

TABLE I Approaches to Archaeological Collaboration Highlighting Key Concepts and Examples

<i>Type of Approach</i>	<i>Emphasis and Key Concepts</i>	<i>Examples and References</i>
Collaboration	Defines a continuum of collaborative approaches. Some have resisted use of the term because of negative connotations in language of war (e.g., “collaborating with the enemy”).	Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008b) discuss and define “collaborative continuum.”
Collaborative archaeology	Closely parallels CBPR approach. Emphasis is on the “collaborative inquiry” approach that aims to meld distinct and disparate understandings of the world.	See Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008b). See Bray et al. (2000) for details of collaborative inquiry.
Cooperative archaeology	Similar to CBPR, but not explicitly community-driven or participatory. Brings together community members and archaeologists for projects that interest communities. Communities are involved, but are not necessarily decision-making partners.	Tesar (1986) discusses an early example at St. Augustine that involved a community advisory board in decision making.
Covenantal archaeology	Native American tribes and archaeologists develop and utilize agreements for archaeological project goals and methods on tribal lands.	Zimmerman (2000) frames the concept. See Bendremer and Thomas (2008) for one example of practice.
Community archaeology	Describes wide range of practices. Engagement of community with the local archaeology is central, primarily at fieldwork stage (not planning and interpretation). Focus is often on education to children/teachers. Others use it in ways similar to CBPR.	Simpson (2010) compares multiple U.S. and UK projects. Marshall’s (2002) special edition of <i>World Archaeology</i> provides an international set of case studies. Moser et al.’s (2002) use of the term is nearly synonymous with CBPR principles.

(continued)



TABLE I (continued)

<i>Type of Approach</i>	<i>Emphasis and Key Concepts</i>	<i>Examples and References</i>
Public archaeology	Often termed “public outreach,” archaeological interpretations are shared with the public, often in schools or with teachers, but they rarely involve the public in planning and decision making. Participants self-select without explicit effort to engage a wide cross-section of community. Some link the term with “applied anthropology” to describe a practice closely akin to CBPR.	Simpson (2010, 1) defines it as archaeology “with or for the public rather than just by and for professionals.”  Shackel and Chambers (2004) provide excellent case studies, many that include CBPR principles.
Civic engagement archaeology	Archaeologists work with communities, but projects are not necessarily community-driven. It intersects in multiple points with goals and principles of CBPR, but the focus is on using archaeology to increase civic awareness and engagement.	Little and Shackel (2007) and Little and Amdur-Clark (2008) provide examples of archaeology’s role in social justice and building civil responsibility.  See Putnum (2000) for foundation—need for increased civic engagement.
Service-learning archaeology	Involves community at all levels, emphasizes benefits to community. Focus is on training students and building civic engagement.	Nassaney and Levine (2009) provide excellent examples and theoretical discussion to support engaged teaching in the twenty-first century.



TABLE 3 Comparison of Conventional Archaeological Research and Community-Based Archaeology

<i>Aspect of Research Project</i>	<i>Conventional Archaeology Research Process</i>	<i>Community-Based Research Process</i>
Primary goal of research	Advance knowledge within the discipline	Primary goal is to answer/address community problems or questions; contributes to betterment of a community (social change); may also include questions that advance knowledge in the discipline, but balanced with spirit of reciprocity.
Source of problem/question	Locating gaps in existing research	Community-identified need or problem.
Who designs and conducts research?	Archaeologists, sometimes with assistance of graduate students	Archaeologists, students, community members (including broad cross-section of members), working in partnership.
Role of researcher with descendant or local community.	Visit local community during field season; act as expert "tour guides" during community visits; observe or interview community members for ethnoarchaeology or experimental archaeology; or no interaction at all	Both a research partner and learner; may still engage in ethno- and experimental archaeology projects, but these are also designed in partnership with community.
Role of descendant or local community in research project	Excavation labor force; research subjects/sources of information (e.g., ethnoarchaeology/experimental archaeology); invited to tour site on "community day"	Both a research partner and learner; active in all phases of research.

(continued)



TABLE 3 (continued)

<i>Aspect of Research Project</i>	<i>Conventional Archaeology Research Process</i>	<i>Community-Based Research Process</i>
Relationship of researcher to community members	Short-term (duration of each field season), task-oriented, friendly, or in some cases detached	Long-term, multifaceted partnership that takes on different roles throughout the process. Stoecker (1999) identifies community organizer; animator; and public educator.
Determination of value and validity of research	Peer review determines validity, contributes to knowledge for the discipline and general human knowledge.	Community review is primary, followed by academic peer review for work that is published for academic use. Value is determined by contribution to community and applicability, and also contributes to positive social change.
Development of research design (data collection, artifact handling protocols, treatment of sensitive materials, curation, etc.)	Archaeologists develop design using professional standards, often with the goal of objectivity, and a heavy reliance on quantitative methods.	Archaeologists work with a community to formulate rigorous yet flexible research design, and develop culturally appropriate field/lab/curation protocols. Traditional and experiential knowledge play a key role, and oral tradition is a valued source of data. Quantitative and qualitative data are valued.
Beneficiaries of the research	Archaeologists, academic community; sometimes "general public" receives limited information through public archaeology and popular media formats.	Archaeologists, descendant or local community members, and may also include multiple partnerships. Public audiences also considered.
Primary curation and access to data	Archaeologists, and those with access to a university (most often students, after they receive some training)	Community or joint archaeologist/ community. Terms are defined in partnership, and rely on cultural protocols defined by the community.



<i>Aspect of Research Project</i>	<i>Conventional Archaeology Research Process</i>	<i>Community-Based Research Process</i>
Method of presenting and disseminating results	Journal articles, academic books, professional conferences; sometimes also popular media via documentaries, news articles, K-12 education and public presentations	Varies widely—academic forms of reporting, but also shorter, plain language reports; may also involve multiple, creative formats (theater, comics, video, oral tradition, radio, ceremonies, narratives, community meetings, or other local media).
Project funding and permission	Grants written by archaeologist (often to university or public funding agencies); permission from government or government agency. Most universities do not require IRB review.	Varied—community-funded, coauthored grants to university or public funding agencies. Grant writing is part of capacity building for community; requires tribal council/community review. IRB review acknowledges impact of archaeology on human communities.
Stewardship	Archaeologists assume the role of steward for the archaeological record.	Community members become stewards or develop joint stewardship plan; community considers how to protect intellectual property related to traditional knowledge and oral history.