Introduction

Universities are increasingly aware of the issue of ‘inclusivity’ and try to address this in their teaching and curriculum content. But what exactly this means, how to go about it in a realistic and valuable way, and why it is important are not always clear or straightforward to departments and those who teach in them. Academic freedoms and maintaining academic standards, as well as more prosaic issues such as time, support and resources, are all common and valid concerns raised by those teaching in Higher Education in addressing inclusivity. How can these concerns be addressed within archaeology, and what sort of practical approaches to inclusivity can be taken to enable all students to have the opportunity to reach their personal learning potential?

This guide offers teachers some routes to reflecting on and enhancing inclusivity in their practice and curricula. Learners will also benefit by considering their own approaches to how and what they learn as well as their assumptions about teaching. It explores what inclusivity means in the changing context of today’s Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). It also addresses some of the ethical as well as practical aspects of teaching and learning in archaeology and what this means for the future of the discipline and its relevance for today’s learners.

The profiles of inclusivity and its concomitant theme, diversity, have become more pertinent in recent years in Higher Education as student populations increase and the demographic profile broadens. However, many Higher Education Institutions have struggled with exactly how to ensure inclusivity. There are concerns about becoming ‘politically correct’ in unhelpful and pejorative ways. A reasonable source of unease for academics is punitive approaches to enforcing diversity which are often perceived as undermining academic freedoms and standards of academic rigour.

The Higher Education Academy (HEA) has begun to support a positive awareness of diversity through engaging with the issues involved, and by offering practical approaches to inclusivity. In 2006 the HEA ran a conference ‘Curriculum Innovation for Diversity’ (www.heacademy.ac.uk/4896.htm), bringing together a range of disciplines to discuss different practical approaches, as well as encouraging commitment and collaboration, and developing an ethos of support for inclusivity in teaching and learning in Higher Education. Additionally, the Subject Centres have contributed to this work; of relevance here is the symposium on ‘Diversity in Archaeology’ (www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/archaeology/diversity_in_archaeology/symposium-2006.php) held by the History, Classics and Archaeology Subject Centre. This was a result of previous collaborations with key researchers in the area of diversity at the Teaching and Learning in Archaeology conference 2005. More recent work has focused on ‘Diversity and the Past’ (www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/events/details.php?id=385&category=archaeology), broadening the discussion to include the related disciplines of classics, history, art history, museology and heritage studies. The scope and the discussions covered in these events, as well as the obvious need to develop support materials to address the issues raised, have resulted in this guide.

We hope to offer teachers and learners the opportunity to reflect on and develop their own practice by considering the concepts, issues and case studies presented here.
Context

The term inclusivity is used here to encompass various other terms which may be more familiar to teachers and learners, including diversity, widening participation and equal opportunities. However, it is more than the sum of its parts. Inclusivity, unlike these other terms, is used to reflect an approach which does not place groups in opposition to each other. It respects diversity, but does not imply a lack of commonality; it supports the concept of widening participation, but does not imply an externally imposed value judgement; it values equality of opportunity, but encourages all to feel that this relates to them, and that the issues are not just projected as being relevant to groups more commonly defined as disenfranchised, and translated into universities’ targets for equality (i.e. those defined in government literature as Black Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, people with disabilities, or lower socio-economic groups).

For many years, the concepts underpinning these terms have created challenges for people and institutions working to try and make Higher Education more socially just and accessible. This, it might be suggested, is because there has been a strong focus on helping ‘others’ (a particular identifiable group) by trying to do what is ‘best’ for ‘them’. Whilst this work has been undeniably important in creating a shift in accessibility, the more complex issues now need attention. People may not consider themselves to be part of a defined ‘group’, have many identities to which they ally, or may resent being singled out as requiring ‘special’ attention, or indeed being excluded on the basis of a perceived ‘lack of diversity’. An alternative approach is to turn the mirror on ourselves and consider our own practice and what it means to us to be good teachers or learners.

The challenges which have begun to emerge as institutions put more effort into encouraging ‘Equality and Diversity’ in their recruitment, teaching, curriculum and retention of students are becoming increasingly evident. For example, groups which are not judged to be ‘disadvantaged’ or ‘deprived’ can begin to feel castigated, excluded or resentful, resulting in a backlash against what is perceived as ‘political correctness’ (Romer 2006). Conversely, groups that are judged to be ‘disadvantaged’ or ‘deprived’ in some way by their difference from a ‘traditional social norm’ (for example in the UK, this is generally associated with the terms middle class, white, male, and able-bodied) may feel patronised, stereotyped or resentful of being judged by aspects of their perceived identity which may be incorrect, or they may not personally associate with or prioritise. For example, two people with disabilities may perceive themselves in entirely different ways; whilst one may see themselves as having a disability which affects their education, the other may not perceive their disability as impacting on their learning, considering being a parent or full time worker to be greater challenges to their studies.

Inclusivity is based around including everyone, with the intention that no individual feels excluded. This may seem obvious, but when considering ‘diversity’ the intention can often become obscured in practice. This guide uses the concept of inclusivity to suggest a different approach which values all, whilst recognising the inherent difficulties that society generates for particular individuals and those who identify with particular groups.
Case Study

From Disability to Inclusion: The Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology (IAA) Project

Tim Phillips & Roberta Gilchrist, University of Reading

The recent legislation relating to disabled students has had a significant impact on aspects of teaching and learning within Higher Education. Institutions are now required to make 'reasonable adjustments' to include all students in every aspect of their courses. These adjustments must not be 'responsive', that is responding to the needs of individuals as and when required; they must be 'anticipatory'. Much work has been done to make on-campus teaching accessible to all students. However, there has been less effort directed at making fieldwork inclusive, especially in subjects like Archaeology where fieldwork training remains a key component of undergraduate study. The IAA project was set up to redress this imbalance.

The inclusion of disabled students into this practical part of the curriculum is, potentially, a major challenge for fieldwork directors. How can they anticipate the specific needs of every individual student who may, or may not, be present on fieldwork training? To determine the extent to which students can effectively participate in the activities associated with archaeology, it is necessary to determine their individual abilities to undertake the typical tasks involved in fieldwork. Firstly, the IAA project team characterised the physical and cognitive demands of the various archaeological tasks taught as part of fieldwork training. Secondly, a self-evaluation tool (ASSET - Archaeological Skills Self-Evaluation Tool kit) was developed with which students can identify their individual abilities and also their transferable skills, and track their development. The incorporation of transferable skills into the tool kit means that it is also applicable for use by non-disabled students. The tool kit was refined through controlled tests with disabled and non-disabled volunteers. This was followed by field trials on three training excavations.

ASSET has been designed for users with little or no previous experience of archaeological fieldwork. It gives them an idea of their potential to successfully complete various archaeological tasks, and the transferable skills related to participating in archaeological fieldwork. The tool kit can be used several times so that the development of skills and abilities can be tracked after each subsequent period of participation in fieldwork. Disabled students have successfully participated in archaeological fieldwork training when there has been an understanding and knowledge of their potential abilities and possible limitations. ASSET allows students to anticipate what, if any, reasonable adjustments may need to be provided. The format of the tool kit also lends itself to integration into Professional and Career Management Skills modules and programmes of student Personal Development Planning.

The project has produced a set of guidelines for good practice for including disabled students in archaeological fieldwork training and for making archaeological excavations accessible to visitors. These are partly based on the observations of the project team, but the main sources of information were the experiences of Archaeology Departments, disabled archaeology students and professional archaeologists. These are available through the HCA Subject Centre.

The successful development of the self-evaluation tool kit for use in archaeological fieldwork training is an example of how making provisions for disabled students can be a benefit to all students.

The tool kit is available as an on-line resource at:
www.hca.heacademy.ac.uk/access-archaeology/inclusive_acc
www.britarch.ac.uk
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Whilst revolutionary in practice, the underlying philosophy of the late 19th Century are still familiar to archaeologists today. Archaeological practices developed by General Pitt Rivers in England, modelled on ideals of military precision, were a key step in the rigorous ownership of the past. Such actions undeniably reflect an expression of power and were often associated with the shipping of large monuments across continents. The Palace Treasures were relocated in amazing logistical feats, such as the Rosetta Stone, Sargon II’s Palace Sculptures, and the Nineveh Palace Treasures, which were moved from the Persians to the British Museum. These actions were part of a larger trend, as artefacts from across the world were collected and brought to institutions like the Louvre and the New York Metropolitan Museum during and beyond the late 18th Century. The British Museum, in particular, was influential in the development of ‘Grand Tours’ that brought treasures from distant shores to the private viewing of white, male, middle-class scholars. Indeed, this has arguably been a significant factor in the discipline’s academic acceptance within Higher Education. However, archaeology additionally has a particular history which further influences its perceptions, practice, and portrayal, as will be briefly outlined here.

### The historical situation

The roots of the discipline lie in antiquarianism, which focused on the collection of objects and artefacts, rather than the study of people and lives in the past. The processes of mapping and collecting influenced the construction of museums, housing and displaying objects for both public and private view. The quest for the collection of items from the past, and from afar, were furthered by periods of colonialism, with the construction of Grand Tours bringing treasures from distant shores. During and beyond the late 18th Century, the British Museum, Louvre, and New York Metropolitan Museum were filled with artefacts from across the world. Artefacts such as the Rosetta Stone, Sargon II’s Palace Sculptures, and the Nineveh Palace Treasures were relocated in amazing logistical feats involving the shipping of large monuments across continents. Such actions undeniably reflect an expression of power and ownership of the past.

Modelled on ideals of military precision, the rigorous archaeological practices developed by General Pitt Rivers in the late 19th Century are still familiar to archaeologists today. Whilst revolutionary in practice, the underlying philosophy of social evolution at the time provided a particular motivation and attitude to the past. Peoples from the past, and from contemporary pre-industrial societies, were perceived as ‘primitive’, ‘savage’ or even ‘barbaric’, considered lower down on a social evolutionary scale which culminated in the modern Western industrialist at the pinnacle. We are all aware of these roots in the study of archaeology, and recognise that the beliefs and values held then are no longer acceptable or relevant. In fact, these beliefs are now recognised by the vast majority as colonialist, racist, and sexist. Judging the past by today’s morals and values however can be considered philosophically problematic and arguably unjustifiable. Whilst recognising and understanding the colonial roots of the discipline within the context of their time, as well as the impact that they have had on the present, archaeologists must now move the discipline forward to ensure its future is more socio-politically aware and responsible.

Archaeology is a powerful political tool; even in the 20th century it has been used for political aims, with works such as Gustaf Kossinna’s *Die Herkunft der Germanen* (The Origin of the Germans, 1911) used and misused by the Nazis in an attempt to utilise archaeology to legitimise the aims of Hitler and his party. Whilst this example is extreme, it does demonstrate the power of the manipulation of the past. There are also other ways of using the past which are empowering or disempowering, for example, traditional land-claims, where the presence of monuments, graves or evidence of habitation influences territorial claims of and against indigenous peoples in Australia, North America, or between Palestine and Israel. These examples demonstrate the relevance and political power of archaeology in the world today.

A less obvious use of the past is the legitimisation of current modern, Western, andro- and Euro-centric and heteronormative ideals, a situation addressed by a substantial body of literature (i.e. Gatens 1992; Gero and Conkey 1991; Tringham 2000; Dowson 2000, 2006; Joyce 2006). It is argued, for example, that our modern ideals of family life, including heterosexuality and labour/parental roles, are projected into the past, the consequence of which is that they appear natural and universal. Research has also begun to challenge more fundamental notions and understandings, such as individuality, personhood and relationships with the surrounding world (Chapman 2000; Thomas 2000; Fowler 2004; Strathern 1988; Boyd 2004). It is only recently that archaeologists have begun to address these assumptions, arguing that we should look beyond our modern perspectives to investigate alternative possibilities for social structures, identities, and ways of living in the past. Whilst for some these perspectives may seem speculative, difficult to grasp, and even more difficult to prove, they do demonstrate that archaeology can offer other perspectives and narratives of the past, portraying alternative dialogues and identities.

Of course, much of this is familiar to modern scholars. The importance of the political role that archaeology can play, and consequently the responsibilities, ethics, and values of archaeologists are not insignificant, but are fundamental to the very issue of inclusivity and the portrayal of the past in the present. Through examining the role of the archaeologist, the circumstances of the creation of past narratives can be more readily explored, and the discipline opened to alternative narratives, with the recognition of the responsibilities and the socio-political role of archaeology today. This theoretical perspective and history of the discipline is undoubtedly open to critique and disagreement. However, discussion of the modern implications of the history and theory of archaeology is important in grounding our practice in the real world.

---

### Inclusivity and Archaeology

Whilst the issues raised above are relevant throughout much of the HE sector, this guide specifically addresses archaeology. This section will ask why issues of diversity and inclusivity are important for archaeology, as well as discussing the historical context of our present situation.

So, why archaeology? Like many other subjects dealing with the past - and a picture seen in Higher Education generally - archaeology has come of age in a climate primarily dominated by white, male, middle-class scholars. Indeed, this has arguably been a significant factor in the discipline’s academic acceptance within Higher Education. However, archaeology additionally has a particular history which further influences its perceptions, practice, and portrayal, as will be briefly outlined here.

#### The historical situation

The roots of the discipline lie in antiquarianism, which focused on the collection of objects and artefacts, rather than the study of people and lives in the past. The processes of mapping and collecting influenced the construction of museums, housing and displaying objects for both public and private view. The quest for the collection of items from the past, and from afar, were furthered by periods of colonialism, with ‘Grand Tours’ bringing treasures from distant shores. During and beyond the late 18th Century, the British Museum, Louvre, and New York Metropolitan Museum were filled with artefacts from across the world. Artefacts such as the Rosetta Stone, Sargon II’s Palace Sculptures, and the Nineveh Palace Treasures were relocated in amazing logistical feats involving the shipping of large monuments across continents. Such actions undeniably reflect an expression of power and ownership of the past.

Modelled on ideals of military precision, the rigorous archaeological practices developed by General Pitt Rivers in the late 19th Century are still familiar to archaeologists today. Whilst revolutionary in practice, the underlying philosophy of
Inclusivity may be more substantially hindered by our inabilities to recognise our own biases and the limitations of our presumptions than an unwillingness to embrace the principle.

Case Study

Being and teaching ‘inclusivity’
Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, University of Cambridge

When considering inclusivity within the context of teaching at universities and HE institutions a number of factors need to be taken into account. This is because the actual characteristics of teaching and inclusivity depend on context. In particular, I find that there are three main, interconnected factors, including considerations and reflections over the potentials and challenges arising from different teaching formats, differences due to variations in the knowledge about the students being taught, and variations in what kind of inclusions are being targeted. Other factors, including specific local ones, such as the ethnic composition of the group or ongoing community projects, as well as issues related to particular academic fields and aims are also relevant; but I believe that increased awareness of the three factors mentioned above may be a helpful first step.

Teaching is per definition about relationships and communication, but neither of these is static. It is therefore of central importance to appreciate how the relationship between the participants will be differently construed according to context and that it is acknowledged that the perception of what is communicated changes as different modes of teaching are employed. Basically, the partners take on different roles depending on teaching format, and with this comes changes in notions of responsibility - what are you meant to do - as well as aims - what can be expected. A clear understanding of how those involved in a teaching situation take on different roles is essential for appreciating how teaching is done. The most common forms of teaching at the universities and other HE institutions are lectures, seminars, supervisions and practicals/demonstrations (including fieldwork in archaeology), and these expect very different ‘role-play’ in terms of the actions being performed. Broadly speaking, lecturing places the lecturer in an active, central role where some importance and authority is being granted to the lecturer while the student usually performs the role of a passive learner. At the other end of the spectra, during supervisions, the student is supposed to be the active partner, and his or her needs and views are central to the teaching, while the supervisor provides guidance and support. In a lecture, inclusivity is therefore largely the responsibility of the lecturer, and it should be brought in through the selection of themes and through accounts of difference. In student-centred teaching modes, on the other hand, the roles change, and the teaching should aim at guiding the student towards being able to think in terms of inclusivity (through critical reflection on sources, biases, assumptions and viewpoints) rather than providing this. On the scale from lecture to student-centred teaching modes one would therefore expect the concern with inclusively to change from being about coverage to being about how you think.

The ways in which issues of inclusivity can be tackled do, however, also depend on one’s knowledge about the pupils being taught and therefore about what they as individuals bring to the teaching context. In large mixed classes, the need for sensitivity towards differences in the backgrounds and experiences of the students would tend to mean that inclusivity may take somewhat predictable forms, while more critical discussions and comments can be made when one knows better what may affect and offend the students. Knowing something about students’ backgrounds may also encourage a greater awareness of the importance of inclusion, as well as making it easier to shape discussions in terms that may relate to differences that may matter to them. This can, however, be difficult, and sensitivity as well as tolerance are needed as students themselves may hold views at opposite ends of the political spectra or express opinions that are oppressive of others.

Finally, as an aim, inclusivity in teaching may be interpreted as referring to the inclusion of others and other views or as teaching students to be inclusive themselves in their ways of thinking; and while overlapping, these are not the same goals and they demand different responses. That teaching should be inclusive of others (including social groups, regions, lifestyles, and arguments) is now commonly agreed on, and the challenge is rather to ensure that it takes place, and in particular, how one decides what/who to include and by implication what/who to exclude. There are no easy rules for this, and decisions must be made in terms of specific aims, including the teaching objectives, and with some notion of priority. Inclusivity cannot aim to be exhaustive but it can hope that the presentation and involvement of different groups and views are made transparent and open to scrutiny and thus dissent. For instance, a lesson on gender in archaeology cannot aim to account for all the different propositions about the relationship between sex and gender and the different epistemologies they are based on, but it can aim to make clear how the sample of arguments presented were selected and are representative of the range available. Inclusivity may therefore be fostered if the decisions and principles used to select the topics covered are made explicit. In this sense, inclusivity may be more substantially hindered by our inabilities to recognise our own biases and the limitations of our presumptions than an unwillingness to embrace the principle. Inclusivity as a practical element of teaching content is thus a substantial challenge, and different individuals may respond to this differently. As a didactic device I have found it important to make it clear to students when something I say is my own personal view rather than a synthesis of general debates or other’s views; I feel this helps them as well as me to be aware of the range of different views and interpretations. It seems a more easily attainable goal to teach students to be inclusive. Critical reflection in one form or another is an established component of teaching at higher levels, and awareness of inclusivity can and has latched onto some of the existing teaching methods and aims; this means that students in general do encounter arguments about ‘alternative narratives’, critiques of andro- or Euro-centric interpretations, etc. As teachers the primary task is therefore not to define the agenda but rather to ensure that students learn to think about and with these themes.
Arguably including those from lower socio-economic backgrounds, and those with disabilities. Research from other disciplines has shown that the consequences of a lack of diversity among role models perpetuates a lack of diversity in student populations (Zinkiewicz and Trapp 2004; Monk 2000; Wellens et al 2004). So there is an argument that we need to encourage and open our subject up to a diverse range of students in order to encourage role models for the future. However, this is a long term approach; it will take time to engage children today, encouraging an interest in archaeology, fostering this into study, and ultimately encouraging research and careers as faculty members. Until strong academic role models represent a diversity of cultures, backgrounds and identities, how are we able to encourage a diversity of students into the study of archaeology? Whilst widening participation is starting to address this from the recruitment angle, it is imperative that inclusivity is incorporated into teaching and learning. This includes the curriculum, fieldwork, and teaching approaches, all of which are addressed below.

Interestingly, although there are no official statistics available, there appear to be more American and Canadian international students than there are British students from ethnic minorities studying archaeology. It has been speculated that this may be due to concepts such as ownership of the past, or to the perception of the value of studying subjects which may not always have a clear lucrative employment goal, such as medicine or law for example (Maharg, Anderson & Murray 2003). Whatever the reasons, clearly there is a differential approach to choosing to study the past, as our student case study in this guide demonstrates.

We have addressed some of the contextual issues and background. Questions which may now arise include asking why inclusivity is desirable and why it should be a motivation for teachers in HE. For some, inclusivity is not seen as a priority; they are not concerned with addressing diversity, being content with the
current status quo which does not engage with the changing world of archaeology and Higher Education. For others however, the reality of the issues they come across in their departments and teaching has opened eyes to the need for diversity. Primarily, legislation such as the Special Education Needs and Disability Act (2001) ([www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/20010010.htm](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/20010010.htm)), and the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) ([www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts2000/20000034.htm](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts2000/20000034.htm)), has had the most significant impact to date, demanding immediate changes. These measures reflect research undertaken by English Heritage for the Government into the need for heritage to be accessible to all (English Heritage 2000). Research highlighted the disenfranchisement felt by many in relation to heritage, with recommendations for the integration of historic environment teaching in schools, the need to reflect a multicultural society through education and teacher training, and the acknowledgement of the ‘contributions, values and needs of different social groups’ in the heritage sector, encouraging educational and community involvement (English Heritage 2000: 23). Such research reflects the growing climate of recognition for the needs of inclusivity and equality, also demonstrated in the government’s aims for 50% of school leavers to be in Higher Education by 2010 (Aim Higher 2007) ([www.aimhigher.ac.uk/about_us/about_aimhigher.cfm](http://www.aimhigher.ac.uk/about_us/about_aimhigher.cfm)). This latest legislation resulted in increased efforts in the area of widening participation. Through widening participation schemes children have been targeted with a view to encouraging them to enter Higher Education. Aspiration-raising initiatives have demonstrated the possibilities open to pupils through a university education. These efforts have primarily targeted areas of low socio-economic status. However, it is now being recognised that this alone is not enough. Whilst many programs have proved to be extremely successful, issues of retention and attainment are only recently beginning to appear on the departments’ agendas. There have additionally been concerns raised about the nature of measuring success and the need to do more than ‘tick boxes’ (Dhanjal and Agate 2005). An inclusive approach is needed throughout the HEIs themselves, not simply through recruitment. It should also be noted that efforts need to be consistent; there have been moves previously by universities to include communities in their work (seen during the 1970s and 1980s for example (Selkirk 1975)); however, efforts and activities have rarely been consistent or lasting. More needs to be done to ensure that education is inclusive once students are actually in HE. This in turn will undoubtedly make the subject more appealing, and so also encourage further recruitment. Making HEIs more inclusive will contribute to the retention of students, but it is also the case that through making teaching and learning more inclusive, all students will benefit.

As well as legislation, there is also a recognised need to encourage inclusivity for the future sustainability of the discipline; it needs to thrive to continue, and retain its importance in the public eye, thus hopefully ensuring that support, and funding, continue and grow. Rather than marginalising groups, this guide addresses how a more inclusive approach will be beneficial to all and offers practical ideas for ways forward.

The Curriculum

The content of the curriculum in the context of this guide refers to syllabus and material; the way that this is taught will be discussed separately below. Recent research undertaken at the University of York (Hull 2005; Romer 2005, 2006) has acted as a case study which suggests that where relevant to the subject being taught, teachers in HE are generally interested in developing their curriculum to reflect and engage with aspects of diversity. The findings from the York Equality and Diversity in the Curriculum project, which addressed disciplines from the Sciences, Arts and Humanities (including Archaeology), found resonance with the experiences from Higher Education Institutions around the UK ([www.edu.salford.ac.uk/scd/edcurriculum/](http://www.edu.salford.ac.uk/scd/edcurriculum/), [www.brad.ac.uk/acad/health/research/cid/index.php](http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/health/research/cid/index.php), [www.sussex.ac.uk/equalities/r-5-5-1.html](http://www.sussex.ac.uk/equalities/r-5-5-1.html)). However, despite this positive desire or intention, the practicalities of implementing change to the curriculum are seen as more problematic for some very straightforward reasons. One of the key concerns for academics is ensuring that they are not just paying lip-service to diversity by stereotyping particular groups or just ‘adding on’ diversity to the traditional curriculum. What is desired is an integration of diversity throughout the curriculum. In other words, mainstreaming, rather than ‘ghettoising’ diversity. However, teachers may consider this to pose more difficulties in practice than the ideas might suggest. These difficulties include the time required to research and make changes, confidence that the changes being made are appropriate, informed and relevant, and that they are not being ‘told what to teach’ by some external punitive, ‘politically correct’ controlling force (Romer 2006).

The availability of time to investigate aspects of diversity in a topic and then incorporate these issues this into a curriculum is seen as one of the primary barriers in the current RAE driven HE culture (although obviously there are also other concerns too, such as the rising demands of maintaining a Continuing Professional Development profile, as well as pressure now being placed on departments to consider the needs of employers, as outlined in the Leitch report ([http://hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/leitch_review/review_leitch_index.cfm](http://hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/leitch_review/review_leitch_index.cfm))). If inclusivity is to be mainstreamed in a valuable way there will be necessary time investment required. Understandably, this can be seen as a barrier by academics who are rightly concerned about time pressures. Academics may be concerned about the amount of time they feel would be needed to carry out the research necessary to enhance the diversity of their curriculum, particularly if the context, issues, or concepts are unfamiliar to them (Romer 2005). However, this concern is one which effectively prevents any action to engage with diversity in the curriculum being taken. Action and change are often prevented by a lack of confidence about how to go about making changes to...
diversify the curriculum. Without guidance as to how to go about implementing changes, particularly in light of a desire to avoid stereotyping, teachers may become stuck. As we shall see below, through making use of reliable guidance, and combining this with open discussion, changes to the curriculum can be made easier, and need not take undue time. As demonstrated through research in other disciplines (Branfoot 2006; and contributions to the Globalising Art, Architecture and Design History project (http://www.glaadh.ac.uk/initiatives/initiatives.htm) including case studies by Shakeshaft; Pratt; Lloyd; Branfoot), developments do not need to be made all at once, but can be introduced gradually. This guide provides some starting points to help teachers build their confidence, and to support them in continuing to take steps towards greater diversity in their curricula.

The research highlighted above suggests that some academics have a concern that diversity will be imposed onto the curriculum in a ‘politically correct way’, regardless of relevance (Romer 2005). This concern is based on a misconception of the aims of inclusivity. Relevance to topic and content are important factors in ensuring that developments in the curriculum are truly valuable. However, discussions of how relevant diversity is to a particular topic are still necessary as relevance may exist in unexpected areas. For example, it may be difficult to see where a discussion of diversity would be relevant in teaching stratigraphy. Yet even in studies of prehistoric and protohistoric social hierarchies, where aspects such as gender, wealth, and belief are commonly seen as relevant, issues relating to disability or ethnicity are more often overlooked.

Broadening the scope of the curriculum at various levels is an obvious way to build inclusivity into what is being taught. Considering which examples and case studies are used can go a long way. For example, addressing disability and its social implications in past societies as part of the curriculum for modules relating to death, burial and human osteology. Or considering issues of ethnicity and class where mass burials of executed slaves exist within the elite burials. This would not only be positive from the perspective of inclusivity, but also enables students to expand their critical awareness and follow up on specific areas of interest. Reviewing course reading lists is another practical way to improve the inclusivity of a course. Adding sources which address diversity directly, such as Hubert’s (2000) edited volume Madness, Disability and Social Exclusion: The Archaeology and Anthropology of Difference or Meskell’s (2004) Private Life in New Kingdom Egypt (which deals directly with aspects of sexual orientation in the past), not to ‘special’ diversity modules, but as part of the reading for general courses on social aspects of archaeology widens the scope for students. Including references for books and articles which are written by archaeologists working within a diversity of socio-political contexts and from a range of archaeological traditions is another way of expanding a course’s diversity. All students will benefit from this type of development as it stimulates engagement with the topics being taught. And while these sorts of approaches do exist in the practice of some, an active awareness of and engagement with including a diversity of content in the curriculum of mainstream archaeology in the UK remains limited. However, as will be discussed below, the issue involves much more than addressing the content of modules.
In recent years there have been interesting developments in the sphere of ‘community archaeology’. There is no established definition of what really constitutes ‘community archaeology’, but the term has generally been used to denote projects – whether landscape or buildings surveys, archaeological excavation or a combination of all three – which bring together members of a particular community for the purpose of investigating aspects of the historic environment around them. Such communities could be urban or rural, of any age, faith or ethnic background, and can be just two people or several hundred.

The key feature of community archaeology is the coming together of volunteers from various walks of life, many of whom have never before been active in archaeology. Sometimes their interest may be sparked by a threat to some local heritage landmark. Other times, it will be a general interest in their local area, perhaps arising out of a professional excavation or specially arranged community fieldwork project. People will be brought together who might not otherwise meet and people from different parts of the community can work together, thus encouraging a greater sense of social cohesion. Some of the people who benefit from community archaeology may be those who might not otherwise have had access to the kind of opportunities that archaeology offers, e.g. those who left school without qualifications, young offenders, people with a disability, particular ethnic groups. For some, it might be the first step towards a re-engagement with education by stimulating a desire to learn more about archaeology or local history. The community of interest in archaeology can help foster a social community with benefits beyond archaeology itself.

Recently, community projects have been given a boost with the launch of the Community Archaeology Forum (CAF). An important feature of this web resource is that it’s a ‘wiki’, using technology similar to that employed by Wikipedia. It is therefore designed to be community-led, so it allows anybody to help build the resource. Once a user has registered and signed-in, they can create new pages describing their project, initiative or research, comment on other people’s pages or add to the advice and guidance section. Webpages, reports, pictures or anything else can be inserted for others to look at and comment on. There’s also a linked email discussion list so that those involved in community archaeology can share advice and ideas, discuss pages created on CAF and broadcast forthcoming events and publications.

One of the first participants in CAF was the Kingsbury High School Archaeology Project (KHSAP). Since 2004, teachers have combined forces with the Institute of Archaeology at University College London to investigate the archaeology of their grounds each summer. Pupils of all ages take part, and pupils from Year 12 have made and posted a podcast describing the project. People will be brought together who might not otherwise have had access to the kind of opportunities that archaeology offers, e.g. those who left school without qualifications, young offenders, people with a disability, particular ethnic groups. For some, it might be the first step towards a re-engagement with education by stimulating a desire to learn more about archaeology or local history. The community of interest in archaeology can help foster a social community with benefits beyond archaeology itself.

Teaching approaches

Many HEIs are now providing support and resources to enable inclusive teaching. Through the support of disability offices, Equality and Diversity, and Widening Participation units, training sessions and information have become standard at the majority of universities. However, these are often generic in approach, with subject specific support and resources only recently beginning to emerge. Work that addresses generic issues, such as accessibility of materials, is certainly valuable and necessary. However, addressing the subject specific issues is also crucial. For example, issues concerning fieldwork, or approaches to teaching about cultural, politically, or ideologically sensitive interpretations of the past, take inclusive teaching to a deeper level.

Generic changes to teaching approaches and materials, such as considering font size in handouts and electronic presentations, or ensuring that lecture notes and other materials are available prior to classes, are simple ways of enhancing teaching to benefit all students, including those with disabilities (such as visual impairments or dyslexia), or students for which English is a second language. Additional circumstances may also arise, such as students with particular religious observances facing opposing responsibilities in attendance at key times during their religious calendars, or that a student who has a preference for a visual learning style may request the images included in a lecture to supplement their notes. It is important that teachers have an awareness that these issues may arise, as well as an understanding of appropriate ways of addressing them. Many generic as well as subject specific (see the case study in this guide From Disability to Inclusion) sources of information about accessibility regarding these issues are now available, much of it online, including:
It is important that teachers have an awareness that these issues may arise, as well as an understanding of appropriate ways of addressing them. One barrier which needs to be considered is the valid concern that some academics have, that if they make detailed notes of their lectures available it will disincline students to attend lectures. Policy in relation to general accessibility issues such as this need to be discussed at Board of Studies level, involving student representatives. However, making pre-emptive reasonable adjustments for students with a disability, such as a visual impairment or Dyslexia, is now a legal requirement upon all HEIs. The most positive ways forward are:

- To ensure that needs are discussed with students prior to starting their first term
- ‘Signpost’ students to relevant support services as early as possible during a student’s time at university
- Allow time before the start of term to put arrangements into place e.g. making audio recordings, notes with large sized font or making assistive technologies available
- Not to assume that a student will always know what support is available to them, either in the case of home or international students
- For teachers, departments and students to work in partnership with the assistance of support offices and staff (e.g. university Disability or Equal Opportunities Offices/Officers).

This process can seem daunting, especially if teachers are unsure of the specific approaches to meeting a student’s needs that are relevant or workable in each individual case. It is important that teachers do not expect themselves to become ‘experts’ in relation to inclusivity, but that they are willing to discuss the issues with the student. However, making the time to attend inclusivity or diversity awareness training is a step which can both increase awareness of good practice in this area and help to build a teacher’s confidence in dealing with student’s needs.

‘Signposting’ or directing a student to a support office to address a need, or another person who might better understand where to direct the student, is an important part of addressing inclusivity in a practical way. One of the questions which often comes up for academics attending diversity training is ‘how can I be expected to know everything about every ‘group’ and every student?’ Time, both for gaining knowledge of aspects of diversity, and with regard to contact with students, is more usually the issue rather than academics not wanting to engage with inclusivity. Being aware of the support within your own institution is key. Teachers cannot be specialists in everything, nor are they likely to have the time to be. Directing students to the right place or person, and being willing to ask for guidance on how to address issues (from both specialist support offices and the student themselves) is a simple way to lighten time-pressures in both the short and long term. If the support is not there at an institutional level, taking the issues to Departmental Boards of Studies and University Teaching Committees should be considered. Letting students know that they can ask for advice and guidance from teachers or the department, and that their needs will be considered seriously, is imperative for an inclusive approach, as the Student Case Study clearly illustrates.

Using student feedback to aid the development of inclusivity in teaching at a departmental level is a way of making use of systems already in place. Student feedback forms or discussion meetings may only require small adjustments or additions to gather the right kinds of information of relevance to inclusivity. Students are then also able to see that their comments are being taken into consideration which helps to build trust that a department will act appropriately regarding inclusivity issues. Just asking the questions but not using the information gathered however, is a pointless exercise which actually acts to reduce trust amongst students. Again, guidance from specialists with developing student feedback mechanisms to make them more inclusive may be required (such as from the staff at Equality and Diversity Offices who have to address inclusivity in monitoring and feedback).

At a personal level, teachers can also engage with inclusivity by beginning to consider their teaching style and the structure of their teaching sessions. In the changing face of Higher Education today, issues such as student learning style and disability access are beginning to resonate more strongly with the experience of lecturers. This does not mean a wholesale shift in practice, nor a reduction in academic rigour. What it does mean is asking yourself some questions. For example, ‘does the way I am currently teaching actually do what I want it to do?’, i.e. communicate information to students and assist them in understanding and thoughtfully engaging with a topic? Again, student feedback, as well as essay marks, exam question choices, and results for modules, can give some guidance here. Discussing this sort of issue with colleagues, directors of studies and support offices are all ways of being certain that any changes you do decide to make are relevant and valuable. Small changes, for example, making time at the end of lectures for questions and discussion, can support a diversity of student learning styles in one session (Hull 2005). Organising modules to have a diversity of teaching approaches may actually be of benefit to all students. As research suggests, ‘matching’ learning styles has positive benefits for student learning outcomes, however strengthening student learning by also encouraging ‘mismatch’ of learning styles has been argued by some educationalists to be of benefit to the student (Coffield et al 2004; Kolb 1984; Matthews 1991). Consequently, flexibility may therefore be the most positive approach for inclusive teaching. Accepting that a range of methods for communicating information to students are different, yet equally as valuable as standing at the front of a room lecturing, can be a challenging idea for some academics. It may even be difficult to actually do, or get used to in practice; after all, quite understandably, teachers prefer to teach in the learning style they personally find most comfortable. Once again discussions are helpful. Teachers want to do the best for their students (Romer 2005), and being open to personal and professional development would appear to be key to both student and staff satisfaction. The true value of changes and developments for inclusivity is therefore in positive outcomes for both student and teacher.
Fieldwork

One of the strengths of an archaeology degree is the role that fieldwork and practical experience play (see the QAA Subject Benchmark Statement for Archaeology 2007, [www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/benchmark/honours/archaeology.asp](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/benchmark/honours/archaeology.asp); and Darvill in press for a summary of recent updates to the Statement). Fieldwork enhances social and personal attributes, such as teamwork, reliability, and responsibility (Brennan et al, in prep.). It also develops academic skills, including analytical thought, attention to detail, and critical thinking and is crucial in promoting students’ understanding of the processes through which interpretations and knowledge about the past are created and presented (Brennan et al, in prep.). However, it can also raise its own issues in terms of inclusivity (see also [www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn/disabil/toch.htm](http://www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn/disabil/toch.htm) for comparable research from geography subject areas). Fieldwork can be physically and mentally demanding for any student, but, for example, it may be of additional concern for a student with a disability. The case study in this guide by Tim Phillips and Roberta Gilchrist (University of Reading), outlines some of the challenges faced by students with disabilities, as well as by departments in ensuring anticipatory measures are taken. It is intended that the guidelines and toolkit produced by the Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology project will go some way towards countering the challenges and situations arising from inclusivity.

Aside from the physical demands of fieldwork, there can be social and emotional issues which surround it. Whilst many students find the conditions of fieldwork conducive to camaraderie and team building, for others the mixed conditions and lack of facilities common to excavation sites can be challenging. For some, the whole experience of fieldwork can be a daunting one, and the gaining of field experience avoided in an attempt to refrain from close living situations and lack of personal space. In reality there is often little that can be done to change living conditions, with excavations run to a limited budget. However, it is the case that certain small steps can be taken to minimise apprehension and fears surrounding the fieldwork experience.

The Inclusive, Accessible, Archaeology Guidelines (Phillips et al 2007: 23) investigate the main factors to consider in the field in relation to students with mental health issues. The highly collective atmosphere of a dig can lead to situations which students with mental health issues may find difficult to manage. It is important that whilst offering solutions, that possible feelings of resentment that may arise from perceived ‘special treatment’ when peers are not aware of the context, is curbed. Disclosing the mental health concerns of a student (or indeed other disability issues) to their peers is not only not a solution, but without the consent of the student in question, it is also illegal. Solutions, such as allowing constructive ‘time out’, are possible; for example, not simply allowing students time alone, but ensuring this is productive through assigning tasks (i.e. processing finds, cataloguing etc.), can go a long way towards eliminating impressions of special treatment. Discussing possibilities with the student in question will help teachers in the field to arrive at the most appropriate and realistic approach for individual cases. If this is something a teacher is not confident about doing, asking a colleague with specific welfare responsibilities or training may be a useful support.

A first step in alleviating concerns - whether they are related to culture, beliefs, disabilities, or other issues - is an understanding of the possible roots of apprehensions (although it should be noted that, although beyond the scope of this present study, financial and time concerns are also common factors in prohibiting fieldwork). Is it mixed accommodation that is feared? If so, this may be due to cultural attitudes, or perhaps simply shyness. Making certain sleeping spaces single sex, and making it known that these will be available, could easily remedy this. One of the most commonly cited concerns has been the reputation of alcohol dominating the social scene of excavation. Again, concerns could arise for a range of reasons; religious, cultural or personal attitudes, health grounds, or previous problems with alcohol. Many students may find the prospect of such an environment threatening or prohibiting, fearing they will
be excluded for not participating, or pressured into drinking. Undoubtedly, it would be difficult to enforce an alcohol-free excavation, and no one is suggesting that this should be the case. However, more can be done to ensure the focus remains on the social aspects of gatherings, rather than primarily highlighting the consumption of alcohol. There are situations, for example, the end of dig party, when drinking inevitably takes place. However, it is not difficult to ensure that alternatives are available and that the focus is placed on the social activity itself rather than drinking. This can go a long way towards social inclusivity.

On a more day-to-day level during fieldwork, whilst it is undoubtedly the case that alcohol does flow, this is far from the universal picture. Yet the alternative experiences are not those that are talked about. For example, on most research sites you will find a percentage of the students in a pub or sat around a campfire drinking beer. You are also likely to find research students, aware of upcoming deadlines, working on dissertations or publications. There will undoubtedly be staff and other team members working late into the night to write-up and process the day’s results, or get on top of a backlog. You will inevitably also find a percentage of people, including staff and students, sat around the kettle drinking cups of tea or hot chocolate. So addressing the situation actually requires few changes. Primarily, a more honest communication of what actually happens on most sites is what is needed.

Ultimately, communication is at the heart of the situation. As demonstrated in our student case study, often fears and apprehensions are exemplified through the lack of a student’s confidence to alert members of staff to their needs. By making clear to students that it is acceptable to have open discussions to address their needs, and that these will be positively received and acted upon in good faith, confidence can be built, and concerns and apprehensions overcome.

So whilst fieldwork may at the outset appear to be daunting and exclusive to some, small changes and good communication can go a long way towards settling fears, and encouraging inclusivity. This will enable all students access to the positive experiences so often cited as resulting from the fieldwork components of undergraduate degrees.
Studying Archaeology: A UK student perspective

Alia Ullah

I have completed a Cultural Heritage undergraduate course at university. During the three years of my degree I faced many new challenges like many of my fellow students. However, as the only South Asian Moslem girl in my year on the archaeology course I believe I encountered a number of new challenges, issues and perceptions when studying archaeology, not only in regards to the faculty but amongst the South Asian community also. I have had some negative experiences, but these have been counteracted with the support from lecturers, tutors and various groups within the university.

Excavation was one of the major issues I faced during my course. In my first year I did not choose to go on excavation due to the way the experience was presented. I was told that after excavating everybody would go 'out for a few beers' as part of the social norm. Due to my religious beliefs I would not be able to be involved in such socialising activities. I do not expect others to stop enjoying themselves as they please, but I feel that perhaps the excavation experience could have been presented in another more inclusive way as individuals like me would have felt more confident about joining in. Another issue with regards to excavation was the fact that I did not want to stay in mixed accommodation. I was too afraid to raise either issue as I felt embarrassed as I appeared to be the only one affected by them so did not feel comfortable highlighting them.

Another perception and challenge I faced was the fact that I suffer from hyper joint mobility, and my doctor suggested that I do not study archaeology as excavation is too taxing. I did not have the confidence to raise the issue with any tutors as I did not know who to speak to in particular. Subsequently, due to the fact that I was not involved in any excavation projects, I felt I was unable to bond with other students on the course, which resulted in an act of perceived self-segregation. I felt so strongly about the issue of perceived self-segregation due to my experiences when studying archaeology that I based my dissertation on the perceived self-segregation of postcolonial communities in Manchester.

Another challenge I faced was the fact that the South Asian community I know posses a lack of knowledge about the benefits archaeology has for wider society. As there is no distinct resulting career path there is a lack of interest in the topic. Also, many South Asians do not consider archaeology as a career path simply because they are unaware that there is a possibility of studying such a topic.

Now I am in my final year I am a lot more confident about raising issues with my tutors and I feel that due to my previous lack of confidence I have missed out on opportunities. After having discussed my concerns with my lecturers and tutors I have found that they have been immensely supportive and have put me in contact with support networks such as the Disability Support Office and the Widening Participation team. The people I have met through these networks have developed my confidence which has helped me to complete my degree. I have now decided to develop a career in the museum sector.

I do not believe that information on events, available support and opportunities in regards to archaeology are brought to the attention of students effectively. To improve and continue the work of support groups in the university, in conjunction with the faculty, would be beneficial as students would realise that support is there. Perhaps the range of topics to study could be made more broad and diverse as this would make the subject more inclusive. I believe that emphasis should be placed on World Archaeology as this would encourage people from all backgrounds to study archaeology at University level. Topics such as colonial archaeology and the archaeology of Asia were not represented in the course at all. I believe that if we start to actively address the issues I have raised and those of other students, archaeology will become more inclusive and others may have the opportunity to study archaeology in the field, not only behind the scenes in museums and similar areas.

Conclusion

The concepts, approaches and case studies presented in this guide are intended to inform teachers and learners of positive routes to inclusivity for archaeology in Higher Education. The motivations that drive inclusivity in HE generally, and in archaeology specifically, are deeply embedded in the cultural, historical contexts of Western academia and the discipline. Being able to incorporate a real understanding of these contexts into inclusive approaches to teaching and learning will help to inform and avoid the pitfalls of a politically correct, counter-productive response.

Protecting academic freedoms, ensuring relevance and the appropriateness of developments and changes, as well as avoiding ‘political correctness’ and stereotyping, can all be seen as positive values for teaching and learning. By breaking down our concepts of categorisations around ‘diversity’, for example, those ‘target groups’ we are all familiar with, we can ensure that while individual identities can be respected, value judgements, as well as concepts of exclusion, can be avoided. Many of the practical approaches for ensuring that all students are included through teaching, and that diversity is embedded in the curriculum content, are straightforward and realistic to implement. The concerns of academics around inclusivity are for the most part understandable. Basic barriers such as time, and access to informed, appropriate support and resources can be addressed in the ways outlined above. However, a discussion of the issues is imperative to inclusivity, as without raising the concerns which allow the critique of inclusivity and diversity, development in this area would be stifled and become the very thing it seeks to challenge; a narrow, static view which is exclusionary.

The approaches to development and change suggested in this guide point to a real need for prioritisation and a recognition that if this work is to be valuable, a long-term view is needed. However tempting the idea of a revolution in teaching and learning practice may be for some, it is unrealistic and would result only in alienating those who hold misconceptions about what inclusivity is and means. Teachers need to be realistic about the changes they are able to implement, and be willing to make a long-term commitment to change, even if this means making small developments initially, which can then be built upon. We are all bound by time constraints and commitment pressures. However, through making gradual changes, real results which make a positive difference to student learning can be achieved. Ultimately, it is hoped that inclusivity will become naturally embedded into the mainstream of teaching and learning in Higher Education. Until then it is necessary to make concerted efforts to raise the profile, and perceived value, of an inclusive approach. While institutional support is undeniably advantageous, by taking responsibility over ourselves and our own actions as individuals, and as teachers and learners, we can begin to implement change.
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