"BUT HOW DO YOU GO ABOUT IT?"

Mobilization Processes in Partnership Building Concerning the Public Face of Contract Archaeology

Mats Engström &
Göran Gruber

Partnership and dialogue are central concepts in national heritage management. This article problematizes the concepts on the basis of a theme project conducted in a high school, where the aim has been to give the pupils insight into history-making processes. The school project was carried out as part of the public activity in a major contract archaeology project. The text has a self-reflexive perspective, analysing mobilization processes in connection with the establishment and implementation of the theme project. The article shows the pragmatic attitude of the institutional actors to different educational ideals, with partnership as an instrument on its own in terms of market aspects. This raises ethical questions about the pupils and the conditions for the desired partnership.

Keywords: Cultural heritage management, contract archaeology, school, community archaeology, mediation, partnership, dialogue, mobilization processes

INTRODUCTION

"Think in time" – this is how the Swedish state authority responsible for matters of cultural heritage, the National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarieämbetet, RAÄ), formulates its vision of the future. The aim is to "promote knowledge and understanding of cultural heritage as an important part in people's lives and their environment". One way to do this

is by "developing methods and arguments in partnership with others". In the preface to the brochure presenting the strategy, the director-general of the Board states that "[g]reater emphasis will be placed on clarity of advice, dialogue, partnership, strategic engagement and involvement in a wider range of societal issues". To achieve the goal, between 2011 and 2013 the Board will focus on the guidelines of this strategy as a foundation for the operations, to strengthen the Board's contribution in the work for a sustainable society (Swedish National Heritage Board 2010).[1]

The last twenty years have seen significant changes in the rhetoric about cultural heritage, a sphere of politics that has been viewed as an instrument for individual welfare and for the social and economic development of society. The shift is reflected in three tendencies (Beckman 2005):

1. in actor patterns, resource flows, and steering, with a decline in the importance of the public authorities in favour of the market, and also with an increase in the importance of the cultural heritage field as a whole
2. in values, goals, and functions, which has involved greater adaptation to democratic and multicultural patterns of thought
3. in the people, the public, that is to say, the recipients who have become consumers whom the heritage institutions serve with experiences, entertainment, knowledge, and local identity on a historical/cultural market.

Not long ago one of the authors (Göran Gruber) conducted a research interview with a colleague who also works in Swedish contract archaeology. The discussion concerned how we as archaeologists create and communicate values based on material remains. The context was a major line project in contract archaeology. In the dialogue it became obvious how tensions between national legislation and administration, institutional structures and interests, scholarly questions and methods, the wishes and expectations of the local community, and personal interests create situations that are difficult to handle.

Both in the heritage discourse and in scholarly archaeology, a great deal of energy has been expended on developing practices and debating the conflict between, on the one hand, a representative system based on the administration's defining and selecting of history, and on the other hand, a direct democracy proceeding from the idea of the potential and

---

1 In the Swedish brochure the term used is *samverkan*, which can be translated as English *cooperation*, but the word used in the English version of the brochure is *partnership*, which is therefore used in this text.

participation of everyone in the use of history (e.g. Dicks 2000; Grundberg 2000; Pettersson 2003; Smith 2004; Högberg & Holtorf 2005; Aronsson 2006, 2009; Synnestedt 2008). In the conversation with the colleague, the tensions were not just visible; they were blatantly obvious. The desired dialogue and partnership cause friction in the everyday work, and also uncertainty and frustration which the archaeologist expressed as follows: "All this talk about dialogue, it's a kind of, it gets like, it's sort of a rubbish word that sounds so bloody good, but how do you go about it, I mean?" (Gruber 2010:182).

A PLACE BY MOTALA STRÖM

In 2010–2011, we the authors – archaeologists at the National Heritage Board's service for contract archaeology in eastern central Sweden, RAÄ UV Öst – carried out a theme project together with the Platengymnasiet high school in the town of Motala in the county of Östergötland. The aim of the project, entitled "A Place by Motala Ström", was to give the pupils insight into how narratives about the past are created and used on the basis of different actors' perspectives and experiences. Through discussions and practical exercises, we wanted to demonstrate history-making processes along the Motala Ström, the river that flows through the town. The work concerned how we, both as individuals and as groups, create places in the landscape. Yet another goal was to find forms for qualitative encounters that differ from normal history-reproducing activities carried out in collaboration between national heritage management and schools. The encounter with the school was part of a much broader public effort within a larger project in contract archaeology.

With the theme project as a case study of how contract archaeology and school can meet, the aim of this article is to display and problematize the mobilization processes that arise when the aim is to "do" partnership and dialogue.

We want to stress that the article does *not* assess the results of the project or to what extent the pupils gained insight. Neither does it discuss processes of learning. Instead the focus is on the more or less successful mobilization of the actors in establishing and implementing it. Depending on the actors we have met in different situations, our actions have been adapted in the endeavour to stabilize them around the theme project. This means that the analysis also considers our own motives and the perspectives on the use of the past that give rise to them, which means that a self-reflexive perspective is applied throughout.

THE CONTEXT OF THE CASE STUDY IN CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY

The project in contract archaeology of which this theme project was a part was initiated when the National Rail Administration (Banverket, now the Swedish Transport Administration, Trafikverket) decided to increase the capacity of a busy freight transport link between Sweden's northern and southern trunk line by building a double track between the towns of Mjölby and Motala. Archaeological planning began in the mid-1990s. Preliminary excavations were conducted at several places along the line. One of these was at Strandvägen 1, south of the Motala Ström. One of the discoveries there was a Mesolithic settlement complex on a scale previously unparalleled in eastern central Sweden (Larsson 2005; Carlsson 2008).

The contract for the final excavation south of the river in Motala was awarded to RAÄ UV Öst. Work began in 2000 and continued in the years 2002 and 2003. The regional authority formulated the following conditions in its decision: "that the mediation of knowledge about the archaeological excavations, in this and future final excavations, will be conducted by Östergötland County Museum […] which is included as an expense for external consultants in the cost accounting of Riksantik-varieämbetet UV Öst" (Länsstyrelsens delbeslut 2, Dnr 220-3775-00).

At the time this was perceived as an unusual wording, since the Heritage Conservation Act was not believed to support expenses for public communication within the framework of a project in contract archaeology. In this case the decision was justified with reference to the high costs of the archaeology. According to the official at the County Administration, it was important that the general public should learn what the archaeologists had found, since the excavations in Motala were so "rich in finds". It was also claimed that the mediation of knowledge was an essential part of archaeological work (Andersson *et al*. 2005:18; Andersson 2008:127).

The first years' excavations in Motala took place within the area that the National Rail Administration had chosen for the double track (Carlsson 2004a, 2004b). The excavations had simultaneously brought insight into the size of the settlement complex, and in the second half of the decade the excavations were expanded both south and north of the river. In preparation for the purchasing of archaeological excavations in the new areas, the County Administration stipulated the following demands for work with the public: "Continuous educational work, such as guided tours, contacts with media, and presentation on websites are deemed important by the County Administration in this connection" (Länsstyrelsens förfrågningsunderlag Dnr 431-4688-09 & Dnr 431-27696-09).

Over the years the work of communicating with the public has been extensive. It has mostly been one-way communication. The archaeologists, as transmitters and experts, have presented the narrative of the excavations and the interpretations of the Mesolithic remains to the recipients. This has been done using a traditional repertoire of forms of mediation: guided tours, exhibitions, new items on radio and television and in newspapers, brochures, posters, books, websites, and electronic newsletters. In 2009 a blog was added and in 2011 a Facebook page, which has further broadened the external interfaces.[2] In an assessment conducted by Linköping University after the first years' excavations, it was noted that "[t]he professional actors are undoubtedly taking the cultural policy in the spirit of 1974 seriously. They want to share the knowledge they consider important and do so through a great many channels […]. No possibility to learn about the excavation should be unknown to a reasonably well-informed citizen" (Andersson *et al.* 2005:102).

As a consequence of the general upgrading of work with the public in Swedish contract archaeology in recent years, and also in view of the extensive mediation already conducted in Motala, we became interested in trying to establish the partnership perspectives that characterize Community Archaeology. The idea of a theme project together with Platengymnasiet was not an explicit part of the plans on which the Östergötland County Administration grounded its decision. It arose during the fieldwork as a consequence of personal motives. This in turn was based on our own academic background and on a desire to translate both scholarly theory, concerning Community Archaeology, and cultural policy into practical action. We were also motivated by more general and traditional ideals of public enlightenment that are a part of the archaeological self-image and thus affect us as individuals.

A brief review of archaeology's public relations not only elucidates how this relationship has been developed and problematized, but also serves as a backdrop to this work and the personal motives driving the authors.

Partnership with the public

Literature about the relationship of archaeology to the surrounding society has been available for quite a long time. In 1972 Charles McGimsey issued his book *Public Archaeology*, and the 1980s saw the publication of a number of books and journal articles about heritage management and its principles (e.g. McGimsey 1972; Dunnell 1984; Cleere 1989).

---

2 http://verkstadsvagen.arkeologiuv.se/; https://www.facebook.com/arkeologivid-motalastrom

These, however, have relatively little to do with the recent discussions about relations with the so-called general public and concepts such as partnership. In the now well-established field of Community Archaeology people are asking what this partnership can (and should) look like in archaeological practice.[3] The encounter with society concerns constantly ongoing activity in which cooperation permeates every step of a project, from beginning to end. According to the advocates, it is not just a matter of involving the local community, but rather of adopting a holistic outlook on the entire process (Moser *et al.* 2002; Marshall 2002; Derry & Malloy 2003). According to Yvonne Marshall, Community Archaeology is "a specific approach to all aspects of archaeological practice and, as such, looks to transform the nature of our discipline in fundamental ways" (Marshall 2002:215).

Part of this reshaping involves giving access to alternative voices and opinions at an early stage. Community partnership cannot be created from above with the aid of laws; it requires local and individual initiatives and contacts (Kelly 2003). Another part consists of the idea of public enlightenment and the fostering of good citizens. This especially concerns projects linked to educational activities in school (Jeppson & Brauner 2003).

In Sweden the debate has been conducted both in the universities and in the heritage institutions. As a result of these new lines of thought, a number of development projects have arisen in an effort to transform theory into practice. In this connection we may mention some institutions' public projects, including Malmö Heritage's "People's Places" (Högberg 2003), the National Historical Museum's "Public Archaeology" (Svanberg & Wahlgren 2007"), and Södertörn University's "Archaeology in the Suburbs" (Burström 2008a, 2008b). Both Anders Högberg and Fredrik Svanberg & Katty Wahlgren show how we can work with educational matters in all aspects of heritage management, from project planning to documentation and feedback. Together with Linda Derry & Maureen Malloy, Stephanie Moser, and others, these texts can be read as models for how archaeologists can work with the public.

"A PLACE BY MOTALA STRÖM" IN PRACTICE

In the late summer of 2010 we contacted the history teachers at Platengymnasiet to ask if they were interested in carrying out an in-depth project

---

3   See also Simpson (2010:1), who problematizes the concept of "community" in these contexts.

together with us. The central question in the various practical elements in the project concerned how places are created.

During the winter and spring we met the teachers eight times to discuss the work in general and also to plan the implementation. The theme project was done by a History B class, a total of 23 pupils aged 16 and 17. Their work extended over eight weeks, taking up a total of ten double lessons. This corresponded to just over 20% of the pupils' entire History B course, which can be regarded as a generous allocation of time on the part of the school.

The implementation of the project was explicitly inspired by an arrangement previously worked out by Anders Högberg as part of similar educational projects in heritage management (Högberg 2003, 2006).

The work on "A Place by Motala Ström" was divided into six parts intended to capture the content of the project and facilitate the achievement of the aims:

1. Start-up – our presentation of the theme. The pupils were free to choose a place that was significant for them (regardless of its geographical location) and present it at www.platsr.se.[4] The aim was to get the pupils to reflect on why certain places are important, and for whom.

2. A stroll along the Motala Ström – The aim of the walk was to show the physical imprints of the many chronological layers in the landscape and to try to raise questions about what happened at the places and what survives. Another idea was that the pupils, in groups of three, would choose a place to work with in a major theme project. To broaden the focus and include issues concerning history-making processes, we simultaneously handed out study questions about how they chose a place, what happened there, and its significance for different people today.

3. Material, theory, and method – this part dealt briefly with archives, maps, and source criticism. Through guest lecturers from the regional heritage management network (Kulturarv Östergötland) and RAÄ UV Öst, as well as visits to the local history society, the aim was that

---

4 Platsr is a community that the National Heritage Board has set up at the request of the Swedish government, where everyone is welcome to describe their places. "A place on Platsr is a defined area for which a person, for one reason or another, shows engagement. Presumably it is where someone feels at home: the village, neighbourhood, or suburb where they live or have lived, the area around the school or the summer cottage. We think that all people carry stories and memories that are often linked to one particular place" (http://www.raa.se/cms/extern/aktuellt/projekt/platsr.html).

the pupils would come into contact with *real* archive material and tackle questions of how to find and assess the value of source material.

4. Excavation – in groups of eight and nine, the pupils took part in our excavations for half a day. This part concerned not only the physical work of excavation but also discussions about how choices are made in archaeological investigations and the questions that the excavated material can answer.

5. Group work – Time was allocated for work in the classroom for discussion, analysis, and searching for information about the places selected by the pupils and the questions raised, in other words, the pupils' own work.

6. Presentation and assessment – The groups published their work on Platsr. This was followed by an oral presentation to the rest of the class, followed by questions and comments. The work ended with the pupils assessing the theme project.

MOBILIZATION PROCESSES

By mobilization processes we mean what is done in order to interest and enrol actors and thereby get them to settle on a problem formulation, in our case the overall aims of the project. In these processes, which can cause varying degrees of conflict, different resources and strategies were used to stabilize the actors around shared sense-making ideas. Two spheres of policy were linked in the study: cultural heritage management/contract archaeology and school (Andersson 2008). This encounter reveals a great many individual actors, including people in authority, managers, colleagues, school management, teacher groups, individual teachers, and pupils, who all act on the basis of personal motives and thus affect the implementation of the theme project. The analytical model was devised to capture *all* conceivable processes that take place when actors' identities, goals, and possibilities are weakened or restricted in order to engage them in networks about specific statements or problems (Callon 1986; Gruber 2010).

The overall problem formulation around which we wanted to assemble the actors concerned a specific participant perspective in which the past is not regarded as something essential that can be pinned down, but as something that is created by a diversity of meaning-creation processes. The crucial thing for our work was to mobilize actors in a critical and participant knowledge perspective and to link this to a school setting. In that context, the contract archaeology project in the town of Motala was a significant starting point and resource – in economic,

structural, learning, and organizational terms – that enabled the entire theme project.

The analyses below are divided according to who it was that acted in the staging of the theme project: the cultural heritage people, the school/ the teachers, the pupils. The survey reveals more or less tense situations in the process of involving and recruiting the actors in the project.

Consensus about the public values of contract archaeology?

It was thus considered rather unusual when the regional authority in Östergötland in 2000 included "mediation" of the archaeological results to the general public as a condition for the decision to purchase the archaeological excavations at Motala Ström. Today, over ten years later, "mediation" is taken for granted in most major projects in contract archaeology. This is sanctioned in the instructions drawn up by the National Heritage Board and is justified by the fact that archaeology is now ascribed an extended purpose in public contexts, so that the general public are regarded as the recipients of research findings as much as scholars are (SOU 2005:12; KRSF 2007). The rants and conflicts provoked by the partnership perspective in the early 2000s are not as noticeable today (Högberg, pers. com.). The increase in work with the public has in fact meant that regional authorities in Sweden are trying actively to strengthen their own competence as purchasers in this field.[5]

During the internal establishment phase when we were working to convince both the project leader and the unit manager about the perspectives of the theme project, great trust was shown in us and in our ability to carry out the cooperation with the school, Platengymnasiet.[6] Without any great opposition or challenges, we received permission and funding to launch the theme project as part of the public work of the contract archaeology project. Our own organization saw the value of local partnership and of educational activity connected to the school. Moreover, it was considered important to show off to the regional authority what we had achieved, as a way to make visible the institution's active and prominent position in the development of contract archaeology. A successful partnership with the high school would ultimately work as a success factor in an increasingly competitive Swedish market

---

5 On 23 March 2011 the Stockholm County Administration held a seminar about mediation in archaeological excavations.

6 Since 2009 Göran Gruber has been part of the project management and has thus taken part in the processes shaping the antiquarian, scholarly, and public perspectives of excavations. During the period he has been responsible for the public activities of the archaeological project.

for contract archaeology. Yet despite the value that was identified, we sensed a lack of commitment to the project, which can be understood as a consequence of the project's organizational structure. While this gave us free hands, it also exposed a boundary in relation to the archaeological project, the main focus of which was on the antiquarian and scholarly value of the places, linked to the Mesolithic context identified at the site. The type of exchange between archaeologists and public that Marshall talks about was not relevant for the contract archaeology project as a whole (Marshall 2002).

When the theme work with the school was presented later on to the County Administration the initiative was not perceived as a problem or as inappropriate action outside the set frames of the project. This regional decision-making authority responsible for the decision approved and justified the initiative by stating that a major archaeological project must have room for "experiment" and methodological development. Our theme project was linked to the extensive public activity generated by the archaeology at Motala Ström. In this way, it was considered capable of demonstrating the broad value of archaeology and how public activities can reach out to different categories of citizens. For the County Administration the theme project was thus an important example in the argumentation to strengthen the status of contract archaeology both internally at the regional authority and in his meetings with the region's members of parliament, since the expense of contract archaeology is often questioned in relation to important local and regional investments.

The encounter with the school and the teachers

The contract archaeology project in Motala began cooperating with Platengymnasiet in 2009, two years before the theme project started. At that time it was a more traditional form of knowledge transmission, where we as archaeologists and experts told the pupils about archaeology and the early Stone Age based on the excavations beside the Motala Ström. This well-developed channel in the form of personal contacts with some of the history teachers was an important resource when we suggested enhancing the cooperation between the institutions. Our idea for a theme project was thus not in itself crucial for the implementation since there was already a mutual interest in institutional partnership. We now tried to benefit from that investment by initiating a shift in ideas.

For the teachers the archaeological project at Motala Ström gave an opportunity to link the subject of history to *reality*. They could use the scholarly and popular archaeological presentations to demonstrate professional dimensions. This in turn would strengthen the legitimacy of history as a school subject while simultaneously telling *wie es eigentlich*

gewesen. They expressed wishes that the pupils could come into direct contact with *real* source material on-site. The teachers wanted simpler questions for the pupils to work with, embracing multiple school subjects and linked to the archaeological project. A recurrent statement that illustrates the teachers' motives for the collaboration was that it would reach the pupils outside the school environment. In this context, the National Heritage Board's community Platsr became a tool that suited our (shared) needs since it helped to make the theme project something *real.*

Initially our own interests were in stark contrast to those of the teachers. Our aim was to establish broad participation about the past and link it to the pupils' own choices, and to be open for discussions about conservation and the value of traces of the past in the landscape. The differing goals for the collaboration created a tension based on a difference in ideas that we were forced to handle. Our ideas were not always immediately popular with all the teachers.

Getting all the history teachers to accept this shift was a crucial task in our meetings with them during the winter of 2010/2011. At these meetings some of them felt that our approach was at university level and could not easily be brought down to high-school level. In the teacher group there were some who questioned the idea, some who were not interested, and some who dismissed it. We therefore expended a great deal of time and energy on our own discussions of how to approach the teachers, and on dialogue with the teachers in the form of telephone calls and group meetings where we presented simple project descriptions. We made copies of relevant literature that discussed our perspectives in school contexts, in order to generate interest. To demonstrate that the project really could be carried out, we also used our own networks and financed a visit by a colleague from another archaeological institution who talked about similar projects that he had run in southern Sweden.

A not unimportant part of the mobilization of the teachers was that they themselves found support in their own steering documents in the curriculum for History B, which was partly based on the same ideas as our own. A wording like "formulating historical problems from short-term or long-term perspectives and analysing them from a conscious and critical stance" was close to the perspectives on critical thinking that we ourselves wanted to establish (Skolverket: Kursplan för HI1202 – Historia B). Moreover, our own contacts with actors in heritage management and the museum world gave further breadth to the theme project, since we were able to satisfy the teachers' wishes for classroom visits by various experts. In our argumentation we also highlighted the encounter between different school subjects as a goal.

During the establishment phase it became obvious what limited time frames the teachers worked with, which affected the degree of commitment in the shaping of the theme project. The texts we sent in advance of the meetings were handed out at the same time as the meetings started. When we went to one meeting imagining that it had already been decided to carry out the theme project and that the meeting would focus on arranging the different stages of the work in a timetable, instead we found that we had to take one step back. Once again we ended up in a discussion of the use of history, and we were forced to present explanations and arguments. We felt that the teachers never got started, which left us feeling frustrated. In this situation it was obvious to us that we would have to serve up a relatively complete project if we were to get under way at all.

The very encounter between the school and contract archaeology was an explicit goal of the theme project. At the same time, the teachers stressed that it was important to put the pupils in the centre. But the school also ended up using its new link to our institution, the National Heritage Board, as a means to strengthen its own trademark in its endeavours to recruit new pupils at school fairs.

The shaping of the actual theme project was done together with one of the teachers whose History B class had been selected. The teachers told us how the classes were currently distributed between the teachers and which of them seemed best suited to the task. This demonstrated an absolute boundary between us and the school, where we had no access and no possibility to affect the decision.

During the work, our own reflections on the drawing of boundaries particularly concerned the division of roles and responsibilities. In the rhetoric a crucial point was to ensure teamwork together with the school and the teachers, as we gave each other scope for action and an opportunity to affect the design, so that it was not just we ourselves who steered the work. We expected active participation by the school in the practical planning. Instead we usually had to take the initiative and make concrete proposals for the arrangement. The feeling that most things were fluid and vague recurred in several internal discussions, both during the planning phase of the project and in the implementation phase. Ultimately, this revealed differences in goals and in the motives of the teachers. This was the first time that we had mounted anything like this, which meant that we had high expectations, encouraged by the literature, of turning theory into practice. The teachers for their part were secure in their own role and the learning ambitions of the school setting, with its potential and limitations. This fostered ambivalence in us about what could be reckoned as a "successful" project, as we ourselves

oscillated between, on the one hand, specified and measurable knowledge, and on the other hand implementing a project with its different parts as a meaning-creating process. This shows that the teachers were not fully stabilized in their support for the partnership perspective of the theme project, and that we ourselves were hesitant about how the mobilization was to be achieved.

The encounter with the pupils

The encounter with the pupils brought a new phase that entailed presenting the project as a finished concept. The focus was on generating interest and involvement in the different parts of the project, and getting the pupils to understand that they would be doing something different from the usual history learning. In this phase the project as a whole was already designed and the framework established. We could thus demand the pupils' time. What we could not demand, however, was their interest and engagement – factors that are crucial if a project like this is to be meaningful. This of course required us as archaeologists to be good teachers. Here we grappled with factors that can be found in all classrooms, such as group dynamics, lack of interest, and differing levels of ambition. Our fine educational goal ran into *reality*, the pupils, and this again raised the question of what role we were supposed to play: teachers, lecturers, experts/archaeologists, or observers? Both for us and for the pupils this caused uncertainty about what we could demand of them and to what extent we had the authority to demand results.

It was not until the pupils, in small groups, took part in the excavations that we, not surprisingly, really felt comfortable. It was also at this stage that we had an opportunity to talk with the pupils in an environment other than the classroom, so that we could informally *discuss* and *debate* both their choice of site and the use of history in general. The fact that the pupils themselves (without their teachers) joined us in the excavation also gave the situation a degree of gravity, a resource that had a positive effect on the discussion; they helped to create their own source material. Another positive side effect we observed was that several of the pupils who were otherwise less active in the classroom were mobilized and took part with great enthusiasm, which also demonstrates the effect of the teachers' wish for the pupils to get out of the classroom.

Our mobilization strategy when introducing the theme projects was to make no mention at all of *educational values* or *alternative learning goals* referring to concepts such as insight and self-reflection. This was intimately connected with a problem that we constantly encountered in the planning of the project. Does the insight that we want to create arise instantly through the project, or does it emerge gradually as a re-

sult of long-term processes? We did not consider it fruitful to explain at the beginning what insight and understanding we hoped the pupils would acquire. Yet this made it difficult to clarify in simple terms the aim of the work and the function of the different elements as parts of this process. This was also pointed out by the pupils in the course of the work, particularly in the final phase when they were supposed to produce material of their own. The broad picture that we wanted to give was instead viewed as a problem since it did not directly indicate a clear final goal. The pupils questioned the point of elements such as studies of archives and maps when they ended up not using them in their own written reports. The writing-up was regarded by the pupils and the teacher as the natural terminus when they had to report on what they had learned. Despite repeated attempts by us to tone down this homework-like stage, it was difficult to affect. The ability of the pupils to acquire an all-round perspective is of course our responsibility, both as teachers and as project planners, but we can nevertheless note that the high value we attached to participating and carrying out the different stages clashed with the pupils' own idea of how teaching should be done and how it is normally done.

Here two general outlooks collide. The many meetings and conversations with the teachers about the aim of the project during the establishment phase were reduced here to an extremely short phase. Now the pupils simply had to accept that the structures and modes of thought that they had (presumably) encountered throughout their schooling, that is to say, having fact-based learning goals clearly pointed out to them, was to be replaced with much more diffuse and complex aims involving critical thinking and personal creativity.

From a pupil perspective, this frustration and uncertainty about what was expected of them, and how their own thoughts were supposed to be incorporated in the texts they wrote, meant that we had to work with the design of the project as it progressed. To orient the discussion more towards questions of how places are created and what they mean, we drew up a series of general questions directly related to this. These broadly formulated questions were created as a supplement and could be used by the pupils when they were working on their own with their places. Looking back, we can see that the questions were frequently used and that in certain cases they were treated more as a kind of manual for how to do the kinds of things that were not part of the usual history teaching, rather than as inspiration for facilitating personal reflection. We can question whether we really succeeded in assembling them around our overall aim concerning history-making processes and critical thinking.

Another question was who would assess what the pupils had done and achieved. Here, however, the answer was obvious. It was the teacher who decided what level the pupil had formally achieved. It was primarily through the group work handed in by the pupils that they were able to show how they had discussed and reasoned about the arguments for conservation and questions about how a place can be created and evaluated from different perspectives. It is difficult to say whether the teacher assessed this rather than the fact-related content, but for our part it was rewarding to see how the pupils tried to tackle the issues we wanted to see them ponder, in connection with the work and their presentation of it.

EDUCATION AND MARKETING

Based on our case, we can see how both conceptual and structural tensions and problems arise when two policy spheres – cultural heritage and school – meet to achieve dialogue and partnership. At the same time, we note that the institutional actors in the study are open to the partnership. The mobilization process for the theme project called for pragmatic action from all actors so that they could achieve their own agendas and goals.

The institutional actors agreed about ideas of education, enlightenment, and insight, although the basis for these ideas differs: on the one hand pointing out something as the past, on the other hand emphasizing processes in the creation of the cultural heritage. The latter differs both from current public mediation in contract archaeology and from the school's traditional classroom pedagogy. The shift in national heritage management and its organization has caused an increased demand for participation and partnership. These ideas are now also represented in the school curriculum. The formerly antagonistic stances are no longer separated by the same sharp dividing line. The differences that exist are toned down, although they are in contrast to the actors' own norms for knowledge. Instead the case study shows a permissiveness and reciprocity in everyday local practice, with the theoretical perspectives existing in parallel. It is clear that our theme project is not a threat either to traditional history teaching in school or to the mediation work of this contract archaeology project as a whole. For the pupils, however, this shift is far from obvious. When the different stages in the project offer a wide range of actors and perspectives concerning how the past and places are created, the pupils tend to perceive this process as vague and elusive since it is not clearly pointed out to them.

The case study also shows how the relationship between education and business is not automatically a matter of conflict for the institutional actors. Paradoxically, we may note that, regardless of whether the pupils have learned anything or arrived at any new insights, that is, whether they have achieved the educational goals that were our aim for the project, the project as such can nevertheless be regarded as successful. We see how the actors who are affected or identified in connection with the theme project – the county administration, the school, contract archaeologists and others in the heritage management sector – wish to highlight and use the partnership work in order to strengthen their own activity. They exploit the possibility to be visible and to take part in an *interesting* and *innovative* project which simultaneously legitimizes and strengthens their brand name on the market where each institution works. From a business perspective, everyone is a winner. Perhaps even the pupils who have had a chance to be seen and to do something different have had some contact with working life, attending a school that evidently encourages cooperation across boundaries. We may ask ourselves whether this means that the educational ideas that are constantly emphasized and reproduced are merely a façade for other, more economic values (Holtorf 2007).

Another area concerns whether we actually allowed the other actors to participate and create along with us. The package of ideas that we presented has remained relatively unchanged from the very beginning and has not really been negotiable. It has been a matter of how we have been able to unite the actors around this. Based on our original idea for partnership building on history-making processes, we ourselves identified shared goals. This involved a lot of dialogue (talk) between us and the school/teacher, but can this be called partnership?

The same thing applies to the fact that the pupils have participated to an extremely little extent in the shaping of the project. This has not just meant that they have had no control over the content; they have not been able to affect or comment on their own role in a school project that extended far beyond the walls of the school. Moreover, without any direct permission they have been photographed and filmed both by us and by a representative of the school, as a way to show off the ongoing work and the partnership. Pictures and texts have then been disseminated, especially on the Internet, not just by ourselves but by several of the actors who were attached to the project at different levels. Everyone has gratefully joined in and tried to make their voices heard among all the others. Whether this is morally defensible from the pupils' point of view can be debated. Is it unproblematic to allow pupils to be seen in public in their capacity as *school* pupils, and is it all right that we let them publish their *school* work on the net where anyone can read it?

CONCLUSION

At the national level there are calls for a broader dialogue and partnership concerning the cultural heritage. With that as our point of departure, we entered the theme project "A Place by Motala Ström", which brings together the school and contract archaeology.

To make it possible in the first place to achieve the desired partnership, it has been important to mobilize the actors involved around a common question, to work out a concept that is appealing and interesting to all the parties as regards educational ideals, political goals, and market/economic aspects. This was necessary if the project was to happen at all. Yet this condition meant that the desired dialogue was out of balance right from the start (or else never existed). We ourselves have steered the majority of the content and the design. If, however, one uses the term 'dialogue' to mean a conversation in which we as experts contribute new knowledge and perspectives as required by the curriculum, then the partnership that has happened was not at all as problematic. Here, however, we run into problems as a consequence of the institutional actors' adaptation to the market, which puts the pupils in a potentially vulnerable position.

The mobilization processes that took place in connection with this theme project raise questions about dialogue and partnership. On the basis of our case, it is clear how strong the institutional structures are, and that the points of contact between them are weak. Meaningful dialogue never really managed to penetrate these walls; our roles are (necessarily?) still heavily influenced by the traditional mediation practice.

Mats Engström
Swedish National Heritage Board, Contract Archaeology Service East
Roxengatan 7, 582 73 Linköping

Göran Gruber
Swedish National Heritage Board, Contract Archaeology Service East
Roxengatan 7, 582 73 Linköping

REFERENCES

Literature

Andersson, J., Aronsson, P. & Petersson, B. 2005. *Uppdragsarkeologins publika sida: Slättbygdsprojektet.* Riksantikvarieämbetet UV Öst, Rapport 2005:52: Linköping: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

Andersson, J. 2008. *Skilda Världar – Samtida föreställningar om kulturarvsplatser.* Diss. Linköping: Linköpings universitet.

Aronsson, P. 2006. Kulturarvets berättelser – industriarvets mening. In: Alzén, A & Burell, B. (Eds) *Otydligt, otympligt, otaligt: Det industriella kulturarvets utmaningar.* Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlag.

Aronsson, P. (Ed.). 2009. *Plats för en bättre värld: Auschwitz, Ruhr och röda stugor.* Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Beckman, S. 2005. Utvecklingstendenser i Nutida kulturarv. In: Aronsson, P. & Hillström, M. (Eds.). *Kulturarvens dynamik: Det institutionaliserade kulturarvets förändring.* Tema Kultur och samhälle, skriftserie 2005:2. Linköping: Linköpings universitet.

Burström, M. 2008a. *Samtidsarkeologi – varför gräva I det förflutna?* Södertörn Archaeological Studies 6. Stockholm: Södertörns högskola.

Burström, M. (Ed.). 2008b. *Arkeologi i förorten: Berättelser från norra Botkyrka.* Södertörn Archaeological Studies 7. Stockholm: Södertörns högskola.

Callon, M. 1986. Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In: Law, J. (Ed.). *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* Sociological Review Monograph 32. London, Boston, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Carlsson, T. 2004. *Arkeologisk slutundersökning: Mesolitikum och yngre järnålder på Strandvägen 1.* Riksantikvarieämbetet UV Öst: Dokumentation av fältarbetsfasen 2004:2. Linköping: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

Carlsson, T. (Ed.). 2004. *Mötesplats Motala: De första 8000 åren.* Linköping: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

Carlsson, T 2008. *Where the River Bends: Under the Boughs of Trees.* Acta Archaeologica Lundensia Series Altera in 8°, No 55. Lund: Lunds universitet.

Cleere, H. F. (Ed.). 1989. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Derry, L. & Malloy, M. (Eds). 2003. *Archaeology and Local Communities, Partners in Exploring the Past.* Washington D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.

Dicks, B. 2000. *Heritage, Place, and Community.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Dunnell. R. C. 1984. The Ethics of Archaeological Significance Decisions. In: Green, E. L. (Ed.). *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, 62–74. New York: Free Press.

Gruber, G. 2010. *Medeltider: Samtida mobiliseringsprocesser kring det förflutnas värden.* Diss. Linköping: Linköpings universitet.

Grundberg, J. 2000. *Kulturarvsförvaltningens samhällsuppdrag: En introduktion till kulturarvsförvaltningens teori och praktik.* Gotarc. Series C. Arkeologiska skrifter No. 33. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Holtorf, C. 2007. *Archaeology is a Brand! The Mening of Archaeology in Contemporary Popular Cultute.* Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Högberg, A. 2003. Människors platser: Integration och kulturarvsbruk i fokus. In: *Agenda kulturarv – inspiration & diskussion* 3. Stockholm: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

Högberg, A. 2006. Kulturmiljöpedagogik och ledarskap. In: Riddersporre, B. (Ed.). *Utbildningsledarskap – nu och i framtiden*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Högberg, A. & Holtorf, C. 2005. Talking People – from Community to Popular Archaeologies. In: Gustafsson, A. & Magnusson Staaf, B. (Eds). *Arkeologi – splittring eller mångfald*. Seminariedokumentation. Riksantikvarieämbetet.

Jeppson, P. L. & Brauner, G. 2003. Hey, Did You Hear about the Teacher Who Took the Class Out to Dig a Site? Some Common Misconceptions about Archaeology in Schools. In: Derry, L. & Malloy, M. (Eds). *Archaeology and Local Communities, Partners in Exploring the Past*. Washington D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.

Kelly, B. 2003. Foreword. In: Derry, L. & Malloy, M. (Eds). *Archaeology and Local Communities, Partners in Exploring the Past*. Washington D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.

Kulturrådets författningssamling. KRSF 2007:2. Riksantikvarieämbetets föreskrifter och allmänna råd avseende verkställigheten av 2 kap. 10–13 §§ lagen (1988:950) om kulturminnen m.m.

Larsson, L. 2005. From Blank Spot to Focal Point: An Eastern Swedish Site from a South Scandinavian Perspective. In: Gruber, G. (Ed.). *Identities in Transition: Mesolithic Strategies in the Swedish Province of Östergötland*. Riksantikvarieämbetet, Arkeologiska undersökningar, Skrifter 64. Stockholm: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

McGimsey, C. R. 1972. *Public Archaeology*. New York: Seminar Books.

Marshall, Y. 2002. What is Community Archaeology? *World Archaeology,* 34(2), *Community Archaeology.* London: Routledge.

Moser, S., Glazier, D., Phillips, J., Nasser el Nemr, L., Mousa, M. S., Aiesh, R. N., Richardson, S., Conner, A. & Seymour, M. 2002. Transforming Archaeology through Practice: Strategies for Collaborative Archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt. *World Archaeology*, 34(2), *Community Archaeology.* London: Routledge.

Pettersson, R. 2003. *Den svenska kulturmiljövårdens värdegrunder: En idéhistorisk bakgrund och analys*. Skrifter från forskningsprogrammet: Landskapet som arena nr 7. Umeå: Umeå universitet.

Simpson, F. A. 2010. *The Values of Community Archaeology: A Comparative Assessment between the UK and US*. BAR International Series 2105. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage.* New York: Routledge.

SOU, Statens Offentliga Utredningar. 2005. *Uppdragsarkeologi i tiden*. Betänkande av uppdragsarkeologiutredningen. SOU 2005:80. Stockholm.

Svanberg, F. & Wahlgren, K. H. 2007. *Publik arkeologi*. Stockholm: Statens Historiska museum.

Swedish National Heritage Board 2010. *Think in Time*. The Swedish National Heritage Board's strategy for 2010–2013.

Synnestvedt, A. 2008. *Fornlämningsplatsen: Kärleksaffär eller trist historia*. Diss. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Unpublished

Länsstyrelsen i Östergötland. Dnr 220-3775-00, delbeslut 2.

Länsstyrelsen i Östergötland. Dnr 431-4688-09, förfrågningsunderlag.

Länsstyrelsen i Östergötland. Dnr 431-27696-09, förfrågningsunderlag.

Personal communications

Högberg, A. 23 March 2011, Stockholm.

Internet

https://www.facebook.com/arkeologividmotalastrom. Accessed 30 June 2011.

http://www.platsr.se. Accessed 30 June 2011.

http://www.raa.se/cms/extern/aktuellt/projekt/platser.html. Accessed 30 June 2011.

http://www3.skolverket.se/ki03/front.aspx?sprak=SV&ar=0405&infotyp=5&skolform=21&id=3103&extraId. Accessed 30 June 2011.

http://verkstadsvagen.arkeologiuv.se/. Accessed 30 June 2011.