. One of the first such institutions was the Bibliotheca Alexandrina, which opened in Alexandria, Egypt in 2002. An 11-story contemporary library, it was conceived as the revival of the city’s ancient library founded by Alexander the Great some 2300 years ago and lost to civilization centuries later. Even more recently, an interactive science centre that could host one million visitors opened in Konya, Turkey as a project funded by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (also known as TÜBİTAK), is the leading agency for management, funding and conduct of research in Turkey.

But it is across the Arabian Gulf that a unique wave of new cultural institutions and world-class facilities is taking shape, of which the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is but one example. New outposts of the Louvre and the Guggenheim are currently being built in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) (as a
result of an intergovernmental agreement between the UAE, France and Spain), as is the Zayed National Museum. These projects are taking place on Saadiyat Island in Abu Dhabi, and are part of the large scale Saadiyat Island Cultural Development overseen by the UAE’s Tourism Development and Investment Company. These developments are part of a master plan that includes high-end residential, leisure and tourism facilities, with seven miles of beaches, championship golf courses, luxury hotels and villas (Ghose 2013). Alongside the construction of museum and tourist infrastructure, the Tourism, Development and Investment Company has a programming department that is displaying exhibitions and cultural programmes in a temporary space ahead of the museum’s planned opening (ibid).

In Qatar, the Qatar Museums Authority, a government-funded entity established in 2005, is responsible for the stewardship and development of heritage sites, museums and cultural institutions in the country. For example, Qatar Museums has been leading an international team of archaeologists and scientists at Al Zubarah Archaeological Site, a once-thriving port on the northern tip of the country, now partly buried beneath the desert (ibid). In 2013, Al Zubarah was designated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site (UNESCO Al Zubarah Archaeological Site, 2013), the first such site in Qatar and one of very few in the Arab Gulf states (ibid). The development of a new Visitor Centre shares the importance of Al Zubarah to the development of trade in the region. Currently being constructed, and due to open in 2016, is the Qatar National Museum, which aims to explore Qatar’s history and cultural identity through various themes including fashion, architecture, and food culture. Similar to cultural exchange agreements between the UAE and European countries, the Qatar Museums Authority similarly engages in a series of bilateral cultural exchange programmes that include the Qatar Japan 2012 and Qatar UK 2013 Years of Culture, and more recently, Qatar Brazil 2014 (ibid).

Such partnerships underscore the similarities of the overall strategic objectives and aspirations of these ambitious projects, as they are driving social development within their own borders while redefining each country’s
relations within the region and with the wider global community. The scale and ambition of these cultural centres establish them immediately as international, while museum professionals have been recruited to the Gulf region from all corners of the globe (ibid). The cultural programmes often entail collaboration with other internationally leading museums, as seen recently with the “Hajj: the Journey Through Art” exhibition conceived by the British Museum and developed by the Qatar Museums for a Qatari audience, and the exhibition of “Pearls” from the Qatar Museums collection staged at the Victoria & Albert Museum in London (ibid). For a small state like Qatar, there are immense benefits in being part of this global network and becoming a recognized cultural hub, particularly as the nation has aspirations to assume an increasingly high profile role in international diplomatic activities (ibid). Cultural diplomacy and the negotiation of soft-power are a significant aspect of these developments.

Furthermore, the projects are all paralleled by rapid economic growth and large-scale investment in infrastructure development as the region emerges as a global commercial and financial hub. The tourism industry is a significant element of economic development in both the United Arab Emirates and Qatar, as seen most clearly in the creation of Abu Dhabi’s cultural district (ibid). In this area regional competition for the tourist market is the driver for most of the cultural development, whilst regional cooperation is a characteristic applied to international relations in other areas including security and trade (ibid).

Even more importantly the cultural projects are tied to social development, with lifelong learning and capacity building programming comprising significant parts of their activities. Each of these nations also view museums and other cultural centres, and more generally a strong cultural creative sector, as holding an important role for expressing a national and regional identity (ibid). This is perhaps best evidenced by the phrase “transformation to a knowledge economy,” that is often expressed in the communication material derived from these projects and initiatives – and refers to diversifying national
industries away from an overreliance on oil and gas exports for national prosperity (ibid).

Interestingly, having an iconic building designed by a renowned cutting-edge architect seems to be a trend. Architect Jean Nouvel designed the National Museum in Qatar and the Louvre Abu Dhabi, Doha's Museum of Islamic Art was created by I.M. Pei, the late Zaha Hadid designed both the Abu Dhabi Performing Arts Centre and Qatar's new Al Wakrah Stadium, while the Norwegian architectural firm Snøhetta are the designers of the Bibliotheca Alexandrina and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture. Unlike the museum projects of Qatar and the UAE, the primary target audience of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is to be local, national and regional rather than international. This is in part due to the Kingdom's larger population; 27 million inhabitants compared to eight million in the UAE and two million in Qatar (Reuters 2012), but also is the result of the relatively small tourism sector in Saudi Arabia outside of the Islamic pilgrimage sites of Makkah and Madinah.

Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture case studies are significant in light of each site or project — more specifically because both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture are at critical points along their arc of development as institutions. In the case of Çatalhöyük, the site was designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 2012 (UNESCO Neolithic Site of Çatalhöyük, 2012), which has significant implications for the reporting requirements of the professional archaeological team, for the local community in terms of infrastructure and tourism development, and in terms of a widening of the stakeholder net, as new global audiences and experts begin to engage with the site and its archaeological record. Furthermore, as the current research project is due to come to an end in 2018 (the expiry date of the research permit granted by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism), it will be interesting to observe the processes for the long-term management planning of a site by a research team whose presence at the site may potentially come to an end. Who will continue the legacy of the management plans once the research team have gone and how is this
potential vacuum of power incorporated into a management plan that outlasts the stay of the research team? What role do the various stakeholder communities have to play in the development of these site management plans and in their implementation after the departure of the research team?

Within the Turkish archaeological context, until the recent passage of the legislative framework that requires the preparation and implementation of “Area Management Plans” (AMPs) for all archaeological sites in Turkey, there has been no legal requirement for future-oriented site management plans that considered the protection of a site once an excavation was completed and activities were concluded. Now, to be awarded an excavation permit each year, an archaeological team must provide a detailed five-year site management and development plan.

In 2004, Çatalhöyük produced a site management plan that was entirely initiated by the project team and in partnership with the TEMPER Project¹. Some observers say this management plan was promoted by departments within Turkey’s Ministry of Culture and Tourism to encourage other archaeological sites in Turkey to prepare similar plans and even inspired the current legal requirement for the five-year AMP (Ian Hodder and Aylin Orbasli pers.comm).

The Çatalhöyük research team and the local State authorities are one of the first to embark on preparing these plans. There have been problems associated with the implementation of the plans, as a high degree of confusion regarding roles and responsibilities exists amongst the various stakeholders who are legally bound to prepare the AMPs. Despite the sweeping nature of the new legislation, and the considerable implications for both professional archaeologists and local communities, the body of research on the new legislative framework remains scant. As such, the issue of stakeholder engagement and stakeholder participation as it relates to a sustainable future for Çatalhöyük has never been

¹ TEMPER Project is an international enterprise within the framework for the conservation and cultivation of cultural heritage, and is financed by the European Community. The aim of the project is to promote awareness of prehistory and make it accessible to the public-at-large. Five countries were partners in the TEMPER Project: England, Greece, Turkey, Malta and Israel.
more pressing. Added to this, the longstanding nature of the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project and the opportunity for comparing the changes brought about by the management plan initiated by the research team and now the management plan initiated by the State will help document the effectiveness of the latter.

For the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, its forecast date of opening to the public is currently 2016, though the institution is already staging a series of offsite programs and events, and is working toward the rapidly approaching “Day One”, or opening day, activities. The Cultural Center is being financed by the state petroleum enterprise Saudi Aramco (whose legal entity name is the Saudi Arabian Oil Company) and is billed as the Kingdom’s home for knowledge, creativity and cross-cultural engagement. Extensive educational and cultural programming is already underway and temporary exhibitions (housed in tents close to the construction site) have included contemporary art from the Centre Pompidou in Paris, an exhibition on Ibn Haytham developed by the UK-based non-profit organization 1001 Inventions, and performances jointly developed by the National Youth Theatre based in the UK and the Saudi Arts and Culture Societies.

As a novel knowledge and cultural institution not only in Saudi Arabia but arguably on the global stage (a function of its multiple components housed within a single facility and the planned cross-function programs such a structure enables), and given its stated objective of redefining what is meant by a creative cultural experience (engaging visitors in the physical facility as well as the online space), the way the Cultural Center introduces itself and then continues to interact with various stakeholder groups is critical; the fact it is doing so without the benefit of an open facility or a strong history or track record of programs makes this task doubly challenging.

This challenge is further exacerbated by the relative unpreparedness of audience development, a result of the lack of a well-established museum, library or performing arts culture in Saudi Arabia since there are few institutions of this kind in the country. Private galleries are relatively new on
the scene but are increasingly numerous. Among the most prominent galleries, Jiddah’s Arabian Wings Gallery opened its doors in 2006, and the Athr Gallery opened in the same city in 2009; the Alaan Artspace, a small art gallery, opened in Riyadh in 2012. In addition, a Jiddah branch of Damascus’ Ayyam Gallery was launched in 2013 (Ayad 2013). The London-based Edge of Arabia arts initiative has been a major force in cultivating and enhancing the contemporary arts environment in the Kingdom, staging a number of shows and exhibitions in Europe, Saudi Arabia and elsewhere in the Middle East since 2008 (Edge of Arabia 2014). A new online portal, the Saudi Art Guide, was created in 2012 to better connect the country’s small but rapidly multiplying arts and cultural institutions (Saudi Art Guide 2014).

Cultural matters within Saudi Arabia, as well as official cultural diplomacy efforts to engage or collaborate with other nations, fall under the purview of the Ministry of Culture and Information. Originally established in 1962 as the Ministry of Information, the body’s portfolio was expanded in 2003 to include cultural affairs. The ministry assumed control of bodies and entities (e.g., the Saudi Society for Culture and Arts, the General Administration of Cultural Activities, as well as official literary clubs) that had previously been assigned to the General Presidency of Youth Welfare; in addition, it also assumed responsibility for the administration of public libraries, hitherto a duty assigned to the Ministry of Education.

The Department of Culture at the Ministry of Culture and Information sponsors a wide range of cultural programs, including literary and drama clubs, folklore classes, library events, arts and crafts, and science projects. The Department also regularly hosts exhibitions, literary readings and symposia at its regional offices as well as its Riyadh headquarters, and sponsors Saudis to participate in international art and cultural events, including poetry and essay competitions as well as exhibits of calligraphy and artwork (Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia in Washington DC, 2014).

At the same time, there have been numerous structural barriers to the development of creative cultural institutions and initiatives, and of cultural
heritage management efforts. UNESCO cites the limitations of trained and experienced personnel as one hindering factor, placing it in the context of the Kingdom's overall social and economic development: “for several decades, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has been giving priority to the creation of a modern state. It has lacked the human resources capable of defining and applying a coherent and scientifically based policy for each important site of its cultural heritage” (UNESCO 2008).

2.4 Case Study Background: Çatalhöyük

The site of Çatalhöyük is situated in the central Turkish province of Konya; an economically and industrially developed city, the Konya Metropolitan Municipality has a population close to 1.1 million (World Bank 2013). Alongside Çatalhöyük, there are several historic and cultural sites in Konya, including the Mevlana Museum, Konya Ethnography Museum, and Konya Archaeological Museum.

The nearest town to the archaeological site is Çumra, and is located 10 kilometres away. The site is 14 hectares in size and consists of two large mounds, each of which has been only partially excavated (see Figures 4, 5 and 6). According to the results of excavations at the site, Çatalhöyük was inhabited 9000 years ago by up to 8000 people who lived in a large “town” (Hodder, 2012a, Hodder, 2012b). Intriguingly, the houses shared common walls, and there were no streets or public passages; rather, it is believed that people moved around on the rooftops and entered their houses through holes in the roofs. Inside the houses there are traces of a variety of art pieces such as paintings, reliefs and sculptures.
Figure 4. 40 x 40 Excavation Area at the Çatalhöyük site. The Director of the archaeological project, Professor Ian Hodder, is seen undertaking a site tour for the local community (photograph by the author, taken in 2011).

The Neolithic remains were first found by James Mellaart in the 1960s (Mellaart 1965, 1967), while new work at the site began in 1993 and is planned to continue to 2018, when the research permit granted by Turkey’s Ministry of Culture and Tourism is set to expire. These new excavations utilize modern scientific techniques to reconstruct the ways that people lived at Çatalhöyük.

Figure 5. South Shelter Excavation Area at Çatalhöyük (photograph by the author; taken in 2011).
Figure 6. The South Shelter Excavation Area at Çatalhöyük (photograph by the author; taken in 2011).

The current archaeological research at Çatalhöyük is undertaken by an international research team led by Stanford University (USA), with a permit granted by Turkey’s Ministry of Culture and Tourism, endorsement by the General Director of Monuments and Museums, and under the auspices of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. Other institutional partners of the project are Selçuk University, Middle East Technical University, Ege University, and Istanbul University from Turkey, University College London, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Oxford University, York University, SUNY Buffalo, Duke University, Cardiff University, Newcastle University, Ohio State University and Gdansk University. Besides the institutional partners of the research project, many other individual researchers affiliated with universities participate in the excavations.

The main sponsors of the project are the Yapı Kredi, Boeing and Koçtaş private companies. Other sponsors are Shell, and Konya Şeker (a local sugar company). Funding for the project has also been received from the Templeton Foundation, British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, Imitatio (The Thiel Foundation), Kaplan Foundation, Turkish Cultural Foundation, Foundation for
Polish Science, SUNY Buffalo, Stanford University, and the Stanford Archaeology Center.

The archaeological site is fenced and guarded all year round; drop-in visitors are guided across the site and through the Visitor Centre by the site's custodians (three guards), though during the research season, tours are organised by tour companies (most of which are located in large cities far from Çatalhöyük, and thus are not part of the local community) and are sometimes guided by the site Director or other members of the research team (see Figure 4). As mentioned above, in 2012, Çatalhöyük received the UNESCO World Heritage Site listing, which has brought about a whole host of new State administrative planning to accommodate the changes that the World Heritage site status, which is further discussed in Chapter Four, Section 2.1.2.

In Turkey, any kind of issue or subject related to cultural heritage falls under the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, as per Law no: 2863 (21/7/1983) “The Law of Conservation of Cultural and Natural Properties”. The purpose of this law is to:

1) Determine the relevant definitions of movable and immovable cultural and natural assets;

2) Organize the necessary activities and processes for the protection of cultural and natural heritage;

3) Determine the establishment and duties of the organizations that will undertake the decisions required in this regard.

Turkey does not operate a system of contract or commercial archaeology; as a result, solely public funding supports the majority of archaeological projects, which is annually allocated by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism to the State’s relevant regional administrative departments. Although State funding is increased each year, its insufficiencies are evermore apparent as archaeological projects are postponed, cut short or not ventured at all (Atıl 1987; Ateşoğlu 2010; Esensel
The small share of public funding allocated to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism is insufficient to support the administrative staff needed for the effective protection of archaeological sites (Esensel 2006), which serves to reduce the archaeologists who work for State museums to either guarding archaeological sites or studying artefacts that are essentially imprisoned within the museum system, as opposed to undertaking original archaeological research projects (ibid).

In criticism of the State governance of cultural heritage resources, Özdoğan (2001) states that the Ministry of Culture and Tourism is lacking an overall contemporary national heritage mission, and that the current bureaucratic systems are out-dated, autocratic structures that have essentially failed to support the recent leap in scientific developments within. Özdoğan, further adds, that centralised governance and an out-of-date autocratic administrative system have essentially created a poor system of resource management coupled with a lack of participatory planning in the management of archaeological sites.

In any given province, the Director of Culture or the Provincial State Museum Director, along with one or two members of qualified staff, carry the responsibility of supervising and monitoring conservation activities; the preparation of an inventory; and all other bureaucratic processing of archaeological sites within that province. This is a stretch in resources considering the large numbers of archaeological sites and museums within each province. In some cases, this small team are responsible for the protection of sites in more than one province, and are therefore far too busy to instigate any new archaeology research projects (Ergeç 2000, 2005). This becomes a major concern where archaeological research projects are required to be undertaken as part of city development schemes. In the absence of commercial archaeology and the shortfall or poor distribution in State resourcing, the often slow manoeuvring of archaeological projects has led to conservation being perceived as stifling development.

This concern was perhaps best expressed by the then Turkish Prime Minister, and currently President, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, placing blame on archaeology for the slow pace of development at the Marmaray rail project (The Art
Newspaper 2011). Rescue excavations at the site of the on-going Marmaray tunnel construction beneath the Marmara Sea have recovered artefacts and human remains potentially dating back 8,500 years (ibid).

This shortcoming may be overcome with the establishment of a commercial (developer friendly) archaeology structure, a better State funding system (Özdoğan, 2011; Ian Hodder, pers.comm), or alternatively, Conservation Planning Units, based within state museums, with specialised responsibilities and capabilities to oversee heritage projects from start to completion.

It is important to note that although heritage laws state that the protection of heritage is a social task, the financial burden of protecting historic works in Turkey has been known to fall upon individual (Arkeologlar Derneği 2010). This is particularly evident in cases of private property expropriation, where private owners of historic works lose their rights because financial and technical assistance for restoration works ought to be offered from the Ministry of Culture by law (Regulation for Law 5366 (16/6/2005) & Regulation for 2863 (21/7/1983) Act 12), yet are not offered in practice (Dilek 2002). This unfortunate but wide-ranging conception of archaeology as stifling development, and the fears of historic property owners regarding conservation matters, can be traced to two inefficiencies within Turkey’s heritage governance structure: the policy framework for the protection of heritage has not been accompanied by a combination of formal and informal public awareness building (Arkeologlar Derneği 2011; Demircioğlu 2005; Dirioz 2006; Güngör 2004; Özdoğan 2011); and decision making regarding the policy framework is centralised while it ought to be participatory (Çandarlioğlu 2003; Demirel 2002; Dilek 2002; Ertosun 2003; Evans 1999).

To relieve such deficiencies, the Turkish government has implemented two waves of legislative amendments, one in 2004 and the second in 2011, to the law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Law Number: 2863, dated 07/21/1983). The amendments have introduced changes to how archaeological sites and works management are planned, practiced and regulated. Essentially the amendments instruct a more decentralized
governance system and are discussed in further detail within Chapter Four, Section 2.4.1.2.

Another area of deficiency can be sought in the overall lack (either by the State apparatus or public cultural institutions) of public awareness-raising campaigns and programmes related to cultural heritage protection and its societal issues. This is also true of formal education. Apaydın (2016) notes that within the State prescribed history textbooks for compulsory schooling years (primary and secondary education), the Turkish past, Islamic periods and the Ottoman Empire feature more prominently than the prehistoric past and the heritage of minority societies; the extensive Palaeolithic and Neolithic periods are noted in a few paragraphs only. Therefore it would not be surprising for these students to value the past and its material culture only if it derives from the Turkish Republic, Islamic and Ottoman periods (ibid).

Apaydın (2016, 10-12) notes the dire consequence of this situation for a prehistoric site like Çatalhöyük. Through an impact-evaluation of the onsite school group educational programme delivered to primary and secondary school age students at by the Çatalhöyük site (see Chapter Four, Section 2.1.6), in which he locates and surveys the attendees of the programme several years after their attendance, Apaydın (2016) demonstrates that most of the participants neither recognise the Çatalhöyük site as their heritage nor as a heritage site at all. Participant comments, like “(I)t is a heritage but not ours’ or ‘(I)t is not a heritage’ show the strong influence of State ideology and social history…which dominates schooling in Turkey” (ibid, 11). These comments also point to the short-comings of the Çatalhöyük educational programme for school groups, for which Apaydın (2016, 11-13) recommends a participatory approach to the development of these programmes, that would involve the archaeological and education team at Çatalhöyük, the formal education apparatus for curriculum development, the teachers who delivery social studies, and the students.
2.5 Case Study Background: The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture

The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is a multi-component, multifunctional knowledge and cultural facility currently under construction in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, in the Kingdom’s Eastern Province (see Figure 7). The Cultural Center, as it is commonly referred to, is being developed by the Saudi Arabian Oil Company (more familiarly known as Saudi Aramco), as part of the Saudi national oil and gas enterprise’s corporate citizenship undertakings. The company has a long history of corporate social responsibility dating back many decades, with programs and activities ranging from the construction of basic infrastructure, power systems and schools; to the provision of community health and agricultural extension initiatives; and local economic development initiatives (Marcel 2006). Now, the Cultural Center is being positioned as the flagship of Saudi Aramco's cultural initiatives and is set to become “a beacon of knowledge, creativity and cross-cultural engagement in the Kingdom” (Saudi Aramco Corporate Citizenship Report 2012, 2). Much of the current information regarding the Cultural Center is only available on the Cultural Center's website or within internal documents that are not publically available. For this reason, much of the official information I reference in this research derives from the Cultural Center's website.
The Cultural Center was officially announced in Dhahran on May 20, 2008 during Saudi Aramco’s 75th anniversary festivities, in the presence of then-King Abdullah ibn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz Al Sa’ud. Speaking at the ceremony, then-Saudi Aramco president and chief executive officer Abdullah Jum’ah said, “This structure will be a prominent national edifice that will serve the community’s knowledge, cultural and creative needs for the future generations...With its innovative form and content, the new monument will be a celebration and recognition of the achievements of thousands of past and present employees, whose efforts contributed to placing the Company squarely in the first ranks of the oil industry. It will also serve as a beacon of knowledge and cultural enrichment that will contribute to the realization of your [King Abdullah’s] vision to convert Saudi society into a knowledge producing community” (Saudi Aramco website 2013).

The Cultural Center is conceived as not simply a “cultural institution” limited to a museum or performing arts spaces, but also a hub for creativity, innovation and critical thinking, and is tied directly to Saudi Arabia’s national
developmental aspirations. Speaking at a “Creativity Forum” event in January 2013, Saudi Aramco’s then Senior Vice President, Abdulaziz Al-Khayyal told the audience, “As we strive to grow vibrant industrial, manufacturing and services sectors, improve our educational system and put in place the conditions necessary for a knowledge-based economy to thrive in the Kingdom, we need creativity and innovation…We need to have an authentic Saudi voice in the great global discussions of our time, and ensure that our country and our citizens are creators of unique ideas, meaningful cultural expressions, innovative companies, and forward-looking technologies and solutions” (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture website 2013).

The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture has staked out “areas of excellence” where it will focus its programs and activities, in keeping with the vision for the institution:

- Contributions to the development of a knowledge society
- Contributions to the rise of a local creative cultural industry
- Excellence in children’s programs
- Energy and awareness
- Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education for youth
- Offsite programs and engagement technologies, including websites, blogs and social media
- Providing a window on the world and to the future, explained as cross-cultural programs that bring the best of other societies and civilizations to Dhahran (while also showcasing Saudi Arabia to the wider world), or technology, content and activities that offer a glimpse into an even richer and more rewarding future for the Kingdom and its people
- Volunteer programs and a culture of engagement
- An unparalleled visitor experience
- A hub for vibrant networking and collaboration.
The Cultural Center building itself is a mammoth undertaking, comprising 80,000 square meters of space and featuring multiple programmatic components (by way of comparison, the British Museum encompasses 75,000 square meters of floor space). The iconic structure, designed by the Norwegian architectural firm Snøhetta, is based on a design of “stones” or “pebbles” that are juxtaposed against one another; each stone is a separate component that complements and is connected to the others. The design also recalls the importance of the region’s geology: the Cultural Center is a few hundred meters from the site of Well Number 7, where oil in commercial quantities was first found in Saudi Arabia in 1938. There is an 18-story tower that reaches some 90 meters into the Saudi sky, while the “Source” monument (with a sculptural element commemorating the discovery of oil) is located 25 meters below grade; in fact, approximately two-thirds of the Cultural Center is located below the surface.

There is also a chronological design philosophy built into the structure, as the Cultural Center’s website notes: “structures below the ground are focused on the past including the archives and the museum. Those on the ground level are linked to the present including the performing arts spaces. The Knowledge Tower, which soars above the rest of the Cultural Center, includes the Lifelong Learning function, which is designed to pave the way for the future” (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture website 2013).

The facility also features an innovative external cladding system comprising 360 linear kilometres of 7.6-centimeter-diameter stainless steel tubing, precision-shaped to follow the building’s organic forms, and wrapped around the “stones” with only nine millimetres of clear space between each “twist.” This design — never before undertaken — will shield the inner skin from the harsh sand and sun found at the site, and reduce interior temperatures. This is a vital feature, as the Cultural Center will be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold Certified, making it one of the most environmentally friendly structures of its kind in the Gulf and a model for other regional institutions. The surrounding 220,000 square meter Cultural Knowledge Park will also contain an Energy Science Cultural Center for
children, as well as a mosque and extensive gardens planted with native plant species that require little irrigation. Given its size and complexity, the Cultural Center is generally considered to be among the most ambitious and most complex projects in the global arts and culture space today.

The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture will comprise a wide range of major components, all under one roof, making it a unique knowledge and cultural facility:

- An Archive housing and displaying corporate and national records, as well as stories of the company and the community;

- A Children's Zone where young children will learn and explore by seeing and doing, and participating in early childhood education programs;

- An Energy Science Center describing the complex world of energy and the role science, engineering and technology play in harnessing and directing that energy;

- A Great Hall capable of hosting major temporary and traveling exhibitions as well as important events and functions;

- Landscaped Grounds surrounding the facility will provide spaces for outdoor cultural programming and environmentally sustainable gardens;

- The Keystone component serves as an ideation incubator and entrepreneurship hub, designed to help Saudi youth bring ideas and products to life through structured processes and frameworks;
• **Lifelong Learning** facilities to develop and deliver educational programs targeting both youth and adult learning, as well as mentorship and knowledge sharing;

• **A Library** offering books, periodicals, e-books and other electronic resources, as well as spaces for reading, study and intellectual endeavour;

• **A Multimedia Theatre** to showcase films and new media presentations;

• **A Museum** exhibiting a permanent collection of traditional Islamic objects, natural history specimens, and contemporary Saudi art, as well as hosting temporary and traveling exhibitions;

• **A Performance Theatre** to present local and international productions of plays and other live performing arts, and host speakers and panel discussions;

• A central **Plaza** with ticketing, food service and retail outlets, which is also envisioned as a lively space for social interactions and informal gatherings;

• And the **Source**, a contemplative space at the Cultural Center of the facility that commemorates the discovery of oil in commercial quantities in Saudi Arabia with a specially commissioned sculptural element (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture Strategic Summary 2014).

Once open, the Cultural Center is set to impact and influence millions of people each year, interacting with and inspiring visitors at the facility itself, and engaging with the public through offsite programs. Online visitors to the website and its educational offerings will represent yet another audience segment for the Cultural Center. Although the Cultural Center facility itself is
still being built, the institution is already engaged in three major off-site programs:

• iThra Youth, which provides hands-on learning experiences in science and mathematics for high school students as well as selected teachers and educators;

• The “Keystone” FABLAB, an innovation and ideation centre, equipped with digital fabrication tools, for Saudi students and professionals interested in invention and entrepreneurship. FABLAB is housed within and run in collaboration with the King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals; and

• The Saudi Aramco Cultural Program (later renamed “Ithra Knowledge Program”); a knowledge, cultural enrichment and arts festival that is being staged in the major cities Jiddah, Riyadh, Dhahran and Al-Hasa, and which welcomed approximately two million visitors during its 2012-2013 run.

In addition to educating and entertaining attendees, these programs are also viewed by Cultural Center leadership and staff as “test beds” for programmatic concepts and logistical systems, and a chance to provide Cultural Center personnel with hands-on experience interacting with visitors and patrons.

One of the most intriguing aspects of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is the Saudi Arabian context in which it is being built. Saudi Arabia is a religiously conservative society, and as home to the two most important Islamic sites, Makkah and Madinah, the Kingdom occupies a prominent position within the wider Muslim world; the official title of the king of Saudi Arabia is “Khadij al-Haramain ash-Sharifain”, or “Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques”. Islamic practice in Saudi Arabia is largely governed by a strict interpretation of the faith, often termed “Wahhabism” as it is shaped by the
teachings of the 18th century CE scholar Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab, though most followers of the school prefer the term *al-muwahiddun* (“Unitarians,” or those who affirm the oneness of God) and argue that “Wahhabism” carries a derogatory connotation (Blanchard 2008).

Regardless of the terminology, there is no denying the central role this strict interpretation of Islam plays in both public and private life in the Kingdom. Wagemakers *et al.* (2012, 56) say “the Saudi state’s version of Islam is a constantly present factor in Saudi society through Saudi Arabia’s laws, education, television programmes, regularly issued fatwas on social and moral issues, the judicial and religious organizations such as the Committee for Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong (*Hay’at al-Amr bi-l-Ma’ruf wa-l-Nahy ‘an al-Munkar*). Consequently, the participants in any intellectual debates taking place in Saudi Arabia have to deal with Wahhabism, or at least cannot simply ignore it as if it does not exist.”

The role of traditional culture and heritage, or *turath*, is another critically important element in Saudi society. Many of these traditional norms and mores derive from a tribal, desert environment — though there are significant regional differences in culture and tradition across the Kingdom. The national museum, folklore festivals (including the annual Janadriyyah festival near Riyadh), and even support for traditional pastimes like poetry recitation, camel racing and falconry serve as touch points of heritage and culture. As Gause (1994, 27) notes, “State-supported projects in all the Gulf monarchies attempt to preserve or recapture aspects of economic and social life that have been in decline since the advent of the oil era. These projects are a way of affirming the cultural values and uniqueness of their society in the face of Western cultural influences.”

Summarizing these dynamics, Lippmann (2003, 42) underscores that “for all its physical transformation, Saudi Arabia remains a socially conservative monarchy and a closed, inner-directed society, one where urban families live behind high walls, sequestered from passers-by and even neighbours. Its
organizing principle is the family, its national document and spiritual beacon
the Koran, its political cement Islam.”

Some Saudis sometimes view as suspect or of little/no value the Arabian
Peninsula’s pre-Islamic heritage; the pre-Islamic era is known in Arabic as
“jahaliyyah,” meaning the “age of ignorance.” This attitude has serious
implications for the preservation, display and study of pre-Islamic sites and
artefacts. For example, the UNESCO assessment of the extensive Madain
Salih archaeological site (which was granted World Heritage Site status in
2008 (UNESCO 2008)) notes, “Visitors’ behaviour sometimes reflects a lack
of respect for the property and its values: minor vandalism, graffiti, use of off-
road vehicles on the site, dropping of waste, etc. The acts of damage seem to
be the result of a lack of understanding of this value. They lead to clean-up
operations that are prejudicial, and may locally affect the quality of
conservation” (UNESCO 2008).

It is interesting to note that the first ever “blockbuster” international travelling
exhibition to derive from Saudi Arabia was the “Roads of Arabia” exhibition,
which showcased the history of the Arabian Peninsula and included artefacts
showing some of the earliest evidence of humankind — some dating back
more than a million years. The Roads of Arabia exhibition was hosted in
leading museums within Europe and the United States of America, such as
the Houston Fine Arts Museum and the Smithsonian Institute, and was
supported by the Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage, and
sponsored by Saudi Aramco and Exxon Mobil.

It is also important to note the Kingdom’s distinctive demographics. First of all,
there is the large youth population: approximately 48 per cent of Saudi
nationals are under the age of 25 (CIA World Fact book, 2013). It is also a
highly urbanised society, with 82 per cent of the population living in urban
areas (ibid). There is a large expatriate community living in Saudi Arabia,
representing roughly a third of the population (Murphy 2012), primarily made
up of skilled and unskilled labourers from South Asia, but also including
professionals and technocrats from around the world. The Kingdom is by and
large closed to foreign tourists (other than citizens of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries or Muslims coming on religious pilgrimage to Makkah or Madinah), meaning that the Cultural Center will be difficult for most foreign tourists to visit. The Eastern Province, where the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is located, has a population of more than three million, with the million inhabitants of the Greater Dammam-Al Khobar area living in close proximity to the Cultural Center (Ministry of Interior Statistics, 2015).

Examining the issue of access to culture, knowledge and information, it is also vital to note that in addition to near-ubiquitous satellite television dishes, there is a high degree of internet penetration in the Kingdom: nearly half of Saudi Arabia’s 29 million inhabitants are online — and one in five Saudis maintains a Facebook page (Arab Youth Survey 2013). According to The Social Clinic, a Jiddah-based social media consultancy, more than three million Saudis are active Twitter users, and the Kingdom accounts for 30 per cent of all tweets in Arabic. Furthermore, on any given day Saudis watch some 90 million YouTube videos — more than any other nation — with views doubling between 2011 and 2012 (The Social Clinic 2012). Saudi Arabia’s ambassador to the United States (since promoted to the role of foreign minister) Adel Al-Jubeir said, “Each young person today has his own TV station: YouTube. His own wire service: Twitter. And his own magazine: Facebook. When every citizen is a walking news conglomerate, you are going to hear and see things differently from the past. There are no secrets in the world today” (Murphy 2013, 37). As such, the youth audience is vital to the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture if for no other reason than sheer demographics, and the online space will be critical given the predilection of Saudis to collect, communicate and exchange information through the Web and social media.

As part of its efforts to better understand this vital youth demographic, in 2009 the Cultural Center commissioned Zogby International, a renowned public polling firm, to conduct surveys of Saudi youth attitudes; in October and November of that year, 2,030 Saudi citizens aged between 15 and 34 were surveyed as part of the effort (Zogby International, 2009). Among the findings, there was a high degree of optimism among the respondents with regard to
their future, with 71% saying they believe they will be better off four years from now, and 74% believing they are better off today than their parents were at their age. 57% believe Saudi Arabia will be better off 10 years from now, and 77% believe it is possible to live a personally fulfilling life in Saudi Arabia (ibid).

Respondents felt the greatest impediments to progress are routines and policy (22%), the education system (21%) and tradition (19%), while 63% believe hard work and ambition are most important in determining their future professional advancement. In terms of education, only 45% agree that the education they received in Saudi Arabia has prepared them well for the future, and asked what they prefer to do in their spare time (from eight possible options), the majority (56%) cited technology or internet browsing, followed by reading and writing (32%) and sports (27%). In terms of sources of pride in being a Saudi, the vast majority (70%) cite religion, followed by educational status (7%), global accomplishments (5%) and the social support system (3%) (ibid).

A second survey was conducted in December 2009 by the same firm, zeroing in on attitudes toward society, arts, knowledge and culture among Saudi youth; the survey included input from 2,021 Saudis aged between 15 and 34 years of age (Zogby International, 2010). In this survey, the area of interest most often chosen by Saudi youth from the given list of interests is technology (27%), with male respondents being twice as likely as women to choose technology; women’s interests are spread out among the arts, technology, travel and education. Generally speaking, the survey respondents do not think the community offers enough opportunities to learn about and or participate in the activity in which they are most interested. Women (56%) are even more likely than men (50%) to say that the community does not offer enough opportunities (ibid).

Respondents in the survey reported that they read between 1-3 books a year (29%) and 4-8 books a year (24%), with just 16% reading more than 15 books a year. Respondents in the highest income group are more likely to read more
than 15 books a year, as are those who have more education. Fiction and self-improvement are the two most popular genres, closely followed by religion. When it comes to entertainment and culture, Saudi youth expressed the most interest in cinema or sports, with less interest in visual arts, and much less interest in drama, live music and dance (ibid).

In findings that may be significant for the operation and space utilization of the Cultural Center’s facilities, the respondents strongly preferred a future that maintains segregation (69%), and further agree that gender segregation in the workforce has a positive impact on the productivity of workers, and a positive impact on education. They are open to working closely with or being friends with persons of a different religious belief and practices than themselves (46%) (ibid).

Given the novelty of an institution like the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, the inherently conservative nature of Saudi society, and the enormous social, economic and cultural shifts taking place in the Kingdom, it is clear to the institution’s leaders that the first order of business when it comes to outreach is simply increasing awareness of the Cultural Center itself, before moving on to a fuller understanding of its components, offerings and activities (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture Strategic Summary 2014).

This task will be made more complex by the Cultural Center’s affiliation with Saudi Aramco — likely with both positive and negative implications. Certainly the strong relationship (internally, the Cultural Center is an integral part of Saudi Aramco’s Public Affairs organization, and publicly the Cultural Center is currently branded as “A Saudi Aramco initiative”) means the institution will be well-funded; designed, built and operated to the high standards characteristic of the company’s other operations; and able to draw upon Saudi Aramco’s cadre of professional and technical specialists and their considerable expertise (for example, in the field of project management). There is also a degree of “protection” from negative public opinion that comes through the association with a well-respected, public-sector entity like Saudi Aramco.
At the same time, some Saudis who are not affiliated with the company — and perhaps especially those living outside the Eastern Province, where since the 1930s Saudi Aramco has had the longest and most intense presence — perceive the corporation as somewhat aloof and remote, with a strong, distinct organizational culture that sets it apart from other government agencies and national institutions. Al-Samaan (1990, 57) argues that the company functions as a clear meritocracy: “education is prized, hard work is expected, expertise is developed, and talent is recognized and rewarded. This island of ARAMCO [sic], off limits to the religious police and largely isolated from the rest of Saudi society, offers visible proof that Saudis can be educated, enterprising and efficient; can work together with purpose and pride; can employ the most modern technologies to operate in world markets; and can remain uniquely Saudi while also competing in the modern world.”

In the December 2009 Zogby International survey of Saudi youth attitudes, the most pioneering company was Saudi Aramco with two-thirds in agreement. The next closest company was Sabic, with 8% agreeing, and 7% agreeing that Saudi Telecom Company is pioneering (Zogby International, 2010). Opinions about the most old-fashioned company is less clear, with 27% not sure, 25% choosing Saudi Telecom Company and 14% choosing Saudi Aramco (ibid).

Although the majority of Saudi Aramco’s work force are Saudi nationals, much of the corporate culture has been inherited from the former American shareholder companies: The Arabian American Oil Company was originally a joint enterprise owned by Standard Oil of California, the Texas Company, Standard Oil of New Jersey and Standard Oil of New York; predecessors of Chevron, Texaco, Exxon and Mobil, respectively. Aramco was purchased in stages by the Saudi government, coming under full state ownership by 1980, and was transformed into Saudi Aramco in 1988. English remains the official language of company business.
2.6 Case Study Field Work

At the Çatalhöyük archaeological site and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, I undertook field research in the form of semi-structured participant interviews (Section 2.6.1) and non-intrusive participant observation (Section 2.6.2), to collect the necessary data to resolve my research questions. Existing literature regarding the two case study sites, while supportive, did not carry the sufficient data I required to answer my research questions (see Section 3 for the literature review methodology).

The observations and interviews at Çatalhöyük took place during the archaeological field seasons lasting from June through to September annually. Outside of these field seasons the site is closed, with no archaeological researchers or local community workers onsite, hence my presence at the site during the off-season months would leave me with little stakeholder interaction to observe.

In contrast, at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, my position as a full-time employee allowed me daily opportunities to observe behaviours and undertake interviews, simply because I am onsite regularly. As such, there was no need to carefully structure observation periods around my work schedule. Some of the observation sessions and the interview sessions were dictated by the operational tempo of the programs currently on offer while the Cultural Center facility is under construction. For example, the schedule of public (or outreach, or off-site) programs is generally limited to several months of intensive activity in a year.

2.6.1 Semi-structured Interviews

As Patton (2002, 340-341) has observed, “we interview people to find out from them those things that we cannot observe” (ibid, 340-341). Interviews play an important role in identifying stakeholder attitudes. They allow for in-depth questioning, cultivate a deeper understanding of thoughts, and allow participants
to express themselves in their own words and in ways that are relevant to their own worldviews. I undertook interviews at the two case study sites for two key reasons:

1) To capture data that was not readily available through non-intrusive observation or my literature analysis, regarding the effectiveness of stakeholder participation practices at the two case study sites and their effectiveness in the long-term sustainability of the site/project,

2) As a tool to check for inconsistencies in the data collected via non-intrusive field observations and the literature review.

In reference to the latter key reason, by conducting non-intrusive participant observation in the field, I was able to judge the degree of alignment or divergence between stated responses during the interviews and actual behaviour in the field — “watch what I do rather than listen to what I say,” so to speak. This was of particular importance because the interview process risks a misrepresentation of views. These may be intentional or unintentional on the part of the interviewees whereby the individual may simply be providing the input he or she believes I am seeking, or provides information to either advance or defend his or her own (often perceived) interests. Regardless of the motive, such inaccurate responses can result in a serious skewing of data and therefore of analyses and conclusions.

To gain the most useful and unfiltered information from the interviewees, I used a semi-structured method during the interview process. By “semi-structured method”, I refer to the practice of having “a set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence and asking each respondent the same questions with essentially the same words” (ibid, 280), yet reserving the flexibility to ask branching questions to continue the conversational tone of the interview, to further engage the individual interview subject, and to delve deeper into their experiences, viewpoints, attitudes or behaviours.
The pre-prepared set of questions focused my research; rather than trying to sample the entire sea of opinion and sentiment related to archaeological fieldwork or arts and culture institutions, I fished in those currents of thought and emotion that are most relevant to my research questions. The interviews were focused, the time was used efficiently, and the analysis and unitising of the data simplified. The advance preparation of a set of fixed questions also reduced the possibility of bias that could result from having different interviews for different people (ibid, 280).

The semi-structured, flexible technique of the interviews offered me an opportunity to pursue avenues of research that had not occurred to me before my engagement with the participants, while also overcoming potential barriers to response such as mutual unintelligibility of language, varying degrees of literacy, and sociocultural constraints on interactions that are posed by differences in age or gender. Naturally the interviews still varied in content and length from interviewee to interview. Having a structured and standardised format meant that the emerging content and topics were relatively consistent.

I adopted a conversational tone to avoid the distancing in hierarchical power — or even resentment — that can result from participants viewing my role as that of the “professional” who is out to impose my values on the respondent or to influence the way respondents reply to the questions, thus producing invalid data while also poisoning the trust and goodwill that is conducive to a meaningful interview. Equally, I cannot claim any special empathic understanding of the experiences of the participants in either setting. In any research involving interactions between a researcher and other individuals, there is always the problem of imposition: would a different researcher have achieved the same results? At heart, this is a function of receiving responses or reaching a conclusion due to the way that a researcher poses inquiries, conducts surveys, and handles the resulting data — in other words, stemming from personal bias due to professional, educational, cultural or social considerations and experiences.
At Çatalhöyük, given my Turkish heritage, I was aware that I cannot maintain a complete personal and social distance between myself and the interview participants who are also Turkish. My identity affects not only my worldview, but will also impact the reaction from my interviewees, who will invariably position themselves in relation to me during our conversations. Often, initial greetings in Turkey were followed by the question “where are you from (referring to your city of origin)?” As I am from Adana, a city not too far from Çatalhöyük, the reaction that I have come to expect is a jovial welcome expressed by the word, ‘Hemşeri’, which roughly translates as, “You are of the same land,” thus encouraging an immediate welcome and cultural affinity. My Turkish dialect and ability to speak English, my educational background and professional discipline, my social status and of course my experience of growing up and living overseas differentiates me markedly from most members of the local communities around Çatalhöyük and to a fairly large degree from the personnel working within the State administrative departments. Therefore, throughout the interviews, I cannot say that I was fully aware of the extent of my nativeness, particularly as this perception may vary from interlocutor to interlocutor. Due to my Turkish upbringing and archaeological experiences, I was also aware that I can potentially make faulty assumptions regarding the official reality of site management in Turkey, mistaking pronouncements for practice, or not understanding progressive changes over time, particularly as these are sometimes incremental in nature and not readily apparent.

The interviews conducted in Saudi Arabia took place in a different context. First of all, they were primarily undertaken in the English language, as I do not speak Arabic. Only for a few respondents was this a barrier to communication or understanding, as English is widely spoken in the Kingdom. For those interviewees who preferred to speak in Arabic, sometimes out of professional preference (e.g., a government official who wished to speak Arabic as it is the official language of the state apparatus), I engaged a translator. I noticed that this created some degree of dissonance and disconnect during the interview process, and perhaps a loss of nuanced understanding in both the questions
and the responses; in addition, going back and forth between languages added to the length of the interview.

I also noticed dissonance related to the fact that I am an expatriate living on a large but secluded company compound rather than a Saudi national living in one of the local communities that surround the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, and therefore affected my perspective about local conditions (e.g., educational systems, economic infrastructure, the role of institutions in intellectual life). The interview subjects were aware of my expatriate status and some couched their responses differently as a result of that knowledge. My translator confirmed to me that there was a degree of “Otherness” that coloured the responses I received from the Saudi interview respondents conversing in Arabic. By the same token, although I am familiar with Muslim culture and social mores given my Turkish heritage and life experiences, I became aware that there are particularly Saudi manifestations of traditional culture and Islamic norms that are different from my own, and again, this may have influenced my interactions with local stakeholders as a result of misunderstandings or misinterpretations on either side; guidance and insight from my translators and my Saudi colleagues at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture went some way toward identifying and avoiding these potential hazards.

There was also always the question of my gender: as a female, I needed to conduct surveys with male respondents in a public setting, most often in the presence of another individual to adhere to social norms prohibiting a man and woman who are not related from being alone in the same social space. The involvement of such an observer may have once again coloured the responses provided by my respondents, or made them less candid in their answers and observations. The fact that I needed an interpreter in some cases meant this factor may also have come into play with certain female survey subjects, who may not have been as open in front of a third party as they would be if it was a one-on-one setting. Finally, there is my position as an employee of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture. On the one hand, I have privileged access to information about the Cultural Center and its
development. On the other hand, I have a professional duty to protect confidential and proprietary information related to the Cultural Center, and not to compromise the trust given to me as an employee and therefore in some ways a representative of the Cultural Center. External interviewees might have viewed my status as a Cultural Center employee either positively or negatively, and may have tempered their responses as a result of that knowledge; some might also have hesitated to criticize the Cultural Center, its programs or its personnel to someone working for the institution, while still others might have complained to me in the belief that I am in a position to effect change or alter policies and practices.

This bias was difficult to avoid in either case study. I am uncomfortable with the ethical dilemma of deliberately holding back information related to my status at both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center, believing that just as I am aware of an interviewee’s background (at least as far as knowing to which stakeholder group he or she could belong), the interviewee has a right to know of my privileged relationship to the cultural heritage resource. Similarly, I do not believe that hiring or engaging a third party to conduct the semi-structured interviews and surveys is a solution: these individuals would have had their own degree of bias which would have impacted the way the questions were asked — even if I specified the questions themselves. More importantly, a third party would not be in a position to ask follow-up questions of the interview subjects as I would, given that they are not aware of the overall objectives of my research. Similarly, in the context of both of these case studies, there was an expectation among many stakeholders that if the conversation is important, the other person needs to be engaged rather than sending a hired interviewer; this is a matter of according a suitable degree of respect and “face” to the other individual, meaning that a third party approach may have resulted in resistance or passivity on the part of the interviewee. In other research contexts (e.g., marketing surveys or census data collection) third parties are a legitimate avenue for soliciting and recording information. In these two case studies, the sample sizes were relatively small and much of the value came through capturing individual insights and perspectives —
militating in favour of intensive, in-depth conversations about complex issues and intangible concepts, rather than superficial ticking of boxes.

In both the Turkish and Saudi settings, there are steps that I took to mitigate any potentially negative factors that may colour the collected data. For example, the semi-structured interviews were undertaken by approaching participants in their own environment where they would have felt most at ease, whether it was their own workplace, a social setting like a café or restaurant, or a friend’s house or their own residence. In addition, permission was sought from each participant prior to conducting the interviews, and I was candid with the participants about the purpose of the research, its scope, duration, and context. Having situated myself ethnographically within the communities operating at and near the two case study sites, as needed, I tried to tap into the trust that I have built via the continuity of my years working at the sites. The assumption here was that the interviewees would talk more openly with me than they would with a complete outsider. It is important to note that the University College London’s procedures for ethical conduct with human subjects were met prior to undertaking the field research.

Outside of my own research no other interviews have been undertaken by other parties at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture. There have been two surveys conducted in 2009 and 2010 (the results of which I have shared in Section 2.5), and two more surveys undertaken by the Research Function at the Cultural Center. The results of the latter two surveys are detailed in Chapter Four. At Çatalhöyük, there are two on-going studies that capture data using the interview method (see Mickel 2013, 2014). I refer to the findings of these studies in Chapter Four. Here it is worth describing the scope of the study undertaken by Mickel (2013, 2014) in reference to its interplay with my field interviews, particularly because Mickel’s data is predominantly captured by the interview method.

The purpose of the interviews undertaken by Mickel (2013, 2014), which form a part of the researcher’s post doctoral dissertation, is to build an oral history of excavations at Çatalhöyük, from the Mellaart excavation era through to the
present. Mickel (2013, 2014) claims that despite the extensive multimedia archives consisting of context forms, databases, diary entries, photography and video clips, many of those hired on the Çatalhöyük project have not participated in interviews or other documentation strategies implemented by the project; thus resulting in a substantial gap in the archival record. Mickel (2013) further states that the perspectives of these individuals, such as the local team members, are crucial to the production of knowledge about the past, because of the particular perspectives they hold in relation to the unique roles they occupy in the excavation process at Çatalhöyük. As such, Mickel’s (2013, 2014) research aims to determine the nature of this gap and how it has impacted our existing knowledge about Çatalhöyük, and in this way, to demonstrate how an inclusive recording strategy would result in a more nuanced and comprehensive archival record.

Mickel’s (2013, 2014) interview sessions, in terms of timing, did not overlap with mine; otherwise there may have been an opportunity to join our efforts. The scope of her study has captured data regarding the challenges and opportunities of stakeholder engagement practices at the Çatalhöyük archaeological project, and I refer to this dataset in greater detail in Chapter Four.

To determine the sample size of my interviews, it was crucial for me to undertake a stakeholder mapping exercise, whereby I mapped the stakeholder groups and identified a representative set of interviewees from each stakeholder group. I prepared a stakeholder map using the information available in the published literature regarding the stakeholder communities of each case study site, and informed by my observations during my role at the case study sites over the last several years. The stakeholder mapping will be maintained, or kept live as a database, through the updated data received from the fieldwork (such as from the participant interviews where they may draw my attention to a new stakeholder group category or refer to members (of whom I am unaware) of an existing stakeholder group category). The stakeholder groups, and their relevance to this research, are described in detail in Chapter Four, Section 2.
The interviews were directed to all relevant stakeholder groups, excluding no particular sector — in part to gauge the degree of impact the various issues have had on various actors in each cultural ecosystem. During the selection of the interviewees, I determined an equal representation from those who had previously been involved in previous or on-going stakeholder engagement practices implemented at the case study sites and those who had not; this helped me to sample the impressions formed by both of these experiences.

In terms of the sample size for the semi-structured interviews, 847 interviewees participated at the Çatalhöyük case study site, and 1,604 participated at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture case study site. It is worth noting here the average time length, demographics, and stakeholder population size of the interviews. An explanation of the population sizes and the samples sizes follows further below.

**Interviews undertaken at Çatalhöyük case study site**

- Shortest interview time: 21 minutes.
- Longest interview time: 3 hours and 19 minutes.
- Average interview time: approximately 1 hour.
- Participant demographics: see Figure 8, below.
- Interviews are not transcribed.

**Interviews undertaken at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture case study site**

- Shortest interview time: 27 minutes.
- Longest interview time: 2 hours and 52 minutes.
- Average interview time: approximately 1 hour and 30 minutes.
- Participant demographics: see Figure 9, below.
- Interviews are not transcribed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çatalhöyük interview participant demographics</th>
<th>N =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local residents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Küçükköy village employed at the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Küçükköy village not employed at the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other villages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Çumra town</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research team</strong></td>
<td>95 out of a population of 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Involved in the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Not involved in the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsors of the site</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 out of a population of 11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site visitors</strong></td>
<td><strong>148 out of a population of 238</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N=</strong></td>
<td><strong>847</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. The semi-structured interview participant demographics the Çatalhöyük case study site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Center interview participant demographics</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>146 out of a population of 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Center Employees</td>
<td>138 out of a population of 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>108 out of a population of 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past program participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Aramco Employee</td>
<td>148 out of a population of 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>10 out of a population of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents Eastern Province</td>
<td>148 out of a population of 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhahran City</td>
<td>302 out of a population of 5,081,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dammam &amp; Khobar Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Province</td>
<td>245 out of a population of 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiddah City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Province</td>
<td>249 out of a population of 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyadh City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Personnel Involved with the Cultural Center</td>
<td>5 out of a population of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved with the Cultural Center</td>
<td>11 out of a population of 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kingdom thought leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International peer organization employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 out of a population of 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 out of a population of 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For any given population, calculating the statistically relevant and procedurally sound sample size is crucial to capturing meaningful and accurate data. There are various statistical techniques for estimating population parameters, and calculating the correct sample size and ensuring the accuracy of results relies on understanding the difference between relative confidence levels and margin of error. The confidence level explains the degree to which we can be certain that results are accurate, while the margin of error indicates the range the survey results would fall between if this confidence level held true.

Standard surveys tend to have a confidence level of 95% and margin of error of 5%. For example, if I wanted to measure the satisfaction of the 200 past participants of a Cultural Center program, I know that a sample of 132 participants will give me the desired confidence level of 95% with a margin of error of 5%. The 95% confidence level indicates that 19 out of 20 times I undertake this interview, the findings would fall within the 5% margin of error – and my 5% margin of error confirms that were I to survey all 200 program participants, the findings would only differ with a score of minus 5% or plus 5% from its original score. Today, the task of determining relevant sample sizes has been made easier by the existence of many statistics websites with in-built calculators. The mathematical formulas that underlie the convenience of these calculators are as follows:

| International partner organization employee | | 15 out of a population of 15 |
| Total participants | | 1,604 |

Figure 9. The semi-structured interview participant demographics the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture case study site.
Sample Size = (Distribution of 50%) / (((Margin of Error% / Confidence Level Score) Squared)

True Sample = (Sample Size X Population) / (Sample Size + Population – 1)

There are two additional elements in statistical analysis that require additional explanation: the confidence level score and the distribution. The confidence level score is the standard deviation value that is commensurate with the confidence level. Where there is a confidence level of 95%, the confidence level score would equal 1.96. The confidence level score measures the number of standard errors to be added and subtracted, to achieve the desired confidence level (the percentage confidence the researcher wishes to attain). The following table (Figure 10) shows common confidence levels and their corresponding standard deviation value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Standard deviation value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Common confidence levels and their corresponding standard deviation value.

The confidence interval is equal to two margins of error and a margin of error is equal to roughly two standard errors (for 95% confidence). A standard error is the standard deviation when it is divided by the square root of the sample size. The standard error is the standard deviation of the sampling distribution of the mean, or in other words, it is the amount by which we expect the sample mean to fluctuate for a given sample size due to random sampling error.
Distribution, then, reflects how skewed the participants to a survey are regarding a given topic. A 50% distribution is considered conservative and sound. Using the conservative confidence level of 95% and margin of error of 5%, the participant demographic sample population falls within the minimum sample size, as determined by the formula noted above.

These sample sizes are a function of several considerations: first, the interviews themselves are rather lengthy and detailed, as they are designed to provide in-depth reflections and insights. This meant that the interviews were time consuming for me as the researcher, and for the respondents. Second, in some cases the available population size is simply small; for instance, there are only a small number of government officials directly associated with either site. Similarly, because there hasn’t been a concerted effort within Saudi Aramco to publicize the Cultural Center, I only focused the interview participation on the Saudi Aramco employees and managers within the Saudi Aramco Public Affairs organisation (in which the Cultural Center, as a department, lies) whose tasks are within range of the Cultural Center. In regards to the site visitors and the research team members, and the site sponsors at Çatalhöyük, for the former two, the population sizes are the total number of visitors who embarked on the site and research team members who were at the site during my field study period, as opposed to the total number of visitors recorded in the visitor record books since records began or the total number of employees, and for the latter, the population are the decision makers of the sponsor company’s department that handles sponsorship relations.

The sizes of the “population” for the participant demographic groups require some further explanation because the population size can be misleading based on the demographic categorizations I have noted here. For example, for the village, town and city residents, the population size is not the entire resident population of the noted town and cities. Instead the population is formed by those participants that were available for me to interview, and the sample size represents those with whom I did undertake the interviews. The population size (those participants that were available for me to interview) was
determined by the cultural sensitivities of the contexts of the two case study sites, and by my professional ethics. Given the conservative public and social life in Saudi Arabia, it is very challenging for a female stranger to approach both men and women and undertake a lengthy interview. Therefore, the demographic population sizes were formed by those that I had a professional relationship with: for example, those who attended the Cultural Center outreach programs, or those who were independently introduced to me by a common point of contact. Although the social norms of the resident and professional community I interviewed regarding the Çatalhöyük site are less conservative, it is still very unusual and not particularly welcome to knock on house or office doors without a pre-introduction by a common contact. I was also keen not to jeopardize the Çatalhöyük Research Project’s working relationships with the local community and Government officials. Although there has been a history of independent researchers who have worked in the Çatalhöyük site area over the years, it would be unprofessional for me to raise expectations around stakeholder engagement at either of the case study sites, especially on behalf of the institution, particularly where I pose interview questions regarding governance matters and future ownership of the case study site. When undertaking the interviews, I quickly became aware that the term “independent researcher” does not entirely equate to “independent of the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project” amongst the local communities and official bodies.

Similarly, because the Cultural Center is at a developmental phase and has not as yet embarked on a public-wide communication campaign to raise awareness and understanding regarding its activities, I could be misperceived as a representative of the Cultural Center, despite stating my “independent researcher status”. My agreement with the Cultural Center management team, who have allowed me include the Cultural Center as a case study in my research, has included my professional commitment to ensure my data collection method does not create reputational damage to the Cultural Center.

I wanted to address some of the same questions raised in the semi-structured interviews to a wider sample population, using survey methodologies. This
would have entailed written or online questionnaires delivered to a random sampling of a particular group or demographic, rather than targeting specific individuals as in the interviews. In addition, these surveys would not have involved face-to-face interactions between me and the respondents, creating greater scope for anonymity. Given my professional role at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, I needed to obtain permission from the management of the institution to conduct these studies, and since there is an existing research function within the Cultural Center, it was decided that my proposed survey would represent an intrusion on the work of the research team, and potentially colour or influence some of their sample populations. Nevertheless, I was given access to the two surveys that the research team had already conducted, and that material is incorporated into Chapter Four.

Because I was unable to conduct such surveys in Saudi Arabia, I opted not to conduct them in the Turkish case study either, so that my body of research findings from the two locations would be more consistent in terms of methodologies and information sources. Still, whenever the opportunity presented itself in the interviews at both sites, I asked yes/no questions that did yield some quantitative data that is suitable for comparison across stakeholder categories and between the two case studies; again, this information appears in chart form in Chapter Four.

It is also important to note here that there are no clear-cut distinctions between the various stakeholder groups, or any reason to suppose that these groups are mutually exclusive. Certainly members of a public agency may also be local community residents, and may or may not have visited and interacted with the cultural heritage resource under discussion. Nor do I assume the results of the interviews to be typical of all such communities, given the specific nature of the two case studies, and even of the identities of the subjects surveyed, as it's impossible to sound out every member of a particular group or institution. These are the eternal problems of representativeness and sample size when a study captures a moment in time and space that cannot be exactly replicated or recreated, and therefore cannot be entirely testable. Due to time constraints for this study, not every individual involved or impacted by the activities at the two
case study sites could be interviewed. The prepared interview questions, posed
to a statistically significant number of individuals from each of the relevant
stakeholder groups, provided tremendous insight to build upon the foundational
data provided by the literature review and non-intrusive participant observation.
The results of the semi-structured interviews are noted in Chapter Four and the
interview questions are noted below.

2.6.1.1 Semi-structured interview questions: Çatalhöyük

What are the essential elements in meaningful and effective engagement of
key stakeholders within archaeological sites and culture and knowledge
institutions?

1. Do you visit the site, and how often?
2. Are you involved in the project?
3. What is your role, and how long have you occupied in that role?
4. Outside of that role, in what ways do you engage with the site/ project?
5. What mechanisms are available for you to participate in the decision-making regarding the current use, and future use of the site?
6. Who are the main stakeholders for this site?
7. How often, and in what ways do these stakeholders collaborate to maintain the operations of the site?
8. In 2004, a new regulation was enacted regarding the development of a site management plan (called the AMP) – since 2004, has your involvement in the site/ project increased?
9. Since 2004, have you noticed an increase in the levels and types of collaboration amongst the other stakeholders in the management of the sites operation and future plans?
10. Who should be responsible for the operations and future direction of the site?

How are these elements best created and activated?

11. What do you envision for the future of Çatalhöyük (next 5-10 years)?
12. Who ought to be responsible for developing the vision you described?
13. What are the main challenges to implementing that vision?
14. How could these challenges be resolved?
15. If you could participate in the decision-making discussions for the current operations, and future decisions about the site, what would be the best way to engage your participation in a sustained way?
16. Who ought to be responsible for engaging your participation?

*In a global context, is there an intellectually grounded, activity-based framework for enhancing both stakeholder engagement and the long-term sustainability of sites and institutions?*

17. Do you think the challenges you described occur elsewhere, at other sites?
18. Do you think the solution(s) you recommend for resolving the challenges at this site would also work at other sites?

2.6.1.2 Semi-structured research questions: King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture

*What are the essential elements in meaningful and effective engagement of key stakeholders within archaeological sites and culture and knowledge institutions?*

1. Do you know about the Cultural Center project?
2. Are you involved in the Cultural Center project?
3. What is your role, and how long have you occupied in that role?
4. Outside of that role, in what ways do you engage with the project?
5. Do you know what the Cultural Center’s vision, mission, goals, governance structure are and could you list six programs undertaken by the Cultural Center?
6. What mechanisms are available for you to participate in the decision-making regarding the development of programs and activities, and the future direction of the Cultural Center?
7. How engaged are you in the development, management, and evaluation of the programs and activities?
8. Who are the main stakeholders for this Cultural Center?
9. How often, and in what ways do these stakeholders collaborate to maintain the operations of the Cultural Center?
10. Who should be responsible for the operations and future direction (the management) of the Cultural Center once it is built?

How are these elements best created and activated?

11. What do you envision for the future of the Cultural Center (next 5-10 years)?
12. Who ought to be responsible for developing the vision you described?
13. What are the main challenges to implementing that vision?
14. How could these challenges be resolved?
15. If you could participate in the decision-making discussions for the current operations, and future decisions about the site, what would be the best way to engage your participation in a sustained way?
16. Who ought to be responsible for engaging your participation?

In a global context, is there an intellectually grounded, activity-based framework for enhancing both stakeholder engagement and the long-term sustainability of sites and institutions?

17. Do you think the challenges you described occur elsewhere, at other institutions?
18. Do you think the solution(s) you recommend for resolving the challenges at this site would also work at other institutions?

2.6.2 Non-intrusive Participant Observation

The term “non–intrusive” is often used to describe a research method whereby participants do what they normally do without being disturbed by observers. It is a qualitative practice with roots in traditional ethnographic research and where
the goal is to enable practitioners learn the perspectives and attitudes held by the study populations. The ultimate aim is to gather first-hand information in a naturally occurring situation (Burns & Grove 2001; Willig 2001). Hence, the key advantages of this method are that participants can be observed in the environment where they carry out the work/relationship that is being observed.

There are varying degrees of “non-intrusion,” governed by the extent to which the researcher engages in the activities of the group under study. For example, does the researcher announce his or her presence to the group, or not? Does she or he respond when asked a question, or ask questions of the group even if the question is simply about “background” information such as the ages or residential locations of group members?

Whatever the degree of non-intrusiveness, criticisms toward using observation as a method of data collection, point to the resulting data as being restricted to the public fronts socially constructed by “actors” who are aware that they are being observed and thus motivated to perform better under observation, and then there are the gate-keepers who ensure that the researcher never goes backstage (Dossa 1997; Coffey 1999; Willing 2001).

Keeping these restrictions in mind, I undertook semi-structured participant interviews with the participants I observed to utilize as a powerful tool to check against instances of “acting” so that I could highlight inconsistencies (see Section 2.6.1 for the semi-structured interview methodology). Also, given my history of work at the two case study sites, I was easily able to identify the “gate-keepers” of information, note how they impact the project and engagement, and how to navigate around them where needed. Although I had access to the “backstage”, on occasion an interview participant would request, for confidentiality reasons, that I not report an aspect of the information they shared with me during the interview process; I have an ethical responsibility to uphold such requests for confidentiality, while utilizing their information for my own edification and contextual framing.

My observations were conducted at or near each of the case-study sites, within the relevant stakeholder communities, or at the workplaces of officials,
administrators and other functionaries whose activities related to the case study site. That is to say, I did not remove the subjects out of their natural setting by inviting them to a location of my choosing to engage in an activity of my design, as might be the case in a focus group study.

Both ethical and practical factors determined the degree of “non-intrusiveness” for my observations. Because I wanted my subjects to be honest with me, I believe I had to uphold the ethical responsibility of being honest and transparent with them up front: reciprocity maintained for fair research practice. With this decision in mind, I announced my presence to the subjects prior to engaging in my observation research. I immediately found that the subjects were satisfied with me simply explaining that the purpose of my presence is to “better understand how various actors interact with the project and each other”. Among the subjects, there did not seem to be an appetite for any further information or a detailed description of my research. I was pleasantly surprised by this situation because I did not want the behaviour of the subject(s) that I was observing to be influenced by their knowledge of my research questions.

Being open with the subjects regarding the purpose of my research, its scope, duration and so forth was also necessary for practical reasons. Given my history of work at the case study sites, and the resulting familiarity of most of the subjects with me and my association to the project, appearing at their activity area to undertake observation without announcing the motivations for my presence would raise questions or even suspicions, and/or prompt the subjects to engage with me directly out of natural social courtesy. Also, given the conservative nature of the communities in both Konya and Dhahran, my presence and interaction with people of both genders required explanation.

As English is the official language at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture and the rest of Saudi Aramco, and is also the primary language used even in interpersonal interactions among employees, I did not require a translator during my observations. That said, when interactions and conversations took place in Arabic, I had difficulty observing and chronicling
the activities. Also, due to local social customs and practices related to gender segregation, I did not have access to all-male programs (e.g., an educational program for students from a boys’ secondary school).

To ensure that I used my observation sessions most productively, I predetermined lines of enquiry that I would address during my observations at both the case study sites. These lines of enquiry stem from the research questions that I aim to resolve:

- What mechanisms and programmes have been developed and deployed to support stakeholder engagement and participation, and how effective are these in ensuring a sustainable management of the cultural centre and archaeological site, its operation, and output?

- What mechanisms and programmes have been developed and deployed to support stakeholder engagement, and how effective are these in articulating and activating the sustainability desires of the stakeholder groups associated with the site/centre?

- What have been the short-term efficacy and long-term sustainability of the mechanisms and programmes (as described in the available literature) in ensuring the sustainable management of the site and institution?

- What are the main barriers and enabling factors to stakeholder engagement and participation?

- What are the essential elements in meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement and participation at the archaeological site in Çatalhöyük that could be similarly created and activated at the Cultural Center and vice versa?
To respond to these lines of enquiry, I firstly armed myself with the data I collected regarding stakeholder engagement practices noted at the case study sites within the published literature and internal documents. Then, I compared what I observed with the recordings in the literature. For example, I observed the many ways in which the various stakeholder groups at the Çatalhöyük site and the Cultural Center were motivated to interact with the cultural resource, the onsite programs and activities, and with other stakeholders, particularly during moments of decision making regarding the governance of the cultural resource. I observed the interactions, interchange and negotiations between the stakeholder groups. I noted the opportunities, the enablers, and the challenges to engagement and participation, either with the cultural resource or with other stakeholder(s). Here, my observations were unstructured to the extent that I was able, in the moment to explore “what is important” to the subjects and “what motivates” them. To make effective use of my time, I also guided my observations in this regard with a set of sub questions:

- Why are certain stakeholders more (or less) engaged than others? Is it a matter of relevance of programs and content, the degree to which a particular group or individual has been targeted for communication and engagement, or a sense of dissociation or even alienation from the cultural heritage resource as currently envisaged and communicated?
- What role do inequities in authority and relationships to decision-making power play in stakeholder engagement activities practiced at the case study site?
- How could low levels of engagement and participation be remedied or effective practices applied to one stakeholder set be expanded to encompass other groups?

In addition to this subset of questions, I was also guided by the responses to my semi-structured participant interviews; hence why I decided to undertake the field
observations and semi-structured interviews in parallel (see Section 2.6.1 regarding the semi-structured participant interviews). For example, if an interview respondent said that barriers exist to family participation at the archaeological site, I tried to ascertain the validity of such a comment through non-intrusive observation. For this reason, I made a concerted effort to observe those whom I had interviewed. Observing those subjects that I interviewed could colour my observation data, given that the subjects under observation are aware of my purpose and lines of questioning and this knowledge may impact their observed behaviour. For this reason, where possible, I undertook two observations of the same subject, once prior to the interview and once following the interview. In total, my observation subject sample size for the Çatalhöyük case study site, and the King Abdulaziz Cultural Center for World Culture site are the same as those noted for the semi-structured participant interviews in Section 2.6.1, Figures 8 and 9.

I was also observant of factors such as hierarchical power, social influence, socio-economic background, degrees of social or religious conservatism, gender, age, and educational level as potential avenues to yield exciting insights into the degree to which these factors pre-determine attitudes and behaviours toward entanglement.

Lastly, I compared my observation findings across the two case studies to record areas of convergence and divergence between similar stakeholder groups in the Turkish and Saudi settings, and to gauge the degree to which there are essential elements of stakeholder engagement that are universal in nature, are site/context-specific, or are a complex mix of global and local considerations. More particularly, I noted those elements of stakeholder engagement that have inspired sustainable management practices in both the Turkish archaeological context and the Saudi knowledge and culture space.

In terms of recording the impressions of the subjects, I decided not to ask participants for their names or other personal information, and instead I simply used the data available to me by observation (e.g., “Cultural Center employee in his 40s,” a “member of the research team in her 50s,” etc.). At both the
Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center settings, the subject communities are small and offering anonymity allowed me to capture spontaneous as opposed to pre-determined, negotiated expressions.

2.6.3 Self-reflexivity During Field Interviews and Observations

Coffey (1999) notes that self-reflexivity relies upon understanding the social and political position of the researcher in relation to the various members of the community that s/he is studying, and an appreciation of how these relationships change during the course of research. During my field research, although my feelings and state of mind were of some importance, I was aware that they should be of little importance in the assessment of the epistemological validity of the data. While my positioned subjectivity is liable to place limits upon my understanding of the data that may be difficult to discern, the recognition of these limits highlighted the true nature of my participation during my fieldwork. Positioned subjectivity has a crucial role to play during fieldwork and does not necessarily mean that my analysis is biased or is scientifically invalid. The validity of my analysis came about through recognising that the problems and answers I sought regarding the relationship of stakeholder participation strategies to sustainability at the case study sites are very much structured by the part that I play in these two case studies.

To counteract the influence of my own biases and presuppositions, I took a number of steps to check those elements that I risked introducing (even inadvertently) as a result of my personal or professional background. These checks included periodically discussing my thoughts and observations with colleagues at both case study sites who hail from a different educational, professional, social, cultural, national and/or linguistic background than my own. With these colleagues I discussed whether I was accurately and adequately recognizing thoughts, positions and behaviours expressed by various stakeholders (while maintaining the anonymity of the stakeholder in question). I endeavoured to use in-depth interviews to inform any
inconsistencies in my field observations; that is, I took trends, dynamics, factors or observations identified in the interviews and observed if they are borne out by the behaviour of various stakeholder groups. At the same time, the non-participant observation data served to "pressure test" the responses to interviews, and determined the degree to which respondents had misrepresented themselves or their communities, even unintentionally (after all, the issues of bias and self-reflexivity apply to research subjects as well as to researchers).

In summary, I used an iterative approach to my activities, alternating between the literature review, semi-structured interviews, and non-intrusive direct observation. Thus, I took learning and insights gained through the use of one research avenue, and applied that understanding to better inform the other research methods. At the same time, I took findings from one of the case studies to see if they were applicable to the other; comparing and contrasting my data and analyses to reach a more accurate and more comprehensive understanding of the two cultural heritage resources being studied than would have been possible by looking at only one in isolation.

3 Literature Review Methodology

The purpose of the literature review, in regards to my research question, was twofold; 1) to place the recent developments, in the area of stakeholder engagement, within a wider contextual understanding regarding the sustainability of archaeological sites and knowledge and culture institutions, and the desired sustainability outcomes of their associated stakeholder groups; and 2) to provide the data, from sample sites and case studies, for a “deep-dive” analyses of stakeholder engagement and participation activities and their relationship to and impact upon sustainability.

In this regard, for the research questions A, A1, A2 and A4 (as noted in Section 1.1), I reviewed the literature on cultural heritage projects where a specific stakeholder engagement strategy or model was implemented over a long time-
span and critically reviewed. This provided the insight into the strategy/model, its implementation and effectiveness, any challenges and their solutions, and the overall long-term outcomes in regards to the sustainability of the project and the desired sustainability outcomes by its associated stakeholder communities.

I first explored the models of stakeholder engagement as practiced in various disciplines. Evaluating this literature helped me identify the most significant factors involved in undertaking stakeholder engagement. For real world examples of stakeholder engagement models in action and their effectiveness in ensuring sustainability, I had to evaluate the literature regarding stakeholder engagement practices in archaeological sites and cultural/knowledge institutions. But before I could do this, I needed to understand the challenges of stakeholder engagement practices in these fields: what are the realities and factors that hinder stakeholder engagement? After identifying and assessing these realities and factors through the information gleaned from my literature review, I sought to identify the various stakeholder engagement models in these fields that have sought solutions to these engagement challenges.

In evaluating these various models, I was keen to understand their successes and failures, and whether they offered a universal solution that could be applied in different geographies and other segments of the cultural heritage space. Understanding the gaps in the academic discourse offered me a pathway to make my own contribution to this wider body of literature in a manner that helps to fill these gaps in our collective knowledge and understanding of this critical area of human endeavour and cultural patrimony.

For questions A3 and A4, I reviewed the literature from research projects undertaken by trans-national institutions such as UNESCO, etc. These provided examples from a variety of geographical regions and contexts, while also noting recommended approaches to engagement and sustainability practices and their perceived strengths and weaknesses. I also reviewed the literature in support and critique of the literature stemming from the trans-national institutions, to arrive at a critically assessed conclusion regarding the concepts, examples, and data presented by these trans-national institutions.
Furthermore, I reviewed the literature for the two case study sites to understand the landscape and effectiveness of stakeholder engagement practices undertaken at Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture.

There is a relative dearth of research into cultural heritage management practices and stakeholder engagement in both Turkey and Saudi Arabia (see Section 2.3). There is a rich collection of documents and documentation that was produced in conjunction with the Çatalhöyük site’s ultimately successful application for acceptance as a UNESCO World Heritage Site; this material is particularly valuable in terms of cultural heritage management best practices that were identified for the site, and the degree to which they have been implemented over time. While Çatalhöyük has been studied intermittently from the 1960s onward (and continues to be a site of active study today), as a new institution there has been very little scholarly research undertaken into the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture or its engagement with relevant stakeholders, much less an assessment of the prognosis for its long-term sustainability as a meaningful and relevant cultural heritage site.

The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is an institution being developed by the national oil company outside of the normal public sector channels responsible for other national culture institutions. Therefore, I examined the internal company documentation related to the Cultural Center, particularly its mission and objectives, the scale and scope of its facilities and programs, and of course the means and methods being utilized to engage with a wide range of stakeholders and enlist their support and involvement. Some of these materials are confidential or proprietary in nature, and therefore cannot be reproduced or quoted in the present study, but as an employee of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, I had unprecedented access to this body of literature — which given the Cultural Center’s current early stage of development, is particularly important as a primary source. For example, surveys and studies separate from my own research have been undertaken into the ways the Cultural Center engages with its stakeholders, the efficacy of various programs, and stakeholders’ views and opinions. I had access to those findings, and integrated them into my own research. In addition, Saudi Aramco as a whole is in the
process of seeking wider and more substantial engagement with local communities as part of its corporate Accelerated Transformation Program. These overtures range from energy efficiency education to social entrepreneurship and traffic safety, and therefore are not necessarily directly related to the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture and its mission. These initiatives do involve engagement with local communities and therefore provided valuable primary data into stakeholder engagement in the Kingdom. At the same time, the Cultural Center is being viewed by some other company organizations as a prospective platform for their own educational, communications, local economic development, or change-leadership efforts, and therefore the documents and proposals they generate did have a direct bearing on the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, its perception by external Saudi audiences, and indeed its own self-conception.

In addition to this, my role at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture has put me in direct contact with a number of institutional players within the Saudi cultural heritage field, including some governmental organizations like the Ministry of Education and the Saudi Commission for Tourism and Natural Heritage, which provided me access to their otherwise restricted documentation and program descriptions regarding stakeholder engagement. Given that the body of literature related to stakeholder engagement and cultural heritage management in Saudi Arabia is relatively limited (hence a reliance on website citations or reference to internal documents), this access to key contacts was immensely valuable for understanding the approaches and trends in stakeholder engagement practices within cultural heritage fields in Saudi Arabia.

It is worth noting that with regard to the language of the documents, some of the materials pertaining to the sites are primarily written in Turkish, which I can easily translate, or Arabic, a language that I do not speak; for the Arabic documents, I enlisted the assistance of competent translators, including some who are active in various aspects of cultural heritage management.

Furthermore, rather than simply relying on second-hand reporting about what goes on in the stakeholder engagement and participation landscape within these
two case studies, I undertook semi-structured participant interviews (see Section 2.6.1) and non-intrusive participant observation (see Section 2.6.2) to counter-check the findings reported in the published literature.

4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the research methodologies that I utilised to gather data from a wide and diverse group of stakeholders in the two case studies, as well as to incorporate the existing published literature on stakeholder engagement and participation, and sustainability within the cultural heritage space, into the present study. The chapter also examined the relative merits and weaknesses of these various avenues of research, whether they are structural, temporal or ethical in nature. The discussion has also highlighted the opportunities to compare and contrast the data and findings from the two case studies, and posited the potential to draw conclusions about the relative universality or specificity of various drivers of stakeholder engagement.
Chapter Four: Research findings from the Case Studies

1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data collected from the semi-structured interviews and the non-participant observation undertaken at Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture. The data sheds lights on the key mechanisms and programs for stakeholder participation at each case study, and the effectiveness of these activities for the long-term sustainability of the site and in the case of the Cultural Center, the institution. Before the issues of stakeholder engagement, its efficacy and its sustainability can be addressed; the question of who the stakeholders are in each of the two case studies must be examined and resolved. Following the stakeholder definitions, the raw data from the semi-structured interviews will be presented, followed by a fuller discussion of these findings.

2 Stakeholder Landscapes

The stakeholder categories for each case study site are based on my non-intrusive observations and are also informed by stakeholder categorization as has been previously assessed and determined in published research regarding Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture.

2.1 Çatalhöyük’s Stakeholder Landscape

The main stakeholder groups of Çatalhöyük are the local community, sponsors and local business owners, the research team, government officials, the wider public (such as visitors to the site), the global archaeology community, and special interest groups such as the Mother Goddess groups. Through my field
observations of each stakeholder group, I have detailed their interactions with and motivations toward the sustainability of the site and the research project.

2.1.1 The Local Community

Among the primary stakeholder groups at Çatalhöyük are the local communities that surround the site, which consist of a series of small villages along with the town of Çumra. The total population of Çumra town is roughly 40,000 (Selçuk Universities, 2015), most of them small-scale farmers, and generally rural inhabitants with low incomes and limited education.

The men and women who work on the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project are mainly the inhabitants of the local village of Küçükköy, 1km from the site, and the local town of Çumra, 15 km from the site. These Turkish men and women work in a variety of capacities from labourers, to site guards and guides, to assisting on the flotation tasks and sorting the heavy residue, to cooks and cleaners. Up to 40 to 50 people are employed by the project during the field season each year. The site guards remain onsite year-round.

Increasingly locals have visited the site from neighbouring villages and towns and also from the regional centre at Konya (as noted in Section 2.1.6). Prior to their visits, their knowledge about Çatalhöyük is from primary school education, the stories they have heard growing up in the local area, and ad hoc information disseminated by the project team. Training is provided to some of the local employees; the purpose of the training is for the employee to understand the significance of their work, and how best they could add value to the research project.

While these locals have a vested, informational interest in the site, their key concern is related to how they could be enabled to benefit economically from the excavation project or the tourists who visit the site. For instance, during the CBPR project survey process (as discussed in Chapter Two, Section 4.4), when asked how the site ought to be developed in the future, many locals lodged requests unrelated to the research project, such as repurposing the
site’s excavation house into a hospital, or providing the nearby local school with new computers. The latter request was granted when Professor Ian Hodder managed to procure funding from local businesses for the new computers. The research project has also contributed to the excavation of a new well, the establishment of a new water supply, and a library in the nearest village, as well as persuading regional officials to build a new school in the nearest village to the site (Hodder 2002, 176). These requests from the local community are in part what constitute meaningful “sustainability” and “sustainable development” for the local communities, which, as seen in this case, can be unrelated to or even run counter to the sustainable development of the archaeological resource.

Recurring jealouslyes between those locals who manage to become employed by the site and those who weren’t so fortunate also point to motivations of financial gain. On several occasions, the local men and women from nearby villages that participated in my interviews expressed concern about the project team’s favouring of Küçükköy residents, above other villagers, for employment positions on the project. Furthermore, these locals would later chase up on the matter each time they saw me. The surveys undertaken by the CBPR project had revealed that the majority of the residents from the five nearby villages endorsed the Küçükköy residents as the rightful partners of the research project (Atalay 2010). There is always some degree of tension between those who have found employment at the site and those who have not — even though the jobs only last through the summer research season, and the salary therefore is not sufficient to support an individual’s living expenses throughout the year. Many of the workers are “in-between”: either in-between jobs, or between their schooling and national service. As a result, most move on after one or two seasons, which create opportunities to hire new employees, yet which also means that any training and experience gained on the job are quickly lost and the new employees must also be trained.

The town administration of Çumra have made a concerted effort to forge links with the site, including using the Çatalhöyük name in various applications such
as for local festivals and the names of local businesses (Bartu-Candan 2005; Bartu-Candan 2007; Bartu-Candan et al., 2007). This has caused conflict in the smaller village of Küçükköy, which is actually nearer to the site than Çumra; as a result, the village residents feel they have a stronger claim to the site than the inhabitants of Çumra — and also engage in using the Çatalhöyük name in various locations and applications, such as branding their shops and products with the Çatalhöyük brand.

Atalay notes “Küçükköy residents have a legal right to engage with Çatalhöyük and to take part in its future planning, care, and management” (Atalay 2010, 422). The legal basis of the argument is unclear, unless she is referring to the landowners whose land borders the archaeological protection zone reserved for the Çatalhöyük site, and who would legally need to be engaged should that archaeological zone need expansion.

The Küçükköy residents have their grounds for complaint. There is more at stake than simple bragging rights: by associating their locales with the Çatalhöyük site, both the villagers and the town residents hope to attract tourists, and tourist lira. This was perhaps most evident when the Küçükköy village mayor and residents expressed heated complaints on the discovery that of the two ill equipped roads that lead tourists from Konya city to Çatalhöyük, the one that passed through Çumra was the only one repaired; immediately relegating the alternative road that passes through Küçükköy to a last resort. Other actors with an economic stake in the game include the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, travel agents, and tourism service companies.

The Küçükköy authorities have attempted to form alliances around the archaeological project and site. As Scott (1985 in Bartu-Candan 2005, 56) argues, “the presence of such a high-profile project so close to the village becomes a means to achieve various local objectives and to manipulate and contest local power relations. In a way, archaeology becomes one of the weapons of the weak”. Among the Küçükköy mayor’s goals have been the construction of a new school in the village, and the repair and upgrading of the
road through Küçükköy to Çatalhöyük (pers.com, a comment by the mayor during a semi structured interview).

On another front, some of the local residents are landowners, and have a vested interest in ensuring that the site does not encroach on their farmland. By the same token, though, the value of their real estate could rise if certain kinds of development were undertaken, including the attraction of larger numbers of tourists.

As with most of rural central Anatolia, the local residents tend to be socially conservative and strict in their interpretation and practice of Islam. For example, their gender roles and behavioural norms are well defined and rigorously enforced through social pressures. Some of the site workers have expressed concerns over the nature of the research activities, which involve excavating human remains, and their belief in the jinn (spirits) who live near the site (Atalay 2010). This raises an interesting quandary: for some members of this stakeholder group — surrounding communities — there is an entire subgroup of local “residents” — the jinn — that is being completely ignored at some considerable peril to all concerned. Offending the jinn by intruding in their habitat or not observing certain strictures or taboos could anger these beings, which are recognized in orthodox Islam and mentioned many times in the Qur’an (according to Islam, the jinn are created beings who, like men, have the free will to accept or reject God and His message, but who were created from fire while man was created from earth, just as Adam was in the Book of Genesis). When members of the research team violate these taboos, local residents become agitated; these negative feelings are at times expressed to Turkish members of the research team with whom they feel some degree of innate affinity, and I myself have spoken at length with members of the local community about the jinn and their position within the community. Far from being distant, mythical figures, in the weltanschauung of local residents, the jinn are neighbours with whom one should maintain cordial relationships — albeit neighbours that are largely unseen. As an example, site guards and local ladies expressed to me their displeasure at members of the research teams visiting the excavation mounds at
night, citing the fact that the jinn would be present there at that time of the day and would not wish to be disturbed.

Whether or not the jinn actually exist is of secondary concern when it comes to stakeholder engagement and attitudes: for many local residents, their presence on the site is a given, and the fact that the jinn are ignored or marginalized serves to alienate local residents to some extent from the research team and its activities — a clear instance of “landscape dissonance” as outlined in Chapter Two, Section 3.1.

2.1.2 Government Authorities and Politicians

The second key stakeholder group consists of governmental bodies and personnel who have a legal and custodial relationship to the Çatalhöyük site. These include the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism (see Figures 11, 12 and 13), which is the ultimate owner of the land demarcated for cultural activities, is responsible for issuing permits for archaeological research projects, and protecting and developing sites in accordance with heritage laws and regulations. Conservation Councils, which are associated with local municipalities, are entrusted with the practical application of these guidelines; for example, site guards (generally members of local communities) are hired and paid by these Conservation Councils. In addition, state-owned museums within cities — where most archaeological finds are ultimately housed — employ specialized experts who audit sites on a regular basis to ensure there are no illegal activities underway, and to ensure that the archaeological materials that are excavated are not exported, and instead are safely stored and curated within Turkey, preferably in a state institution. There is inevitably some degree of competition among the interests of these various state cultural bodies: for instance, should important archaeological finds be housed and displayed in a local museum close to the site where they were uncovered, or taken to Istanbul, Ankara or other large cities where they are more accessible to greater numbers of viewers?
Figure 11. Prof. Ian Hodder showing the Çatalhöyük site to the Turkish Minister of Culture and Tourism (archived photograph from the Çatalhöyük website).

Figure 12. Prof. Ian Hodder showing the Çatalhöyük site to the Turkish Minister of Culture and Tourism (archived photograph from the Çatalhöyük website).
Figure 13. Turkish media personnel at the Çatalhöyük site, capturing footage of the Turkish Minister of Culture and Tourism’s visit of the archaeological site (archived photograph from the Çatalhöyük website).

Of course, state actors go beyond those in the cultural sphere. Local governments in Konya City, Çumra Town and Küçükköy Village have all staked some claim to Çatalhöyük — if not to the site itself, to the “brand” which carries some degree of value in association. Because the archaeological site is internationally known and could be developed as a tourist destination (see Figure 14), “ownership” of Çatalhöyük has important ramifications for local economies and the sense of self-identification of residents. Over the years, prospective gains from a more cooperative approach between the local governmental entities have been forfeited in a zero-sum game framework, where no entity benefits except at the expense of the others. The roles of each of these governmental actors are treated in greater detail below, as part of the discussion of the legal framework governing Çatalhöyük.
Figure 14. HRH Prince Charles of the United Kingdom monarchy, observing the children’s activities at Çatalhöyük during a guided tour by Professor Ian Hodder (archived photograph from the Çatalhöyük website).

It is important to note here that Konya is a city known for its religious fundamentalist and/or nationalist politics. In the first round of 2015 elections, the majority of the votes from Konya city residents were given to the two most conservative political parties; 65% for Justice and Development Party (AKP), and 16.4% for Nationalist Movement Party (CHP) (Haberler 2015). In recent years the region has been the centre of Islamic companies and traditional rural Islamic attitudes towards community and social norms. As Ian Hodder has observed, “when politicians such as the local town mayor, or governor give talks to the press at the site, they talk about the importance of the locality and the region. They say the presence of Çatalhöyük demonstrates the special nature of the region – the importance of the land and its traditions” (Hodder 2002, 175). The site and the research project could always be subject to the political motivations of the local politicians, and must find the best approach to engage these influential figures whilst protecting the data from becoming exploited through interpretations that are not scientifically grounded or linked to any oral histories.
At an international level, UNESCO is heavily vested in Çatalhöyük, which is now included in the roster of World Heritage Sites. UNESCO’s interests revolve around the application of a host of regulations and site management practices that will protect the site for future generations. While Turkish governmental organizations are responsible for their implementation, UNESCO audits the progress of these efforts, and bears some degree of moral responsibility for awarding World Heritage Site status; in fact, should any of the significant factors or characteristics that constituted the basis for inclusion be forfeited or lost, the site could be delisted.

2.1.3 Local Business Owners

Local business owners constitute yet another stakeholder group. Small businesses in the area seek to benefit from greater tourist numbers, and as discussed above, there is significant disagreement about where the primary motor route to the site should be, given the positive impact it will have on local businesses. Local businesses also profit by supplying goods and services to the research team during the dig season (e.g., food, maintenance and janitorial services, small scale construction projects, etc.). Some local businesses oppose any expansion of the protected heritage site for fear it could interfere with their business prospects. For example, there are local contractors engaged in public sector infrastructure works like highways and pipelines located in close proximity to Çatalhöyük.

2.1.4 The Research Team

The research team at Çatalhöyük is the stakeholder group in closest contact with the archaeological heritage and has the most to gain or lose by the way the site is managed over time. Each member of the team has an individual research agenda and knowledge development objectives, within the larger, unified archaeological goals of the team as a whole. The site has also been a ground for capacity building for students and young archaeologists, helping them gain experience in archaeological field practices and research norms. Academics depend on the site for data for their research and by extension, for the
development and progress of their professional careers. To some extent, everyone associated with the research team benefits from a higher profile for Çatalhöyük, and are therefore vested in both its publicity and its sustainability as an active site of field archaeology.

In terms of the team’s composition, it includes both Turkish and foreign team members, as well as practitioners of different disciplines (e.g., artists, social scientists and architects). The team is generally present on site during the three-month excavation season during the summer; otherwise the site is closed and the research team is dispersed geographically, while remaining in contact via electronic means.

2.1.5 The Sponsors

The sponsor community is yet another stakeholder grouping that is essential to the sustainability of the Çatalhöyük research project. Major international donors include Coca-Cola, while the largest national sponsors include Koç Holding (a major Turkish industrial conglomerate) and Turkish Airways. These companies gain publicity through their corporate citizenship activities, and occasionally they host business visitors at the site. They do not maintain an onsite presence, nor do they insist on any decision-making role in the research project’s objectives or operations. Occasionally, a delegation from the sponsors will be hosted at the site through a tailor-made visitor experience.

2.1.6 Visitors to the Site

The tourists who visit Çatalhöyük are another important stakeholder group, with considerable influence over the physical site itself as well as the sustainability of the research project. There is some interest in developing Çatalhöyük as a tourist destination: for the research project itself that means a higher profile and a possible new revenue stream, while for local business people, visiting tourists could represent a new market. Therefore, the development of relevant infrastructure such as a Visitor Center, gift shop, appropriate roads and other transportation means, other food and retail outlets, etc., are in the interest of
some. At the same time, such developments could threaten the integrity of the archaeological site and impede future research: one would not want to build a new Visitor Center on top of a yet-to-be excavated burial mound. All in all, though, this is a relatively passive, non-engaged stakeholder group, and for some, their interaction and interest in the site may only last a few hours.

Since 2004, tourist numbers have exceeded 10,000 people per year, and in 2013 the visitor total exceeded 20,000 for the first time (Perry et al. 2013, 290-294). There was a change in the international versus local visitor demographics in 2013, when international visitors peaked above the national ones – a development which may have been in relation to Çatalhöyük’s World Heritage inscription (ibid). Visitors from Turkey significantly outnumbered international visitors until early 2012, in the range of 75-80% local to 20-25% international. According to the visitor data for 2013 and 2014 these two demographics are converging (ibid).

According to Perry et al. (2013, 290-294), the majority of international visitors come from Canada, Germany, Italy, the UK and the USA, and tourists from over 70 countries have travelled through the site since visitor records began at Çatalhöyük in 2002 (ibid). In the last two years, there has been a huge increase in Japanese tourists of nearly 3,000 people in 2013 (see Figure 15). Japan was barely represented at all in the visitor records prior to 2012; with only 26 Japanese tourists noted in 2011 (ibid). Japanese visitor numbers exceed the total number of Americans who visited in 2013 by nearly 300%, hinting a trend in touristic practice that is most likely linked to Çatalhöyük’s UNESCO designation (ibid).

Within Turkey, the city of Konya provided the largest number of total local visitors in comparison to other locations, as well as the highest frequency of visits and largest group sizes (ibid). While the total number of visitors from Konya increased in 2013, those of other Turkish nationals stayed similar with the frequency of visits decreasing (see Figure 16). There is a move towards single visits from larger tourist groups. Turkish schools and universities tend to visit in high numbers (sometimes in the hundreds) particularly during April and May (ibid).
Figure 15. The demographic of international visitors and visitor numbers to Çatalhöyük from 2010 to 2013 (Perry et al. 2014, 291, Figure 30.4).

Figure 16. The demographic of local visitors and visitor numbers to Çatalhöyük from 2010 to 2013 (Perry et al. 2014, 291, Figure 30.3).

Each year, during the field seasons, approximately a 550 school children from Konya and the towns neighbouring the site are hosted at Çatalhöyük and are encouraged to visit the site and engage with the project through a one-day (from 10am – 2pm) educational programme (called an “Archaeology Workshop”) consisting of a series of activities designed by the three- to four-member onsite education team (Sert 2014, 224). The activities include
presentations about the site and its history, a re-enactment of Neolithic daily life through a small theatre play, a guided tour of the site and on-site Neolithic experimental house, making small mud-brick houses and figurines, and excavating the 1960s spoil heap near the excavation areas. The aim of the programme is “introducing Çatalhöyük, to develop a sense of cultural heritage protection with the case of Çatalhöyük” (Sert 2011, 224). The program, funded by the site’s sponsors, has been delivered to pre-high school groups each year since 2003. An evaluation of the educational benefits offered by Çatalhöyük’s research team’s programme for school groups is undertaken by Apaydın (2016), and is discussed in Chapter Three, Section 2.4.

2.1.7 The Global Archaeological Community

At a further remove there is the global archaeological community, for whom Çatalhöyük represents a compelling research site. Over the years, a number of ground-breaking theories have been associated with the site, it has acted as a test bed for innovative heritage management and stakeholder engagement theories, and has played host to several varied individual research efforts. As some scholars believe that Çatalhöyük is the earliest town in human history, the findings made there have a potential scholarly and intellectual impact that transcends the site itself, even colouring the way mankind views the origins of human societies. The site resonates also with those experts interested in the chronology of human development in the region.

2.1.8 The Special Interest Groups

One of the more interesting and most active international stakeholder groups is the Mother Goddess devotees who believe that Çatalhöyük was the site of a mother-goddess cult and home to a matriarchal society — a theory advanced in the 1960s by James Mellaart, who led the earliest excavations at the site (Mellaart 1967). Overall, the site offers no unequivocal evidence of matriarchal culture or a dominant mother goddess; nevertheless, these devotees feel a special affinity for the site, and in fact have held ceremonies during their visits to Çatalhöyük.
There is a great diversity of such groups from Ecofeminists, to Goddess New Age travellers, to Gaia groups (Hodder 2002, 178). One specific offshoot of the interest in the site from women’s movements was a fashion show staged in Istanbul by Bahar Korcan, a Turkish/ international designer (ibid). She based an exhibition on the theme of Çatalhöyük and the women of other times (ibid). The clothes were inspired by the site and the catwalk was a model of Çatalhöyük, and slides of the site and its material culture were shown in the background as part of the experience (ibid). The press coverage extended globally to France, Japan and beyond, and even the popular Turkish pop singer Tarka made an appearance (Hodder 2002, 177-178).

The Mother Goddess group has been in touch with Professor Ian Hodder, the site director, to discuss the site findings in light of their own interpretations. Hodder, in fact, has had to perform some degree of a balancing act to recognize the sometimes competing interests of this group and the local community and Turkish government — an issue mooted in correspondence between Hodder and a representative of the Mother Goddess devotees, as captured in an online forum. Hodder wrote (Çatalhöyük website 2014):

The issue of how the local people see the past is a long and complex one, as is their response to us. Some see the project as an opportunity to make money from tourism. Others see it and the influx of Goddess visitors as disturbing. Some have very little knowledge of history beyond the division pre-Islamic/Islamic.

I am very concerned that we do what we can to mediate and negotiate between the different local, national and international interests in the site. We are asking the local community to produce their own exhibit in our on-site museum, and it may be that members of the Goddess community would like to do the same. My concern is that we all remain sensitive to the different currents of interest and recognise that they can conflict with each other. Ultimately and most importantly the site belongs to the Turkish state, and our efforts have to correspond to their decisions and policies.
2.2 King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture’s Stakeholder Landscape

Given its size, scope and significance, The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture has a number of stakeholder groups with which it is now or will be interacting. These groups include the Cultural Center employees, the Saudi Aramco management team, local business owners, the arts and knowledge community, cultural centres in the Gulf region, and locals of the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia, who make up the majority of the projected visitor demographic.

2.2.1 The Cultural Center employees

The staff of the Cultural Center, currently numbering some 200 employees and set to rise to approximately 300 by opening day, is one critical group. The work force are employees of Saudi Aramco, and include both Saudis and expatriates from a number of nations, males and females, and representatives of various disciplines within the knowledge and cultural fields, as well as financial analysts, human resource specialists, clerical staff, etc. The proportion of female employees at the Cultural Center is relatively high for a Saudi Aramco organization, though this is not surprising given both the proportion of women in the global cultural field and the overwhelming majority of men found in the company’s core oil and gas and industrial services organizations.

The Cultural Center’s staff is also characterized by a significant range in levels of professional experience: many of the Saudi knowledge and cultural professionals are relatively young and inexperienced — again, not surprising given that there is no tradition of these job families either in the company or in the Kingdom as a whole. Therefore, a sizable number of the senior specialists are expatriates, though most of the managers and administrators
are Saudi nationals — many of them with decades of experience in other Saudi Aramco departments. Over the last five years, the Cultural Center has sent a number of its young Saudi employees for various educational and developmental assignments, including advanced degree programs at universities and internships at leading cultural institutions in Europe and North America.

2.2.2 Saudi Aramco Management

Another key “internal” stakeholder group comprises Saudi Aramco management and line employees. Although everyone in the company has perhaps heard about the Cultural Center, or at least seen the facility under construction near the Saudi Aramco headquarters, the degree of awareness about its goals and objectives, programs and offerings, and progress toward opening day remains highly variegated and somewhat spotty. The chief concern is that uninformed Saudi Aramco employees — including managers and administrators — are not able to communicate effectively about the Cultural Center within their professional and private social networks, and that the institution is therefore missing a golden opportunity to “spread the word” about the Cultural Center and its potential during this pre-opening phase when public opinion about the Cultural Center is being formed.

Similar to the way in which Çatalhöyük and other archaeological sites within Turkey compete for annual public (governmental) funding, the Cultural Center’s budget is analysed alongside those of other Saudi Aramco departments. These budget allocations include funding for programs and activities, goods and materials, contracted services, and staff labour costs; capital budgets for buildings and facilities are allocated through a separate process. As part of the budgeting process, the Cultural Center has to present its three-year plan to company management, advocating for the requested funding and staff numbers required for on-going operations and the run-up to “Day One” activities once the Cultural Center opens. This is a process involving minute scrutiny of both plans and activities carried out to date, and
forms one of the most important vehicles for internal corporate stakeholder engagement.

In August 2013, Cultural Center management delivered a presentation to the company’s Executive Committee, which comprises the outside members of Saudi Aramco’s Board of Directors. The presentation focused on an overview of the Cultural Center, its institutional mission, and its current slate of outreach activities, and was well received by the group (the presentation was delivered in Oslo, headquarters of the Cultural Center’s architects, Snøhetta). The presentation was designed to provide the Board members with an updated overview of the Cultural Center, and elicit their endorsement and support as one of the most important set of decision makers for the Cultural Center.

2.2.3 The Local Residents

Local community members — including the residents of Greater Dammam, Al Khobar and the company’s own housing communities in Dhahran, Ras Tanura and Abqaiq — are also significant stakeholders. The Greater Dammam metropolitan area contains a population of some 4.1 million residents (WECP 2014), and has been home to the Kingdom’s oil industry since the 1930s. As such, there is a close, interdependent relationship between the local population and Saudi Aramco, with many in the area employed by the company directly, working on company projects and activities through contractor companies, or in firms that cater to employees and their dependents, such as grocery stores, restaurants, dry cleaners, etc.

Generally speaking, the local community invests a great deal of trust in Saudi Aramco — but at the same time, this has led to heightened expectations of the Cultural Center in terms of the quality of programs as well as the facility itself. These expectations were further amplified in May 2014 with the opening in Jiddah of the King Abdullah Sports City, a multi-venue sporting complex that contains a state of the art, 60,000-seat stadium; the Sports City project was managed by Saudi Aramco and was the focus of a nationwide celebration marking the ninth anniversary of the accession to the throne of
King Abdullah, who was in attendance at the inaugural football match. In the wake of the celebration, there were calls in the media for Saudi Aramco to take on other important infrastructure and development projects (Arab News 2014).

It is likely that most of the repeat visitors to the Cultural Center will hail from the cities and communities within the Greater Dammam area, as will most of the Cultural Center’s volunteer corps. At the same time, these communities will also be facing issues like increased vehicular traffic and other growing logistical demands as a result of the Cultural Center and its programs, and so quality-of-life issues may be a mixed result for some stakeholders. Furthermore, proposals to develop the surrounding area into a mixed-use Cultural District will have even greater impact, given that it will contain commercial, retail, office and cultural spaces.

2.2.4 Local Arts and Knowledge Community

Local knowledge and cultural institutions and individual practitioners represent a subset of the community that is likely to be among the Cultural Center’s strongest advocates. Once open, the institution should provide an inspiration and even a platform for their efforts, activities and products, but in fact, the creation and enrichment of a vibrant arts, knowledge and culture “ecosystem” in the local community is one of the Cultural Center’s primary objectives. This objective is tied to and aligned with the Kingdom’s efforts to develop a knowledge society and to further diversify its economy, going beyond natural resource extraction to value-added secondary and tertiary industries and more dynamic engineering and services sectors. Furthermore, the enhancement of public views toward the knowledge and culture industries — for example, attitudes toward acting or filmmaking as a professional career, or the economic value of knowledge industries — is another element in the Cultural Center’s strategy (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture Strategic Summary, 2014).
To date, the local institutional environment for knowledge and cultural pursuits has been underdeveloped and inchoate; therefore, the Cultural Center has tremendous potential to be a hub for interchange among professionals and amateur practitioners in these fields, in addition to providing facilities and platforms for their activities.

2.2.5 Business Owners

Another potentially important subgroup within surrounding communities involves business owners and entrepreneurs who will benefit from the Cultural Center and its activities, and at a later date, potentially the wider Cultural District development. At an immediate level, there will be opportunities to supply the Cultural Center directly with the goods, materials and services required for its operations, though at the moment the number of local vendors and contractors capable of meeting the Cultural Center’s needs and standards appears to be limited; furthermore, because the Cultural Center procures goods and services through Saudi Aramco’s contracting procedures, local vendors and suppliers must meet the oil company’s stringent standards for registered companies. This limits the Cultural Center from working with a number of local companies, particularly small and medium-sized firms that do not do business with Saudi Aramco on a regular basis.

Once the facility opens its doors, there will also be an increased (though indirect) demand for visitor services, including transportation, accommodation, dining and food services, etc. The Cultural Center recognizes not only its own need for goods and services, but also the larger potential positive impact on the local economy, and in its strategic planning will explore the creation and provision of sustainable economic opportunities for the local private sector (ibid).

2.2.6 In-Kingdom and Regional Cultural Institutions

Within the wider Gulf region, there are millions more potential visitors to the Cultural Center, but perhaps the most interesting regional stakeholder groups
are other knowledge and cultural institutions, including public sector museums, libraries and performing arts venues, as well as smaller private galleries and collections. The Arabian Gulf is one of the world’s cultural “hotspots” in terms of the development of new facilities and institutions, particularly in the United Arab Emirates, Qatar and, to some extent, Bahrain. Recent developments include Qatar’s Islamic Arts Museum and Katara Cultural District, Abu Dhabi’s Saadiyat Cultural District (which will feature local branches of the Guggenheim and Louvre museums), annual and biannual arts festivals in Dubai and Sharjah, and the new National Theater of Bahrain in Manama.

On one hand, these new knowledge and cultural institutions represent competition for the Cultural Center, whether for visitors, for partners, for qualified staff, for permanent collections, for traveling exhibitions and performances, or simply for name recognition and notoriety in the global arts and culture landscape. On the other hand, they are also peer entities with which cooperation could provide tremendous synergies and potentially significant cost savings (e.g., if two or more institutions pool their resources to fund a regional tour by an international performing artist or group).

There are a number of institutions in the Kingdom, ranging from ministries to professional societies and private businesses that also have an interest in the Cultural Center’s development and program offerings; in some cases, the Cultural Center may represent a powerful ally in advancing their interests; in others, the Cultural Center represents new business opportunities; and in still other cases, the Cultural Center may be seen as intruding on one’s own turf, area of interest or scope of responsibility. The Cultural Center’s institutional partners (in the Kingdom, in the region and further abroad) also have a stake in the organization’s future, as they have linked their reputations to some degree to that of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture through collaborative working relationships and institutional alliances.
2.2.7 The Kingdom’s Leadership

The country’s leadership, including the royal family, have a stake in the Cultural Center — in part because it is named after the founder of the modern Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, King ‘Abd al-‘Aziz bin ‘Abd al-Rahman Al Sa’ud, who is also the father of the current king, Salman ibn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz.

2.2.8 The Global Knowledge and Culture Arena

Looking further afield, there are also a number of stakeholders in the global knowledge and cultural arena that have some kind of vested interest in the Cultural Center. The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is currently working in collaborative relationships with several knowledge and cultural institutions; some of these are in the Kingdom or elsewhere in the Arab region, but the majority are located in North America, Europe and China; at the same time, the potential for additional partnerships or “alliances” is being actively explored. By the same token, there are a number of local and international exhibitions, performing artists and performing arts troupes, visual artists, and other arts and culture practitioners that have expressed an interest in working with or providing services and content to the Cultural Center.

Nevertheless, there have been some guarded expressions of possible concern among some parties about the Cultural Center’s ability or willingness to “push boundaries” in terms of intellectual and artistic freedom, given the conservative nature of Saudi society and the Cultural Center’s affiliation with Saudi Aramco, considering the company’s own corporate interests and institutional reputation. Yet the Cultural Center’s capacity to serve as a “window” onto Saudi Arabia — and eventually a doorway into the Kingdom — is conversely one of the primary draws for many existing and potential international partner institutions and individual professionals.
3 Semi-structured Interview Data

Some of the semi-structured interview questions were set to provide me with background information; these queries are highlighted in grey below. Therefore I have only presented here the data collected for the remaining questions that provide quantitative insights into the relevant line of questioning. Also, some of the interview questions were not relevant for some of the (stakeholder group) participants, and the absence of data from those stakeholder groups will signal this decision. I have only noted the highest percentages in the answers that I received to the interview questions. Percentages do not always add up to 100% due to this rounding.

3.1 Answers Received to the Semi-structured Participant Interviews at the Çatalhöyük Case Study

Figure 17. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question four: Outside of that role, in what ways do you engage with the site/project?
Figure 18. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number five: What mechanisms are available for you to participate in the decision-making regarding the current use, and future use of the site?
Figure 19. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number seven: How often, and in what ways do these stakeholders collaborate to maintain the operations of the site?
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Figure 20. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number eight: In 2004, a new regulation was enacted regarding the development of a site management plan (called the AMP) – since 2004, has your involvement in the site/project increased?
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Figure 21. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number nine: Since 2004, have you noticed an increase in the levels and types of
collaboration amongst the other stakeholders in the management of the sites operation and future plans?

Figure 22. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number ten: Who should be responsible for the operations and future direction of the site?
Figure 23. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number twelve: What do you envision for the future of Çatalhöyük (next 5-10 years)?
Figure 24. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number thirteen: Who ought to be responsible for developing the vision you described?

Figure 25. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number fourteen: What are the main challenges to implementing that vision?
Figure 26. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number sixteen: If you could participate in the decision-making discussions for the current operations, and future decisions about the site, what would be the best way to engage your participation in a sustained way?

3.2 Answers Received to the Semi-structured Participant Interviews at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture Case Study
Figure 27. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number five: Do you know what the Cultural Center’s vision, mission, goals, governance structure are and could you list six programs undertaken by the Cultural Center? Please list these.
Figure 28. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number six: What mechanisms are available for you to participate in the decision-making regarding the development of programs and activities, and the future direction of the Cultural Center?

Figure 29. Above: Answers to the semi-structured interview question number seven: How engaged are you in the development, management, and evaluation of the programs and activities?
Figure 30. Above: Answers to the semi-structured interview question number ten: Who should be responsible for the operations and future direction (the management) of the Cultural Center once it is built?

Figure 31. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number twelve: What do you envision for the future of the Cultural Center (next 5-10 years)?
Figure 32. Above. Answers to the semi-structured interview question number sixteen: If you could participate in the decision-making discussions for the current operations, and future decisions about the Cultural Center, what would be the best way to engage your participation in a sustained way?

4 Mechanisms and Programs

Mechanisms and programs for stakeholder engagement and participation undertaken at Çatalhöyük have received some examination in Chapter Two, Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. The mechanisms and programs that have not previously received analysis in the literature will be presented here as part of my non-intrusive observations. To date, a systematic model of stakeholder engagement has not been undertaken at the King Abdulaziz Center for World
Culture; therefore the mechanisms presented here are fully based on my non-intrusive observations.

4.1 Stakeholder Participation Mechanisms at Çatalhöyük

4.1.1 An Ad Hoc, Individual-driven Engagement Practice

Professor Hodder has been a major actor in stakeholder engagement for the Çatalhöyük site, and even though his activities are often undertaken on an ad hoc basis and are in support of other research project objectives that lie beyond the narrow confines of stakeholder engagement, they are arguably the most effective means of stakeholder engagement at Çatalhöyük.

These efforts begin with his work to secure working permits for the project and his team of up to approximately 120 individuals, which requires continual interface with government officials and regulators from the local to the national levels. His pursuit of funding from both domestic Turkish and international institutions and businesses, constitutes yet another element of ad hoc (or informal) stakeholder engagement. He also regularly makes himself available to members of the Turkish media, and every summer the newspapers and news channels feature stories about Çatalhöyük and the research project (as an example of his efficacy in this area, Hodder arranged for Prince Charles of the United Kingdom, to visit Çatalhöyük and interact with local dignitaries — as an aside, one of the villagers who met Prince Charles later asked me to chase down the status of his requests made to the Prince upon my return to London (see Figure 14)). Finally, he is often requested to participate in archaeological conferences and symposia throughout Turkey, where he is able to engage with, and influence colleagues from Turkey and around the world who are working on sites and projects in the country.

His position requires some degree of interaction with various stakeholder groups, and his charismatic personality and passion for archaeology and the preservation of the archaeological resource make him an effective spokesperson and representative for the research project (as a note, this PhD
research was inspired by Professor Hodder’s long-term vision of establishing an archaeological park that would incorporate not only the Çatalhöyük site, but several other unexcavated archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity, which are potentially under threat from modern infrastructure development).

Hodder’s long-term vision for the establishment of an archaeological park, and its benefits to the key stakeholder groups of the site are yet to be shared with the local community. Based on the responses to my semi-structured participant interviews, none of the locals were familiar, in particular detail, with the long-term vision and strategies of the research project.

4.1.2 Top-down, Prescripted Participation

Recent developments in Turkish national cultural legislation and regulation have focused on creating a more sustainable, structured and systematic approach to cultural resource management through stakeholder identification and engagement. As such, stakeholder engagement at Turkish archaeological sites is no longer a “nice to have,” but a mandatory requirement for the management of these resources.

Over the years, there have been several revisions to Turkey’s cultural heritage laws and regulations (Akınoğlu 2007; Akurgal 1998; Atakuman 2010). Despite recent developments in Turkey’s heritage laws, the current legal and administrative systems continue to receive criticism regarding their deficiencies in protecting historic environments (Copeaux 1998; Karakaş 1997; Kennedy 1998a, 1998b; Kinze 2000; Özdoğan 2011; Özel 1998; Özsunay 1997; Simsek 2011; Yalçın 1997; Yenişehirlioğlu 1999; Yıldız 2010). Mehmet Özdoğan (2001; pers.comm.) claims that the problem with heritage management in Turkey is that it is far too centralised.

The Turkish government has implemented two waves of legislative amendments, one in 2004 and the second in 2011, to the law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Law Number: 2863, dated 07/21/1983). The amendments have introduced changes to how
archaeological sites and works management are planned, practiced and regulated. The amendments can be summarised as:

1) The decentralization of governance via the privatization of heritage developments;

2) The decentralization of governance via the introduction of participatory planning tools in heritage management.

Increasingly the financial burden of heritage tasks are being shared by private funders; the most significant examples of this are:

1) The introduction of a hundred per cent tax exemption on monetary sponsorship expended by private companies to cultural projects (see Law 5225 (21/7/2004));

2) The privatisation of the entry ticketing system to almost all heavily visited archaeological sites and museums (Sponsor Sorunsali 2011).

In 2004, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism paved the way for the transfer of legal operational rights of ancient sites and museums to private tourism companies and associations (see Law 5225 (21/7/2004)). The move aims to revitalise ancient sites and museums that have been attracting fewer and fewer visitors each year. Companies can now be responsible for the excavation, entrance fees, and the organised events held at selected sites. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism will continue to appoint Excavation Directors (see Law 5225 (21/7/2004)). This new legislative change has been accompanied by State decisions to enforce longer excavation field seasons so as archaeological excavation teams reveal ruins in a shorter time-span and consequently attract more visitations and increase entrance ticket sales.

In 2004, the new amendments made to the law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Law Number: 2863, dated 07/21/1983) introduced the compulsory requirement for the preparation of a State-endorsed archaeological
site management plan as a long-term management planning tool for all registered archaeological sites. The legal requirement for the production of archaeological site management plans poses a significant change to how archaeological sites are protected and presented in Turkey (see Figure 33).

With this change, the current legal requirement for all registered archaeological sites is to have an archaeological site management plan (Yönetim plânı) (see Regulation for Law 2863 (21/7/1983) Act 2), and where appropriate, the projected developments specified within the site management plan must be integrated within a conservation-led reconstruction plan (Koruma amaçlı imar plânı) and a conservation-led landscaping project (Çevre düzenleme projesi) (see Regulation for Law 2863 (21/7/1983) Act 17).

The purpose of the site management plan is threefold:

1) Provide protection for cultural and natural assets in accordance with the principle of long-term protection for the archaeological, historical, natural, architectural, demographic, cultural, and socio-economic aspects of archaeological sites;

2) Solve issues regarding visitor usage of the site;

3) Provide an annual and five-year programme and budget for the site’s proposed developments and conservation strategies.

Prior to the introduction of this legal requirement, although site management plans were produced (either by the State’s administrative authorities or the voluntary choice of research teams operating within sites), for the larger number of registered archaeological sites in Turkey, a site management plan was not a reality. For this reason, the current compulsory requirement for planning has generated confusion amongst archaeological site managers, research teams, heritage specialists, State authority personnel and other stakeholders as they all try to grasp their roles within the preparation of a site management plan.
This bafflement was perhaps inevitable and has ensued since 2004 due to the fact that no standard guideline has been produced to accompany these new regulations. The main source of information regarding changes within Turkish heritage law is the Ministry of Culture and Tourism offices and website (see Ministry of Culture and Tourism website). The website lists all laws, international conventions, regulations, decisions of the Council of Ministers, resolutions, regulations, papers, guidelines, circulars and bilateral agreements (protocols). A review of all the guidelines provided for specific regulations reveals that where they outline roles, tasks and responsibilities, the guidelines that are provided are very general and not specific or detailed in any way (see for e.g., Guideline for Laws 3386 & 5226 as changes to Law 2863 Act 57 & Law 4848 Act 9). Where the guidelines concern technical matters, such as the compulsory requirement for standard visitor information panels at all registered archaeological sites, the guidelines are technically very specific, providing the required dimensions, colour and material for the panels (see Guideline for Law 2863 [21/7/1983] changes by Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Yüksek Kurulu on 5/11/1999 & 5/12/1951).

Following the introduction of the 2004 legislative revisions, a period of two years, later extended to three, was provided for site managers to initiate the preparation of their site management plans. Where appropriate, the conservation-led reconstruction and landscaping plans are prepared in parallel to a management plan, or are seen as a prerequisite to such a plan. Where there is an on-going research project at an archaeological site, the drafting of the plans falls under the remit of the project/site directors. In this way, these plans represent a significant move towards ensuring that all archaeological research projects commit to a long-term site conservation strategy that will outlive the duration of the research project. In the absence of active projects, the drafting of the plans is carried out by the relevant regional Conservation Councils.

What remains uncertain is what happens in the transitional period when a research project ends and the full management of a site is handed over to the Conservation Council. Who will be responsible for ensuring a commitment to
the conservation projects listed within the three plans? The legislative literature does not make this clear, and various staff within the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and various regional Conservation Councils were unable to clarify the matter in personal communication with the author. This is unfortunate because this transitional period in the management of an archaeological site is crucial to the sustainability of a site’s protection and also a phase in management transfer that is yet poorly understood.

Overall, the introduction of a compulsory archaeological site management plan points to the State’s efforts in decentralising the governance of archaeological sites and heritage projects by transferring this legal responsibility from the central Ministry of Culture and Tourism to local Coordination and Super Advisory Boards that are set up specifically to participate in the assessment, approving, implementation, monitoring and updating of the plans for each archaeological site (see Figure 32).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining an archaeological site</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Tourism assisted by the regional Conservation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of the management plan</td>
<td>Site manager and in the absence of a site manager, the Regional Conservation Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Assessment of the management plan  | Coordination and super advisory Board  
• Formed by at least five members who must be:  
• Those with property rights in the site  
• Representatives of chambers of occupation  
• Representatives of civil society organizations  
• The representatives of relevant departments within Universities;  
  the chairman is chosen amongst the members. |
| Approval of the management plan    | Coordination and supervisory Board  
• Chaired by the Site manager  
• Formed by at least five members; two members are internally selected from the Advisory Board and all further members are selected from relevant bodies that have serviced the preparation of the management plan |
| Implementation of the management plan | Site manager  
Regional Conservation Council  
Consist of the following members:  
• Three representatives graduated from the following disciplines: Archaeology, art history, museology, specializing in architectural and urban planning  
• Two faculty representatives preferably in the disciplines of archaeology, art history, architecture |
and urban planning, to be selected by the Council of Higher education

- The mayor or the governorship (depending on the territorial boundaries of the site)
- Two representatives from the Directorate of Public Works and Settlement (where appropriate)
- The Regional Director of the General Directorate of Foundations or a representative (where appropriate)
- A representative of the General directorate of Forestry (where appropriate)
- (Act 20065, Article 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring of the management plan</th>
<th>Coordination and supervisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updating of the management plan</td>
<td>Coordination and supervisory Board Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33. Legislative brief for preparing a site management plan (Regulation for Law 2863 (21/7/1983) Act 2).

The move to decentralise the long-term management responsibilities away from the central powers of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism has been regarded as a much needed action ( Özdoğan 2001). According to Özdoğan (ibid) a centralised, or top-down approach to heritage management creates an overall unhealthy working relationship between the various administrative bodies that are allocated responsibility in archaeological site protection. According to the members of the State with whom I undertook semi-structured participant interviews, one example of this is the dynamic between the municipalities and the regional Conservation Councils. Municipalities wanting to initiate urban development tend to view the decisions of the regional Conservation Councils as stifling this development. The municipalities lack the
required qualified professionals to execute decisions on scientific as opposed to political grounds.

Despite this reality, during conservation planning processes, it is the municipalities that tend to tender for conservation projects. This situation alone has led to numerous examples whereby, to promote tourism or enable urban development, heritage assets have been allowed to be used for development purposes which run counter to the global philosophy of protecting a site’s values (Hürriyet 2011; Tüm Gazeteler 2011).

These new legal enforcements are essentially the top-down (State-derived) prescription and organisation of the archaeological resource. The introduction of the site management plan is, as an example, a very detailed and specific form of legislative enforcement.

In essence, for sites like Çatalhöyük, the AMP proposes to form a site management process that actively integrates the views and decisions of various governmental authorities and all other stakeholders of the site. The future-orientated AMP commits site management teams to think ahead and plan resources and programs accordingly. For archaeological sites where the AMP will outlive the life of a research project, the management team are thereby mandated to account for how their current site interventions, some of which compromise the preservation of the physical heritage, will be maintained in the long-term. Additionally, the various stages of planning approval required in implementing the AMP would offer opportunities for the State and local authorities to weave a site’s development into long-term regional development schemes.

The AMP process aims to devolve the centralised governance of archaeological sites. The responsibility of the archaeological area and the preparation of the AMP are devolved to the relevant municipalities (as Management Authorities) as opposed to the central Ministry of Culture and Tourism (see Figure 33). In addition to this, the formation of Advisory Boards and Coordination and Audit Boards in accordance with the AMP regulation
further devolves centralised governance by limiting the climb of conservation
development proposals up the governance hierarchy for endorsement.

Although it can be argued that central government is still present within the
processing of the AMP, in the form of the municipality, municipalities, due to
their geographic proximity to archaeological areas, are more likely to opt for
“local” management objectives. This is based on the hypothesis that placing
management at the lower levels of government means the people more
dependent on the archaeological resource will be more likely to make
decisions that favour sustainable forms of use. For example, the criteria for
the architectural, aesthetic, cultural, building materials, climate, social
structure, etc., of each archaeological area differ, and municipalities, as
opposed to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, are more likely to recruit
experts who know the area and use sensible local resources. In addition, local
funding opportunities are better met by municipalities. Even where the higher
levels of government hold better access to experts, resources and
information, it is the local government administrations that better monitor the
pulse of local stakeholder views and attitudes.

Devolving of centralised governance through a participatory planning process
like the AMP would require clarity regarding the formation, duties, powers,
and relations of the various stakeholders being integrated to manage the
archaeological site. An example of confusion with roles and responsibilities
can be given regarding the rights of property owners whose property are
located within the boundaries of protected areas: Article 3, Paragraph 10 of
Law 2863 (Law number 2863, official gazette date: 23/7/1983) states that the
determination of an archaeological area is the role of the Ministry of Culture
and Tourism. While the Ministry determines the boundaries of the
archaeological area, the Management Authority determines the boundaries of
the Management Area. If public property falls within the boundaries of the
Management Area, yet outside of the archaeological area, there is no clarity
regarding the capacity in which property owners participate in the Advisory
Board.
It must also be noted here that the Area Manager and the members of the Advisory and Coordination, and Audit Boards are not given employee rights; this may impact the efficient operation of their required tasks.

4.2 Stakeholder Participation Mechanisms at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture

Given that the issue of stakeholder engagement is complex and multifaceted, the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture will find its character in an idiosyncratic combination of a range of strategic dimension, including the quality of its cultural offer; the quality of local governance; the quality of knowledge production; local entrepreneurship development; talent development; attraction of investment; the management of social criticalities; capacity building; local community involvement; and internal and external networking. As the facility itself remains under construction, much of the work undertaken to date to engage stakeholders has taken place in off-site locations, and even in the virtual space. It is fair to say, though, that stakeholder engagement at the Cultural Center remains in its earliest stages, and that this will be a significant growth area for the Cultural Center in the months and years to come.

At the Cultural Center, there are a number of structured and semi-structured approaches that have been employed to engage various stakeholders. Many are not wholly or primarily focused on stakeholder engagement, but while they are designed to enable the Cultural Center to achieve other key organisational objectives, they also provide benefits in building relationships with stakeholders, communicating information and messages to audiences, and soliciting views, perspectives and ideas from concerned individuals and institutions.
4.2.1 Public Programs

Perhaps the most visible programs conducted by the Cultural Center so far have been the Saudi Aramco Cultural Program (later rebranded as the iThra Knowledge Program) and the iThra Youth programs targeting young people with science and math education. The Cultural Program has drawn by far the largest number of visitors (2 million total in the 2013-2014 events held in Jiddah, Riyadh, Dhahran and Al-Hasa), and Cultural Center staff have been the primary movers behind its development and implementation. According to the 24,326 (out of 640,747) visitors surveyed by the Cultural Center’s research team during the four-week Riyadh Cultural Program, the average dwell time for the visits was two hours and eleven minutes per visit, with 66% of the visitors spending between one to three hours per visit. Nearly a third of the visitors were satisfied with the program, and would like to return for a repeat visit.

The iThra Youth programs have featured individually branded programs (e.g., iDiscover, iSpark, etc.), but the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture linkage has been emphasized. With both the Cultural Program and the iThra Youth programs, these have been opportunities to preview the kinds of programmatic offerings the Cultural Center will provide, and therefore have attracted attention to the institution in a positive way.

In January 2013, the Cultural Center held a two-day Creativity Forum in Dhahran, near the site of the Cultural Center itself. Featuring both Saudi and international speakers and panellists, the Forum explored the boundaries and linkages between art and science, with roughly 600 attendees drawn from across Saudi Arabia.

A similar program was held in December of 2013, and focused on the role of knowledge and the knowledge economy in Saudi Arabia’s future. The Knowledge Society Forum was a three-day event, featuring both domestic and international speakers and panellists, and was conducted in collaboration
with UNESCO and the King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals (KFUPM), which is adjacent to Saudi Aramco’s Dhahran complex. The theme is directly related to the Saudi government’s stated objective of creating a knowledge society in the Kingdom. Roughly 600 participants, most of them drawn from Saudi Arabia, attended the event.

4.2.2 On-line Facilities

In June 2013, the Cultural Center launched a new website in Arabic and English, featuring a wider array of information than its previous online offerings (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture website, 2013). This remains an “interim” site, and is limited in terms of educational offerings and interactivity, which will feature more prominently as the institution moves closer to opening day.

Similarly, the Cultural Center currently maintains a relatively low-key social media presence, but this is also seen as an area for growth moving forward. The Cultural Center’s YouTube channel is more active, with more than 1,500 subscribers; one of the Cultural Center’s videos, dedicated to the institution’s iRead program, has garnered more than 300,000 views (King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture YouTube 2015). The YouTube channel features excerpts from Cultural Center programs like the Creativity Forum and Knowledge Society Forum, as well as original promotional programming. The YouTube presence also contains material developed as part of a collaboration between the Cultural Center and MBC Group, the leading broadcaster in the Arab World with some 165 million viewers across its multiple channels. The “Subscribe” programming encouraged young people to engage with STEM disciplines, with two presenters performing fun, easily replicable science experiments to illustrate the scientific method. Given the remarkable penetration of the Internet and particularly social media in Saudi society, these online stakeholder engagement strategies hold considerable potential for future relationship building, particularly if the virtual conversation becomes a truly two-way dialogue, rather than a one-way broadcast mechanism, as is currently the practice.
4.2.3 Partnerships and Sponsorships

An area of more intensive activity has been in the areas of sponsorships and partnerships, or “alliances” as the Cultural Center staff often refer to them. These involve engagement with other knowledge and cultural institutions or projects; the distinction lies in the nature of the engagement, with sponsorships generally comprising a financial payment to support an organization or activity in return for sponsorship privileges and some mutually agreed collaborative outcome, while alliances involve a greater degree of collaborative work (for example co-curation of an exhibition or joint management of an event).

Notable sponsorships include the Saudi Arabian pavilion at the 2011 Venice Biennale, multi-year sponsorship of international programming at the annual meetings of the American Alliance of Museums, and a number of research projects and conferences undertaken by the Arab Thought Foundation, and Art Dubai Group. The Cultural Center has entered into collaborative alliances with a number of domestic, regional and international institutions and entities; for example, the Cultural Center is working with the Saudi Ministry of Education as part of its iThra Youth programming, with the National Youth Theatre of the United Kingdom to produce original theatrical works in the Kingdom, and with the British Museum and the Natural History Museum (UK) on the development of galleries and gallery content within the Cultural Center’s Museum component.

Some of these relationships are designed primarily to build the capacity of other institutions (this is particularly true of in-Kingdom sponsorships and alliances); others to tap specialized expertise, best practices or compelling content and collections; and still others to avail professional development opportunities for Cultural Center staff, through work assignments and internships, for instance.
4.2.4 The Volunteer Program

One program that has benefits well beyond stakeholder engagement is the Cultural Center’s local volunteer program; in fact, volunteers are viewed as a critical element in the institution’s future work force strategy, performing tasks and duties alongside regular employees and contractors. At the moment, volunteers are most often employed at the iThra Knowledge Programs, undertaken in various locations around the Kingdom during the year. These are normally young men and women of high school or college age who provide services to visitors, including delivering information about the site and programs, helping to manage crowds and visitor traffic, or giving tours of exhibitions; in return, volunteers gain job-relevant experience, the chance to work in a professional environment (often for the first time given that most are students), and a valuable entry on their curricula vitae (see Figure 34). For many, it is also an opportunity to mix with others in their peer group in a socially “safe” and acceptable venue, while giving back to their local community. During a typical month-long run of the iThra Knowledge Program, some 500 volunteers participate, and in recent programs, applications from prospective volunteers have outnumbered the available slots.

Figure 34. 42% of the 324 volunteers surveyed during the Riyadh Ithra Knowledge Program noted acquiring new job skills as the main benefit of volunteering (Cultural Center Research Team 2014 survey results).
In terms of stakeholder engagement, the volunteer program provides benefits on two levels: first, the Cultural Center is building a core constituency of contacts and advocates among socially active young people, who will be one of the institution’s key stakeholder groups given their demographic presence and their future impact on Saudi society. These young men and women are experiencing the Cultural Center first hand even before it’s opening, and are considered as part of the Cultural Center “family.” At the same time, they act as credible third-party ambassadors to other visitors, to their non-volunteering peers, and to their families. Therefore, ensuring their validation in the Cultural Center activities, particularly those relating to the volunteer program, such as the training of volunteers is vital (see Figure 35). Given their role as temporary workers, they can speak not only to the Cultural Center’s programs but also to the way the Cultural Center manages its activities, treats its staff and cultivates an atmosphere of inquiry, analysis and creativity. The volunteer program also resonates well with Saudi Aramco stakeholders, for whom corporate social responsibility and service have a long tradition (“Citizenship” is one of the corporation’s five core values).
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Figure 35. Approximately 48% of the 324 volunteers surveyed during the Riyadh Ithra Knowledge Program said the volunteer training was very good (Cultural Center Research Team 2014 survey results).
4.2.5 Internal Communications

Internal company communications and an ability to engage stakeholders within the company is vital to ensuring endorsement of the Cultural Center’s programs, initiatives and activities, and to securing the necessary resources, including not only capital and operating budgets, but also manpower and service contracts. Because the Cultural Center does not utilize any external funding in the form of sponsorships or incoming donations, this internal stakeholder channel is very much the Cultural Center’s financial and resource lifeline.

To some extent, internal communication at the Cultural Center remains a work in progress. There is a substantial number of new employees arriving as the organization ramps up for its opening, some programs and initiatives remain in the planning stages, and the overall brand architecture and positioning continue to be developed and refined. Furthermore, the Cultural Center rests within a larger organizational structure related to Saudi Aramco itself, as seen in Figure 36.
4.2.6 Guest Relations

In addition to these somewhat structured stakeholder engagement programs and strategies, there are a whole host of other inchoate outreach activities conducted on an ad hoc basis. These include visitors coming to the Cultural Center's offices; sometimes these are visitors that the Cultural Center itself has invited, but often company visitors to Saudi Aramco visit the Cultural Center as part of their tour of the corporation. These may be as frequent as one a day, and given the senior status of these corporate visitors, the arrangements and preparations that must be made are considerable. Other categories of visitors include Saudi government officials, faculty and staff from Saudi academic institutions, thought leaders and heads of domestic and international cultural and knowledge institutions, and even members of the Saudi royal family. The unified strategy that governs these visits is Saudi Aramco’s corporate protocol applied to host visiting guests. These visitations are a chance to introduce the Cultural Center, its vision, its current and future programs, and its staff to highly influential individuals first-hand, and to enlist
third-party advocates for the Cultural Center. Unless the motivation for the visit is related to creating an opportunity for future collaboration with the Cultural Center, there is no systematic follow up with visitors after their departure.

Aside from visitor experience surveys undertaken at the iThra Knowledge Programs (see Figure 37), there are only pilot mechanisms to capture stakeholder views, opinions, ideas, criticisms or other feedback.
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**Figure 37.** To learn about culture was the highest motivation for visitors to the 2014 Cultural Program in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (Cultural Center Research Team 2014 Survey Results).

As might be expected, at the moment most of the organization’s effort is being devoted to the construction of the facility and the front-end engineering of programs, and as such, knowledge of stakeholder sentiment is still at an early phase and is developing in step with the programs themselves.

This task is particularly difficult in a society like Saudi Arabia, where many of these cultural experiences are new and there is little baseline data against
which to judge the quality of the offerings or their logistics. In other words, what constitutes a “good program” in the eyes of a visitor? To what is the experience being compared, and by what criteria is the experience being judged? Furthermore, Saudis tend to avoid giving offense to their hosts in either a social or a professional setting, so that comments from visitors are likely to be complimentary, even if somewhat vague.

Nearly all categories of respondents’ felt that Saudi Aramco should continue to manage the Cultural Center once it is built. Cultural Center staff, Saudi Aramco staff and management, and volunteers overwhelmingly voiced their support for continued company governance. Among all of the respondent groups, only government officials wanted the Saudi government to assume control, while Western Province residents, international peer organizations and international partner staff would like to see the Cultural Center operate as an independent organization; in-Kingdom artists and academics were split between Saudi Aramco governance and an independent organization structure.

Most of those who advocated Saudi Aramco’s continued role as owner and operator of the Cultural Center pointed to the company’s proven track record of managing major projects, its reputation for quality delivery, its network of domestic and international contacts, and its ability to finance the Cultural Center and its programs over the long-term. International peers and partners had to familiarize themselves with the company’s contracting and procurement procedures, which are designed for an industrial energy company, not a knowledge and cultural institution.

_Saudi Aramco staff (expatriate, mid 40s):_ “You need to have a powerful company like Saudi Aramco to keep supplying the amount of funds and resources the Cultural Center will need, plus Aramco has the international networks and credibility that can attract the international players. Otherwise, it will be difficult to get top institutions to do business here. I think a lot of the Cultural Center’s staff are female, and in Aramco that’s okay; outside, I think it may be problematic.”
Eastern Province resident (late 1960s): “Why are you even asking that question? [with a smile] Who else would do it? Aramco built the Eastern Province from the ground up, and they are the only ones who can do this, and do it right. I trust Aramco because I have seen what they can do. The Aramco people can be full of themselves at times, but they have a good reputation for getting things done. Leave it with Aramco!”

Government official (early 50s): “Aramco has done a good job with the Cultural Center, and I don’t think anyone else could build it the way Aramco is building it. But if this is going to be a national Cultural Center for arts, and knowledge and culture, it should be part of the Kingdom’s cultural system, and that belongs with the Ministry of Culture. The same thing happened with KFUPM [the King Fahd University for Petroleum & Minerals, next to Saudi Aramco in Dhahran]: Aramco built it and then it was under the Ministry of Petroleum, but now it reports to the Ministry of Education. That’s only fair, and I think that is what should happen with this new Cultural Center.”

International peer staff member (late 40s): “It is difficult at times doing business with Saudi Aramco: it is an oil and gas company and that’s the way they approach their contracts and agreements. We’re a museum, and we don’t work that way. I think some kind of independent existence, maybe tied to Aramco but with its own way of doing business, is the way to go. At least there should be a separate board of advisors. Not everyone wants to work with an oil company; not all of my donors were thrilled with the idea, and that makes it that much more difficult to justify the partnership in my own mind.”

International partner staff member (late 50s): “In my experience, it’s suffocating being part of a large company, but if you become an independent organization you will be out in the cold and you may freeze.”
4.3 Efficacy of Stakeholder Participation

4.3.1 Çatalhöyük Case Study

As noted in Section 4.1.2, the AMP is one of the most recent national efforts to enforce an integrated and participatory approach to the management of archaeological resources by national and local governments, and in partnership with communities and resource users. Çatalhöyük is one of the first archaeological sites in Turkey to enforce the AMP.

The research team members and the State personnel note an increase in levels and types of interactions since the introduction of the AMP. During the interviews, it became clear that this increase in levels of interaction have not resulted in the full participatory decision-making regarding the development of the Çatalhöyük site. Instead, the majority of the increase in stakeholder interaction has been to comply with the AMP regulation requirements.

Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (early 40s): “What the plans bring is a constant contact with all the local authorities and the project team in setting out the future of the site. The plans do open dialogue with the local community mainly because it is Çatalhöyük and unlike most projects we have a tradition of community engagement at this site...”

Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (late 50s): “The process for preparing the site management plans was explained to us by the Ministry (of Culture and Tourism) staff. They were also unclear yet gradually we have both come to an understanding. We are still unclear of all the roles involved and what needs to be done, and if the other parties have done their bits or who ought to be chasing it up? The site management plans cost us [money] to produce and I haven’t seen anything explaining who pays... no-one wants to be responsible for doing the wrong thing.”
Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (late 40s): “The bureaucratic procedures that are required from the State are scary...the local authority staff have a habit of sending us back and forth for missing documents...”

State personnel (late 50s): “The operating principles of the Advisory Board are not clearly stated. The regulation gives the Management Authority the right to choose the Advisory Board members, which renders the democratic formation of the Advisor Boards meaningless and in what capacity will the Area Manager participate in the Coordination and Audit Board meetings? Are Area Managers granted a vote? If not, if they simply participate to serve the approval process, this participation is rendered meaningless...not to mention the exclusion of the Area Manager in the Advisory Board is a serious shortcoming for the coordination of the management process...on paper the regulation assumes the Advisory Board will function as a democratic unit with the active and democratic participation of people affected by the process of managing...expressing their objections, actively participating in the decision-making process or decision opportunity...”.

Çatalhöyük Research Team Member (late 40s): “It seems the AMP regulation applies to specific urban and archaeological areas which can divorce an area’s links to the rest of the city. I think these plans ought to be within the framework of a comprehensive planning for the city. One way to achieve this may be for the AMP regulation to require the use of an information system (GIS), which is user-friendly. This way the relevant administrative authorities, such as the regional Conservation Councils, can screen development proposals and identify areas for which an archaeological assessment will be required. I am hoping this will then encourage the development of professional archaeological units to relieve Turkey’s current centralised public funding system.”

Çatalhöyük Research Team member (early 40s): “An integrated archaeological area management process for Turkey has been much delayed, and therefore accumulated problems, contradictory decisions cannot be solved easily, however, it must not be forgotten that the main objective is not
to make plans but to apply them…it is not acceptable to approach legislative planning requirements with the attitude that uncertainties will be addressed as implementation of plans take shape, especially where decisions infringe on freedom and property rights of individuals.”

A degree of dissatisfaction in the lack of governance engagement was verbalised by Küçükköy residents who had previously echoed similar complaints regarding their minimal role within management in the 2008 community consultation surveys undertaken by Atalay (2010).

Çatalhöyük Research Project team member and Küçükköy resident (early 40s): “…I don’t think archaeology sites will work unless we are involved … Both in Konya and Ankara (Ministry of Culture and Tourism) they are not interested in community participation and see management as being centralised.”

Küçükköy resident (early 30s): “So far I don’t think there has been a group from Çumra town or the village who can take responsibility for the management of the site when the current research team leaves.”

Küçükköy business owner and resident (mid 40s): “We don’t talk with the local authorities, if we have any questions we ask the site guards. We wouldn’t know who else to ask.”

State personnel (mid 40s): “The public will not support something they do not see; they cannot visualise it. If the excavation team and municipality create something like an archaeological park, the local community will support it. This is the most successful way forward.”

Çatalhöyük Research Project employee and Çumra resident (late 20s): “If the excavation ends the site will become a forest, no one will do anything here, what can the villagers do here? It'll collapse and fail and end. Who will manage the site when the site Director leaves? We don’t know – if we could choose we would like the same Directors to manage it.”
Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (early 30s): “I don’t think anyone at the [State] museums will listen to the locals. I don’t think archaeology is sustainable in Turkey unless community is involved and commercial archaeology is developed… I have no idea what will happen when we (the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project) leave, we’ve been asking the locals yet I’m no clearer; they have asked for the dig house to become a health clinic yet it’s highly unlikely.”

Non-participation can be both a rational strategy and a reflection of their considerations about costs verses benefits. For Çatalhöyük, a majority of individuals from Küçükköy and the other surrounding villages find it easier not to participate in the decision-making processes of their neighbouring site, either due to the language barrier or the fact that they are already relatively well off as farmers.

Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (mid 50s): “I think its money that drives participation; if they [the local communities] would get a financial reward from Çatalhöyük, they would care... At the site of Troy, participating in the touristic site pays off for local people; but here you cannot market a Lawrence of Arabia story for the Konya plain.”

State personnel (late 40s): “If more tourism facilities were built at Çatalhöyük, it will need to be regulated, as with a lot of areas of potential tourism development, people from all over Turkey will come and try to set up business here. Local business owners may be marginalised. If tourism were to develop in a large way here at Çatalhöyük, it would have developed by now. I don’t think the local villagers are interested.”

State personnel (late 30s): “The locals are a relatively rich, agricultural community; by living near Çatalhöyük, they do not gain much economically yet they gain educationally, particularly the schools through community projects [delivered at the archaeological site].”
Çatalhöyük Research Project employee and also resident of Küçükköy village (mid 50s): “When the Director asks us to find workers for the field season, we struggle; we have eight hundred residents [in Küçükköy] yet it took us ages to recruit 3 people for this season. The villagers do not want to work here because the project pays little and the duration is short, only one to three months. The workers here receive 50% less than what they earn working in agriculture, plus in agriculture their meals will be provided and they can work for seven months. I can’t envision more employment at the site.”

Çatalhöyük Research Project employee and also resident of Küçükköy village (early 40s): “The project has a low impact on my life because the field season is short. It would be good if it were all year round. The researchers benefit the most from this site… In the past there was two researchers that taught us things, since then no one spends that much time teaching us. I’m the only one working here since the 1990s; everyone has come and gone as they are young and go to do their national duty [army conscription], school, or permanent employment. If the project duration is only one month next year also, I will quit too because it's just not enough. I’ll stay if [the excavation] is three months.”

Local business owner and Çumra town resident (early 40s): “… I expected a lot from this project hence why I opened [my business here], yet I have been disappointed, the tourism infrastructure has not developed. I have lost money and the future is grim…I have lost financially yet have benefited culturally and have met a diversity of people through the research project…I don’t think it’s worth investing in the area because visitation here lasts one hour and there is nothing else to see for the tourists. Any job opportunities that are created here need to be all year round.”

Çatalhöyük site visitor (late 40s): “I came here four years ago and things were the same; the Neolithic house, the museum and the café. The excavation is bigger now but the things for the visitors are almost the same. It will be good for the locals if tour buses come here and there are shops or
stalls to sell things. I imagined I’d buy a handmade rug here, but the site guards told me to go to shops in Konya city.”

Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (late 30s): “There are discussions to build 10-15 Neolithic Houses; a Neolithic village, in the local [Küçükköy] village from which the villagers can branch off other visitor services. If we were to build the Neolithic village at the site, the financial gain will go to the State and not the villagers.

Local business owner and Çumra town resident (mid 40s): “[in response to the proposals for building a Neolithic houses in the village] I don’t think the Neolithic houses will bring new visitors to the site because our houses in the village all already look like these.” (See Figures 38 & 39).

Figure 38. Reconstructed Neolithic house at Çatalhöyük site (photograph taken by the author in 2008).
According to the local residents, while interactions may increase at Çatalhöyük between the various stakeholders as a result of the various engagement practices, a participatory management of the archaeological area cannot truly take place unless empowerment and benefits are assured for the local community stakeholder group.

Çumra resident (late 30s): “Lack of information and transparency is the biggest challenge in Turkey… if the locals can help manage the site the Ministry [of Culture and Tourism] may say: “you have a good idea here at Çatalhöyük which we can use everywhere, let’s discuss it”.”

Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (late 20s): "[regarding the future of the site] the excavation should continue uninterrupted; otherwise it will be just like James Mellart’s post-excavation; an un-kept land with a site guard. Once active, a site ought to remain active. There have been debates over sharing Çatalhöyük between the local Çumra town, Küçükköy village and Konya authorities. We have to be careful when we choose where to shop etc. Çumra town wants to take on a bigger role in the future of Çatalhöyük, … recently they wanted to be the location choice for the proposed Çatalhöyük museum.”
**Küçükköy resident (late 50s):** “We would like our village to be seen and developed within the Çatalhöyük tourism plans, yet this is not happening. The local town [Çumra] benefits from this site the most; Çumra has claimed Çatalhöyük into its town land boundary and receives association with Çatalhöyük’s developments in media coverage – our village losses out. Tourists always travel to the site via Çumra...”

**Çatalhöyük Research Project team member (late 40s):** “Projects like setting up a merchandising business for the local women here requires support from a big commercial company; this cannot happen on a local level because these people [the locals] don’t have all the expertise to set up the framework. For ambitious plans like a local hotel, a lot of impact analysis is required by the Ministry [of Culture and Tourism] which I don’t see happening. Impact analysis ought to be compulsory in the site management plan. Big developments can be damaging to the mud-brick archaeology…The development plans for the museum will involve years of bureaucracy because the infrastructure does not as yet exist, however, while this goes on, on the ground a small community engagement programme is necessary to build relationships and community capacity to deal with larger development schemes in the future.”

During her early studies at Çatalhöyük, Atalay (2008, 38) noted, “the replacement of one power structure with another without changing the way power is perceived and enacted is pointless”. Changing the attitudes of all stakeholders regarding the significance of participatory management, and in particular, community participation could be better met if the AMP is accompanied by a combination of compulsory formal and informal public awareness building initiatives and mechanisms to motivate and inform active community involvement.

**Küçükköy resident (mid 30s):** “Why aren’t the Konya authorities coming to meet us and our Mayor to tell us about changes and how we could be a part of Çatalhöyük? They could make announcements at our village; write
something in the papers or on posters. I follow the news and I talk with the [Çatalhöyük] site guards and our mayor, I’m no more clearer on how I can be involved in Çatalhöyük … if they don’t know, and I don’t know, who then knows anything?”

4.3.2 The King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture Case Study

At the Cultural Center, the data I have collected related to stakeholder engagement and the efficacy of stakeholder participation show an institution that is currently focusing on a small number of highly critical stakeholder groups.

During the development phase of the King Abdul Aziz Center for World Culture, the critical stakeholders that are being engaged are primarily those occupying senior positions within the Cultural Center or relevant Saudi Aramco organizations, or those who exercise some degree of decision making power, particularly related to resource allocation. These groups include the staff of the Cultural Center itself (although not everyone at the Cultural Center is engaged to the same extent), members of Saudi Aramco management, and the staff of international partners.

When it comes to the Cultural Center staff and members of company management, the stakeholders who responded affirmatively are engaged largely as a result of Saudi Aramco’s corporate governance and routine business procedures: that is, requests are circulated to them as a result of the approval process, not through elective engagement activities. As a result, their views are solicited on individual decisions and actions primarily related to resource allocation and materials procurement. Those individuals within these two groups who are not directly involved in decision-making are those who replied that they were not aware of the Cultural Center’s strategic direction and upcoming programs.
Even within the Cultural Center itself, the majority of respondents said they do not know about the organization’s vision, mission, goals and governance structure. This is the result of a number of factors and drivers. First, there is a large number of employees going out on developmental programs or rotational assignments, and a similarly large number of new employees arriving in the run up to the facility's opening. There is also a focus on individual programs and activities undertaken by the organization. For example, meetings at the Cultural Center tend to focus on specific tasks and involve only the task teams.

*Cultural Center staff member (expatriate, mid 30s):* “When I joined the Cultural Center, I was sent to meetings with team members from the various divisions within the Cultural Center to learn more about their work. This was helpful, but I didn’t really get a sense of the larger picture of where the Cultural Center is going, what our annual plans are, and what my role would be in making this happen.”

*Cultural Center staff member (expatriate, early 40s):* “Sometimes I sit in meetings and ask myself, ‘What am I doing here? I am not giving anything and I am not taking anything.’”

The third dynamic influences vertical communication: upward communication is managed by “gatekeepers” who control the flow of information and data going to senior leaders, this is with most businesses and is not unique to Saudi Aramco. The combination of these factors accounts for the relatively high proportion of individuals within the Cultural Center who are unaware of the organization’s priorities and programs.

The staff members of international partner organizations exhibit a relatively high degree of awareness largely as a result of the open, collaborative communication channels and the contractual agreements that bind them to the Cultural Center. While there has been a concerted effort to reach out to a number of leading cultural organizations, these engagement efforts are
reinforced by Saudi Aramco’s rigorous contracting procedures and requirements.

*International partner staff member (late 30s):* “I found the Cultural Center staff, and the Saudis in particular, very forthcoming in discussions about their programs, the kinds of sensitivities they need to be aware of, and the constraints they have to deal with. These folks know what they are doing.”

*International partner staff member (mid 50s):* “I had my team roll up their sleeves to be more hands-on in undertaking the joint projects. However, Aramco has very strict contracting rules, and since this is not what is called for in the contract, we adhered more closely to the scope.”

Most stakeholder groups exhibit a relatively low degree of awareness of the Cultural Center, its strategies and its programs. These “other” stakeholder groups are not necessarily being purposefully excluded from engagement, but rather have simply not received the messages and information being disseminated by the Cultural Center. This is mainly due to the fact that the Cultural Center is yet to launch its communication campaign, but can also be a relative lack of interest among the stakeholders in question.

*Cultural Center volunteer (Saudi, early 20s):* “I enjoy volunteering and this is a good way to meet people while doing something good for the community. It makes me proud to be here. But I don’t really know a lot about the King Abdulaziz Cultural Center itself, just about this program...”

*Central Province resident (Saudi, late 50s):* “I don’t know what they are doing in Dhahran, but I wish we had something like that here in Riyadh. The Knowledge Program (Cultural Program) is great, so I guess the Cultural Center will be something like this.”

*Government official (mid 50s):* “It’s a Saudi Aramco thing, and so we don’t really know much about what they are doing. They are sort of off on their own.”
*In-Kingdom artist (early 40s)*: “I am happy to be more involved in some of the Cultural Center’s arts programs, because these are things that I wish were around when I was growing up, or starting off as an artist. I am just not sure where the programs will be going once the Cultural Center opens.”

Knowledge of the Cultural Center’s mission, strategies and programs demonstrates the relative level of awareness of the institution among various stakeholder groups, but it is not necessarily indicative of the degree to which stakeholder views, opinions and needs are integrated into the organization’s decision making and programming choices.

The Cultural Center staff responses are an extremely mixed bag: a minority believes that end-users are very engaged, a plurality believes they are somewhat engaged, and the remainder believe end users are rarely engaged. To some extent, the variety of responses is down to different perceptions of stakeholder engagement, and the nature of stakeholder integration: in several instances, I had to explain the question in some detail. This is indicative of the development phase of a systematic approach to stakeholder engagement and the integration of their views into programming decisions, as can be expected of an institution in its early phase of development.

Furthermore, not all of the respondents are directly involved in program development, and instead are focused on program implementation, logistics, or other support activities. These individuals tended to have a reduced understanding of the role that stakeholders play in shaping programs and the current mechanisms applied to achieve stakeholder participation.

The most important factor behind the varied responses is the type of program each respondent is working on. Those who felt that there is a high degree of end user engagement tended to be engaged in Cultural Center outreach programs that are already drawing crowds, engaging participants, and generating user comments and feedback. In a sense, these are live events that are provoking reactions, and therefore end user comments that can be
integrated into program decisions. This also accounts for the sense among outreach program participants that they are very engaged in program decisions and evaluation: in fact, most of their input is being directed toward those respondents among Cultural Center staff who also see a high degree of end-user influence.

This is an extremely positive development, and is a promising sign for the future sustainability of end user input and stakeholder participation: as more programs “go live,” there will be more end users to contribute views, opinions and feedback. There is also an element of organic development toward stakeholder participation, as noted by the response below:

**Cultural Center staff member (Saudi, mid 20s):** “At FABLAB, we don’t need to engage end users on program development, because we are using a tried and true recipe that has been deployed around the world with success. It’s like a template. But at the same time, we don’t tell visitors what they should be making; that’s completely up to them. So in a sense, the program is decided individually by each visitor.”

**Outreach event participant (Saudi, mid teens):** “I think it’s cool that we’re designing the workshop; at my age you don’t often get that kind of opportunity.”

**Cultural Center staff member (Saudi, late 20s):** “We always listen to what our visitors have to say. That’s important… So for example, last year I noticed that the Chinese shows at the theatre were very popular, so this year we’re bringing more of these shows from China.”

**Outreach event participant (Saudi, late teens):** “I felt like I was really a part of the Cultural Center team when we were working on the workshop. I even helped organize my team’s display at the final event, and we had so many people come by and say such nice things. People confused me for one of the Cultural Center staff.”
Those members of the Cultural Center staff who felt that end user views are somewhat valued and utilized tended to be individuals developing programs that will be implemented once the Cultural Center facility itself is opened. In other words, they are consulting end user needs to some extent, but without year-round live programs, their ability to solicit these views are limited.

**Cultural Center staff member (Saudi, late 40s):** “(Data about end user opinions) has to be pulled together to get a broader perspective, and there needs to be a mechanism to generate data, and then a way of disseminating it across the Cultural Center…Eventually we want to do original research, because there is so little data available in the Kingdom…We are trying to make do with what is out there.”

**Cultural Center staff member (Saudi, late 30s):** “We are keeping a low profile when it comes to these programs, I guess for a couple of reasons. First of all, Aramco tends to be very low profile when it comes to new initiatives... But also, we don’t want to make waves … prior to launching our official public communication strategy.”

Volunteers, by contrast, feel they are not involved in program development or evaluation, largely because of the role that volunteers play in any cultural institution. Voluntary acts of kindness, service or charity are an integral part of Islamic teachings and Saudi society, and are mentioned explicitly in the Qur’an [see, for example, Sura 2, Ayahs 261-65]. These are generally individual acts of charity or devotion, rather than part of an organized volunteer program, which are relatively scarce in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, the notion of volunteering as part of a wider program is relatively new; this has created a good deal of excitement among young people, and there have generally been more applicants for volunteer positions than slots available. At this stage, volunteers are almost exclusively engaged in crowd management activities; some are asked to present materials or guide tours, and a number of these volunteers (overwhelmingly young Saudi men and women) have done an exceptional job. Going forward, as the Center's volunteerism strategy
is finalized, there will be more formal channels of engaging the volunteers in the development and evaluation of the Cultural Center's programs.

*Cultural Center volunteer (Saudi, late teens):* “I am lucky to be a part of the iRead event, which is awesome...my role is very clear: I am supposed to keep the aisles clear and make sure everyone is evacuated through these doors in case of an emergency. That’s it.”

*Cultural Center volunteer (Saudi, late teens):* “I take school groups around the exhibition and explain the displays to the students. If there are questions, or let’s say one of the teachers has a comment or doesn’t like something, I tell (X), my supervisor...”

The staff of international partner institutions provided a varied picture: some felt their input had a major impact on the development of Cultural Center programs, pointing out that knowledge sharing was an integral driver for their engagement and a central feature of their contracts. Others, though, felt that their advice or input was diluted, while still others pointed to the difficulty of traveling to Saudi Arabia, interacting with Cultural Center staff and gauging local community attitudes.

*International partner staff member (mid 50s):* “This is a real opportunity for me as a professional: there are not many places where you can be in on the ground floor, shaping a new institution and its cultural offerings. It’s not the easiest way to exert influence, but this is such an interesting experience, I wouldn’t trade it for anything.”

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, I have examined the stakeholder landscape at both of the case study sites, considered the motivations for engagement of the various stakeholder groups, and outlined the strategies in place at each institution to engage stakeholders. I also assessed the efficacy and sustainability of stakeholder integration in Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World
Culture and presented the research findings from the non-obtrusive participant observations and semi-structured participant interviews, and cross-referenced these data with my literature review where applicable.

In the next chapter, I will analyse these data and findings in greater detail, drawing a number of conclusions about the role, efficacy and mechanisms of stakeholder engagement at the two case studies.

What is perhaps most remarkable from my research into Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is the number of similarities in stakeholder engagement issues between these two incredibly different case studies. Far from being a case of apples and oranges, it is clear that both cultural institutions face many of the same challenges and facilitating factors when it comes to stakeholder engagement and participation, and have developed remarkably similar approaches to grappling with them. This discussion forms the basis of the next chapter.
Chapter Five: Analysis – Issues and Critique

1 Introduction

This chapter draws upon the findings of the non-participant observation undertaken at the two case study sites to compare and contrast the stakeholder engagement strategies, practices and experiences at Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture. A series of issues and drivers related to stakeholder engagement and the integration of stakeholder views, perspectives and desires into the programs and operations of the two sites are identified, and the similarities and differences between the two cases are described. This exercise demonstrates that although these may appear to be two very different cases set in very different social, cultural, legal and economic contexts, there are in actuality a great number of similarities when it comes to the efficacy of stakeholder engagement, the strategies and practices being pursued, and the degree to which stakeholders feel engaged or empowered and have their input integrated into the present and future operation of these two initiatives. This underscores the fact that there are a series of similar drivers or factors that colour the stakeholder engagement experience, and may indicate the universality (and certainly confirm the commonality) of these factors.

It should be noted that the conclusions set forth in this chapter are drawn from the qualitative and quantitative data from the interviews and surveys set forth in Chapter Four.

2 Stakeholder Classification

In both of these case studies, there is a clear differential between what could be termed “primary stakeholders” who are engaged more often and with greater purpose and clarity than is the case with other stakeholder groups. The identity of these primary stakeholder groups remains steady over time, rather than shifting or rebalancing periodically. At both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center, the primary stakeholders are those individuals and institutions
who either provide the program’s “license to operate” or make available the financial, logistical and operational resources necessary for continued activities. In other words, these are the groups that provide the legal standing and material resources required for the very existence of the two programs. At the end of the day, the groups that provide access and/or significant resources must constitute the primary stakeholder groups for any given cultural or knowledge program or facility.

At Çatalhöyük, the research team’s authorization (that is, the “license to operate”) is provided by the Turkish state and more precisely by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, at the national level and the municipal conservation councils at the local level. The engagement activities undertaken by the research team with these state actors is continual, intensive, focused on maintaining the team’s ability to perform its work on site — and most importantly they are mandatory. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism is also a provider of financial resources, but the primary resource-driven stakeholder relationships are with corporate sponsors, and here again there is a good deal of time and attention paid to maintaining positive relationships and continued access to funding. For example, Figure 17 (in Chapter Four) demonstrates the high proportion of sponsors that have visited the site with comparison with other stakeholder groups. At the end of each funding cycle, to entice a continued collaboration, a bespoke business case is shared with each major donor, to demonstrate the company’s return on investment, the benefits of aligning its corporate reputation with the Çatalhöyük brand, and the prospects for even greater benefits that will accrue from continued funding of the research project. Ties with academic institutions are also a focus of interest by the research team, since universities and museums provide some degree of funding, but more importantly, provide much of the human capital (e.g., archaeologists, students and administrators) and much of the customer base for the resulting intellectual and academic product. Çatalhöyük has no mass tourism audience that it must cater to; as a result, the site does not generate significant revenue from tourist footfall and therefore, the resources are not at present forthcoming to produce “popular” archaeological content in any significant volume.
At the Cultural Center, the same dynamic is in place: it is the guarantor of access and institutional standing and the provider of resources that constitutes the primary stakeholder group. In contrast to Çatalhöyük, this is one and the same entity: namely, Saudi Aramco and its management. As a company organization, the Cultural Center operates with a degree of autonomy from the Saudi national legal framework governing arts and cultural institutions and this unique situation provides both benefits and risks to the Cultural Center. As in the Turkish case, the Cultural Center and its leadership spends most of its stakeholder engagement focus on the holder of the license to operate and of the purse strings, and as at Çatalhöyük, these are mandatory interactions instructed by Saudi Aramco’s corporate rules, regulations and procedures. For instance, Figure 27 (in Chapter Four) shows a relatively high level of understanding of the Cultural Center’s mission, vision, goals, governance and programs, while Figures 28 and 29 (in Chapter Four) demonstrate a high degree of access to the Cultural Center’s leadership and a similarly high degree of influence when it comes to determining the institution’s future direction. Furthermore, Figure 32 (Chapter Four) demonstrates that three in four respondents among Saudi Aramco management expressed a desire to serve on the Cultural Center’s board of trustees.

So, instead of inventories, excavated materials, and excavation and development reports provided to State authorities and business cases presented to corporate donors, the Cultural Center submits on an annual basis a three-year business plan and set of initiatives to procure funding and manpower, provides mandatory accountability reports twice a year, and communicates with company management on an on-going basis. Therefore, while the specific identity of these primary stakeholder groups differs in the two cases, their status is a function of the same calculus: the power relationship between the initiative/program team and the authorizing and funding entities that provide the program’s very lifeline.

Internal stakeholders — that is, employees, volunteers and other members of the work force — would seem to constitute a primary stakeholder group based on their close proximity to the work, the need in both cases for highly qualified
and often highly specialized manpower, and the desirability of a strongly motivated team to carry out each institution’s mission. In practice these groups are secondary stakeholders in both cases. The leadership of the two teams places priority on relations with the primary stakeholders: in case of a meeting with a major donor or official that conflicts with a scheduled staff interaction, the leaders will always opt for the engagement opportunity with the regulator or the funder.

Furthermore, while having a highly functioning team is an essential element for both projects, the fact remains that any highly functioning individual member of the team can be replaced, and therefore the engagement level can be minimized as time and resource constraints dictate. These are, in fact, rational choices based on an assessment of the vital needs of the Çatalhöyük site and the Cultural Center itself. The changing staff line-ups at both sites simply serve to reinforce this dynamic, as both entities have proven that they can continue to function with different team members, even in positions of some degree of authority.

Local community residents constitute another secondary stakeholder audience at both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center. At Çatalhöyük, there is a recognition that locals are important for the interpretation of the site, provide a number of the employees on staff, protect the archaeological resource throughout the year, and serve as hosts to the largely foreign research team. Furthermore, there is also a recognition that the research team is altering the physical context for the local community as a result of its excavations, and that local residents are in many ways the “owners” of the Çatalhöyük site: they will remain long after the research team departs, and in fact will have a good deal of influence (positive or negative) over the long-term disposition of the site. There is also an understanding that were discontent among the local community to reach a crisis level, residents could exert influence on the all-important primary stakeholders described above: State officials and regulators may be forced to revoke permits and authorization, and a corporate donor will think twice before being associated with a controversial undertaking that is acting against the interests of locals.
Most of these considerations are not pressing, and stakeholder engagement is only one tool to keep local residents satisfied. In addition, some of these factors or interests are not wholly within the power of the research team to control or influence: for instance, residents who are prevented from undertaking economic development or infrastructure projects because they would infringe on protected areas are pitted against the state regulators rather than the research team — though the team are often targeted for criticism because they are on-site. Furthermore, the research project is not dependent on tourist visitation, and certainly doesn’t need to have local residents visit the site to provide any sort of funding or even to fulfil the academic and educational mission of the program: knowledge is by and large generated for the domestic and international academic community of scholars, not for popular consumption. In fact, access to the archaeological site is highly controlled and designed to keep local community members out, unless they are chaperoned by a site guard. The Figure 17 (in Chapter Four) shows that relatively few members of local communities access the site; while Figure 18 (in Chapter Four) underscores the important role the site guards perform as interlocutors and “ambassadors” for the project to local community members.

For the Cultural Center, local communities also constitute a secondary stakeholder group. The mission of the institution requires a degree of community engagement that is not present at Çatalhöyük: the Cultural Center is designed to make a positive impact on Saudi society and Saudi citizens. In point of fact, though, the Cultural Center must also be aware of and work to mitigate possible negative consequences to the local community, such as increased traffic and pollution, stress on existing infrastructure, rising prices for services, etc. There have been limited efforts to engage local residents in discussions of these possible impacts, even as the Cultural Center considers expanding its reach into a surrounding Cultural District. The lack to date of systematic engagement with local residents is clear from the Figures 27 and 28 (in Chapter Four). While the Cultural Center facility remains under construction and there are no programs being staged there, this level of limited interaction can be sustained. Once the Cultural Center opens, it will need to draw visitors in their thousands — not necessarily for financial
reasons, but to demonstrate its impact and ability to fulfil its original mission and the promise of the facility.

Other stakeholder groups can exercise some degree of impact on programs like Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, and in some limited areas their influence can be considerable (e.g., a partner institution being asked to provide staff, a program or an exhibit). They generally lack the “lifeline” relevance or the physical proximity to rise beyond the status of tertiary stakeholders. This is again reflected in both of the case studies, where engagement of tertiary stakeholder groups tends to be ad hoc, voluntary and non-intensive. This is clearly demonstrated in the Figure 18 and Figure 29 (in Chapter Four). For example, excavations at Çatalhöyük will continue with or without the support of the Mother Goddess special interest group, and the Cultural Center does not depend on the active engagement of Saudi educators to perform its work.

2.1 Institutional Value Proposition

The efficacy and importance of stakeholder engagement activities can be gauged by the degree of interaction with various audiences, whether that is number of meetings held, time spent in discussions, the volume of reports and materials presented, etc. But stakeholder engagement is not simply a matter of talking: it is also driven by the content and value (real and perceived) of the interactions. In other words, what is the narrative being delivered to each stakeholder group, how responsive are the interlocutors to each other’s interests and concerns, and how compelling is the project’s value proposition over the long term? The quality of the interaction must be considered when assessing the long-term sustainability of the stakeholder engagement and integration functions, because the story must be compelling to remain effective. There are few if any objective measures of the value proposition or program narrative, and often times their impact can be felt or seen only after the fact. In addition, the cumulative worth of the overall value proposition can be magnified by the sum of various interactions: the business case presented to a prospective donor becomes more compelling, for instance, if there is a
high degree of interest in the project among other stakeholders, a greater number of visitors or audiences, or endorsement by a major state agency.

In both of these case studies, the projects in question have had to articulate an overall value proposition that is aligned with their missions as institutions, but also tailor their narratives for various stakeholder groups who have individual interests or concerns that must be addressed. That is, the value proposition has to be both subdivided and expanded upon to cater to the needs and desires of various individual stakeholder groups, to solicit their support, to secure necessary resources, or to inspire desired actions.

At Çatalhöyük, the overall mission is centred on the discovery, excavation, interpretation and preservation of the archaeological material resource, and the development and distribution of the resulting knowledge; there is also a core theoretical and academic value proposition: to create, test and refine the science and discipline of archaeology and related fields (including, of course, the theory and practice of stakeholder engagement). At the same time, in its engagement with local residents, the research team has to demonstrate the potential economic value of the site, provide compelling reasons to preserve the resource even at the expense of other potential development activities, and inspire a sense of pride in the heritage of the region and its unique place in human history. The aspirations for the site in the future as captured in Figure 23 (in Chapter Four) shows the different priorities at work among the various stakeholder groups. Similarly, when it comes to State regulators, the Çatalhöyük team must demonstrate compliance with all of the relevant legislation while also working to differentiate the site from other similar archaeological sites around the country — a mission in which it has been highly successful, sometimes to the point of engendering envy from other less well known and more economically challenged dig sites.

At the Cultural Center, the value proposition is based on being a catalyst for the development of a knowledge society, a platform to showcase Saudi talent and intellect, and to promote the development of original, “home-grown” knowledge and artistic products. At the same time, the value proposition must also appeal to members of company management who are more comfortable
dealing with industrial, commercial and engineering considerations, and for
whom the overall value proposition can seem overly intangible and difficult to
measure. This can be seen in Figure 31 (in Chapter Four), where many
members of Saudi Aramco management would consider the option of
operating the Cultural Center with a dedicated endowment — the only
stakeholder group to propose this as an option for the future of the institution.
The value proposition has also been tailored to be presented to local
residents who are unfamiliar with a knowledge and cultural institution like the
Cultural Center, simply because no facility of its kind exists in the Kingdom or
the wider Gulf region.

Partners are another interesting stakeholder group, in that the elements of the
overall Cultural Center value proposition have to be accented to demonstrate
alignment with their institutional missions, values and capabilities, and in
some cases, the connection between the Cultural Center and Saudi Aramco
has been either amplified or downplayed to better collaborate with prospective
partners. Figure 30 (in Chapter Four) shows the degree to which international
partners and peers, and a sizable proportion of domestic thought leaders,
would like to see a foundation be responsible for the operations and future
direction of the Cultural Center, while most other stakeholder groups would
prefer that it continue as status-quo, the full responsibility of Saudi Aramco.
The chart is also remarkable for the high proportion of Cultural Center staff
members who proposed a future independent existence for the institution.
Although there was little unanimous definition of what this would entail in
regards to the legal context of the Kingdom. This is not surprising as these
legal considerations would need to be thought through and worked out by the
Saudi Aramco Law Department with consideration to the Kingdom’s laws and
regulations governing the cultural creative field.

In both the Turkish and Saudi cases, there is a linguistic factor that must be
taken into account when modulating and calibrating the value proposition for
local audiences (whether average residents or regulators, scholars and
business people). In both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center, the primary
language of operations is English, and English is the lingua franca in both the
international archaeological and knowledge and cultural communities. When
interacting with locals, both institutions must utilize either Turkish or Arabic, both to ensure the content is understood accurately and to demonstrate an appropriate level of respect. For example, Professor Ian Hodder learned Turkish and regularly utilizes it (to great effect) when dealing with Turkish authorities and community members, despite also having an interpreter in the room.

Also, both institutions have had to continually refine, update and revise aspects of their value proposition depending on the changing sentiments of various stakeholder audiences, varying levels of interest, and shifts in the social and economic environments. Individual stakeholder groups are dynamic in their own right, as constituent members leave and arrive, roles shift, new opinion leaders and decision makers emerge, and internal power relationships are accordingly altered. Just as important, though, is the constantly changing balance among various stakeholder groups, and shifting patterns of rivalry, alliances, and confluence of views and interests. Figure 22 (in Chapter Four), for example, captures the rivalry and competition between Çumra and Küçükköy, as residents of both villages see a role for their own local officials in managing the site in the future — to the exclusion of the other village/town. Although a specifically tailored value proposition may be offered to one group, that doesn’t mean that other stakeholders are not also “listening in”: for example, promises of economic development made to one group may not be easy to square with pledges of environmental preservation extended to another. This means that the institutional value proposition for both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center is constantly in flux, not in terms of its basic promise or orientation, but rather in light of its details, the emphases placed on one element or another, and the communications means used to articulate and communicate the proposition to different audiences.

2.2 Governance Framework

At both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center, the legal, regulatory and governance framework exerts a high degree of influence on the stakeholder landscape, dictates degrees of stakeholder engagement, and colours the
value proposition and other content of the stakeholder engagement narrative. As such, governance and “reporting” considerations are in many ways foundational, dictating how power is distributed, authority determined, resources allocated and programs designed.

At Çatalhöyük, the regulatory and governance framework is highly variegated. Within the team, there is a clear and relatively flat reporting mechanism, with a director, a site manager, university heads with research teams, and independent archaeologists, in addition to support staff. Externally there are a wide variety of state entities that must be engaged. The research team is ultimately accountable to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, regional Conservation Councils, municipal authorities, donors, the administrators of academic partner institutions, and ultimately the wider academic community, for whom adherence to best practices is a critical source of endorsement and reputation. There is also a role to play for UNESCO as the final arbiter of best practice, and to some degree the UNESCO World Heritage Site certification serves as the ultimate line of defence for the site, a compelling reason for continued state resource allocation, and a method to position Çatalhöyük as one of Turkey’s most prominent and most important cultural sites. There are a number of World Heritage Site standards that must continue to be met over time to maintain the certification, and UNESCO reserves the right to delist any site that falls short. Finally, for all of its prominence, Çatalhöyük is an active archaeological site among many that fall under the Turkish governance framework and it must compete for resources and attention with other sites.

For the Cultural Center, by contrast, the governance structure is set by the regulations and procedures of the Saudi Arabian Oil Company, or Saudi Aramco. There is no requirement to submit accountability or activity reports to government agencies or external institutions at present, and for partner institutions these requirements are simply whatever degree of transparency is required by the contractual agreements, which are determined according to Saudi Aramco’s contracting system. Within the company the Cultural Center is subject to scrutiny and oversight just like any other line organization, and must therefore comply with the corporate reporting guidelines, contracting and
procurement procedures, human resource policies, and auditing controls. That said, the Cultural Center is a unique entity within the Saudi Aramco governance framework (unlike Çatalhöyük, which is one of many similar sites): although there are roughly 200 different departments within Saudi Aramco, there is no other cultural institution with which the Cultural Center is in competition. While this allows the Cultural Center to easily differentiate itself from gas processing plants, shops facilities and transportation organizations, for example, it also means that it is operating in a regulatory framework that was not originally established to take account of its unique needs and requirements. If the Cultural Center was moved out from under the current governance framework provided by Saudi Aramco to fall under the regulatory constraints of, for example, a ministry department, the consequences could be different. An example of such a shift can be found elsewhere in Dhahran: the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals previously fell under the purview of the Ministry of Petroleum & Mineral Resources and was funded by this ministry; once it was moved to be the responsibility of the Ministry of Higher Education (which was later combined with the Ministry of Education), it had to compete with other universities in the Kingdom for funding.

Therefore, the governance framework at Çatalhöyük can be characterized as more varied, more subject to interpretation by various actors, and providing relatively more space for manoeuvre within the legal framework, particularly the Archaeological Management Plan established by the Turkish state. By contrast, the Cultural Center operates within a more tightly controlled and more uniform governance structure, albeit one designed for a global scale energy company than for a knowledge and cultural institution. This is the result of the Cultural Center being developed as a line organization in an already well established industrial and commercial enterprise, rather than undergoing organic growth as is the case at Çatalhöyük.

### 2.3 Economic Impact

For any archaeological site or knowledge and cultural institution, its impact on the local community in economic terms is an important driver of stakeholder
engagement and integration. Local business people are keen to leverage any commercial opportunities the site or facility might provide, community members are interested in jobs and career opportunities, and there is the prospect of an economic “ripple effect” from the money being spent directly on the initiative or by the tourists who will visit. For many in the local community, these economic benefits are one of the main reasons to engage or disengage from the initiative. From the perspective of the research or project team, local economic development generally falls rather far down the agenda, behind the main academic, educational or transformative mission of the institution. That is, local economic impact is a by-product, not a primary objective.

At Çatalhöyük, the archaeological site is not the primary driver of economic activity in the surrounding area, which is agriculture. In addition, there are merchants to meet the needs of the local villages, and a sugar factory has been established within the last 10 years. Çatalhöyük does exercise an economic impact through creating demand for goods and services required by the team (roughly 120 people at any given time during the research season) and by providing employment opportunities for site guards, labourers and builders. Yet this demand for goods and services as well as labour requirements are seasonal (with the exception of the three site guards, who are constant — they have even established a Facebook group), so for roughly nine months of the year the site is dormant and there is no economic activity or benefit for surrounding communities. Tourist traffic does create some additional opportunities, but here again these groups only come during the dig season, and in fact, most of their lira is spent in the larger city of Konya, roughly 40 minutes from the Çatalhöyük site. In addition, merchants from Konya occasionally bring rugs and other goods to sell at Çatalhöyük to visiting tourists; while this might be thought to provoke a negative response from local business people, there are no rug merchants in the local communities and therefore the Konya sellers do not constitute direct competition. The research team has endeavoured to maximize its relatively small direct economic impact by sourcing food and materials locally where possible, rather than bringing supplies from further afield. This activity also raises certain sensitivities, as there needs to be a balance between purchases from the nearby Küçükköy
village and the larger Çumra town to preserve goodwill in both communities. Therefore, as a whole Çatalhöyük has relatively limited and very seasonal local economic benefits for local stakeholders. Most stakeholders would like to see this state of affairs change. According to Figure 23 (in Chapter Four), only the research team and the State personnel identified as their primary interest in the future of the site, continued archaeological research; other stakeholder groups were keen to note their interest in tourism development.

On the other hand, there is a permanent economic impact, seen by locals as largely negative that are permanent: a sort of economic exclusion zone designed to protect archaeological sites that have not yet been excavated or explored. As a result, certain lands are off-limits to local farmers, cannot be used for roads or pipelines, and are not eligible for use as industrial or manufacturing sites. The limits of this area have been determined by the Conservation Council through an inventory of the various mounds in the area, but at the moment there is not enough funding available to determine the archaeological significance of the various mounds, and therefore whether they should be preserved as is, preserved via excavation and record, or made available for economic development by lifting the current degree of protection. The plans for a larger archaeological park, may greatly extend the boundaries of the preservation area, and will in any case raise the significance of each individual mound already under protection because it will become part of a larger archaeological zone, similar to the way in which an individual stream or hill takes on greater importance if it is part of a national park. There are already infrastructure developments taking place (I accompanied Professor Ian Hodder to examine and document the impact on the archaeological resource at several mounds, including one which had a road built through it), and any increase in the size of the protected area is likely to bring the project into conflict with local economic actors who favour even further development. And while a larger archaeological park or zone may attract more visitors, it is difficult to justify such a measure on purely local economic grounds, given the relatively small numbers of tourists who currently visit the site (see Figures 15 and 16 in Chapter Four).
The economic impact of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture to date has been muted because the facility itself is still under construction. The local representative of a major overseas construction firm is carrying out the construction of the facility. Most of the workers are expatriates, primarily from the Indian subcontinent, and therefore there is negligible job creation for Saudis as part of the construction phase of the project, other than the approximately 200 Saudi employees working in the offices of the Cultural Center. There is economic demand for food, housing supplies and of course building materials, but the relative impact at present is small given the massive industrial and infrastructure projects currently underway elsewhere in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia (as an indicator, the Sadara petrochemical project, a joint venture between Saudi Aramco and Dow Chemical, is alone roughly 25 times larger than the Cultural Center in terms of investment requirements).

Once the Cultural Center opens, there are new niche industries envisioned that would spring up as a result of the Cultural Center’s presence, for example, art-handling companies, theatrical and audio-visual production firms, costumers and carpenters, and hospitality vendors and event management companies. In fact, this is one area in which the Cultural Center’s core mission and local economic development do intersect: the creation and enhancement of a local cultural creative industry. The degree to which various stakeholder groups support this goal can be ascertained in Figure 31, in Chapter Four. In part this is because such artistic and cultural industries have proven to be an essential component of knowledge societies elsewhere in the world, and in part this is so that the Cultural Center’s own needs can be met more easily and less expensively through a shorter supply chain, while also acting in alignment with Saudi Aramco’s own imperative to increase local content in its purchasing and procurement activities. There is also a role for in-Kingdom companies other than Saudi Aramco and other Saudi institutions to invest in these industries.

The possible economic impact from visitors and their needs may be much greater than the Cultural Center’s direct impact. The Cultural Center projects between one and a half to two million visitors per year once the facility is in full
operation, creating retail opportunities at the Cultural Center for outside contractors and companies. In addition, these visitors will need to eat, travel, and in many cases find lodging, and these requirements will need to be met by local companies and communities. While these commercial opportunities will be generated by the Cultural Center, they need not be coordinated with the institution: anyone can establish a restaurant or coach service to meet visitor needs without reference to or permission from the Cultural Center itself. There may, of course, be negative economic impacts from these developments (e.g., more expensive real estate prices, overtaxed infrastructure, the intrusion of larger companies from Riyadh or Jiddah drawn by the visitor traffic — as is possible at Çatalhöyük as well), but all in all the impact is projected to be positive.

The commercial relationship between the Cultural Center and the local business community will become more intensive, if the footprint of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture future expands in the form of a larger cultural creative hub of mix-use businesses surrounding the Cultural Center. The discussions regarding such a business model and its commercial practices are still at an early stage, but there could be an incubator model that will have more long-lasting and deeper economic impacts on the local community than is the case with servicing visitor traffic or supplying the Cultural Center’s direct needs (See Figure 31 in Chapter Four).

What then, of the impact on Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center from local economic development? For Çatalhöyük, more intensive and sustainable local economic development could generate funds for the long-term protection and development of the site, and engage the local community and demonstrate an economic value for the site and its preservation. Given that one day the research team will leave and hand responsibility for the site over to a national, regional or local team, positive economic benefits could be a major enticement to protect, preserve and promote the archaeological site (for the views of various stakeholder groups on the future management of the site, see Figure 22 in Chapter Four). For the Cultural Center, the attraction of a steady stream of visitors to the facility is an essential element in achieving its transformative mission. While the Cultural Center’s offerings will be the main
draw, there is no doubt that visitor numbers will also be influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the amenities on offer for tourists: is there a first-class hotel nearby, how easy is it to get to and from the Cultural Center and the airport, are there facilities in the community for people with special needs, etc.? Therefore, the Cultural Center will have a vested interest in ensuring the availability of such services and facilities, though it would need buy-in from, and to collaborate with, the various responsible ministries to shape such a development.

In both cases, there is a need to balance the desire to use local economic development as an enticement for the engagement of local communities and the long-term sustainability of the institution’s core mission on the one hand, and being entangled in potentially controversial economic planning and development issues or local conflicts and disputes among economic or regulatory powers to the detriment of the institution’s work and interests (the future visions that stakeholders have for both sites can be seen in Figure 23 and Figure 31 in Chapter Four).

There is one other economic issue or question that faces both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture: what are the costs, benefits and risks of greater commercialization of each site? Thus far, this issue has not been systematically analysed or addressed at either site, let alone plans or strategies developed and implemented. Greater commercialization could increase the scope and scale of opportunities for stakeholder engagement by permitting a wider variety of economic actors to be directly involved in the life of the site or institution. Commercialization could also represent a distraction from the institution’s core mission, given the amount of time and effort required to market and manage these commercialization opportunities on an on-going basis.

Greater commercialization may also not be in alignment with local needs or desires — for whom does commercialization cater, community members or the institution’s bottom line? Again, will it be the local business people of limited means who engage or bigger players from outside the area who have the necessary capital, expertise and networks to make the most of these
openings? At Çatalhöyük, will commercialization depend on attracting larger numbers of foreign tourists whose behaviour may not conform to local cultural practices? If these opportunities are instead directed toward niche “adventure travellers” who might be more culturally sensitive and eco-friendly, who will be responsible for the marketing activities necessary to reach those individuals globally? For the Cultural Center, will a greater concern with meeting financial and commercial targets “price out” ordinary people by dictating shows and exhibitions that appeal to an elite able to pay the price of admission? If the Cultural Center takes on a more commercial air, this may also reflect badly on the Cultural Center’s role as “the flagship of citizenship” for Saudi Aramco, and as a “gift to the nation”. In addition, for both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center there is a risk of backlash from peer institutions and groups who may see greater commercialization as “selling out” and putting a price tag on archaeology, arts, culture or knowledge. So commercialization could build bridges of mutual interest and provide incentives for stakeholders to engage, or disenfranchise and alienate critical audiences. As such, decisions about whether or not to engage in certain economic activities must be assessed not just in financial terms, but also in light of their alignment with core mission objectives, potential reputational implications, and impact on stakeholder interests.

2.4 Physical Presence

The physical footprint of both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture is yet another primary driver of stakeholder engagement, particularly but not exclusively with local stakeholders: even for international peer institutions, for example, the physical presence of the two sites creates logistical and financial hurdles to closer engagement. The nature of the physical presence at each site is very different, where the characteristics of space represent a certain degree of constraint or freedom. Çatalhöyük is extremely site specific: the whole endeavour is based on the archaeological record found in that particular place. As such, it cannot be moved or relocated, and while the archaeological resource can and must be interpreted,
there is a limit as to how the physical reality of the site can be altered or “improved upon”. Certainly the activities conducted by the research team and the knowledge it produces can be broadcast more widely, especially in the academic community, but in the end, the research depends entirely upon the site and continued access to the archaeological riches found there.

For the Cultural Center, the facility itself is critical to the visitor experience and therefore to the mission of the institution, but it also functions as a “home base” for other non-site-specific activities that include outreach and digital programming — activities that are already under way well in advance of the opening of the Cultural Center itself. Furthermore, the location of the Cultural Center was a deliberate choice made by Saudi Aramco, and the degree of control over that site is more complete than at Çatalhöyük. So, for example, the architectural competition that determined the design for the Cultural Center facility has no homologue at Çatalhöyük, as there was no scope in the Turkish case for such an elective activity.

The desire in both cases to shape the physical environs and surrounding area, at Çatalhöyük as an archaeological park and at the Cultural Center potentially through a surrounding cultural creative hub, has been addressed above in light of their local economic impacts. There is clearly an effort to exert control over physical space and its usage that is at work in both initiatives. In both case studies, these are exclusionary strategies: by dictating the physical use of space the research team/institutional leadership excludes it from being used in other ways that are not related to the mission of the initiative, so for instance the land could not be used for pipeline right of ways, farming, storage of equipment, industrial or manufacturing sites, etc. According to the laws of physics, two objects cannot occupy the same space, so the issue of physical presence represents a zero-sum game, in which even multi-use developments will still require certain zoning decisions to exclude certain functions or structures. Again, both case studies exhibit both an “offensive” element (extending the core mission) and a “defensive” aspect (protecting interests to the exclusion of others). This could also be thought of in architectural terms as “positive” or “negative” space, where the “negative”
decision not to build in a certain area is nevertheless still a conscious decision based on creating positive benefits — for example, Central Park in the heart of Manhattan.

Thus far, the ability of local stakeholders to make their voices heard in these spatial determinations has been limited: at Çatalhöyük the decisions about extending and preserving protected status ultimately fall to the Conservation Council based on input from the research team, while at the Cultural Center, the land that would host a cultural creative hub or zone around the Cultural Center already belongs to Saudi Aramco so the company will be the ultimate arbiter as to its use. The degree to which local residents feel they are able to influence decisions about the future of the two sites can be seen in Figures 20 and 21 and Figure 29 in Chapter Four.

2.5 Identity

One often-overlooked aspect of stakeholder engagement is related to the reputation of the site or institution — in business terms, its brand and brand identity. The power and distinction of a strong, readily defined brand can bring intangible benefits to those who are associated with it, and that includes various stakeholders. Local communities can gain a sense of pride and distinction from association with a famous landmark or archaeological site; an archaeologist may wish to have a distinctive, well-known site on his or her CV; an artist may prefer to exhibit in a space which commands a good deal of name recognition; and institutional partners can benefit from the “halo effect” of a reputable initiative or program. In all cases, there is something more than just economic benefit or increased knowledge that acts as a magnet for stakeholder engagement.

At Çatalhöyük, there is an on-going dispute about the ownership of this locally powerful brand, with both Küçükköy and Çumra vying for control and “ownership” of the Çatalhöyük name and reputation. In point of fact, legal ownership and branding rights to the name have not been definitively decided, and intellectual property rights and registration is a grey area: for instance, could a local businessman open a “Çatalhöyük Café” or a “Çatalhöyük Travel Agency”? What about products branded with the name destined for the tourist
trade? At the moment there is no controlling brand ownership structure in place to resolve such issues. Also, as one of Turkey's best known archaeological sites, there are tangible benefits that accrue to the brand, including the attraction of qualified young researchers, more enticing sponsorship opportunities for donors, and access to the corridors of power that comes with greater name recognition.

The power of the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture brand has a great deal of potential but is largely unproven due to the current state of development: institutional partnerships are still being forged, and the Cultural Center has yet to host its first major visiting exhibition in its own facility. To date, the Cultural Center has been able to attract partnerships and alliances with the Centre Pompidou, the Natural History Museum (UK), the National Cultural Center for Performing Arts (China), and Britain’s National Youth Theatre, just to name a few. Locally, though, the potential power of the brand has yet to be fully capitalized upon, as some offerings are branded as Saudi Aramco programs, and others bear the iThra tag. At present, the Cultural Center’s branding strategy is under development, and while the institution’s overall value proposition is well framed, it has not been officially launched and therefore not as yet systematically communicated amongst the Cultural Center’s key audiences, as demonstrated by Figure 27 in Chapter Four. As a result, the Cultural Center’s brand has played a minimal role in stakeholder engagement and participation activities.

2.6 The Role of Stakeholder Engagement

As we have seen, there has been an active approach to stakeholder engagement and participation at both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, as well as an understanding of the need to develop relationships with a wide range of individuals, groups and institutions both internally and externally. Some of these interactions are driven by the exigencies of day-to-day operations and activities, others by the need to secure permits and/or resources, still others by physical proximity, and yet other relationships that have been driven by longer term strategic considerations, including the future sustainability of the work of the research
team in Turkey and the knowledge and culture institution in Saudi Arabia. But there is a question of how much importance is given to stakeholder engagement and participation in each case, and how the theory and practice of stakeholder engagement and integration has been approached both at Çatalhöyük and at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture.

One key indicator of the level of importance that has been accorded to stakeholder engagement is the degree to which efforts to engage various audiences have been structured and sustained over time. In both case studies, the stakeholder engagements that have been most structured, most systematic, most intensive, most consistent and most long-lived are those with the authorizing entities that are the source of the “license to operate” (state authorities in the case of Çatalhöyük and Saudi Aramco management at the Cultural Center), the providers of financial resources (primarily corporate donors in the Turkish case and again Saudi Aramco management in the case of the Cultural Center), and those interactions that are mandatory under the terms of the AMP and related Turkish legislation at Çatalhöyük and in corporate regulations, guidelines and procedures for the Cultural Center. Otherwise, stakeholder engagement tends to be ad hoc, periodic, and of varying intensity in terms of both content and the efficacy of communications, as seen in the data from the Çatalhöyük case study site, see Figures 18 and 19 and Figure 29 in Chapter Four.

Thus the default case for stakeholder engagement at both Çatalhöyük and at the Cultural Center is in the form of opportunistic interactions based on either individual initiative or undertaken at the request of the other concerned party. As a result, many of the strongest stakeholder relationships at both locations are person-to-person rather than institution-to-institution, and while these are often high quality interactions in terms of communication, content and results, they are potentially vulnerable to turnover in personnel on either side. At Çatalhöyük, Ian Hodder, Sonya Atalay and the Visualisation Team have been the most active interlocutors with the widest range of stakeholders, and have particularly intensive relationships with members of the local community (including those employed at the site). All three have been associated with and active at the Çatalhöyük site for many years, and there is no doubt that
the overall research program has benefited greatly from their long tenure and intensive efforts over time. But if one or more were to leave the project for whatever reason, there is very little in terms of a system of procedures or institutional memory that would allow a successor to be immediately effective as a substitute interlocutor — and there is in fact no official succession plan in place to designate the next person in line who could both act as an understudy and serve to reinforce the stakeholder engagement benefits achieved to date through the assurance of continuity.

A similar dynamic prevails at the Cultural Center, where the director is generally the most visible and most active spokesman, ambassador and negotiator for the institution. It is true that various division heads (each of whom is responsible for a specific function or area of the Cultural Center's activities and programs) interact frequently with external stakeholders, including peer institutions, providers of materials and services, program participants and audience members, etc. But again, these are often driven by immediate operational or programmatic needs, are conducted on an individual and ad hoc basis, and are subject to degradation in the absence of a particular project champion or member of the Cultural Center's management team. As a result, the director plays the most important role in articulating and communicating the overall institutional value proposition and speaking on behalf of the entire centre.

Certainly the benefits of a systematic and sustained approach to stakeholder engagement and participation are clear: sustainability, consistency, focus on the important and not just the urgent, and the ability of new team members to step in and fill the vacuum should an incumbent depart. And yet there are benefits from the individualistic and ad hoc approach that prevails at both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center. Interlocutors can sense the passion of an individual representative or spokesperson more clearly than they can determine the institution's level of commitment — and in fact in both the Turkish and Saudi cultural contexts, individual engagement is often a prerequisite for a sense of institutional confidence. By the same token, many of the local stakeholder groups also operate on the basis of individual action and initiative and occasional rather than sustained engagement. Therefore,
there is some question whether a systematic and sustained approach to stakeholder engagement would be appreciated or reciprocated by many of the most important stakeholder groups; it is important to note at this point that where there is currently a systematic degree of activity in either case study, the counterpart entity (e.g., the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the local Conservation Council, Saudi Aramco management, etc.) is also bound by laws, rules, regulations and resource requirements to engage with the Çatalhöyük research team or the Cultural Center. In other words, these authorizing entities and resource providers are bound by the same requirements for systematic and regularly scheduled interactions as are applied to the two case study entities, and therefore the reciprocity of the systematic approach is assured. Otherwise, there are few enticements or coercive measures that the Çatalhöyük team or the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture can take to ensure that the party across the table (so to speak) will also adopt the same level of commitment and organization — and in fact the cases in which other external entities have attempted to engage on a systematic basis have not been met with a reciprocal degree of planning.

Furthermore, an individual-centred, *ad hoc* approach allows for the natural charisma, intellect and subject matter expertise of various leaders and professionals to shine through; in the end, both archaeology and cultural endeavours are a combination of team efforts and individual contributions, and there is real value in letting personalities come to the fore when dealing with various stakeholder groups. In addition, these spontaneous and *ad hoc* approaches are more adaptable to changing conditions, whether internal dynamics like new organizational priorities, funding and resource requirements or personnel changes, or external factors like economic conditions, changes in regulations, infrastructure developments, or in fact changing needs and desires among outside stakeholder groups. Systems and sustainability have their place, but so do spontaneity and selectivity.

This begs the question, though, of how stakeholder input, views, needs and desires are utilized in each of the case studies. Given the non-systemized nature of the engagement process itself, it should come as little surprise that the integration of stakeholder views is often fragmented in each of the case
studies; the degree to which the stakeholder groups feel they have influence over the two sites, and the mechanisms by which that influence can be exerted in the future, can be seen in Figures 17, 18 and 19 and Figures 28, 29 and 32 in Chapter Four.

At Çatalhöyük, there is no legal or administrative requirement to map or engage with stakeholder groups not identified in the AMP as part of the conservation process, unless they are owners of property or assets within the archaeological zone. This includes most members in the local communities that surround the archaeological site. Therefore, there is no legal necessity to maintain a system to integrate stakeholder feedback: as long as the Turkish authorities continue to issue permits to archaeological teams, they have the right to continue their research and excavations, regardless of stakeholder sentiment or interests. Turkish perspectives are thus much needed to contribute to the discussion on participatory archaeological resources management across the world.

Therefore, in terms of the way archaeological activities are conducted at Çatalhöyük, stakeholder attitudes are communicated to staff through on-site meetings: these are relatively minor concerns, such as the way staff dresses or behaves in local communities, that could create friction with local stakeholders. In addition, regulatory changes related to heritage management are also communicated in these meetings, and some of these may have an impact on institutional stakeholders, such as local museums that may receive artefacts from the site. Longer-term stakeholder concerns, such as local economic development, repurposing of infrastructure and facilities for community use, or the marketing of Çatalhöyük as a brand, are seldom communicated to staff and therefore not acted upon. As a result, there is considerable loss of opportunities and little momentum to achieve results that may positively impact local communities and build their confidence in the research team and the archaeological project as a whole. While the intentions of the research team are good, there remains room for more structured channels for communication, analysis and decision making related to stakeholder views.
At Çatalhöyük the CBPR project is very much a bottom up effort, yet it is undertaken by a team who are only available during the dig season. As a result, the engagement of stakeholders takes place during a relatively limited window of time, and is periodic rather than sustained. This is the same for the efforts of the Visualisation Team. Furthermore, the capacity building that takes place through the CBPR project has no real outlet, as there are no structured and systematic opportunities for local stakeholders to voice their concerns (other than during the surveys implemented at the choice of project team members), demand action on their priorities, or have their perspectives heard and acknowledged by those wielding power (whether that power accrues through official authority or through access to resources).

The stakeholder engagement project undertaken by the Visualisation Team has great promise, yet this is the type of engagement that needs to be expanded beyond providing more accessible site interpretation facilities by addressing larger socio-economic accessibility issues such as intellectual property rights, tourism development, etc. They require support from non-local stakeholders that can help set up local businesses; such regional or national companies or governmental departments that will help fund, or facilitate the development of local industries. For instance, Ian Hodder successfully lobbied a sugar company to donate computers to local schools, after community members brought this need to the attention of Sonya Atalay’s CBPR team. This demonstrates that these channels can be developed and activated to benefit all parties, and yet at the moment they remain tenuous and underutilized, particularly at a strategic level.

Furthermore, the ability to integrate stakeholder input is limited by the lack of a solid framework to articulate and activate these views with external decision makers and regulators, given the terms of the AMP. Even were a study of potential socioeconomic impact of the site on local communities completed, for instance, it would need to be communicated to a specific individual or team with the official regulatory power structure who could move it forward as an action, since there is no systematic framework for such an input. Without such an external “champion,” proponent or advocate, the odds of implementing such a proposal are limited — and the most effective proponents come from
the local or national power hierarchy. The mayors of Küçükköy and Çumra, for instance, have both engaged on issues such as road improvements leading to the site, with the road passing through Çumra being upgraded while that through Küçükköy remains underdeveloped, given the larger town’s greater political influence and capital.

There are instances where stakeholder interactions have been utilized in a strategic manner by the research team, enhancing the sustainability of the site over time. It is interesting to note that attempts to augment the protection of the Çatalhöyük site through greater stakeholder engagement have focused not on engaging and energizing local stakeholders as much as they have involved appeals to international bodies and public opinion. The Çatalhöyük research team actively led efforts (along with the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism) to win UNESCO World Heritage Site status for the site, so that the higher public profile and supra-national rules, regulations and criteria governing World Heritage Sites would help to safeguard Çatalhöyük for generations to come. Therefore, at a strategic level the opinions and perspectives of local stakeholders — those who might best be engaged in bottom-up engagement activities shaping the research project and site development — are of secondary importance and influence, and were judged to be less effective means of protecting the unique cultural heritage.

Mickel (2013, 2014, 2015) has performed some interesting work on the issue of integrating local knowledge into the official site research findings. For the last three years, she has undertaken interviews with 40 locally hired people who have worked at Çatalhöyük, to capture their memories of the archaeological practices and findings of the Çatalhöyük Archaeological Research Project and compare these stories to the formal excavation archives. The purpose of Mickel’s work is to “demonstrate how the site workers’ oral histories complement the archival record, providing additional and important information that is different from the multimedia databases created by the project since site workers have very rarely participated in the creation of any kind of documentation at Çatalhöyük” (Mickel 2015, 296). Ultimately, Mickel is trying to assess the role these site workers play in knowledge production at Çatalhöyük with the further aim of demonstrating
how crucial local team members have been to the production of knowledge about the past. Mickel (2013) also endeavours to show the particular perspectives locals have to offer the field of archaeology by occupying unique roles in the excavation process at Çatalhöyük as well as at other archaeological sites around the globe.

The interviews discussed the site workers' knowledge of the research methodologies employed at Çatalhöyük, how they learned to perform the jobs for which they are hired, the perspectives on the excavation they gain from occupying these positions, and their ideas about what they envision for Çatalhöyük after the current excavation ends (Mickel 2015).

Those interviewed in 2013 addressed decision-making processes, particularly with regard to site safety and related procedures and practices. They related stories of several accidents that had occurred on the project site, and went on to suggest precautions that would help to avoid or mitigate such incidents in future. The interviewees also described the ways in which they learned the processes associated with their jobs, and the details of these activities that might go unnoticed to someone who had never participated in them. In fact, Mickel (2014, 227) argues that this is the case for many of the activities or functions for which local team members are hired to assist, and "so despite extensive, flexible, and reflexive documentation strategies and publications there remains a large amount of the excavation methods that has gone unrecorded". Mickel (2013) also notes that oral history interviews represent a robust means by which these stages in the research process can be more fully documented, thus ensuring a more rounded understanding of how data were collected and analysed, and how knowledge about the past was created by the various participants who were actively engaged in the project. Too often, workers are hired to perform on-site tasks or labour and given capacity-building training for those activities, but their privileged perspectives as local inhabitants are not captured, analysed or integrated into the “authoritative” interpretation of the site or its past.

Anything happening in the labs, in particular, was seen as completely mysterious by nearly all of Mickel’s interviewees — and yet even common
elements in the excavation process (e.g., photography, unit sheets, and the washing of finds) were viewed as similarly mysterious (Mickel 2015). In fact, Mickel (2015) notes that some of her interviewees said that they were “not allowed” to take part in, or sometimes even observe, those basic elements within the excavation, documentation and research processes.

Despite the fact that many of the locals engaged on the project possess some degree of specialist knowledge, nearly everyone with whom Mickel spoke emphasized their ignorance rather than their knowledge about Çatalhöyük and the excavation process (Mickel 2013, 2014, 2015). Some stated that if another project director came to dig at Çatalhöyük, they would be unable to advise this person in any way, or to explain how research had been conducted previously. This clearly contradicts the fact that some were willing to advise on potential dig sites and safety measures. This could be the result of interviewees feeling they understood only part of the excavation and research process but could not comment on its totality, or it might be driven by a reluctance to pose suggestions to professional, trained archaeologists — which would be an indicator that the locals themselves denigrated the importance of the knowledge they possessed.

Instead, Mickel (2014, 229) notes that the locals were much more confident and comfortable sharing their knowledge of Neolithic lifeway, stating that their ancestors had lived similar lives: producing, storing, and cooking food; decorating their homes; and cleaning in the same way as ancient residents of Çatalhöyük had. In fact, one woman said that the houses in Çatalhöyük were “just like my house”. Even in cases where villagers no longer perform the same tasks, Mickel relates that “interviewees emphasized how recently these traditions faded from practice. ‘Even my mother used to grind grain,’ one woman told me, as well as, ‘we were still cooking in pottery when I got married. Now that we use tin it doesn’t taste as good’” (ibid, 229). This stated link to the past might be surprising, as it reinforces the notion that the village is simple (or even primitive) rather than modern and developed.

In point of fact, though, providing ethnoarchaeological information has been one of the more productive ways in which villagers have assisted the
Çatalhöyük researchers (Shankland 1999). One interviewee even participated in a video documentary posing as a Neolithic woman (Mickel 2015). Mickel (2015) posits it may be beneficial to local team members in terms of status or remuneration to present themselves as unmatched experts in the lifeway of the past. Such a dynamic may therefore complicate the ability to authenticate the information they provide, in that there could be ulterior motives for “producing” such insights.

Although Mickel has not yet published her datasets, within her analysis she states that her research has illustrated “the gaps in the scientific records kept by the archaeological team, as a result of this division of labour” (Mickel 2015, 297). To offer the potential of filling these gaps, during the 2015 excavation field season Mickel (2015) undertook an experiment: she selected a number of local site workers, armed them with still cameras, and asked them to capture the excavation process through photography. These individuals were given complete editorial freedom to capture what they felt were significant moments or images. Mickel then compared their images to the photographs taken by the site’s official documentation team (ibid). She believes this is one method by which local perspectives and insights can be better incorporated into the analysis (ibid). It should be noted that these photos are not designed to replace the “official” photographic record, but rather to complement and at times challenge the images and interpretations collected by the research team (ibid).

In regards to future activities at the Çatalhöyük site, the local members of the site team who had worked on the project the longest used their experience from previous seasons to suggest new excavation plots where the archaeologists could attend to find the most burials and artefacts — the elements of Çatalhöyük which hold the greatest interest and relevance for these local team members (Mickel 2013, 2014, 2015). When asked whether or not they were prepared to share these suggestions with future research team members who had never been to the site, they said they were concerned that such input would not be accepted or appreciated by these professional archaeologists (Mickel 2015). When Mickel went on to ask
whether they thought their ideas were likely to be implemented, nearly everyone offered disclaimers such as, “We can’t know the future” or argued that anyone seeking to develop the site should talk with (site director) Ian Hodder rather than them, even if they had worked on the project for many years and clearly possessed insights as a result (ibid).

At the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, given it is currently at its early stages of development, the findings of focus groups, visitor surveys, and other stakeholder engagement efforts are not communicated widely, because to date there are no avenues or forums for such information sharing or discussion of lessons learned at a scale larger than for “internal staff only”.

An exception to this general practice concerns the efforts of the library team to ensure its collection is suited to the needs of its users. These efforts included a reading trends research project to gage the reading practices of various age groups (e.g., how often and how long people read, whether they read in groups or individually, etc.), as well as their subject matter interests. These data, combined with an analysis of available titles in Arabic, are being utilized to select books for the library.

It must be noted here that as an energy company that is state-owned, Saudi Aramco does not have a base of individual or institutional shareholders with which it must communicate and negotiate, and its customer base is overwhelmingly composed of other large corporate entities rather than individual consumers, and most transactions are conducted on the basis of long-term contracts. Therefore, there are few mechanisms within Saudi Aramco as a whole to solicit the views of external stakeholders or to channel them into strategic or operational decision making; instead, long-term corporate objectives and operational practices designed to maximize efficiency and safety are the primary drivers of decision making.

Finally, there is the question of how stakeholder engagement is tracked, monitored and assessed. At Çatalhöyük, efforts to gauge the progress or benefits of stakeholder engagement activities have been limited to specific academic projects undertaken by individual researchers, and have focused
primarily on testing theoretical models, concepts and best practices, rather than feeding into cultural heritage management strategies or activities. Again, there are some regulations within the AMP that mandate the number and type of meetings that need to be held and the stakeholders that must be in attendance, yet there are no key performance indicators (KPIs) that track the impact of these meetings or the degree to which stakeholder views are assimilated and activated.

It should be noted that some quantitative measures could be considered as proxy indicators of engagement levels with various stakeholder groups. These include, for example, numbers of visitors to the site; numbers of participants in special events conducted by the research team; fundraising results among both domestic and international contributors; the ease of getting permits from various governmental agencies, including those at the local and regional level; and the amount and quality of media coverage in local outlets. Many, though not all, of these numerical indicators are tracked, and yet without a dedicated strategy and communications team to make sense of them, there is no systematic activation of these findings. This is also due in part to the fact that different individuals keep track of these indicators (e.g., site guards maintain visitor books and records, fundraising results are tracked by the financial liaison and the site Director, and assessment of media coverage is simply anecdotal) and there is little or no integration or analysis of these data.

A similar situation is in place at the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, in that formal key performance indicators related to stakeholder engagement are still under development. As at Çatalhöyük, there is no regulatory or legislative requirement to measure or report stakeholder engagement indicators; rather, the standard Saudi Aramco corporate KPIs are applied, and these are predominantly related to business results, resource utilization, and loss prevention (that is, health and safety) statistics. These KPIs are used for internal measurement only, and are not reported to outside agencies. Therefore, as at Çatalhöyük, proxy indicators stand in for more robust stakeholder engagement metrics.
Chapter Summary

This chapter compared and contrasted stakeholder engagement at both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, looking at the ways in which stakeholders are classified and categorized and the degree of importance that is accorded to stakeholder engagement as a function. The institutional value propositions that are used to attract and engage stakeholders have been identified, and the governance frameworks that regulate (and in certain cases mandate) stakeholder engagement have been described. The present and potential local economic impact of the two entities has been analysed, and the various stakeholder perceptions of that impact discussed. In addition, the impact on the physical space incorporating and surrounding the two case studies has been examined, as has the potential power of the Çatalhöyük and King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture brands. Finally, the role that stakeholder engagement and the knowledge and information gained form interacting with various audiences has been assessed.

All in all, it is fair to say that stakeholder engagement in the two cases is ad hoc and driven by individual interest and initiatives, rather than the product of a systematic, well-regulated and well documented process that is sustained over time. There is currently very little meeting between top-down and bottom-up approaches. As such, a sustainable model for stakeholder engagement has yet to be developed and introduced in either of the two case studies, but there is certainly fertile ground and strong strategic and operational justification for such an effort or initiative at both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center.

As a result, the following chapter will attempt to lay the foundations for a stakeholder engagement and participation model that is built for sustainability, meaningful exchange and capture of information and perspectives, the integration of stakeholder views into the work of the cultural site or cultural
heritage entity, and a systematic approach to the issues and drivers behind stakeholder engagement and participation.
Chapter Six: A New Model of Stakeholder Engagement and Participation

1 Introduction

This chapter will lay the foundations for a stakeholder engagement model that is built for sustainability, meaningful exchange and capture of information and perspectives, the integration of stakeholder views into the work of the cultural or cultural heritage entity, and a systematic approach to the issues and drivers behind stakeholder engagement and participation. As such, it looks beyond the stakeholder engagement process itself to identify factors such as power relationships, economic and social considerations, and the optimization of communications channels.

As noted in Chapter Two, Sections 2, 3 and 4, the academic literature captures examples of archaeological and cultural heritage sites where top-down and bottom-up stakeholder engagement strategies and efforts fail to connect, and where various systematic (rather than ad hoc) models for the sustained engagement and integration of stakeholder perspectives have yet to be fully realized or activated. These two realities are also noted as the most significant stakeholder engagement challenge at the two case study sites discussed in Chapters Four and Five. In addition, there are clearly lost opportunities to share best practices and common methodologies among such cases. This chapter aims to remedy this major challenge and create opportunities for shared best practice.

While the model is drawn primarily from my investigation and analysis of Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, it is designed to be applicable to any cultural or archaeological institution, regardless of size, location, mission, or area of responsibility. The model functions almost as a kind of compass for stakeholder engagement and participation: the findings and responses provided by the institution can then be used to determine courses of action, relative priorities, resource requirements, and structures,
systems and guidelines for stakeholder engagement. By using the model, insights can also be gained into the proper balance between a top-down and a bottom-up stakeholder engagement and resource management approach: while the first is often more efficacious in the short term, the second is required to ensure true sustainability and relevance to a wider group of audiences, and the model can help to identify an appropriate balance between the two.

Therefore, the model is analytical rather than predictive, and is designed to enable cultural and heritage resource management professionals to ask the right questions rather than to provide them with ready-made answers about stakeholder engagement. Furthermore, this model builds upon a wide array of academic studies, models and methodologies, as described in Chapter Two, Section 4.

As noted in Chapter Two, Section 4.5, a stakeholder participation model must make seemingly foreign practices more compatible with all local settings, and thus more acceptable to local communities (Kreps 2003), as well as the full range of stakeholders. Beritelli et al. (2007) speak of the need to define and develop universal rules and mechanisms that put together all of the actors involved at both institutional and business levels, in order to define a successful and competitive system which can deliver an effective strategy of development at all levels of the process. When translated into the cultural heritage sphere, the most fundamental motivation for making heritage management a more inclusive, participatory process is rooted in the acknowledgement that good governance efforts are greatly enhanced and sustained by the fair and equitable participation of key stakeholders. However, within the cultural heritage space, there is still little evidence of a stakeholder participation model that demonstrates links to sustainability and one that is also universal to all situations.

The proposed model builds on the three central features that Strand et al. (2003) identify as common across an inclusive model of professional work:
1) The notion of a collaborative enterprise between academic researcher and community members;

2) The democratization of knowledge through the validation of multiple sources of knowledge and the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination;

3) The underlying goal of social action for the purpose of achieving social change and social justice—an objective that may not be directly tied to the research aim of a given site, project or institution.

However, the proposed model goes beyond these three features because, as noted above, it looks beyond the stakeholder engagement process itself to identify factors such as power relationships, economic and social considerations, and the optimization of communications channels.

It is hoped that were this analytical model to be applied in various locations, it could form the basis for comparative studies which would add to the body of academic knowledge on stakeholder engagement, and illustrate that while engaging and listening to stakeholders is an imperative common to all cultural institutions and initiatives, the manifestations of that engagement are highly varied, and indeed unique to each case.

2 The Four Plus Four Model

The proposed stakeholder engagement model can be referred to as the “Four Plus Four Model”, see Figure 40. The first four elements are diagnostic in nature, and are designed to capture the essence of the institution or initiative, as well as the ecosystem in which it operates, the stakeholders with whom it engages, the regulatory framework that shapes it, and the socio-economic impacts it creates (both positive and negative).

The second four elements are prescriptive, in that they point the way toward meaningful and effective action based on the findings of the analysis or
diagnosis. These elements include a messaging and topics map to help develop meaningful content for stakeholder engagement; a channel map that describes the optimal media of communications; the capture, analysis, dissemination and integration of stakeholder feedback; and the tracking and monitoring of stakeholder engagement activities and impacts. This second set of four elements constitutes the stakeholder engagement strategy, and should take the form of actionable initiatives, programs and organizational frameworks designed to maximize the benefits of stakeholder engagement for both the institution and those with whom it interacts and affects.

Figure 40. Four Plus Four Model chart.
2.1 Mission Definition/Delineation

The first step in creating a meaningful framework for stakeholder engagement is to clearly and succinctly define the mission of the cultural site or cultural heritage institution itself. In fact, there are likely to be (at least) two primary missions for any institution or entity, termed here as the “noble mission” and the “practical mission.” The noble mission is the *raison d’être* of the institution, set by its key objectives. This might be the unearthing, cataloguing and analysis of an archaeological resource; the preservation and display of historical artefacts or artworks; the propagation of knowledge and information; or the development of artistic talent in the community, to name just a few possible examples.

2.1.1 Noble Mission

The noble mission of an institution may appear to be self-evident, even from the name of the entity: for instance, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art is clearly a museum where art is displayed. However, the devil may lie in the details: is a museum primarily devoted to the display of art to the general public, or the conservation and proper storage of artworks? Does the museum have an educational function, and what part of its noble mission is dedicated to creating a greater awareness and appreciation of art among different stakeholder groups? Even then, is its primary audience art lovers who already appreciate the institution’s holdings, or children who may not know much about fine art at all? Does the institution have an obligation toward lesser-privileged segments of the community where it is located? To what degree is it committed to interacting with international peer institutions? And of course, this leaves aside the question of the type of art it is devoted to collecting, preserving and displaying (e.g., contemporary artwork, Old Masters, art from a particular region or country, sculpture versus paintings and etchings, etc.).
Without a clearly defined noble mission, it is difficult to know where stakeholder engagement should begin and end, and therefore a shared and agreed-upon understanding of the noble mission acts as a kind of first principle for stakeholder engagement: without it, there is no clear direction or imperative for stakeholder engagement, and the institution will never be able to define “success” in reaching audiences if it does not know what it is trying to accomplish with them. A clear and shared definition of the noble mission also safeguards the entity from being subjected to the short-term or individual considerations of those entrusted with that noble mission; in other words, once the destination is defined and communicated, it cannot be changed on a whim. Therefore, the first question that must be answered in the model is: “Why do we exist, and what are we here to accomplish?”

Cultural institutions have complex roles, with multiple agendas, and need clear mission statements of primary functions.

This raises the question of who defines the entity’s noble mission. In some cases it may be straightforward: it is the donor who establishes both the institution and its mission, as in the case of an endowed university or charitable foundation. In other cases, the issue of who defines the noble mission is more diffuse, and there may be a number of individuals involved in the discussion and decision. In addition, the nature of an institution or entity may change over time due to either internal or external factors: in archaeology, for example, the main mission of any expedition in the 1920s or 1930s would have been the excavation and cataloguing of the archaeological record, most likely coupled with the repatriation of the finest artefacts to the sponsoring institution or museum; today, the mission will have shifted to universal access to materials and knowledge, the placement of the archaeological material in the existing sociocultural landscape, and the opening of interpretation to many different viewpoints and voices.

In most cases, though, it will be internal decision makers who determine and define an institution’s noble mission. And yet this mission cannot exist in splendid isolation from the expectations and perspectives of other concerned stakeholders. While a museum may be focused on the preservation and
display of historical items, other stakeholders may desire the institution to pursue community education, social and economic development programs, or the utilization of artefacts in religious or social ceremonies. Therefore, while the primary objective(s) of the institution may remain inviolate, there needs to be a consideration of the way in which the noble mission is achieved, so that stakeholders are either better aligned or at the very least placated. Otherwise opposition from various stakeholders who have objections on other issues or factors may jeopardize the successful achievement of the noble mission.

However, while some degree of negotiation on the way in which the noble mission is accomplished is a desirable element, too much negotiation runs the risk of what in the military is often termed “mission creep.” While the entity tries to remain focused on the achievement of the noble mission, stakeholder expectations cause its work, activities and initiatives to deviate from this objective, or add additional elements that may be desirable to influential audiences, yet do nothing to advance the entity’s core goals. This is often an insidious process, as the term “creep” implies, meaning that a clear definition of the noble mission is essential to avoid misalignment in the future.

Furthermore, mission creep often occurs following initial successes, as stakeholder groups become familiar with the institution’s capabilities or powers of influence, and therefore seek to use the institution for their own ends (even with the best of intentions). Since negotiations are by their very nature give-and-take affairs, those involved in stakeholder engagement must have both clear knowledge of the noble mission and a firm understanding of where the “red lines” related to that mission are drawn. Only then will they be aware of areas for negotiation and compromise and, conversely, where no compromise is to be considered.

As discussed in Chapter Two, Section 4.3, mission creep is possible with the PAR stakeholder participation model: PAR suggests a notion that stakeholder communities can take control of their cultural and intellectual heritage, with some external assistance, often without providing a systematic and critical assessment of the overall heritage governance structure (e.g., the legal and administrative framework, the hierarchy of power, and political, economic and
social dynamics at all levels) within which this reclamation of control is to be sustainably managed. Conversations with stakeholders will not always be smooth as they take place on contested ground, created by past appropriations and separations, and sometimes are informed by a legacy of outright conflict. Time will always be needed for confronting difficult issues, developing trust, and participating in the networking that is required of those who are committed to the communities. In this way, PAR takes as a given the desirability of incorporating “bottom up” views and perspectives—potentially at the expense of the effective implementation or internal coherence of the research project in question, or the sanctity of the noble mission, given that even the final objectives of the research are amorphous. In other words, if everyone gets a say on every issue, how are decisions reached and enforced? How often is these decisions revisited, and are they subject to revocation once the popular will turns? How can stakeholder views be balanced against the goals and objectives of state authorities, for example, given the inequities in decision making power that exist between the two groups? All of these questions represent a challenge for PAR, which is often promoted as a short-term alternative to research conducted over a long term. Furthermore, the relationship between the practices of PAR and the sustainability of a project, resource, or is social and economic benefits is not as yet clearly demonstrated within the cultural heritage field.

As was noted in Chapter Two, Section 4.1, while embracing the Polyphonic stakeholder engagement model Hodder (2002, 175-177) explains that archaeologists have an ethical responsibility to ask questions about the past that resonate with stakeholder communities, but that this also involves the archaeologists taking a stance with regard to how the data can be used to support arguments that are made by the interested parties (ibid). As per the Polyphonic approach, Hodder (ibid), recommends negotiating research questions with the various stakeholder groups who hold an interest in the cultural heritage resource: for the case of Çatalhöyük, these could be the questions posed by the local politicians regarding the lineage of the Çatalhöyük inhabitants to the modern day peoples of the Anatolian plain; questions posed by European politicians that visit the site regarding the
historical linkages of Turkey to Europe; questions posed by the international feminist/mother goddess groups regarding the role of women in prehistory; questions posed by the locals regarding land use in prehistory and the significance of the Konya plain as a location of choice for early settlers; and questions posed by artists regarding the prehistoric “art” at Çatalhöyük, its significance in history, and the inspiration it provides for contemporary art (ibid).

For instance, Hodder (ibid) notes that when the ambassador of the European Union visited the site, he made speeches to the press regarding the fact that there was no boundary between Europe and Asia at the time of the Çatalhöyük civilization. He referred to the evidence discussed with the Çatalhöyük project team for the existence of cultural contacts between central Anatolia and south-eastern Europe in the Neolithic period, taking from this “proof” of his view that “originally” Turkey was indeed part of Europe (ibid). This is in rather stark contrast to the local politicians’ views, and while the research team pointed out that based on current evidence, there are difficulties with the notion of a large-scale spread of Indo-Europeans associated with agriculture, the ambassador had already assessed the evidence through his own contemporary political lenses (ibid).

Understanding, accommodating and navigating amongst these various stakeholder agendas, and inequities and inequalities in interpretation and in decision making power, is very important if a polyphonic approach is to work; particularly as some groups will not be able to position themselves in the conversation on their own. This is where the Four Plus Four Model differs from the Polyphonic, yet adding to it, by articulating both a noble and practical mission, as discussed below.

2.1.2 Practical Mission

Simultaneously, the institution must define and consider its “practical mission,” which defines the objective by which its noble mission is to be achieved. More specifically, the elements of the practical mission must enable the entity
to achieve its noble mission, sustain its operations over time, attract and retain the necessary talent, obtain facilities and infrastructure, and track progress through meaningful indicators and metrics. If the noble mission is "why," then the practical mission defines the "how" of an institution operating in the cultural and creative arena.

Too often, the noble mission and the practical mission are seen as being in opposition, or at the very least the practical mission is seen as a distraction from the institution’s higher calling. And yet the practical mission, as well as its interim goals and operations, is essential for the achievement of the noble mission, and in fact can represent new and exciting pathways for the noble mission and a source of dynamic energy and momentum. The practical mission may also provide opportunities to give tangible expression to the intangible objectives of the noble mission, for instance through a building or facility dedicated to the pursuit of the noble mission, which in time may become an icon or symbol for that mission.

There is a similar dynamic at work among some leading arts and culture institutions, including museums and performing arts spaces. For example, the mission of New York’s Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts commits the institution to fulfil “three primary roles: world’s leading presenter of superb artistic programming, national leader in arts and education and community relations, and manager of the Lincoln Center campus” (Lincoln Center for Performing Arts 2015). Here the iconic nature of the Lincoln Center itself is not only acknowledged but integrated into the noble mission, so that the “practical mission” imperative of managing a facility becomes part and parcel of the noble mission. The power of the Center is also leveraged through the branding of many of the institution’s major programs, including Live from Lincoln Center, the Lincoln Center Festival, Lincoln Center Books, Lincoln Center Dialogue, Lincoln Center Out of Doors, Lincoln Center Education, and Lincoln Center Local. Here, “Center” signifies institution, facility and activity, creating a powerful synergy between the noble and practical missions of the entity.
Another broadly applicable manifestation of this dynamic is the creation of a sustainable and vibrant ecosystem to ensure the viability of the entity itself. A theatre requires actors, directors, producers, writers, musicians, back-of-house technicians, marketing and front-of-house services, set and costume designers and fabricators—and of course audiences willing to pay the price of admission. If the theatre’s noble mission is, perhaps, “to produce high quality theatrical experiences that provide new insights into the human condition”, this objective will not be possible if the necessary people, skills, resources and infrastructure are not available. In such a case, the pursuit of the practical mission is essential for the achievement of the noble mission. And yet by creating opportunities in the theatre for cultural professionals or even amateurs, the practical mission also gives these men and women theatrical experiences that provide them with new insights and perspectives—which is itself a restatement of the noble mission. Therefore, the two missions (noble and practical) should be seen as interrelated, intertwined and indeed inseparable, because it is through the practical mission that the noble mission finds expression, takes root, and provides opportunities for engagement, interaction and support from external and internal stakeholders alike.

Furthermore, while the noble mission is not up for negotiation and should not be subjected to constant change, the practical mission must by definition be pragmatic, and therefore has to be adaptable to changing contexts and scenarios. Indeed, when understood and actuated properly, the practical mission can help the institution proactively shape its surrounding ecosystem in the service of the noble mission.

For example, as discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, once the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture opens, there are new niche industries envisioned that will spring up as a result of the Cultural Center’s presence; for example, art handling companies, theatrical and audio-visual production firms, costumers and carpenters, and hospitality vendors and event management companies. In fact, this is one area in which the Cultural Center’s core mission and local economic development do intersect: the creation and enhancement of a local cultural creative industry. The degree to which various stakeholder groups support this goal can be ascertained in Figure 31 (in
Chapter Four). In part this is because such artistic and cultural industries have proven to be an essential component of knowledge societies elsewhere in the world, and in part this is so that the Cultural Center’s own needs can be met more easily and less expensively through a shorter supply chain, while also acting in alignment with Saudi Aramco’s own imperative to increase local content in its purchasing and procurement activities. There is also a role for in-Kingdom companies other than Saudi Aramco and other Saudi institutions to invest in these industries.

Of course, such proactivity is impossible without a solid appreciation of stakeholder concerns and interests or a strong network of stakeholder engagement, which is why interacting with audiences and integrating their perspectives and viewpoints can indeed be seen as “mission critical”.

Clearly the cultural entity’s business model is a major component of the practical mission, and disciplines or callings such as archaeology, art, culture and the development and transmittal of knowledge are not simply altruistic pursuits, but business. Too often, the business development function in cultural institutions is perceived by others within the entity as overly concerned with the bottom line, lacking an appreciation for the finer points of the noble mission—and even worse, reduced to attempting to quantify that noble mission and putting a dollar value on “culture”. This overly commercial mind-set rankles with some cultural and creative practitioners, even though as one bon mot sometimes attributed to H.L. Mencken says, “When I hear artists or authors making fun of businessmen, I think of a regiment in which the band makes fun of the cooks”.

This perception not only undermines the importance of the business development function and the men and women who are responsible for meeting the institution’s financial needs, but it also devalues the connections and opportunities for meaningful engagement that come through business and commerce. Few individuals in the community are capable of producing world-class art or breakthroughs in archaeological theory and practice, but nearly everyone can contribute in some form to a fundraising drive, and therefore feel like they are enabling the success of the institution.
Again, this is not to argue that the noble mission should be subservient to the practical mission, or that the altruistic objectives of the institution are open to negotiation or modification for commercial or practical benefit: this is not an auction. However, the model does reflect the need to clearly define both the noble and practical missions as well as their relationship to one another, the areas which are open for negotiation with external stakeholders to advance one or both missions, and the ways in which they can be synergistically linked. This exercise is the starting point for the model, and without these definitions and understandings, stakeholder engagement is like a ship without a rudder or a compass without a needle.

For instance, as discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, at Çatalhöyük the overall mission is centred on the discovery, excavation, interpretation and preservation of the archaeological material resource, and the development and distribution of the resulting knowledge; there is also a core theoretical and academic value proposition: to create, test and refine the science and discipline of archaeology and related fields (including, of course, the theory and practice of stakeholder engagement). At the same time, in its engagement with local residents, the research team has to demonstrate the potential economic value of the site, provide compelling reasons to preserve the resource even at the expense of other potential development activities, and inspire a sense of pride in the heritage of the region and its unique place in human history. The aspirations for the site in the future as captured in Figure 23 (in Chapter Four) shows the different priorities at work among the various stakeholder groups.

At the Cultural Center, the value proposition is based on being a catalyst for the development of a knowledge society, a platform to showcase Saudi talent and intellect, and to promote the development of original, “home-grown” knowledge and artistic products.
2.2 Stakeholder Map

The second step in the model is to define and map various stakeholder groups. The first stage in this step of the process is to identify various stakeholders according to criteria that are relevant to the institution and its work, with the understanding that some stakeholder groups may already be defined by policies and regulations (as an example, the Turkish Area Management Plan discussed above (Chapter Four, Section 2.4.2) identified key stakeholders as well as their respective roles in the decision making process, though these were often high level definitions, they were not exhaustive or comprehensive, and in practice there was some confusion as to implementation). Criteria might include considerations like proximity to the site or institution, age and gender, socioeconomic status, language, professional affiliation or discipline, nationality, circle of influence/share of voice, or educational level. Of course, these categories are not mutually exclusive and there will be a good deal of overlap and shared membership in these groups, and a 45-year-old Spanish-speaking female lawyer who lives within ten miles of the institution and maintains a blog about traditional music will fall into several of the above categories.

However, simply identifying categories of stakeholders is in itself insufficient, and tells us relatively little about the group, its relationship to the entity, or its relationship to peer groups. For that, there must be a mapping exercise in which each stakeholder group is analysed according to different factors.

First and foremost among those factors is the relationship of the group and its members to the entity itself. What interests of the group does the entity serve (or could it be made to serve), what benefits accrue to the group from a relationship with the entity, and what risks are entailed for the group from that relationship? In other words, why should the members of this specific stakeholder group care about the institution, or why would they wish to keep their distance?
Once these interests are understood, the degree of influence or power of the group must be assessed. This also involves looking at the power of key members of the group, whether these are identified leaders or simply influential members of the stakeholder faction. In particular, the institution must identify those stakeholder groups (or individuals with those groups) who have the ability to enable or ensure the entity’s success, or conversely, the power to block the entity from achieving its objectives. This might include financial capacity to fund projects or programs, regulatory power, the ability to shape public opinion through endorsement or condemnation, or even control over lands around the site of the institution or site which may facilitate or hinder access. Sometimes this will be a binary “pass/fail” consideration, where the stakeholder group can “make or break” the entity; however, it is more likely that the group will be able to exercise some degree of influence rather than absolute power. In this case, the entity needs to understand the degree to which each stakeholder group can facilitate or hinder the institution’s work and its progress toward achieving both its noble and practical missions.

As discussed in Chapter 5, Section 2, the authorization of the research team at Çatalhöyük (or the “license to operate”) is provided by the Turkish state, and more precisely by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism at the national level, and the municipal conservation councils at the local level. The engagement activities undertaken by the research team with these state actors is continual, intensive, focused on maintaining the team’s ability to perform its work on site—and most importantly they are mandatory. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism is also a provider of financial resources, but the primary resource-driven stakeholder relationships are with corporate sponsors, and here again there is a good deal of time and attention paid to maintaining positive relationships and continued access to funding.

For example, Figure 17 (in Chapter Four) demonstrates the high proportion of sponsors that have visited the site with comparison with other stakeholder groups. At the end of each funding cycle, in order to entice a continued collaboration, a bespoke business case is shared with each major donor, to demonstrate the company’s return on investment, the benefits of aligning its corporate reputation with the Çatalhöyük brand, and the prospects for even
greater benefits that will accrue from continued funding of the research project. Ties with academic institutions are also a focus of interest by the research team, since universities and museums provide some degree of funding, but more importantly, provide much of the human capital (e.g., archaeologists, students and administrators) and much of the customer base for the resulting intellectual and academic product. There is also an understanding that were discontent among the local community (which is a secondary group of stakeholders) to reach a crisis level, residents could exert influence on the all-important primary stakeholders described above: State officials and regulators may be forced to revoke permits and authorization, and a corporate donor will think twice before being associated with a controversial undertaking that is acting against the interests of locals.

At the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture for World Culture, while the specific identity of these primary stakeholder groups differ, their status is a function of the same calculus: the power relationship between the initiative/program team and the authorizing and funding entities that provide the program’s very lifeline.

Then, there must be an assessment of the current and desired levels of engagement with these individual stakeholder groups, ideally informed by the history of the engagement. That is, with which stakeholder groups does the entity want to maintain the closest and most intense engagement, which stakeholders need to be managed with a minimum of effort and resources, and which stakeholders need to be kept at a distance?

As noted in Chapter Five, Section Two, one key indicator of the level of importance that has been accorded to stakeholder engagement is the degree to which efforts to engage various audiences have been structured and sustained over time. In both case studies, the stakeholder engagements that have been most structured, most systematic, most intensive, most consistent and most long-lived are those with the authorizing entities that are the source of the “license to operate” (state authorities in the case of Çatalhöyük and Saudi Aramco management at the Cultural Center), the providers of financial resources (primarily corporate donors in the Turkish case and again Saudi
Aramco management in the case of the Cultural Center), and those interactions that are mandatory under the terms of the AMP and related Turkish legislation at Çatalhöyük and in corporate regulations, guidelines and procedures for the Cultural Center. Otherwise, stakeholder engagement tends to be ad hoc, periodic, and of varying intensity in terms of both content and the efficacy of communications, as seen in the data from the Çatalhöyük case study site, see Figures 18 and 19 and Figure 29 in Chapter Four.

Once the nature of the relationship between the entity and the identified stakeholder groups has been mapped, it is important to assess the power relationships, alliances or rivalries that exist among these different groups (and among individuals within groups). Where possible, the underlying drivers of those relationships should also be understood and the degree to which the entity can influence those drivers should be assessed. For example, two local communities in close proximity to a cultural site may share the same interests with the cultural institution in question, yet one is more powerful because its mayor is a member of the ruling party, while the second is led by a member of an upstart opposition group. In addition, these two communities may be in competition with one another for resources at the same time they are collaborating to achieve other ends. With that understanding, the entity is better placed to take appropriate actions and deliver relevant messages, information and value propositions. The stakeholder map would need to be a living document that registers the ever-evolving power dynamics of the stakeholder groups.

However, this is the time when the entity needs to refer back to its defined noble and practical missions, and to ensure that engagement with various stakeholder groups ultimately serves those missions rather than simply the interests of these groups. The entity may have a desire to reach out to disenfranchised populations and adopt an inclusive approach to its programming. However, alienating more powerful stakeholders may put the very existence and sustainability of the entity at stake, in which case the institution is in no position to achieve either its noble or practical missions. This requires some degree of objectivity and even cold-heartedness: one’s sympathies may lie with an underprivileged group in society, but if extending
aid to that group creates a backlash from more powerful players, then it may place the mission in jeopardy.

Again, these are not always binary/do everything or do nothing choices. Rather, understanding these power relationships, alliances and rivalries can point to methods or programs to serve multiple stakeholder groups, to bring groups together around shared interests rather than points of dispute, and to strike a balance between various groups. In some cases, this means creating alternatives to a zero-sum perception: in the hypothetical case of two rival local communities, for instance, the entity might wish to pursue a “regional development” proposal or scenario which adds value to both towns, rather than one prospering at the expense of the other.

Strict adherence to the noble and practical missions can also help an institution avoid being caught in the middle of a dispute that is peripheral to its real concerns (such as an archaeological site being dragged into debates over local economic development plans or a museum being asked to choose sides over curriculum development programs). The institution needs to “stick to its knitting,” rather than being pulled into side issues—since just as the institution has interests to pursue with various stakeholders, these different groups may wish to enlist the institution as an ally or point of pressure for its own issues.

The stakeholder map is already fairly complex, given that there are a series of stakeholder groups defined, a set of interests between each of them and the entity identified, and the relative power relationships and degree of affinity or aversion between them (and ideally, the drivers or motivations behind those relationships). And yet there is another facet that must be considered in the proposed stakeholder engagement map, and that is the set of other influencers that shape the perceptions and interests of these stakeholder groups. Stakeholders are not listening just to the entity or institution, even on questions related to the noble or practical missions. Instead, they may be gathering information or listening to the viewpoints of other entities or actors, whose interests and objectives may be in alignment with or opposition to that of the cultural institution.
For example, an archaeological research team may be stressing the need for sound environmental conservation methods to local landholders, while these landowners may also be approached by real estate developers, a commercial enterprise wishing to build a factory near their land, or a political party campaigning on a platform of indigenous land rights. The cultural institution needs to understand that in most cases the noble mission does not put food on the table, and that stakeholders have other interests or concerns of their own, as well as a range of other entities competing for the stakeholders’ time, attention, agreement or resources.

At this point, a sense of priority should become clear, with a greater understanding of which stakeholders must be engaged, which should be engaged, which could be engaged, and which are best avoided (sometimes because of outright enmity, but most often simply because of a lack of relevance or shared interests or values). However, there are two other factors in the stakeholder engagement equation that must be applied at this point for such engagement to be effective and meaningful; the regulatory framework and the socio-economic analysis.

2.3 Regulatory/ Legal/ Governance Framework

The first of these factors is an examination of the regulatory, legal and governance framework that applies to the institution or entity and its concerned stakeholder groups. This framework often supersedes other stakeholder considerations, because it is an extremely powerful, durable and sustained set of constraints or channels. For instance, stakeholders who might find common cause may not be able to collaborate with one another because of prohibitions established by legal or regulatory guidelines, or the hierarchy imposed by a certain governance structure. Legal and regulatory considerations may also skew or distort shared interests, so that common objectives on the ground may translate into competition or even conflict in a governance or legal setting.
This framework also has significant implications for resource availability and allocation, since governance considerations often dictate where money and other material resources are directed, and how personnel relate to one another, including the relative autonomy of individual decision makers and lines of reporting authority. For instance, to what extent does a research team leader have to answer to a local or national government official, or is a museum curator beholden to the chairperson of the board of trustees?

At the same time, governance structures affect not only internal relationships and power distribution, but could also redirect the noble and practical missions. A state-sponsored or supported institution may be asked to direct its energies into areas of interest to the ruling party, while a private organization may need to tailor its offerings to adhere to the needs of local business leaders, who provide the bulk of its charitable donations and grants.

The nature of regulatory frameworks is also important to consider. There are three broad axes that need to be considered. First, there is the degree to which regulations are fixed or malleable. Too often, out-dated rules, regulations and legislation remain on the books, meaning that institutions are not able to grow beyond the roles established for them by past decision makers working from then-current intellectual, cultural or economic conditions and perceptions. As such, the growth of social media, information technology and the privacy concerns they raise may be largely unaddressed in cultural or artistic legislation, leaving institutions in these areas starved for legal guidance. So while there may be legislation regarding the physical display of human remains, do those same regulations apply to digital models or images shared via the Internet, or computer mapping of human genomes, genetic codes, etc.? In addition, fixed regulations that are difficult to change may not take account of changing socioeconomic conditions among the populations they are designed to serve, nor are they welcoming of adaptation to best practices or success stories found elsewhere.

For example, as noted in Chapter Five, Section 2, the Cultural Center is a unique entity within the Saudi Aramco governance framework (unlike Çatalhöyük, which is one of many similar sites): although there are roughly
200 different departments within Saudi Aramco, there is no other cultural institution with which the Cultural Center is in competition. While this allows the Cultural Center to easily differentiate itself from gas processing plants, shops facilities and transportation organizations, for example, it also means that it is operating in a regulatory framework that was not originally established to take account of its unique needs and requirements. However, were the Cultural Center to one day be moved out from under the current governance framework provided by Saudi Aramco to fall under the regulatory constraints of, for example, a ministry department, the consequences could be different. An example of such a shift can be found elsewhere in Dhahran: the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals previously fell under the purview of the Ministry of Petroleum & Mineral Resources and was funded by this ministry; once it was moved to be the responsibility of the Ministry of Higher Education (which was later combined with the Ministry of Education), it had to compete with other universities in the Kingdom for funding.

The Cultural Center must be prepared and undertake due diligence and risk assessments for the possibility of governance shift so as it is prepared for such future developments.

Second, there is the question of specificity versus adaptability. Greater specificity in governance and regulatory structures provides stronger guidance and leaves less room for misinterpretation and mistakes. Specific legislation or regulation also provides a higher degree of predictability for cultural and archaeological organizations and institutions, which can be important in terms of resource availability and distribution, manning, and the provision of services. However, this also leaves less room for manoeuvre, meaning that an institution’s efforts may be devoted primarily to meeting the letter of the law rather than its spirit, or even achieving either the noble or practical missions of the organization. Overly ambiguous regulations or governance frameworks can be equally problematic, however, in that the steps necessary for adherence and compliance may not be clear, and the relative decision making power of various individuals and entities within the system may be unfocused. This can lead to duplication of authority or a situation where no one is clearly empowered to take action, leading to confusion, inefficiency and sometimes
outright conflict. As is the confusion among practitioners reported regarding the very top-down Area Management Plans dictated by the government for all archaeological sites in Turkey; see Chapter Four, Section 2.4.2.

For example, as discussed in Chapter Four, Section 2, the governance framework at Çatalhöyük can be characterized as more varied, more subject to interpretation by various actors, and providing relatively more space for manoeuvre within the legal framework, particularly the Archaeological Management Plan established by the Turkish state. By contrast, the Cultural Center operates within a more tightly controlled and more uniform governance structure, albeit one designed for a global scale energy company than for a knowledge and cultural institution. This is the result of the Cultural Center being developed as a line organization in an already well established industrial and commercial enterprise, rather than undergoing organic growth as is the case at Çatalhöyük.

The third aspect of regulatory frameworks is the degree to which decision-making authority is centralized or dispersed. Highly centralized decision making power can be efficient and highly focused on big-picture outcomes, yet also distant, out of touch with conditions on the ground, and insensitive to stakeholder demands and perspectives. Highly diffused decision-making structures place authority closer to individual projects and sites, but may also result in fragmentation, a patchwork quilt of practices and regulations, and the forfeiture of economies of scale in terms of resource development and allocation. This leads to duplication of effort, undesirable competition, and the possibility of unfair advantage or corruption (all of which could conceivably be found in a function such as fundraising, for instance, where each local authority is competing for the same donor’s dollar). This is a situation that could be experienced in large companies that have many social development initiatives, and without clear coordination the departments responsible for each initiative may reach to the same donors for funding with little knowledge of the same efforts by the other departments. And while centralized authority may impose standards that are adverse to specific cases or sites, diffused decision-making may create pockets of lower standards that do not meet the
expectations of national authorities or professional disciplines (e.g., the preservation of the archaeological record or of artistic works).

Therefore the model must capture the realities of the regulatory and governance systems in place in two ways. The first is to map the power relationships, reporting structure, and relative autonomy of each player. This map would capture economic/resource relationships (where the money and materials are coming from), decision-making processes and structures (who has oversight over whom, and how is that authority exercised), how oversight is enacted (auditing and reporting mechanisms or access to financial records, for instance), and how information, ideas and perspectives are captured, transmitted, recorded and acted upon (for example, who is entitled to speak to whom, and how much weight are their views given). The time element of these various relationships also needs to be captured where possible, such as terms of office for an advisory board, periodic reporting requirements, the duration of legislative actions, etc.

The second tool to capture the impact of regulatory and governance frameworks are a set of three continuums: durability vs. malleability, specificity vs. adaptability, and centralization vs. diffusion. For ease of use and comprehension, these continuums can simply be line graphs, with various aspects of the regulatory, legal and governance frameworks plotted against them.

Taken to the next level, both the map and the continuums could plot trends toward changing conditions: for example, is the regulatory framework growing more decentralized over time, and how fast? Is the power of resource holders being eroded by the advent of additional revenue streams—and again, how quickly is that trend being manifested? Capturing that trend allows a cultural or research institution to anticipate future movement and take either corrective or defensive action in advance of the trend, or seek to accelerate or reverse the trend in light of its own interests and objectives. The map and continuum then become more than just snapshots of current conditions, or even dynamic registers of trends and movements: they become powerful planning tools and
even media of communication at a strategic (and arguably philosophical) level.

2.4 Socio-Economic Analysis

The last element in the model that captures current conditions and future trends is a socio-economic analysis of the surrounding ecosystem. This is a relatively straightforward examination of the positive or negative impact that the institution or site has on the surrounding community, economy, cultural values and norms, and spatial organization. The site may bring economic benefits to some stakeholders while threatening the prosperity and livelihood of others, and those divergent results and impacts need to be captured in the model.

Baseline data need to be captured first, however, so that the projected impacts and their magnitude can be computed, and then their actual impact on the ground measured over time. This analysis must be tied very closely to the stakeholder map described above, because most of these impacts will be exercised on a specific group or groups. Understanding the nature of those impacts must be combined with insights into the stakeholder map if desired outcomes are to be realized and unintended consequences avoided. For example, a site may be projected to increase commercial opportunities for service-oriented businesses, but will the beneficiaries of those opportunities be local entrepreneurs or big business interests from outside of the region who snap up these new market openings. This then brings the regulatory framework into play, since many of these benefits/drawbacks are best managed through regulations or legislation.

The baseline data would be captured at various levels, and related directly to the activities, or development that the project wishes to track and monitor. The baseline data could range from polling visitor attitudes to capturing data on the economic contribution of the heritage or creative sector on the national economy. Such data gathering could be extensive and deplete resources quite quickly; therefore the site or institution will need to be precise in
articulating what it wishes to measure in regards to understanding its socio-economic impact, and how it proposes to measure this.

For both the Çatalhöyük and King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture cases, baseline data to aid the analysis of their socio-economic impact are as yet insufficient. This data collection has been undertaken by past student researchers on the Çatalhöyük project, however the results are not widely shared. For the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture, it is yet to start. Generally speaking, within Saudi Arabia, data regarding the overall contribution of the creative industries, such as the arts, media, entertainment etc., to the national GDP are minimal – particularly if we are to compare the output to the annual reports that are produced by the British Council or the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in the UK. This baseline data will be fundamentally important for the Cultural Center to measure its development toward achieving its noble mission. Similarly for Çatalhöyük, baseline data (in a living document and not simply a snapshot by one research student or research team) will be incredibly important to understanding and promoting the socio-economic role of a high-profile site like Çatalhöyük to the region. Systemizing the Çatalhöyük tourist visitor data collection process is a worthy effort in capturing visitor trends (as noted in Chapter Two, Section 4.3). However, this data and its interpretation will remain in limbo unless it is meaningfully tied to a larger dataset – for example, the tourism trends in the region, or the economic benefit to the region/city of tour bus groups.

This need was also noted in Chapter Five, Section 2. While the stakeholder engagement project undertaken by the Visualisation Team at Çatalhöyük has considerable promise, this type of engagement needs to be expanded beyond providing more accessible site interpretation facilities and to address larger socio-economic accessibility issues such as intellectual property rights, tourism development, etc. They require support from non-local stakeholders that can help set up local businesses; such regional or national companies or governmental departments that will help fund, or facilitate the development of local industries.
Therefore, as a whole Çatalhöyük has relatively limited and very seasonal local economic benefits for local stakeholders. Most stakeholders would like to see this state of affairs change. According to Figure 23 (in Chapter Four), only the research team and the State personnel identified as their primary interest in the future of the site, continued archaeological research; other stakeholder groups were keen to note their interest in tourism development. On the other hand, there is an economic impact that is seen by locals as largely negative, and that is permanent: a sort of economic exclusion zone designed to protect archaeological sites that have not yet been excavated or explored. As a result, certain lands are off-limits to local farmers, cannot be used for roads or pipelines, and are not eligible for use as industrial or manufacturing sites. The limits of this area has been determined by the Conservation Council through an inventory of the various mounds in the area, but at the moment there is not enough funding available to determine the archaeological significance of the various mounds, and therefore whether they should be preserved as is, preserved via excavation and record, or made available for economic development by lifting the current degree of protection. The plans for a larger archaeological park, however, may greatly extend the boundaries of the preservation area, and will in any case raise the significance of each individual mound already under protection because it will become part of a larger archaeological zone, similar to the way in which an individual stream or hill takes on greater importance if it is part of a national park. There are already infrastructure developments taking place, and any increase in the size of the protected area is likely to bring the project into conflict with local economic actors who favour even further development. And while a larger archaeological park or zone may attract more visitors, it is difficult to justify such a measure on purely local economic grounds, given the relatively small numbers of tourists who currently visit the site (see Figures 15 and 16 in Chapter Four).

For each of these development possibilities there are both positive and negative impacts that could only truly be examined through capturing baseline data. This data could then add power to the lobbying of the protection of a site within a regional park, or in some cases, the protection of a village from the
damaging side-effects and pace of mass tourism, and in other cases, the reconciling of conflicts between a local village and local town within a larger regional development plan that will benefit both of these areas.

What then, of the impact on Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center from local economic development? For Çatalhöyük, more intensive and sustainable local economic development could generate funds for the long-term protection and development of the site, and engage the local community and demonstrate an economic value for the site and its preservation. Given that one day the research team will leave and hand responsibility for the site over to a national, regional or local team, positive economic benefits could be a major enticement to protect, preserve and promote the archaeological site (for the views of various stakeholder groups on the future management of the site, see Figure 22 in Chapter Four).

For the Cultural Center, the attraction of a steady stream of visitors to the facility is an essential element in achieving its transformative mission. While the Cultural Center’s offerings will be the main draw, there is no doubt that visitor numbers will also be influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the amenities on offer for tourists: is there a first-class hotel nearby, how easy is it to get to and from the Cultural Center and the airport, are there facilities in the community for people with special needs, etc.? Therefore, the Cultural Center will have a vested interest in ensuring the availability of such services and facilities, though it would need buy-in from, and to collaborate with, the various responsible ministries to shape such a development.

In both cases, there is a need to balance the desire to use local economic development as an enticement for the engagement of local communities and the long-term sustainability of the institution’s core mission on the one hand, and being entangled in potentially controversial economic planning and development issues or local conflicts and disputes among economic or regulatory powers to the detriment of the institution’s work and interests (the future visions that stakeholders have for both sites can be seen in Figure 23 and Figure 31 in Chapter Four).
There is one other economic issue or question that faces both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture: what are the costs, benefits and risks of greater commercialization of each site? Thus far, this issue has not been systematically analysed or addressed at either site, let alone plans or strategies developed and implemented. Greater commercialization could increase the scope and scale of opportunities for stakeholder engagement by permitting a wider variety of economic actors to be directly involved in the life of the site or institution. However, commercialization could also represent a distraction from the institution’s core mission, given the amount of time and effort required to market and manage these commercialization opportunities on an on-going basis.

It is also important not to overlook the spatial element of various plans, programs and initiatives, because “space” seldom has an advocate, and yet spatial dissonance and disconnection, as discussed in Chapter Two, Section 3.1, can have a powerful negative impact. For example, a fence constructed to better preserve an archaeological site may hinder the movement of flocks or herds, thus creating a good deal of resentment among local farmers and ranchers, considerable negative economic impact to local families, and a disruption of longstanding social conventions and even organizational patterns in a society linked to the movement of livestock. Thus an initiative undertaken with the best of intentions (preservation of the archaeological resource, which is fundamental to the noble and practical missions) ends up creating considerable negative impacts—and pushed far enough, herdsmen may simply tear out the fencing and allow their animals to graze on the site itself. The many negative consequences of spatial dissonance and their real life examples are explored in Chapter Two, Section 3.1.

Also, as discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, the ability of local stakeholders to make their voices heard in these spatial determinations has been limited: at Çatalhöyük the decisions about extending and preserving protected status ultimately fall to the Conservation Council based on input from the research team, while at the Cultural Center, the land that would host a cultural creative hub or zone around the Cultural Center already belongs to Saudi Aramco so the company will be the ultimate arbiter as to its use. The degree to which...
local residents feel they are able to influence decisions about the future of the two sites can be seen in Figures 20 and 21 and Figure 29 in Chapter Four.

Therefore, it becomes clear that the various elements within the model—mission delineation, stakeholder mapping, the regulatory/governance framework, and the socio-economic analysis—are all interrelated and must be approached in a holistic manner. Synergies among these various elements can be identified and encouraged, while discrepancies or conflicts among them minimized and addressed. These connections allow for a broader understanding of elements like commercialization, for example, which have impacts well beyond the economic and which may need to be mitigated or encouraged to extract the greatest possible benefits while doing the least amount of harm. Such “win-win” solutions will also be more sustainable over time, because they have a larger number of beneficiaries and supporters, and create greater loyalty and allegiance among various stakeholders, whether regulators, investors, donors, local community members, or even internal staff.

2.5 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

Once the first four elements of the “Four Plus Four Model” have been captured and analysed, there is a need to put that learning into practical action, and leverage those insights in meaningful and effective ways in the day-to-day activities of the institution, site or project. Therefore, the second set of four elements constitute the basic building blocks of a stakeholder engagement strategy, and point the way toward specific programs, measures and touch points to energize the stakeholder engagement function.

As with the noble and practical missions, these strategies must be based on a clear set of objectives, and these in turn should serve to support one or both of the missions themselves. These strategy elements must also take account of the contours of the stakeholder map (with the understanding that these relationships are dynamic and subject to constant change and realignment), the constraints and structure of the regulatory and governance framework,
and the socioeconomic landscape. To ignore any one of these facets of stakeholder engagement and organizational structure is to run the risk of wasting efforts, appearing irrelevant, or causing actual harm to those stakeholders the institution is working to benefit.

It is also important to note that while the first four elements can be addressed concurrently (though it could be argued that the noble mission at the very least must be defined and agreed upon as a matter of first principles), the second four elements must be approached consecutively, in that each element builds on the previous step.

2.6 Messaging/ Topic Map

The stakeholder engagement strategy begins with the development of a messaging or topic map. This is a matter of looking at each stakeholder group and the interests it holds in the initiative or institution, and then determining the proper content, information and messages to be delivered to that group in support of the noble and practical missions. As such, the messaging/topic map must be formed through the interplay of the two parties: the issuing institution and the receiving stakeholder. This may be a formal dialogue or discussion, but in most cases it simply entails the institution examining the information and insights it has about the stakeholder group and adapting messages accordingly. As such, the message content is not entirely in the control of either party to the conversation: one has a topic it wants to address, but has to do so in terms that are meaningful, relevant and acceptable to the other interlocutor.

Perhaps the most significant message to be communicated to any stakeholder group is the overall institutional value proposition for that specific cohort, in a manner that ties back into the noble mission, the practical mission or both, and yet is mindful and respectful of the stakeholders’ needs, aspirations and worldview. This is simply an expression of what the institution means to the stakeholder, why the stakeholder should care, and what the stakeholder should expect from the institution. This is likely to be very rich and
detailed when dealing with primary stakeholders who share a good deal of interests with the institution, are emotionally or financially invested in its success, and have a number of ways to interact with and even influence the institution. In the case of secondary or tertiary stakeholders (as determined by the stakeholder map), the value proposition is likely to be more limited, or even mono-dimensional, simply because the range of interests and the benefits on offer are more limited.

Therefore the value proposition for each stakeholder group must be bespoke and specific if it is to be meaningful and effective: the value proposition of an archaeological site for a prospective corporate donor will be very different from that posed to a government regulator, much less to a local craftsman, farmer or merchant. That is not to say that the noble or practical missions need to be altered or adapted; rather, it is the way these missions are presented that must be thought through and handcrafted for each group. There is a useful analogy of a mountain on a plain: the mountain itself does not change shape, but its contours, topography and silhouette will look very different to individuals standing at the four cardinal points of the compass who see only the northern, eastern, southern or western faces of the mountain. Similarly, different aspects of the noble and practical missions should be presented to each stakeholder group so that the institution is not only relevant and understandable, but perceived as a desirable partner in dialogue and shared activities and interests. There must also be credible plans in place to activate these value propositions once they are delivered, including, for example, ways to build local capacity, create new educational or economic opportunities, or integrate stakeholder perspectives into institutional planning and programs.

Moving on from the basic value proposition, the messaging needs to encompass information that will move each stakeholder group in the desired direction—or in the case of antagonistic groups, will help to neutralize their opposition. This requires a thorough understanding of what the site or institution needs from each stakeholder group: for a donor, the information should serve to open up the chequebook, while for a local farmer, it might need to stress the importance of preserving land rather than cultivating it.
There is a need to articulate benefits and minimize negative impacts in the communications—though this should never be done by compromising the truth, or delivering disinformation. It is in some ways a marketing communication, in which the institution and its mission are “sold” to the stakeholder group in question, in return for their support and engagement.

As discussed in Chapter Two, Section 4.3, as part of the PAR model: The Yapi Kredi-Sponsored Exhibition was designed to convey, through community-themed panels and a digital slideshow of images, the local and non-specialist involvement at the Çatalhöyük archaeological site over time. The focus was on the Çatalhöyük archaeological project team of past and present. Through a “behind the scenes” view of the site, such as the lab processes, the excavations, and community contribution in the form of labourers, cooks, etc., the Visualisation Team wanted to dissolve the mysteries of the archaeology project as well as presenting the contribution played by various stakeholders.

As demonstrated by this project, the PAR stakeholder participation model documents the multiplicity of values a place or an object holds for people who have cared for it in the past, and in the present. This can be understood through the combining of archival information with archaeological data, oral histories, and information on land-use practices, to integrate all available layers of knowledge and values associated with a place.

However, it is important that the institution does not overpromise, or raise unrealistic expectations among stakeholders. This applies not just to material benefits or access to the site or programs, but even to the degree to which stakeholder perspectives will be integrated into the institution’s planning and activities. For example, conducting a visitor survey in conjunction with an exhibition or performance implies that the input received will be used to make changes or improvements to the next such event. If the intention all along is to continue to stage events in the same way regardless of visitor feedback (for example, the need to admit a certain number of visitors to ensure profitability or to stage displays using certain structures to adhere to fire and safety standards), then expectations among recipients have been unfairly raised.
This is also related to the sustainability of engagement with each stakeholder group. Primary stakeholders will always command the lion's share of stakeholder engagement bandwidth because of their importance to the lifeline of the institution. However, there will need to be a determination of the appropriate level of engagement for each secondary and tertiary stakeholder group, given the finite nature of time and resources available to hold these conversations. There needs to be a strategic allocation of stakeholder engagement activities to provide optimal benefits to the institution and each stakeholder—and in fact some tertiary stakeholders may not desire too frequent or too intensive interaction, as their interest in the institution may be minimal to begin with. Beginning with an unrealistic degree of engagement may result in hard feelings later, as stakeholders feel abandoned or marginalized after the first wave of contact.

In addition, the messaging map will need to balance long-term interests with short-term requirements. It may be a productive strategy to engage with stakeholders in relatively tactical, short-term issues at the beginning, in order to build trust and credibility, to better establish lines of communications and learn more about working styles and expectations. These elements can then be leveraged when tackling more strategic issues that play out over a longer period of time. However, there is a danger that the dialogue never moves past the here and now and on to the later and important, minimizing the effectiveness and benefits of the engagement function.

There is also a need to consider the relative importance of a strong brand for the institution, initiative or site, and the degree to which stakeholder engagement and integration can help build that brand. The benefits of a strong brand for a site like Stonehenge are clear (Bender, 1998): name recognition, visitor numbers, a place in popular cultural as well as academia, and even a sense of national identity and heritage. Would Çatalhöyük, for example, benefit from a similarly strong “brand” in the Turkish context, and if so, what is an appropriate resource spend to build and maintain that brand?

Stakeholder perceptions and touch-point experiences are vital to the health and credibility of any strong brand, and therefore stakeholder engagement and messaging become vital tools in brand. Brand also implies the need for a
brand governance framework and ownership/intellectual property rights, which must also be worked into the calculus. As noted in Chapter Four, Section 4.1.1, the most impactful brand building activities of Çatalhöyük are as yet ad hoc and implemented predominantly by the engagements of the site Director with the VIP guests he hosts at the site, the presentations of Çatalhöyük he undertakes at industry conferences, and his annual engagement with the media. Without a clear governance structure, the Çatalhöyük brand also has created a vacuum of power whereby the local village competes with the local town over the use of the brand.

As discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, there is an on-going dispute about the ownership of this locally powerful brand, with both Küçükköy and Çumra vying for control and “ownership” of the Çatalhöyük name and reputation. In point of fact, legal ownership and branding rights to the name have not been definitively decided, and intellectual property rights and registration is a grey area: for instance, could a local businessman open a “Çatalhöyük Café” or a “Çatalhöyük Travel Agency”? What about products branded with the name destined for the tourist trade? At the moment there is no controlling brand ownership structure in place to resolve such issues. Also, as one of Turkey’s best known archaeological sites, there are tangible benefits that accrue to the brand, including the attraction of qualified young researchers, more enticing sponsorship opportunities for donors, and access to the corridors of power that comes with greater name recognition.

In addition, both Çatalhöyük and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture have had to continually refine, update and revise aspects of their value proposition depending on the changing sentiments of various stakeholder audiences, varying levels of interest, and shifts in the social and economic environments. Individual stakeholder groups are dynamic in their own right, as constituent members leave and arrive, roles shift, new opinion leaders and decision makers emerge, and internal power relationships are accordingly altered. Just as important, though, is the constantly changing balance among various stakeholder groups, and shifting patterns of rivalry, alliances, and confluence of views and interests. Figure 22, in Chapter Four, for example,
captures the rivalry and competition between Çumra and Küçükköy, as residents of both villages see a role for their own local officials in managing the site in the future—to the exclusion of the other village/town. Although a specifically tailored value proposition may be offered to one group, that doesn’t mean that other stakeholders are not also “listening in”: for example, promises of economic development made to one group may not be easy to square with pledges of environmental preservation extended to another. This means that the institutional value proposition for both Çatalhöyük and the Cultural Center is constantly in flux, not in terms of its basic promise or orientation, but rather in light of its details, the emphases placed on one element or another, and the communications means used to articulate and communicate the proposition to different audiences.

Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, the ability to integrate stakeholder input is limited by the lack of a solid framework to articulate and activate these views with external decision makers and regulators, given the terms of the Area Management Plan. Even were a study of potential socioeconomic impact of the site on local communities completed, for instance, it would need to be communicated to a specific individual or team with the official regulatory power structure who could move it forward as an action, since there is no systematic framework for such an input. Without such an external “champion,” proponent or advocate, the odds of implementing such a proposal are limited—and the most effective proponents come from the local or national power hierarchy. The mayors of Küçükköy village and Çumra town, for instance, have both engaged on issues such as road improvements leading to the site, with the road passing through Çumra being upgraded while that through Küçükköy remains underdeveloped, given the larger town’s greater political influence and capital.

The language used for the messaging is key too. It is important to understand the impact on the audience of not just the message, its medium, but also its delivery – the tone or voice to be used.
As discussed in Chapter Two, Section 3.3, the language used in cultural heritage management practices shape not only our conceptualizations of the past, but also social relations of power in the present. Collaboration is at base conversation - a flexible interchange about stakeholder needs and perspectives until mutual goals take shape (Meskell 1998, 2005), and if language is power, then progressing forward to a common language is an important way of advancing toward a shared authority. Ultimately, the degree of understanding is related to the amount of effort that is applied, but also to the quality of that effort (Pyburn 2000), so all collaborators must be aware of the inclusive and exclusive nature of language, and the way that language has the potential to be divisive and to deceive (Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006).

2.7 Channel Map

Once the messaging map has been determined (that is, a set of topics and information identified for each stakeholder or stakeholder group), a channel map must be created to ensure the effective, efficient and timely delivery of those messages. This map answers the questions of what avenues, forums, tools and touch points are available to deliver this information, and which of those channels will be most effective in furthering the stakeholder conversation.

This will be determined by examining the following considerations: which channels are mandatory (e.g., for example, required by government laws or organizational by-laws, such as an annual financial report) and which are discretionary (for example, an open house, newsletter or Facebook page for local residents)? Are there channels that are inappropriate for certain cultural reasons (such as mixed-gender meetings) or logistical considerations (low levels of literacy, different language groups, or relative familiarity with information technology)? What is the proper balance between intensity and coverage (for example, a billboard may register a large number of impressions, but the value of that interaction is extremely limited, while an
hour-long town hall meeting will be intensive and interactive but reach a relatively small number of participants)? In addition, what resource costs are associated with different media or channels, whether financial, time-related, call on expertise, or use of facilities and physical assets? Also, which channels enable two-way communication and a sharing of views (dialogue) and which are limited to one-way delivery of information and messages (broadcast)?

As with message map development, the channel map is not determined solely by either the institution or the stakeholder group; the institution must understand how different audiences receive, process and disseminate information, what channels they have access to, and how they relate to information intellectually or emotionally. By the same token, institutions must consider their own ability to use different channels, their proficiency and effectiveness using different media, and the resource restraints that apply to communications media, including the need for review, authentication and approval of information prior to release.

Finally, there has to be recognition that information targeted at one stakeholder group is likely to be “overheard” by other stakeholders, who may not share interests with the primary target group. Very few channels are confidential, so what is said to one group will almost invariably be shared (intentionally or unintentionally) with others. Therefore, a letter sent to a large local business concern regarding local land use will probably find its way to government regulators, local landowners or farmers, or possibly environmental activist groups. At the same time, every stakeholder has access to information and messages being delivered by other parties, so the institution’s message and medium is simply one voice in a much larger conversation, and the degree to which that message is credible and compelling will go a long way toward determining its effectiveness in claiming share of voice.

As discussed in Chapter Five, Section Two, at Çatalhöyük access to the archaeological site is highly controlled and designed to keep local community members out, unless they are chaperoned by a site guard. In Chapter Four,
the Figure 17 shows that relatively few members of local communities access
the site, while Figure 18 underscores the important role the site guards
perform as interlocutors and “ambassadors” for the project to local community
members.

The local villagers receive much of their communication from the site guards,
therefore the guards have a significant role in the communication and
understanding of the projects core and sub messages – and will need to be
trained/ involved in order to understand the significance/ consequences of
their role and deliver on their role. The messages to be delivered by the
guards would be one key element of the overall messaging map.

Therefore, in terms of the way archaeological activities are conducted at
Çatalhöyük, stakeholder attitudes are communicated to staff through on-site
meetings: these are relatively minor concerns, such as the way staff dresses
or behaves in local communities, that could create friction with local
stakeholders. In addition, regulatory changes related to heritage management
are also communicated in these meetings, and some of these may have an
impact on institutional stakeholders, such as local museums that may receive
artefacts from the site. However, longer-term stakeholder concerns, such as
local economic development, repurposing of infrastructure and facilities for
community use, or the marketing of Çatalhöyük as a brand, are seldom
communicated to staff and therefore not acted upon. As a result, there is
considerable loss of opportunities and little momentum to achieve results that
may positively impact local communities and build their confidence in the
research team and the archaeological project as a whole. While the intentions
of the research team are good, there remains room for more structured
channels for communication, analysis and decision making related to
stakeholder views.
2.8 CADI: Capture, Analyse, Disseminate and Integrate

The third element in the stakeholder engagement strategy can be referred to as “CADI,” denoting the “Capture, Analysis, Dissemination and Integration” of the information, ideas, insights and data collected from the stakeholder engagement and participation process. The act of stakeholder engagement does have value in and of itself, because it demonstrates that the institution considers that stakeholder group worthy of attention and interaction, and acknowledges its position in the ecosystem. However, the real value of stakeholder engagement comes only when the insights and understanding it produces are leveraged within the institution, initiative or research project.

This stage or element on the Four Plus Four Model addresses the issues of “how do I handle the information, data and views that I get from engaging with other individuals and entities, and how do I extract value from this work?” Capturing or collecting data is a relatively straightforward process, though it does require thought about the methodology and format(s) in which data will be collected, categorized and preserved over time, as well as protected from unauthorized access with a due concern for privacy. This can be an extraordinarily resource-intensive process, and there must be a decision about the degree to which collection activities are pursued. For instance, does metadata need to be attached to interview transcripts to allow for greater search-ability and access—or do interviews need to be transcribed at all? Today’s technological platforms may not be in use tomorrow, so the issue of long-term accessibility needs to be considered: the transition from written notebooks to floppy disks to optical readers to flash memory will continue in the future, so previous iterations of data will need to be migrated to new platforms over time if they are to remain accessible. In other words, there is a need to “future-proof” at least the most essential data being collected so that future generations retain access to those views and insights.

The analysis element is also important, in that this is where sense is made of the data, patterns and trends are first identified, and the implications of findings can be imagined and debated. The exact nature of the analysis, and
the identity of the analysts, will vary from case to case. However, the need to periodically revisit the findings of these analyses are universal, as stakeholder groups metamorphose, interests and perspectives shift, and the relationship between the institution and its stakeholders grows and develops over time. There is also a need to balance the benefits that come with using a wider range of analysts versus the need for cohesion and specialization provided by a smaller team: the first will generally provide a wider range of perspectives and professional expertise though sometimes at the cost of focus, while the second can be more efficient and more trenchant in their discussions, but with a limited range of viewpoints. The appropriate answer will vary from case to case, but the question does need to be debated and deliberated as part of the stakeholder engagement strategy.

Dissemination of stakeholder perspectives and views will track closely with the institution’s governance structure and decision-making process. It will also influence organizational attitudes toward the role stakeholder engagement plays in the life of the institution: are stakeholder needs and desires a primary driver of program development and delivery, a secondary consideration which may shape but not overcome a primary mission or objective, or are stakeholder views irrelevant? Wider dissemination of stakeholder views within the organization (including the participation of professionals and experts from the institution during stakeholder engagement opportunities) can go some way toward shaping the answer to that question, but by and large it will be determined by the institution’s leadership team, their priorities and the tone that they set.

Integration of stakeholder views is the critical interface between the stakeholder engagement team and the rest of the institution, including those who lead the organization, develop its plans and programs, and deliver activities related to the noble and practical missions. In a sense, this is where the individual or team responsible for stakeholder engagement turns loose of the data, information and ideas, and allows them to take root elsewhere in the organization. Program and project leaders then have the responsibility to integrate stakeholder perspectives in their work, and to weave them into their overall planning and programming process, along with, of course, necessary
resources, facilities, equipment, staff time and expertise, development within their profession, and other variables and considerations. There is no mandate for stakeholder views to be the sole determinant of projects or programs, and very seldom will they be even the primary consideration. However, stakeholder views—and the function of stakeholder engagement—cannot be ignored if the institution’s noble and primary missions are to be achieved, sustained or furthered.

Given the non-systemized nature of the engagement process itself as discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, it should come as little surprise that the integration of stakeholder views is often fragmented in each of the case studies; the degree to which the stakeholder groups feel they have influence over the two sites, and the engagement mechanisms by which that influence can be exerted in the future, is clearly reflected in the responses to the semi-structured interview questions noted in Chapter Four, Figures 17, 18, 19, 28, 29 and 32).

### 2.9 Tracking and Monitoring

The fourth element of the stakeholder engagement strategy is tracking and monitoring stakeholder engagement and participation levels, positive and negative impacts, and the degree to which stakeholder feedback is integrated into the life of the institution. This provides an indicator of efficacy over time, delivers valuable inputs to the planning and programming functions, build credibility for the institution and for the stakeholder engagement function within the institution, and ultimately help the institution achieve its noble and practical missions using stakeholder engagement as a strategic tool.

For example, as discussed in Chapter Five, Section 2, efforts at Çatalhöyük to gauge the progress or benefits of stakeholder engagement activities have been limited to specific academic projects undertaken by individual researchers, and have focused primarily on testing theoretical models, concepts and best practices, rather than feeding into cultural heritage
management strategies or activities. Again, there are some regulations within the AMP that mandate the number and type of meetings that need to be held and the stakeholders that must be in attendance, yet there are no key performance indicators that track the impact of these meetings or the degree to which stakeholder views are assimilated and activated.

This element must rest on a firm foundation of meaningful Key Performance Indicators, or KPIs. The selection of KPIs is critical, because they underscore the institution’s priorities, direct its resources, and align employees and their efforts. For example, is the institution measuring the number of meetings held with local residents, or the number of recommendations that are produced at each such meeting? In the first case, it becomes advantageous to hold a large number of short, relatively superficial meetings, since the meeting itself is the basis for the goal; in the second, the indicator requires that each meeting be more intensive and interactive, and that the dialogue and discussion is actually captured. This has very clear implications for the way that staff employs their resources and allocates their time, and equally clear ramifications for the quality of stakeholder interaction.

There must also be a blend of qualitative and quantitative measurements. The former are beneficial in capturing nuances and trends but are more resource intensive and general involve a smaller pool of respondents; the latter are easier to capture across a broader sampling of participants, but are often better indicators of activity than of output. There will also ideally be a combination of lead and lag indicators, so that the institution can both identify looming trends and developments and track the magnitude and effect of developments once they occur; both are necessary for sound planning and program design and activation.

These KPIs must also be tracked over time to be truly beneficial. Therefore, attention must be given to how measures are taken and assessed, as well as the continuity of sample sizes and constituency (e.g., soliciting the views on the same topic from the same or similar set of respondents allows for a strong temporal analysis, while a change in topic or respondent profile may invalidate the historical trend assessment). Benchmarking is another valuable tool, in
that it allows the experiences and learning from other institutions or case studies to be integrated into the assessment; however, apples must be compared to apples and not to oranges, so the specific informational and research needs of the institution may need to be compromised to capture data of a more universal, and therefore comparable, nature.

There should also be a mechanism or system by which performance against KPIs is fed back into the institution’s planning and operations functions. This might include incentive programs for employees or groups that meet targets, management “dashboards” that show areas of strength or concern as determined by achievement of KPI targets, or the reallocation of resources to stakeholder engagement programs and channels that evidence a high degree of success as shown by the Key Performance Indicators. Without such systems or mechanisms, tracking and monitoring can become purely academic exercises; similarly, without well-conceived, credible KPIs, there will be little external or internal confidence in their value or trust in their findings.

Going one step further, though, tracking and monitoring activities, and the KPIs and other qualitative and quantitative data that feed them, can be further leveraged through sharing. This might take place at a national or transnational level; through a designated database, ombudsman, government agency or professional society; and touch upon both best practices and lessons learned. Clearly the prospects for the replication of successful local models that are addressing important problems are limited by the fact that local initiatives require national intervention to help them communicate with each other and advocate for them with the many sectorial agencies of central government whose actions influence what occurs at the local level. The establishment of an institution such as an ombudsman or advocate for local efforts in the area of participatory area management may be a way forward.

Such an institution would specialise in forging practical linkages between national and local programs that can promote a sense of shared ownership and result in planning and implementation that integrate across the site, communities and different levels of government. The institution can also arrange awareness-raising and capacity-building events, and create
opportunities to work together on specific projects and programs, as well as offering courses and/or internships covering the pressing necessities of organising, planning, researching, and regulating the uses of archaeological or cultural resources.

3 Chapter Summary

This chapter proposed a new analytical and planning system for meaningful and sustainable stakeholder engagement and participation: the Four Plus Four Model. The first four elements are diagnostic in nature, defining the institution’s noble and practical missions, mapping its universe of stakeholders, delineating the constraints and channels imposed by its regulatory environment and governance structures, and finally considering a range of socio-economic concerns that, while not the primary focus of the institution or even determinative of the likelihood for its success, do exercise a great deal of influence over the institution, its activities, its room for manoeuvre, and its acceptability among key audiences. The second set of four elements is prescriptive, and taken together, constitute an institution’s stakeholder engagement strategy and form the foundation for various stakeholder engagement and outreach activities. These four elements include a message and topic map; a channel map; the “CADI” functions of capturing, analysing, disseminating and integrating stakeholder views; and finally, the tracking and monitoring of stakeholder engagement activities, centring on a robust set of Key Performance Indicators.

It is hoped that this Four Plus Four Model could be implemented in a wide range of cases in various parts of the cultural and creative landscape, pressure tested with on-the-ground findings, and used as the basis for comparative studies and hopefully the sharing of best practices globally.
Chapter Seven: Thesis Conclusion

This thesis has examined what constitutes meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement and participation in the cultural heritage space, and the role that such engagement and participation play in the sustainability of archaeological sites and cultural institutions and the preservation of the interests of stakeholder communities. It has utilized a range of research methods and methodologies, including semi-structured participant interviews and non-intrusive participant observation, as well as an analysis of the existing literature related to this topic. It has drawn upon field research undertaken at two different case study sites: Çatalhöyük, a Neolithic archaeological site in central Turkey; and the King Abdulaziz Center for World Culture in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, a new multi-component arts, knowledge and cultural facility still under development.

Despite the very different natures of the two case studies, it is clear from the results of the research that they share many of the same challenges and opportunities related to stakeholder engagement, and the effective integration of stakeholder views, opinions and desires in the sustainability of their activities and the overall meaningful relevance of these activities to a variety of stakeholders. The thesis has proposed a new model of managing and structuring stakeholder engagement activities, to ensure that not only is the engagement itself effective and sustainable over time, but that conversations with stakeholders are fully informed by a wider range of considerations, including the social, economic, regulatory, environmental and spatial ecosystem, and the framework of power relationships that govern that ecosystem.

During my research, I have identified a number of strengths and weaknesses in the international discourse in this field. There are a number of challenges to developing an explicit methodological structure that could be universally applied. One such challenge is the diverse range of contexts in which such stakeholder engagement is practised, and their confidential nature (Rosoff 1998; Peers and Brown 2003). There is also the need for a flexible mechanism that accommodates the reality that stakeholder communities are constructed and therefore are eternally open to negotiation (Kreps 2003; Tully
307. Understanding these challenges is key to developing participation mechanisms that offer sustainable management practices that effectively and consistently meet these challenges. Hence, a stakeholder participation model must make seemingly foreign practices more compatible with all local settings, and thus more acceptable to local communities (Kreps 2003), as well as the full range of stakeholders. Beritelli et al. (2007) speak of the need to define and develop universal rules and mechanisms that put together all of the actors involved at both institutional and business levels, in order to define a successful and competitive system which can deliver an effective strategy of development at all levels of the process. When translated into the cultural heritage sphere, the most fundamental motivation for making heritage management a more inclusive, participatory process is rooted in the acknowledgement that good governance efforts are greatly enhanced and sustained by the fair and equal participation of key stakeholders. However, as discussed in Chapter Two, within the cultural heritage space, there is still little evidence of a stakeholder participation model that demonstrates links to sustainability and one that is also universal to all situations.

Set against these challenges, there are various actors ranging from international bodies to governments, institutions, and individuals playing a role in the interpretation, protection and preservation of cultural heritage. With the Internet and the spread of other communication channels such as social media, there are exciting opportunities to draw interest and crowd-source the creation of new knowledge. These channels, if used wisely by heritage practitioners, could meaningfully usher in a multitude of new and different voices into the dialogue on cultural heritage and its sustainability, and lobby for better governance and regulation or more participatory practices. In so doing, such a development could also break down disciplinary barriers or the current methodologies for heritage management that create the disconnects and dissonances noted in Chapter Two.

Fundamentally, the two case studies have demonstrated to me that although these may appear to be two very different institutions or initiatives set in very different social, cultural, legal and economic contexts, there are in actuality a
great number of similarities when it comes to the efficacy of stakeholder engagement, the strategies and practices being pursued, and the degree to which stakeholders feel engaged or empowered and have their input integrated into the present and future operation of these two initiatives. This underscores the fact that there are a series of similar drivers or factors that colour the stakeholder engagement experience, and may indicate the universality (and certainly confirm the commonality) of these factors.

The conclusions set forth in Chapter Five are drawn from the qualitative and quantitative data from the interviews and surveys that I undertook. The issues I encountered throughout the research process were mostly related to access to individuals for the interviews and surveys, or being diplomatic in order to not raise suspicions or expectations. Had I not had privileged access to these two case study sites, I believe my data would have been far scarcer, particularly in regards to documenting the development of the Cultural Center in Saudi Arabia. Another area of challenge was the limited availability and access to quantitative and qualitative data regarding stakeholder engagement practices in the cultural heritage fields in Turkey and Saudi Arabia.

With regard to the importance of my study, and original contribution to the literature, I hope that the Four Plus Four Model could be implemented in a wide range of cases in various parts of the cultural and creative landscape, pressure tested with on-the-ground findings, and used as the basis for comparative studies and hopefully the sharing of best practices globally.

While I would have enjoyed testing and implementing the Four Plus Four Model as part of this PhD thesis, such an undertaking within the confines of this research was not possible, nor was it an undertaking that I as an individual would have had the power to implement. However, to support my peers and all cultural heritage practitioners in adopting the Four Plus Four Model, I see a benefit in highlighting the main issues, in regards to power, administrative and institutional structures, etc., that they may experience when activating the Four Plus Four Model.
These issues include relinquishing some of the power and authority to the lay person (a non-practitioner); welcoming and injecting business acumen into the cultural heritage practice – particularly developing business models that provide optimal governance and financing structures over the long term, and business strategies for branding, marketing and communication; articulating long-term strategic goals, and achieving buy-in for these goals from stakeholders - most of whom are motivated by short term (human life-span length) goals; and finally, sharing data and experiences – determining the most effective and meaningful way to capture lessons learned and administer best practice.

The effective and meaningful documentation of lessons learned from various case studies across the globe, and the sharing of this best practice will contribute greatly to the progress toward a universal approach to stakeholder engagement and sustainability practices at cultural heritage sites and centres. Going forward, I look forward to pursuing opportunities to activate the Four Plus Four Model.
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