

ANALECTA PRAEHISTORICA LEIDENSIA 47

PUBLICATION OF THE P.J.R. MODDERMAN STICHTING/
FACULTY OF ARCHAEOLOGY
LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

EXCERPTA ARCHAEOLOGICA LEIDENSIA II

EDITED BY
HANS KAMERMANS AND CORRIE BAKELS



LEIDEN UNIVERSITY 2017

Series editors: Corrie Bakels / Hans Kamermans

Editor of illustrations: Joanne Porck

Copyright 2017 by the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden

ISSN 0169-7447

ISBN 978-90-822251-4-3

Contents

Enigmatic plant-working tools and the transition to farming in the Rhine/Meuse Delta 1

Aimée Little

Annelou van Gijn

A visual spatial analysis of Stone Age sites 11

Milco Wansleeben

A world ends: the demise of the northwestern Bandkeramik 19

Pieter van de Velde

Luc Amkreutz

Neutron-based analyses of three Bronze Age metal objects: a closer look at the Buggenum, Jutphaas and Escharen artefacts 37

Hans Postma

Luc Amkreutz

David Fontijn

Hans Kamermans

Winfried A. Kockelmann

Peter Schillebeeckx

Dirk Visser

Late Neolithic V-perforated buttons from a female burial in SE Poland: a comprehensive study of raw material, bone technology and use-life 59

Kinga Winnicka

Social space and (self)representation within Late Bronze Age Aegean and East Mediterranean palatial architecture 75

Ann Brysbaert

Excavations of Late Neolithic arable, burial mounds and a number of well-preserved skeletons at Oostwoud-Tuithoorn: a re-analysis of old data 95

Harry Fokkens

Barbara Veselka

Quentin Bourgeois

Iñigo Olalde

David Reich

Figuring out: coroplastic art and technè in Agrigento, Sicily: the results of a coroplastic experiment 151

Gerrie van Rooijen

Loe Jacobs

Dennis Braekmans

Natascha Sojc

Location preferences of rural settlements in the territory of Venusia: an inductive approach 163

Anita Casarotto

Enigmatic (?) friezes on Praenestine cistae 211

L. Bouke van der Meer

Visualizing antiquity before the digital age: early and late modern reconstructions of Greek and Roman cityscapes 225

Chiara Piccoli

Socio-economic status and plant remains: Maastricht (the Netherlands) 1875-1930 259

Corrie Bakels

Robine Groen-Houchin

Research design and dialogue: dynamics of participatory archaeology in Chalcatongo and Yosondúa, Mixteca Alta, Mexico 271

Alexander Geurds

The image of archaeology: consistencies and deflections through time among the Dutch, concurrences and deviations across Europe 289

Monique H. van den Dries

Krijn Boom

The image of archaeology: consistencies and deflections through time among the Dutch, concurrences and deviations across Europe

Monique H. van den Dries and Krijn Boom¹

A 1996 survey on the perception of archaeology among 3,820 Dutch citizens demonstrated that they attached a strong value to archaeology. Interest and concern was solid, however historic consciousness was low and the degree of participation even lower. The new 2015 NEARCH research project has collected comparable data on a larger scale, for nine European countries. This paper will compare the 1996 data to the 2015 data to evaluate differences in societal perception through time. The Dutch data will also be compared to the data from the other countries to evaluate national differences. Information will be assessed regarding the public image of archaeology, the level of knowledge, societal interest in and support for archaeology, and the participation and consumption patterns. This information is crucial to developing an optimal strategy for inclusion of and interaction with the public in archaeological research.

1 INTRODUCTION

There is an abundance of data on the public's view of archaeology and on the societal significance of archaeology in the Netherlands. In 1996, the Dutch archaeological sector initiated the first large public survey which was carried out by a specialised agency (NIPO/AIC 1996). Through interviews and questionnaires, 3,820 citizens were asked about their knowledge of Dutch archaeology, as well as their attitude and response to it. The general trend was that a majority (56%) of the participants valued archaeology, but that 60% did not participate in activities like site visits, or in consuming archaeology products. The people that did were mostly males aged 45 and above, with a high level of education and a high living standard.

During the consecutive decades, the government's social and cultural trends watching agency (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau) monitored developments in cultural participation and observed a slight increase in attention for cultural heritage, and higher visitor numbers for various museums and monuments between 1995 and 2007 (Van den Broek *et al.* 2005; Van den Broek *et al.* 2009, 9). This increase was however most pronounced with those particular segments of the public that were already used to participating.

Additionally, the Archaeological Heritage Management chair group of the Faculty of Archaeology (Leiden

University) and its students conducted several studies on public engagement and participation. While these included mainly small, local target groups, they too revealed a consistency in positive attitudes, yet underdeveloped participation levels (*e.g.* Lampe 2010; Van den Dries *et al.* 2015; Van den Dries *et al.* 2016; Wasmus 2010; Wu 2013).

In 2015, the NEARCH research project² conducted a survey on society's perception of archaeology among 4,516 adults (age 18 and older) from nine European countries (England, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Spain and Sweden). It included a representative sample of at least 500 people from each of these countries.³ The questionnaire was composed by the NEARCH research team, and data collection was carried out by Harris Interactive, a company specialised in public surveys. Harris Interactive selected participants from its access panels, between December 29th 2014 and January 6th 2015.⁴ For the Netherlands, the 500 survey respondents were divided into five age categories (18-24; 25-34; 35-44; 45-59; 60 and more), four regions (North, East, South, West) and three socio-professional categories (SPC+, SPC- and inactive people)⁵.

With the addition of the latter survey to the existing dataset, diachronic and synchronic comparisons are possible. These comparisons show interesting developments within the last twenty years in public perception in the Netherlands, as well as some noticeable differences between the Dutch and other European countries. This article discusses the Dutch and wider European image of archaeology, the public's acquaintance with sites and heritage management policies, its interest in and support for archaeology, and its participation levels, by comparing the rich dataset amassed over the past decades to new survey data collected in 2015.

2 IMAGE

The NEARCH 2015 survey results indicated that the Dutch public views archaeology primarily as an academic endeavour; the respondents most commonly defined it (Q1) as a 'study of the past' (51%). A majority (77%) also associated archaeology with the word 'science', when they were asked to select two keywords from a list of six (Q3).⁶ Moreover, they considered its prime role as 'knowing the

	Eng	Fra	Ger	Gre	Ita	Neth	Pol	Spa	Swe
A science	46	60	82	88	65	77	68	67	65
A profession	33	29	27	13	25	33	21	27	23
A cultural activity	28	30	29	27	33	17	14	23	27
A leisure pursuit	6	6	4	2	1	4	7	2	4

Table 1 Responses (in percentages) of the NEARCH survey participants across Europe to the question 'As you see it, archaeology is...' (Q3). The participating countries are represented in alphabetical order

Italy	Greece	Spain	England	Netherlands	Poland	France	Germany	Sweden
24	21	13	9	8	7	5	4	3

Table 2 Percentages of the NEARCH survey respondents believing archaeology contributes to national or the local economy (Q4). The European average was 10%. The order of the countries follows the rank order of the percentages (from high to low)

Italy	Greece	Germany	England	Spain	Poland	France	Sweden	Netherlands
9	9	7	7	6	6	5	5	3

Table 3 Percentages (from high to low) of the NEARCH survey respondents believing archaeology participates in the sustainable development of an area (Q4). The European average was 6%

Greece	Spain	Italy	Germany	France	UK	Sweden	Netherlands	Poland
7.0	5.6	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.5	2.4	1.9	1.7

Table 4 Travel and tourism's direct contribution to the GDP, 2014 (source: <http://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic%20impact%20research/countries%202015/spain2015.pdf>)

Italy	Spain	France	Germany	United Kingdom & Northern Ireland	Greece	Sweden	Poland	Netherlands
51	45	42	41	30	18	15	14	10

Table 5 The number of inscribed World Heritage sites in 2016 (source: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>)

Greece	Spain	France	Germany	UK	Poland	Italy	Netherlands	Sweden
13.7	6.9	6.7	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.2	2.9	2.8

Table 6 Travel and tourism investments' contribution (in percentages) to the total capital investment, 2014 (source: <http://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic%20impact%20research/countries%202015/spain2015.pdf>)

France	Spain	Italy	Germany	UK	Greece	Poland	Netherlands	Sweden
14.4	11.2	8.3	5.7	5.6	3.8	2.8	2.4	1.8

Table 7 Share (in percentages) of international tourist arrivals in 2014 (source: United Nations World Tourism Organisation 2015, 8)

history of the Netherlands' (56%). Between the subgroups of the Dutch sample, there were not many statistically significant differences, except that 48% of the 18-24 years old considered archaeology 'a profession', against only 24% of those in the age group of 25-34.

Some interesting differences in opinions could be observed between different European countries. The emphasis on *knowing* was for instance stronger among the Dutch than in other European countries, as the average European score for 'knowing the history of [my country]' was 44%. And despite the fact that in *all* countries archaeology was principally seen as 'a science', rather than, for instance, 'a profession' (table 1), this correlation was strongest among the respondents from Germany and Greece. The population in England showed the least strong correlation between the concepts of science and archaeology (46%). This difference could be related to variations in the meaning of the word 'science' in different languages.

The survey demonstrated that few people in Europe directly link archaeology with social and economic values; for instance only a minority of respondents per country considered it a cultural activity (table 1), and even less considered it a leisure activity. Only Poland had fewer people who considered archaeology a cultural activity than the Netherlands, while the respondents in Italy, France and Germany selected this option significantly more often than the European average of 25%.⁷

Even when the question about the value of archaeology was posed in a different way (Q4) and people were asked what they consider the three main roles of archaeology, only 5% of the Dutch thought of archaeology as having a role in entertaining citizens (against 4% for Europe as a whole) and 4% indicated that it contributes to the quality of life (4% for Europe as a whole). The younger age categories (18-24; 25-34) selected these options more often (11% and 9%) than those above the age of 35. It was only in Poland that slightly more people (9%) thought of archaeology as having a role in entertaining citizens. It was again in Poland that most people thought of archaeology as contributing to the quality of life (8%). Overall these are rather low numbers, and they suggest that the European political bodies designate a stronger role to cultural heritage in regard to social and economic development than the public.

Another interesting result was that when asked to give their own definition of archaeology (Q1), nobody in the Netherlands defined it as 'the preservation of remains (objects)'. This is striking, as the safeguarding of remains has been a core aspect of our profession from the very start; the first resolution to protect archaeological remains – i.e. the megalithic tombs (*hunebedden*) in Drenthe – dates back to 1734. Moreover, protecting monuments and other important

cultural heritage objects has always been the prime objective of the Monument Act since it was first implemented in 1961. The number of respondents that spontaneously thought about the preservation of remains when thinking about archaeology was low in all European countries (1%).

When subsequently asked why they considered archaeology useful (Q2), 79% of the Dutch answered 'to *know* where we come from/to *learn* about our past' (against the European average of 75%). Fortunately, none of the respondents from the Netherlands selected the option that archaeology is *not* useful. On the other hand, the Dutch did not consider it valuable for 'tourism/economy/employment' either.

When asked about the main roles of archaeology (Q4), only 8% of the Dutch respondents indicated that it contributes to the local or national economy (table 2). More men (14%) than women (4%) were convinced of this. For Europe as a whole, the average was 10%, but a remarkable difference in opinions could be observed among the people in Greece and Italy, where 21% and 24% indicated that archaeology contributes to the economy. Spain scored above the European average as well (13%). The smallest numbers of people believing archaeology contributes to the local or national economy was counted in Sweden (3%).

Not surprisingly then, Greece and Italy also had the largest number of people indicating archaeology contributes to the sustainable development of an area (Q4); 9% of the respondents selected this answer in both countries (table 3). Of all participants, the Dutch had the least faith in archaeology as an agent in the sustainable development of an area.

These differences in how archaeology is valued in economic terms are intriguing, yet rather difficult to explain. For the various countries there may be particular reasons why people think archaeology is, or is not, an important economic asset. In Greece and Italy it may for instance be related to the fact that (archaeological) heritage tourism has a high contribution to the GDP (table 4). This contribution is smallest in Poland, the Netherlands and Sweden. The number of World Heritage sites is also likely to be an important factor (table 5); Italy and Spain have the highest number, Sweden, Poland and the Netherlands the lowest. Additionally, Greece has the highest investment levels in tourism (table 6), far more than the Netherlands, Sweden and Poland. Furthermore, Greece had experienced an exceptional growth of 23% in international tourist arrivals in 2014 (United Nations World Tourism Organisation 2015, 7), just before the NEARCH survey was conducted.

These data may explain why the Dutch, Swedes and Poles experience little perception of economic value in relation to archaeology, yet they cannot explain the whole picture. For example, Italy belongs to the top five of tourism destinations,

but so do France and Spain. The latter even have a higher ranking (United Nations World Tourism Organisation 2015, 8) and a larger share of international arrivals (table 7). Why then do so few French and German citizens see economic value attached to archaeology?

2.1 *Image of archaeologists*

When asked about the activities that archaeologists conduct (Q6), the Dutch respondents indicated that archaeologists 'protect remains from the past' (94%), but the options that were selected most were 'they carry out excavations' (98%) and 'they discover treasures' (96%). The Dutch selected this last option more often than the other respondents across Europe (87%).

We do not know what causes these differences and why the Dutch are so focussed on the discovery of treasures. However, it does seem to be a widespread phenomenon, as during one of our community archaeology activities we also noticed that people were very focussed on discovering spectacular finds, and that they had a high expectation of finding something important during their participation in the dig (Wu 2013, 51). Some people even suggested to the organisers of the community dig that "next time they should pick pits that had equal chances to find things in the ground" as this would be more fair to all participants (idem). Perhaps part of the reason for this perception is that it is indeed through spectacular finds that archaeologists usually present their news and profession. This certainly is the focus of many Dutch media, as several studies of Dutch newspaper articles on archaeological issues have shown that the press is mainly focussed on reporting finds (Kramer 2013, 57). The newspapers that were included in these analyses also tend to associate archaeology with 'science' rather than culture as this is the section in which they publish most articles on archaeology (idem). Unfortunately, no data on media representation of archaeology is available for the other countries incorporated in this study, therefore it remains unclear whether the differences between countries visible in our data are related to differences in the journalistic approach common in each country.

3 KNOWLEDGE

3.1 *Acquaintance with the system*

With regard to the knowledge levels of the Dutch public, the NEARCH survey results showed there was little accurate knowledge about the heritage management system that is implemented in legislation in the Netherlands since 2007. While the introduction of development-led archaeology and a market system with contractors (in 2000) led to a fieldwork practice that has been dominated by the private sector since (see for instance Van den Dries 2013, 48), 63% of the

respondents thought amateur associations were the prime actor group conducting archaeological research (Q5), followed by universities (61%) and public institutes (59%). Men in particular thought amateur associations conduct archaeological research; 71% against 56% of the women. Only 28% (25% of the males against 30% of the females) thought companies play a role in archaeological research. The older age groups (45-59; 60+) in particular believed amateurs and universities still played a major role. As this was indeed the case some decades ago, it seems they have missed out on the more recent developments.

In Europe as a whole, the role of companies was mentioned by 40% of the respondents, and significantly more often by the younger age categories (18-24; 25-34; 35-44) than by people aged 60 and up (31% only). It seems that across Europe, older people in particular had not noticed how the situation had changed in the last two decades, with the introduction of the private sector into archaeological research.

Of all European survey participants, the Dutch were the least up to date regarding the role of the private sector. It must be noted that Greek respondents selected the option 'private companies' even less often than the Dutch, but this relates to the fact that no companies are active in archaeological research there, rather than to a lack of knowledge. The Netherlands also had the highest number of people (12%, against the European average of 5%) indicating they actually could not answer this question.

When confronted with the question of who manages archaeology in the Netherlands (Q17), the Dutch public displayed a clear lack of awareness. More than half (51%) of the respondents seemed to believe that the national government is the main actor managing the archaeological heritage (Q17). Indeed, this used to be the case, but the situation changed in 2007, when the revised Monument Act (as of 2016 replaced by the Heritage Act) formally gave local authorities the prime decision power on archaeological research. Only 30% of the respondents considered municipalities the main actors in archaeological heritage management. Remarkably, 'archaeological associations' were selected as the answer by 35% of the survey group although we have no such associations in the Netherlands. It is however possible that people interpreted amateur associations as falling under this description.

Men were most pronounced in their choices; 65% thought the national government manages archaeology, against 38% of the women; 37% of the men selected 'municipalities', against 23% of the women. Females more often (30%) indicated not to know (against 12% of the males). Younger age groups picked the national government far less frequently. They seemed to have a more accurate idea of the

situation than elderly people, although the younger people also indicated more often that they did not know (37% versus 14% of the 60+).

When asked about their understanding of the concept and policy of ‘development-led archaeology’ (Q22) – better known in some countries as ‘preventive archaeology’ – 75% of the Dutch indicated *not* to be familiar with it, against 64% of the European average. The people in England were the least familiar with the concept (76% indicated not to know it). Preventive archaeology was best known in Poland and Italy, where 49% and 45% indicated to know the term. Among the Dutch respondents, there were no significant differences between the region groups, gender groups or the socio-professional categories.

These are discrepancies across Europe that cannot as yet be explained due to the lack of sufficient contextual data. They may perhaps relate to how archaeology is represented in the national and local media, but this is a speculative hypothesis at best, as there is no data on this for the whole of Europe. For the Netherlands, we do know that the newspaper analyses discussed above showed that for the past couple of years hardly any news articles exist on issues such as the implementation of a new Monument Act, or of development-led archaeology (Kramer 2013, 57). If these newspapers did write about issues relating to the role of archaeology in society, it usually concerned ‘problems’, like the costs and other burdens involved in archaeological research (*idem*).

3.2 *Acquaintance with archaeological sites*

The respondents were asked about their acquaintance with 13 famous archaeological World Heritage sites (Q12); 8 of these (such as Pompeii, Stonehenge, and Petra) turned out to be known by the majority of the Dutch. Best known was the Acropolis in Athens (82%), followed by Italy’s Pompeii (known by 80%). All 13 sites were better known by males than females. Young people (18-24 years) had the least knowledge of the sites; for instance 57% of them knew the Acropolis in Athens, against 87% of the people above the age of 60. There was also a remarkable difference between the socio-professional categories, with significantly more people in the SPC+ category being acquainted with these sites than those in the inactive or SPC- category.

Compared to other European respondents, the Dutch scored lowest for knowledge of the World Heritage sites (Q12). They were least acquainted of all respondents with 6 out of the 13 sites that were shown to them. For comparison, the French had the lowest score on 4 sites, the English on 2, the Poles and Greek both on 1 site only. Regarding the Acropolis in Athens for instance, 82% of the Dutch indicated to know it, against 94% of the Spanish, 91% of the Germans. Moreover, the Terra Cotta Army of Xian (China) was known by 58% of the Dutch, against 84% of both the Italians and Spanish (the European average was 73%). This low level of acquaintance with the Terra Cotta Army is particularly remarkable, as the Dutch massively visited the blockbuster exhibition on the terracotta army in 2008.⁸ The Italians had the highest score on 6 sites, all well above the European average.

We cannot at this point explain the observable differences. Tourism studies have shown that Dutch people travel quite a lot (table 8), so they could in theory be expected to be more acquainted with famous archaeological sites. The Dutch are also in the top three of the cultural practice index of the European Commission’s Eurobarometer on cultural access and participation, which states that ‘The northern European countries, led by Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands, stand out as having the highest levels of cultural engagement [...]’ (TNS Opinion & Social 2013, 9). Could this striking result then perhaps relate to differences in school education programmes, or to the amount of attention to history and heritage in the most popular media that the respondents (see the section on information sources below)? Again, we can only speculate as we do not know of comparative studies on this for the whole of Europe.

3.3 *Information sources*

The Dutch survey participants indicated that their three main sources of information on archaeology (Q8) are documentary programmes and news reports on television or on the radio (selected by 46%), news articles in the national press (32%) and regional press (29%). Far less people mentioned gathering information by visiting archaeological sites or exhibitions (23%), reading books (19%) or visiting dedicated heritage days (8%). The low percentage for this last option

UK	Netherlands	Germany	Sweden	Poland	Italy	France	Spain	Greece
29.6	21.4	15.1	10.0	7.3	6.3	3.9	3.8	3.3

Table 8 Share of the population that has taken part in outbound trips in 2014 (source: [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/File:Population_\(aged_15_and_over\)_participating_in_tourism,_2014.png](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/File:Population_(aged_15_and_over)_participating_in_tourism,_2014.png))

did not come as a surprise, as there have been only very few of such dedicated days in our country. In the future, more people may be informed through such events, as in 2015 – after the survey was conducted – the National Days of Archaeology were installed, which are meant to become an annual event.⁹

Young people were significantly less focussed on written sources, television and visits and much more on social networks (20% for young people, 3-8% for the other age groups). This pattern is not unique for the archaeology domain, it was also found in both national (Cloin 2013, 91) and European surveys (*e.g.* TNS Opinion & Social 2014, Standard Eurobarometer 82) on media use. This implies that if the archaeological sector wants to reach out to various age groups, it needs to utilize a variety of information channels.

In comparison with the other European countries, the consumption of television documentary programs and news reports by the Dutch is rather low (46%), as the European average was 56% (table 9). Dutch people do watch less television than some other Europeans (table 10), but not much less than for instance the population in England, where 59% indicated to use this as a source of information on archaeology. This lower consumption level could therefore indicate that we may have less archaeology on offer than

some other countries, like for instance the United Kingdom (who had some famous programmes like ‘Time Team’ and ‘Meet the Ancestors’), but this has never been studied.

The Dutch did consume significantly more information through the national (32%) and regional press (29%); the Netherlands scored the highest in this regard (table 11, table 12). Greece and Italy had the lowest level of local (regional) newspaper use (6%). Does this mean there is more intense (local) news coverage on archaeology in the Netherlands? There is no data available about the level of press coverage of archaeology across Europe, but a master study on the representation of stakeholder values in local Greek newspapers suggests that at least some heritage projects are extensively covered by the Greek local media (Kotsaga 2016). Perhaps the relatively high level of attention for archaeology in the Dutch local press could relate to the fact that in our country, decisions on archaeology are made by local authorities, so their impact on the local policy and local budgets may also be felt directly by local communities. A counter argument is that these figures match quite neatly other survey results on European media use (table 13), showing that a relatively high consumption of written press by the Dutch and a low consumption by the Greek is the usual pattern. These results on general media use however do not explain why the NEARCH survey found low numbers

France	Greece	England	Germany	Italy	Sweden	Spain	Poland	Netherlands
60	60	59	58	57	55	55	54	46

Table 9 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents being informed on archaeology through documentary programs, or news reports on television/radio (Q8)

Spain	Italy	Greece	Germany	Poland	France	UK	Netherlands	Sweden
92	90	88	84	83	81	81	80	73

Table 10 Share of the population watching television (almost) every day, in 2014 (source: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb82/eb82_media_en.pdf)

Netherlands	UK	Greece	Poland	France	Spain	Sweden	Germany	Italy
32	26	24	23	22	22	21	19	16

Table 11 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents being informed on archaeology through articles in the national press (Q8), European average 23%

Netherlands	Germany	France	Sweden	Spain	Poland	England	Greece	Italy
29	17	13	13	10	10	9	6	6

Table 12 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents being informed on archaeology through articles in the regional press (Q8), European average 13%

for Sweden, as the Swedes generally have a high consumption of written press too (table 13).

4 ATTITUDE

4.1 *Public support*

With regard to the attitude of the public, the NEARCH survey showed that there is a high level of support for archaeology and archaeological research among the Dutch respondents (Q13). An overwhelming majority of 89% indicated that they think archaeology is useful, and almost three-quarters (73%) also thought it is important for the Netherlands to support archaeology (Q14). Moreover, 76% believed that having archaeological remains is an asset for a municipality (Q14), and two-third said that the construction of a road or building would have to be postponed if archaeological remains were found (Q15).

This positive attitude was however not unanimous. There were differences in opinions between age groups that Harris Interactive calculated as being statistically significant; for instance 77% of the young people (18-24) were convinced that archaeology is useful (Q13), against 93% of those aged 60 years and more (see table 20 below). While 81% of the older people (60 and up) thought that having archaeology is an advantage for a town, this was only the case for 65% of the young people (18-24). Moreover, 58% of the young believed that supporting archaeology is important for the country, in contrast to 77% of those of 60 years and older. There was also a bit more support among men than among women, although the differences were not statistically significant. On all of the issues just mentioned, women had a score slightly below the Dutch average. There was also more support among the people in the higher socio-professional category than amongst those in the lower category or the unemployed.

In comparison to the other European countries, public support was considerably less strong in the Netherlands. Although the percentage of Dutch saying they value

archaeology equalled the European average of 90% (Q13), with only England and France having lower scores (83% and 89% respectively), only 73% of the Dutch indicated that it is important for their country to support and develop archaeology (table 14), which is the lowest percentage of all evaluated countries. For comparison; in Greece and Italy almost everybody acknowledged that this is important. To give another example, 77% of all participating Europeans indicated that the construction of roads and buildings would have to be postponed when archaeological remains were to be found (Q15). In the Netherlands only 67% thought so. This was in fact the lowest score, followed by that of the Swedes (69%). The highest support was found in Greece, Spain and Germany (81%, 81% and 80% respectively).

The Dutch were the most satisfied with regard to the effort that is being made to maintain the archaeological record; only 40% said too little effort is being made, against the European average of 58%. In Italy this percentage was more than double; 90% thought much more effort should be made. The question is “how we can explain such differences between countries?”. Does the Dutch level of satisfaction imply that its heritage management approach is deemed sufficient and effective and that in some other countries there are more concerns? Or does it perhaps illustrate a lack of interest?

While few people were acquainted with the concept of development-led archaeology, or ‘preventive archaeology’ - as was discussed above (Q22), most European survey participants seemed to support this approach to heritage management. After the questionnaire had provided information on this concept and explained that it was introduced by the Malta Convention, almost all (92%) Dutch citizens subsequently responded that they think development-led archaeology is a good idea (Q24). Most of them (95%) thought the Malta Convention is a good thing as well (Q23). Interestingly, the Italians were the most positive; 98% was in favour of the Convention. Italy also had the highest number

Sweden	Germany	Netherlands	UK	France	Italy	Spain	Poland	Greece
70	56	54	32	31	26	21	12	7

Table 13 Share of the population reading the written press (almost) every day, in 2014 (source: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb82/eb82_media_en.pdf)

Greece	Italy	Spain	Germany	Poland	England	France	Sweden	Netherlands
95	94	85	82	82	81	81	77	73

Table 14 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents agreeing that it is important to support and develop archaeology (Q14). The European average was 83%

(95%) in favour of the concept of preventive archaeology (Q24). This is interesting as Italy was the last country to ratify the Malta Convention and implement the principle of development-led archaeology. In fact, Italy had not yet ratified the Convention when the survey was conducted, this happened only afterwards, on June 30th 2015 (table 15). The Germans were the least positive about the concept of preventive archaeology; they had the only negative score (9%) which was higher than the European average of 7%.

4.2 Responsibilities

When asked *who* should manage archaeology and whether the survey participants consider it the state's duty (Q18), 60% of the Dutch agreed, with males being particularly convinced (68%, against 53% of the females). A remarkably large group of 29% of the youngest respondents (18-24) disagreed, against 15% of those of 60 and above. For them it is apparently less self-evident that the state should be in charge. There were no real differences in the answers between people living in the different Dutch regions, but there were some differences between the socio-professional categories. Two-third of the people in the SPC-plus category agreed on the role of the state, against 55% of the inactive people and 56% in the SPC-minus category.

The response to this question (Q18) further illustrates the considerable differences in opinion between the participating countries. The British citizens were the least convinced that it is the State's task to manage archaeology; the European average was 65%, but only a minority of 42% of the British said so (23% disagreed, 35% did not know). The strongest proponents of a state-driven management system were the Italians, of whom 86% agreed, followed by the Spanish and the Polish citizens, of whom respectively 76% and 74% agreed.

When it comes to financing archaeology (Q19), the national government was at the top of the list for a large majority (75%) of the Dutch respondents. The European public thought so too (the European average was 75%), although the scores did differ from one country to another. The Swedes and British scored below the average, with 63% and 68% respectively. The government was chosen most often by the Italians and Greeks (respectively 84% and 82%).

Interestingly, only 20% of the Dutch put 'people undertaking building work that requires archaeological research' – usually referred to as 'disturbers', often consisting of developers, but also farmers and ordinary citizens building a house or a shed – at the top of their list of parties that need to finance archaeology. This is remarkable, as in practice disturbers are the prime funders of archaeological research in the Netherlands.

A small minority of 8% of the Dutch selected 'inhabitants through taxes', which was less than the European average of 12%. Most positive about the tax construction for funding archaeology were the Swedes, as 20% indicated inhabitants could pay taxes to pay for archaeology. 'Sponsoring through donations' was selected by only 29% of the Dutch, versus 44% for Europe as a whole. In fact, of all European participants, the Dutch were least in favour of asking sponsors to take part in financing archaeological research. The French were most positive about this option (56%). Together with 40% of the British, the French (39%) were also the most positive about asking the disturber to pay for the archaeological excavations that their building activities may cause.

Among the Dutch participants, no significant differences were found between the two gender groups. There was however a difference in opinions between the age categories. Of the young people (age 18-24), only 55% selected 'the national government', versus 81% of those aged 60 and older. As already indicated above, the young did not think of the authorities as the prime actor. When trying to contextualize this discrepancy, the perception of authority amongst younger individuals must be taken into account. Bruggeman (2000) demonstrated that young people do think that local and national authorities play an important role in society, but they also have a rather negative image of these authorities. Panel discussions had shown that young people are more negative than positive about the performance of authorities (idem, 97) as they are not very accessible for young people due to a lack of transparency and the use of complex wording and jargon. Consequently, many young people do not have a clear idea of what the authorities actually do (idem, 97). This is potentially part of the explanation as to why young people do not immediately think of authorities as having a leading role in archaeology.

France	Sweden	Poland	UK	Germany	Greece	Netherlands	Spain	Italy
1995	1995	1996	2000	2003	2006	2007	2011	2015

Table 15 The years in which the countries participating in the NEARCH survey ratified the Malta Convention (source: http://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/143/signatures?p_auth=3RBz9R9M)

4.3 *Personal interest*

Despite the high level of support among the Dutch, they showed much less emotional attachment and interest in getting personally involved (Q14). In fact, of all European survey participants the Dutch were the least interested in archaeology (45%, against the EU average of 62%) and showed almost the least attachment to it (44%, against the EU average of 54%). Only the Poles showed less attachment (41%). The French, Greek and Swedes showed the highest levels of interest; 63%, 62%, and 62% respectively.

A typical example of this low interest is that 64% of all European respondents would agree to add archaeology to the subjects taught at school (Q14), while only 45% of the Dutch did so, followed by the Poles (48%). The Greeks and Italians were most in favour, 85% and 80% respectively. The Dutch were also the ones that were most satisfied with regard to the amount of information that is available on archaeology (Q15); only 50% indicated there is too little, against 86% of the Italians and 77% of the Poles (the European average was 69%). Together with France, the Netherlands also had the lowest number of people complaining about the attention to archaeological history in museums (both 44%, against the European average of 58%). The Italians (78%) and the Poles (67%) were the least satisfied with what so far had been offered.

Within the Dutch respondents group, there was some disagreement on several issues. For instance, the youngest people (18-24) were much more positive than the others about the level of knowledge dissemination that is going on (Q15); for only 36% it was too little, against 61% of the age category of 35-44, and 54% of the 60+. Men and women disagreed with one another as well; a majority of the males (56%) indicated there is too little information on archaeology available, against only 45% of the women. Moreover, more males (49%) than females (39%) wished to see increased attention to archaeology in museums. The higher educated people, those with the jobs in the SPC+ category, were also slightly less satisfied than those in the other socio-professional categories. Inactive people showed much less attachment (35%) to archaeology than those in the SPC+ category (50%).

These differences suggest that those who match the profile of typical participants – and probably participate most – want

to have more, while the segments that participate less (or hardly at all) seem to be satisfied as it is. This actually matches the results of an evaluation among 401 participants of the national days of archaeology of 2015. When people signalled weak points regarding the content of the event, these almost exclusively (86%) concerned wishes for more; more information, more activities, more participation opportunities, etc. (Van den Dries *et al.* 2016).

4.4 *Interest in getting involved*

Despite the fact that a large number of Dutch participants indicated in the NEARCH survey to be (highly) interested in archaeology, only 14% indicated an interest in studying archaeology (Q9). In comparison with the European average of 27%, this number is quite low (table 16). In fact, of all participating countries, the lowest interest was measured in the Netherlands, the highest among the French.

For the Netherlands, no major differences were found between the various socio-professional categories, but there were disparities between gender groups, with most interest being measured among females, both across Europe (29% against 24% of the males) and in the Netherlands (16% versus 12% males). Among the Dutch, the age group of 35-44 showed the strongest interest in studying archaeology (26%). Surprisingly, interest was lowest among respondents between 18-24 years of age (12%) – the group of potential students – and those of 60 and above (8%), while across Europe young people (18-24) had the highest interest (34%).

The fact that females have a higher interest in studying archaeology is also reflected in the student numbers at the Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University; since 2008 female students have outnumbered male students every year, in all three levels (bachelor, master and research master).¹⁰ This may however not necessarily or exclusively be related to archaeology, as the overall trend of the last couple of years has been that slightly more female than male students start a university training (51.5% for 2015).¹¹ Nevertheless, it can be seen that on average in Europe there are slightly more female archaeologists (50.7%) working in archaeology (Aitchison *et al.* 2014, 30). In some countries, like Greece and Italy, there is even a strong dominance of women in the profession, with proportions of 76.3% and 70.8% respectively (idem 2014, 27).

France	Sweden	England	Greece	Italy	Spain	Poland	Germany	Netherlands
38	34	29	28	28	28	25	15	14

Table 16 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents indicating an interest in studying archaeology (Q9). The European average was 27%

The Netherlands also had the lowest number of people (40%) who would want one of their children (or other young relatives) to work in archaeology (Q14). The European average on this was 49%. Most interested in having a relative working in archaeology were the Greek and Italians (both 59%). The Dutch that were designated to the socio-professional plus-category due to their job, showed more interest (42%) in having a child or relative working in archaeology than for instance inactive people (34%).

We can only speculate as to the reasons for this relatively low interest in the archaeological profession in the Netherlands, since we have no data available on arguments. Perhaps it relates to the fact that jobs in archaeology in the Netherlands are known not to pay very well (Van Londen *et al.* 2014), although this is the case in many other countries as well. In fact, many Dutch archaeologists are rather well off, as they have a permanent contract (Aitchison *et al.* 2014). Moreover, the Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe transnational report also shows that the number of archaeologists actively employed had grown between 2006 and 2012 in countries like Germany (+88%) and the Netherlands (+75%), while it dropped seriously in Spain (-66%), the UK (-30%), and Greece (-18%) (*idem*, 21). The Dutch profession nevertheless had some bad press coverage when archaeologists expressed concerns in the media about the lack of work as a result of the economic crisis. Again it is mere speculation whether such expressions have an impact, but we can confidently state that a good salary and having a stable contract are important for young people. In a European survey over two-thirds of the young people expressed concerns about finding a stable job or a long-term contract, 49% were concerned about the level of salary (TNS Political & Social 2015, 14).

The results could also indicate that archaeology as a profession is not very well known, or not popular for other reasons. This may in particular be the case among groups like young Dutch migrants. They seem to prefer jobs not associated with manual labour (Adlouni and Hermesen 2009, 15). Furthermore, it may be an effect of the change in policy. At the end of 2014, Parliament accepted the government's proposal that would abolish the scholarship system as of 2015 and turn the free bursaries into loans.

Unfortunately we lack comparable data from earlier surveys, so we cannot evaluate whether this interest is declining. We do know that the number of new Dutch Bachelor students in general has decreased since 2013 (although Masters numbers have grown) and that this is not related to changes in the national demographic profile of our country (Van Eck *et al.* 2013).¹² In particular, student numbers in the domain of Language and Culture have been decreasing in the last couple of years.¹³ Whatever the reason

may be for this lack of interest among Dutch students, it is something the Dutch archaeological sector should pay attention to.

5 PARTICIPATION

A final aspect of the NEARCH survey concerned the actual involvement of the public, their level of participation, and their preferences regarding their involvement. More than half of the Dutch respondents indicated (Q7) they had at least once visited an archaeological monument (58%), an exhibition (54%) or a site (53%). Slightly less people had ever read a book on archaeology (42%) or visited a theme park (39%) and only 8% indicated to have ever taken part in an excavation. Participation in the latter case probably was interpreted as 'visiting', since there have been very few opportunities in the Netherlands to actually join an excavation and to actively conduct some digging (see Van den Dries 2014).

Unfortunately, when asked about specific site and museum visits (Q12), participation numbers turned out to be much lower. For example, a large majority had heard of some or most of the larger national museums with an archaeological collection – such as 75% for the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden and 68% for the Museum in The Hague – , but only 25% and 21% of the respondents had actually visited these. The Hunebed Information Centre in Borger had the highest visitor numbers; 36% of the respondents indicated to have visited it. But again, double the amount (72%) had heard about it.

It could be observed that there was much more participation by men, by the older age categories (age: 45-59; 60 and up) and by people in the socio-professional plus-category. For instance 76% of the men indicated to have watched at least once a documentary about archaeology, against 60% of the female respondents; 27% of the youngest respondents (18-24) said to have visited an archaeological reconstruction, against 51% of those of 60 years and above (Q7). When asked about specific visits to museums or site parks, the differences between the socio-professional plus (SPC+) and minus categories were considerable; 32% of SPC+ had for instance visited the National Museum of Antiquities, against 18% of SPC-; 32% of the SPC+ had visited theme park Archeon, against 21% of SPC- category.

The results also indicated that people mostly visit heritage places that are close to their hometown; much more respondents from the northern region had for instance visited the Hunebed Information Centre in the northern part of the country, while those living in the western part had paid more visits to the museums and parks in that region. The preference for culture and leisure destinations within a short distance of one's hometown is something that has been

observed in other studies as well (*e.g.* Harms 2006; Van den Dries *et al.* 2016).

Visitation and participation numbers in the Netherlands were in most cases significantly lower than the European average (Q7). For example, 76% of the European respondents indicated they had at one point visited an archaeological landscape or monument, against 58% of the Dutch (table 17); 70% visited a site, against 53% of the Dutch. The average for exhibition visits was 64% for Europe; 54% for the Netherlands. The numbers on participation in excavations were lower in the Netherlands as well, with 8% for the Dutch and 11% on average for Europe, as were those on reading a book or magazine on archaeology; 56% on average, against 42% for the Netherlands. In total, the Dutch scored below the average on 8 out of 15 activities and on all of these 8 they had the lowest count. To compare, the people in England scored below average on 14 out of 15, but had the lowest score on only 3 of the activities. The Italians participated more than on average on all 15 activities, the Greek on 11 out of 15.

A lack of participation by the Dutch was also visible in other aspects of the survey. For example, only 12% indicated to have gained information on archaeology through visits to sites during trips abroad (Q8). The European average on this was 24%, and only the Poles scored less (10%). In particular, those Dutch having a job that was designated to the lower socio-professional category and inactive people indicated not to be informed through such visits (both only 9%). For the SPC+ category this was 17%.

The Dutch paid relatively few visits to the most famous World Heritage sites (Q12). In fact, they scored below the European average with their visits to 5 sites, including the

Acropolis, Pompeii, the Pyramids of Giza, and Carthage (Tunis). A clear exception were the Dutch visits to Stonehenge; 12% indicated they had visited the site (against the European average of 10%). The highest number of visits to Stonehenge were nevertheless paid by the Germans, Italians and Swedes. In those countries 13% of the respondents said to have paid a visit to it. This time the Greek scored lowest; they had paid the least visits to all 14 sites (the Acropolis was excluded from their questionnaire as a site abroad). The Italians again had the most scores above the average, followed by the Spanish; on 4 sites both had significant higher counts than the average. Overall, the average percentage of the Dutch that had visited at least one of the sites was smaller than most other countries (table 18).

These figures match other data on travelling behaviour rather well, except for Spain. They include Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Italy in the top-10 spenders in international tourism.¹⁴ The high percentage for Spain deviates from these figures and is puzzling, as it also had far less international airplane departures in 2014 than for instance the Netherlands; 11,783,000 against 17,928,000 for the latter.¹⁵

There were some noticeable differences between the Dutch subgroups. Males had visited many more of the famous World Heritage sites than females; 7% of the men had for instance been to Machu Picchu (Peru), against 2% of the females; 52% of the men said to have heard of the city of Teotihuacan (Mexico), against 36% of the women. It did not come as a surprise that many more people of older ages had visited more of these sites than the youngest people (18-24). It was a bit more surprising that significantly more people in the socio-professional category + had paid visits to these sites than those that were inactive or in the SPC- category.

Visits to an archaeological:	Eng	Fra	Ger	Gre	Ita	Neth	Pol	Spa	Swe
monument	69	77	65	96	92	58	73	89	67
site	59	73	69	95	88	53	49	79	67
theme park	17	33	17	54	63	39	71	40	29
exhibition	52	58	62	58	77	54	72	80	59

Table 17 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents that have ever visited an archaeological monument, site, theme park or exhibition (Q7)

Spain	Italy	Germany	France	England	Sweden	Netherlands	Poland	Greece
9.7	9.0	8.3	7.3	7.25	7.2	7.0	5.7	3.3

Table 18 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents that had visited one of the 13 World Heritage sites mentioned in the survey. The European average was 7.3%

This difference presumably relates to the expenses involved with travelling to most of these remote locations. However, as the visits to Stonehenge showed a similar discrepancy between the socio-professional categories, while this site is relatively easy to visit for Dutch people and at relatively low costs, the differences in the number of visits between the socio-professional categories also seem to suggest there may be a difference in interests between these groups.

5.1 *Wishes and preferences regarding participation*

When asked what archaeological period the Dutch respondents would prioritize if they had to select a site or exhibition visit (Q11), no unanimous preference could be distinguished. Prehistory, Classical archaeology (including the Roman Era) and the Middle Ages all got almost equal scores (of 21%, 22% and 19% respectively) and one quarter of the respondents did not choose at all. Interestingly, this pattern of spread preferences was rather similar for the whole of Europe, except that Antiquity had a higher count in Italy (54%) and Greece (60%) (against the European average of 36%).

As this lack of outspoken preference for a particular era among the Dutch has been noticed before (*e.g.* Wasmus 2010)¹⁶, it is important to acknowledge, and should be taken into account by local authorities, in particular when they decide on selection policies. It seems to suggest that the selection preferences of the local authorities as they were found in municipal policy plans a few years ago (Van Vuuren 2010), may not necessarily coincide with the interests of society at large. It must be said however that the question posed in the NEARCH survey was about visiting an exhibition or site, not about selection policies. We do not know if given the dilemma's local authorities are faced with in making selection choices, the public would choose the same.

There were however some differences in interest between the Dutch age categories; young people (age: 18-24) seemed significantly more interested (11%) in younger periods (the modern era) than all other age categories (2-6%). Again, the reason for this is not known, but it could perhaps be related to the fact that the Dutch (primary) school curriculum follows a chronological approach rather than a thematic, in which much more attention is paid to the historical periods than to the Roman period and prehistory. For instance in the 2006 implemented Canon of the Netherlands, which consists of 50 time frames of important events in Dutch history, and which is meant to direct history education, the whole of prehistory and the Roman period is discussed in two frames, the middle ages in seven, the other forty one deal with the modern and contemporary period.¹⁷

The survey results also indicated a significant difference between males and females with regard to the interest in the

middle ages. While for the prehistoric and classical periods no differences were found, less women (16%) than men (23%) showed an interest in the middle ages. As we have recently witnessed a difference in interest in participation between men and women in the context of a community project in Oss (Van den Dries *et al.* 2015, 227), and as the NEARCH survey also showed more interest with women (45%) than men (42%) for participating in an excavation, the question could be raised how well the outreach activities, outreach products (like books and movies), and exhibitions that so far have been on offer, have suited the interest and wishes of both men *and* women. Could there perhaps be a causal connection between their interests, the engagement options offered, and the participation levels that are lagging behind for women? This question is further fuelled by the fact that we found a larger interest in consuming archaeology and in participating with older males, but a larger interest in studying archaeology among young females.

Another interesting outcome of the survey is that 72% of the Dutch respondents would like to visit an archaeological site in their own country, 43% would like to take part in it, and 32% have a wish to be involved in the decision making process in case of a nearby archaeological project (Q16). Males were overall more interested than females, and in particular in taking part in decision making processes (39%, against 26% of the females). People in the higher job category (SPC+) were also more interested in joining an excavation (46%) and in making decisions (40%) than inactive people (36% and 23% respectively). The same was the case with people between the age of 25 and 34; 63% wanted to join an excavation, 46% had an interest in decision making. With those of 60 and up this was only 33% and 32% respectively.

Even though the interest in getting actively involved in fieldwork or in participatory governance was not expressed by a percentual majority, the results do indicate that there is a demand for this in at least forty per cent of the population. This result was expected based on previous small scale quantitative and qualitative studies conducted or supervised by the current authors (*e.g.* Amsing 2015; Lampe 2010, 39; Van den Dries *et al.* 2015; Van der Heijden 2016; Wasmus 2010; Wu 2013), and can now be consolidated on a national scale with the NEARCH 2015 data. Perhaps this can provide a stimulus for the national, regional and local authorities to develop a more participatory approach to heritage management, as this is not yet practiced in the Netherlands (see also Amsing 2015; Van der Heijden 2016).

While on the one hand this public interest in involvement in governance issues is encouraging, it is on the other hand again a figure that is significantly lower than the European average of 51%. In fact, of all respondents the Dutch showed

the least interest in what we could call participatory governance. In Italy for instance, 62% had an interest in taking part in a decision making process, in Greece and Poland this was 57%. The question remains whether this relatively limited interest among the Dutch represents their lack of interest or their confidence that the people in charge are doing fine. In any case, there were several other indications that interest levels are relatively low; for instance 43% was interested in participating in an excavation, against 61% of the other Europeans, and 73% of the Greek. Moreover, 29% of the Dutch would like to attend a conference on archaeology (Q16), against a European average of 52%. The Netherlands also counted the lowest number of people that would be interested in contributing to funding an archaeological excavation (table 19).

Among the Dutch respondents, the lowest interest in visiting an archaeological site was observed in the younger age groups. Of those between 18 and 24 years, 54% showed an interest in visiting an archaeological site, compared to 81% of the people between 45 and 59 years of age (Q16). This matched the other data on young people, showing their often deviating opinion and image of archaeology (table 20). Only 58% of 18-24 years also said that it is important to support archaeology (Q14), compared to 77% of the elder people. Moreover, 22% of the young thought archaeology should be added to the subjects taught at school (Q14), against 51% of respondents of 60 years and above.

Diverging patterns of interest in cultural heritage and participation for young people were found in other national and international surveys as well (*e.g.* Van den Broek *et al.* 2009, 35; TNS Opinion & Social 2013, 17). These surveys illustrate how difficult it is to attract young people and to entice them into participating. As an additional example, a master student study at Leiden University on how digital technology could help to attract youth, demonstrated that

young people (16-24) would nearly all like to see a more intense use of digital technology in museums, but that they would only be persuaded to visit these museums if the experience exclusively used virtual reality (Ottolander 2015). However, a remarkable shift happened in the NEARCH survey when people were asked if they would like to take part in an excavation (Q16). This time older people showed the least interest (32% of the 45-59 years of age; 33% of those of 60 and above) and those between 25-34 the most (63%).

6 TRENDS IN THE NETHERLANDS AND BEYOND
Even though a comparison of images, attitudes, interests, support and participation between Europeans shows some comparative results for the Netherlands that could be considered disappointing, when we compare the results from the 1996 and 2015 surveys, some positive developments can be noted. Through the NEARCH survey we learned that more respondents have become acquainted with organisations offering knowledge and outreach activities, from 65% in 1996 to 80% in 2015. For example, the number of people acquainted with the National Museum of Antiquity (Leiden) went from 45% to 72%. For theme park Archeon (Alphen aan de Rijn) percentages went up from 55% to 80%, and for the Allard Pierson Museum on classical archaeology in Amsterdam even from 4% to 43%. Additionally, some visitor numbers have gone up as well; in 1995 7% of the respondents had visited Archeon, in 2015 this was 26%. Interest in participation has increased as well; in 1995 35% was interested in visiting an excavation (NIPO/AIC 1996, 19), in 2015 this was 43%. Furthermore, the overall perception of the value of archaeology has changed; in 2015 89% indicated archaeology to be ‘useful’ and ‘of great value’, while twenty years ago this was only 56%.

Italy	Poland	Sweden	England	Germany	Spain	Greece	France	Netherlands
36	36	34	32	32	31	26	24	23

Table 19 Share of the NEARCH survey respondents that was willing to contribute to the funding of excavations (Q16). The European average was 30%

	18-24 years of age	25-34 years of age	35-44 years of age	45-59 years of age	60 and more
modern	32	48	61	65	74
moving	77	89	88	92	93
useful	78	85	91	92	91

Table 20 Opinions of the age categories in the Dutch NEARCH survey on the question ‘For you archaeology is?’ (Q13)

Unfortunately, there are some downward trends as well; while in 1995 28% of the respondents showed *no* engagement with archaeology, twenty years later this is 48% (Q14). In 1996 archaeology was *not* popular among 43% of the respondents, in 2015 this number had grown to 48%.

Something which has not really changed, is how archaeology is primarily associated with education; in 1996 61% of the respondents associated archaeology with 'learning', in 2015 56% associated it with 'knowing'. This seems to be the pattern across the board, as other NEARCH survey participants had a similar association, if somewhat less strong. It is also a relation that is persistent as it was for example discussed in 1996 by the European Association for Tourism and Leisure Education Project that learning usually is one of the main motives for cultural heritage tourism (Richards 1996, 24-25) and that it almost directly emanates from education. A clear example is how 'Most of the early Grand Tourists were aristocrats for whom a trip to continental Europe was often a coda to a classical education' (idem, 11).

Another constant result throughout the years is the over-representation of older males with a high level of education (and better paying jobs) in visitor numbers. In 1996 a clear relation was noticed between interests in participating, age and living standard; heavy users were 45+, mostly males with a high level of education and good living standard (NIPO/AIC 1996, 18). The higher the level of education, the higher participation levels were. This was still the case in the NEARCH survey, and an evaluation among the visitors of the first Dutch national archaeology days (of 2015) confirmed it too. In this evaluation 54% of the visitors (not including children) acknowledged to have been in higher education (Van den Dries *et al.* 2016). It can be considered a general and continuous pattern, as various studies through time and across countries have made similar observations (*e.g.* Richards 1996; Van den Broek *et al.* 2005; Kraaykamp *et al.* 2014), that we are missing out on large groups in society, like the lower educated, the disabled, and migrants (*e.g.* Fujiwara *et al.* 2014; Kraaykamp *et al.* 2014; Prescott 2013). Richards for instance concluded in 1996 that 'In general, cultural tourists can be characterized as having a high socio-economic status, high levels of educational attainment, adequate leisure time, and often having occupations related to the cultural industries.' (45). The TNS Political & Social survey of 2015 on the European youth also said that 'The main socio-demographic difference is by level of education. Respondents who finished their education at the age of 20 or over are more likely to have participated in a cultural activity (91%) than those who ended education at the age of 16-19 (85%) or at the age of 15 or under (74%). The difference is greatest in relation to visits to monuments or attractions (70% of those who finished their education at

the age of 20 or over, decreasing to 43% of those who ended education at the age of 15 or under)' (7).

These observations lead to the conclusion that even though we have seen increasingly intense public outreach activity in the past three decades, the sector does not seem to have reached a wider audience than twenty years ago. It is doubtful whether many people from the group of potential participants that NIPO/AIC distinguished (1996, 27), have been reached. Given the fact that these patterns seem to be quite consistent throughout time and present in many countries, it is tempting to simply accept them as unchangeable. There are however some concerns for the future connected with these trends. One particularly worrying trend is that young people do not seem to have a very positive image of archaeology and that student numbers have decreased. As young people are the future generation of professionals and our future consumers and participants, this should alarm the sector and its training institutes.

Moreover, as in both the Netherlands and Europe as a whole population demographics may, and probably will, change - given the current and expected migration figures - and as new heritage policies (like development-led funding) have made the sector more dependent on public support than ever, it is worrying that an actual feeling of being involved is felt only by a small segment of the population. What may for instance happen with the local (financial) support for archaeology if this segment decreases or loses power? What could happen in case of a growth of the segment of young people in local demographics? Or of migrants or other people that do not feel connected to archaeology?

7 TO CONCLUDE

Based on the 2015 NEARCH public survey among 500 Dutch citizens, it can be concluded for The Netherlands that in comparison with the NIPO/AIC survey results from 1996 there is a fair amount of public support for archaeology, as a large majority, larger than in 1996, thinks it is useful. There is however little accurate knowledge among the Dutch about what is actually going on in archaeological heritage management. They also do not particularly consider archaeology useful as an economic asset or a leisure activity, or as a contributor to sustainable development, or one's quality of life. Rather, archaeology is primarily associated with science and as a useful element in the context of education and learning. Moreover, within some segments of the public the image of archaeology is not overly positive. Particularly young people think of it as rather out-dated. A positive evolution is that overall visitor numbers have increased, albeit mostly within the profile group that keeps being overrepresented namely well-educated older males. There is however far less interest in the results of public engagement efforts and in participating than in other

European countries. And what's more, there seems to be a low intention among the underrepresented profile groups to get involved in archaeology in the (near) future, in any case percentages are lower than with the other European citizens. The data gained through the 2015 NEARCH survey and the other surveys it was compared to, show the invaluable information that can be gained from directly questioning the public on their perceptions of archaeology. This information is essential in aiding researchers to create new policies and develop alternative strategies to get a wider audience connected to and involved in archaeology.

Acknowledgements

This publication was produced in the framework of the NEARCH project with the support of the Culture 2007-2013 programme of the European Commission.

We are very grateful to Jessica Palmer for her editing and valuable comments to the draft version.

Notes

1 The authors are partners in the NEARCH project. Monique van den Dries represents the Faculty of Archaeology (Leiden University) as the project leader. She supervises the activities and studies conducted in this context. Krijn Boom is involved as a PhD researcher. His study focuses on the effect of archaeological activities on (local) communities and how this can be measured and analyzed.

2 www.nearch.eu.

3 This is less than the 3,000 that took part in the NIPO/AIC survey of 1996, yet this number is representative for the 17 million inhabitants the Netherlands has (Source CBS 2016).

4 Harris interactive uses access panels to ensure the reliability and representativeness of the results. These panels consist of 2.5 million members for Europe from which they can invite people to join.

5 Harris Interactive uses the socio-professional category +, which includes the job categories 1: Business owner; artisan; merchant or similar occupation; 2: Independent professional (e.g. doctor, lawyer, or architect); 3: Business manager; government agency staff member; intellectual, creative occupation; 4: Staff professional (e.g. technical expert, supervisor, teacher, or nurse) 5: Farmer. The socio-professional category – includes the job categories 1: office worker; 2: Labourer.

6 The survey consisted of 28 questions, indicated in the text as Q1 – Q28. The results are available on www.nearch.eu; see also Kajda *et al.* forthcoming for an interpretation of the results by the NEARCH team.

7 The report provided by Harris Interactive indicates when the differences between the categories are statistically significant.

8 In the Drents Museum (Assen) more than 350,000 visitors were counted in 2008 (<http://www.volkskrant.nl/recensies/bezoekersrecord-voor-terracottaleger-in-assen~a890188/>). Close to the Dutch border, in the Minderbroederskerk (Maaseik, Belgium), 190,000 visitors were counted in 2008/2009 for the same exhibition (<http://www.demorgen.be/binnenland/organisatie-wil-terracotta-leger-xi-an-naar-ieper-halen-badb99ef/>).

9 See www.nationalearcheologiedagen.nl.

10 Personal communication Femke Tomas (Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University), based on '1cijferHO' (status October 2016).

11 <http://www.onderwijsincijfers.nl/kengetallen/wetenschappelijk-onderwijs/deelnemerswo/eerstejaars-in-het-wetenschappelijk-onderwijs>

12 See http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/PBL_2013_Demografische%20ontwikkelingen-2010-2040_1044.pdf.

13 The number of new bachelor students in Language and Culture decreased from 5795 in 2009 to 4154 in 2015 (source: http://www.vsn.nl/f_c_ingeschreven_studenten.html).

14 <http://www.tourism-review.com/top-spenders-in-international-tourism-news3766>

15 See for Spain: <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/spain/international-tourism>. See for the Netherlands: <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/netherlands/international-tourism>.

16 Most people (66) in this survey liked all periods equally well; 44 had a preference, but altogether the differences were small, with 12 in favour of the Roman period, 12 for the middle ages, 7 for prehistory and 3 for the period after 1600 (Wasmus 2010).

17 <http://www.entoen.nu/en>

References

Adlouni, K., and F. Hermesen 2009. *Het betere werk. Beroepsbeelden van allochtone jongeren*. Almelo: Variya. (<http://docplayer.nl/4038055-Het-betere-werk-beroepsbeelden-van-allochtone-leerlingen-variya-leeft.html>)

Aitchison, K., E. Alphas, V. Ameels, M. Bentz, C. Borş, E. Cella, K. Cleary, C. Costa, P. Damian, M. Diniz, C. Duarte, J. Frolík, C. Grilo, Initiative for Heritage Conservancy, N. Kangert, R. Karl, A. Kjørulf Andersen, V. Kobrusepp, T. Kompare, E. Krekovič, M. Lago da Silva, A. Lawler, I. Lazar, K. Liibert, A. Lima, G. MacGregor, N. McCullagh, M. Mácalová, A. Mäesalu, M. Malińska, A. Marciniak, M. Mintaurs, K. Möller, U. Odgaard, E. Parga-Dans, D. Pavlov, V. Pintarič Kocuvan, D. Rocks-Macqueen, J. Rostock, J. Pedro Tereso, A. Pintucci, E.S. Prokopiou, J. Raposo, K. Scharringhausen, T. Schenck, M. Schlaman, J. Skaarup, A. Šnē, D. Staššiková-Štukovská, I. Ulst, M.H. van den Dries, H. van Londen, R. Varela-Pousa, C. Viegas, A. Vijups, N. Vossen, T. Wachter and L. Wachowicz 2014. *Discovering the Archaeologists of*

Europe 2012-14: Transnational Report. York: York Archaeological Trust.
(http://www.discovering-archaeologists.eu/national_reports/2014/transnational_report.pdf)

Amasing, E. 2015. *Assessing values and interests. Stakeholder engagement in the development of archaeological site parks in the Netherlands*. Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).

Bruggeman, D.A.G. 2000. *De Overheid in Beeld Beelden van jongeren aangaande de overheid als instituut en als werkgever*. The Hague: Stichting Alexander.

Cloin, M. (ed.) 2013. *Met het oog op de tijd. Een blik op de tijdsbesteding van Nederlanders*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Fujiwara, D., T. Cornwall and P. Dolan 2014. *Heritage and wellbeing*. Historic England. (<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/heritage-counts/pub/2190644/heritage-and-wellbeing.pdf>)

Harms, L. 2006. *Op weg in de vrije tijd. Context, kenmerken en dynamiek van vrijetijds mobiliteit*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP-publication 2006/9).

Kajda, K., A. Marciniak, M. Pawleta, M.H. van den Dries, K. Boom, M.P. Guermandi, F. Criado-Boado, D. Barreiro, J. Richards, H. Wright, A. Synnestvedt, K. Kotsakis, K. Kasvikis, E. Theodoroudi, A. Marx, K. Salas Rossenbach, F. Lueth, I. Frase and M. Issa, forthcoming. Archaeology, heritage and social values. The panorama of European archaeology from the public perspective. *European Journal of Archaeology* 20 (3).

Kotsaga, K. 2016. *News' distributors as stakeholders of cultural heritage. Perspectives on heritage values from the state, local communities and the general public. The case of Amphipolis*. Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).

Kraaykamp, G., N. Notten and H. Bekhuis 2014. Cultuurparticipatie van Turken en Marokkanen in Nederland -Toetsing van een identificatie-en sociale netwerkverklaring. *Mens en Maatschappij* 89 (2), 201-220.

Kramer, R. 2013. *Liever met je kop in het zand dan in de krant? Analyse van een selectie van Nederlandse krantenartikelen over archeologie uit de jaren 2006, 2008 en 2010*. Deventer (Unpublished Bachelor thesis Saxion Hogeschool).

Lampe, S. 2010. *Digging up the public*. Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).

NIPO/AIC 1996. *Samenvatting Bevolkingsonderzoek 'archeologie'*. Leiden: Archeologisch Informatie Centrum (Archeologisch Informatie Cahier 10).

Ottolander, R. 2015. *Digital technologies: the link between youth and cultural heritage?* Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).

Prescott, C. 2013. Heritage and the new immigrant minorities: a catalyst of relevance for contemporary archaeology? In: P.F. Biehl and C. Prescott (eds), *Heritage in the context of globalization. Europe and the Americas*. New York/Heidelberg/Dordrecht/Londen: Springer Briefs in Archaeology, Archaeological Heritage Management.

Richards, G. (ed.) 1996. *Cultural tourism in Europe*. Wallingford: Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International.
(http://www.tram-research.com/cultural_tourism_in_europe.PDF)

TNS Opinion & Social 2013. *Special Eurobarometer 399 - Cultural Access and Participation*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture.
(http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_399_en.pdf)

TNS Political & Social 2015. *Flash Eurobarometer 408 - European Youth*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture.
(http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_408_sum_en.pdf)

TNS Opinion & Social 2014. *Standard Barometer 82 - Media use in the European Union*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication.
(http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb82/eb82_media_en.pdf)

United Nations World Tourism Organisation 2015. *Tourism Highlights, 2015 edition*. Madrid: UNWTO.
(<http://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284416899>)

Van den Broek, A., F. Huysmans and J. de Haan 2005. *Cultuurminnaars en cultuurmijders*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP-publication 2005/7).

Van den Broek, A., J. de Haan and F. Huysmans 2009. *Cultuurbewonderaars en cultuurbeoefenaars*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP-publication 2009/8).

Van den Dries, M.H. 2013. Does Holland look like Malta yet? Reflections on the achievements with development-led archaeology in the Netherlands. In: M.P. Guermandi and K. Salas Rossenbach (eds), *Twenty years after Malta: preventive archaeology in Europe and in Italy*. Bologna:

- Istituto per i Beni Artistici, Culturali e Naturali della Regione Emilia Romagna, 43-54.
- Van den Dries, M.H. 2014. Community Archaeology in the Netherlands, *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 1(1), 69-88.
- Van den Dries, M.H., K.H.J. Boom and S.J. van der Linde 2015. Exploring archaeology's social values for present day society. *Analecta Prehistorica Leidensia* 45, 221-234.
- Van den Dries, M.H., K.H.J. Boom and R. Kramer 2016. 'Wij willen meer!'. Een bezoekersevaluatie van de Nationale Archeologiedagen, *Vitruvius* 37, 4-9.
- Van der Heijden, N. 2016. *Connecting the past to the present. A study on the level of community involvement during the World Heritage nomination process of the Roman Limes*. Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).
- Van Eck, J.R., F. van Dam, C. de Groot and A. de Jong 2013. *Demografische ontwikkelingen 2010-2040. Ruimtelijke effecten en regionale diversiteit*. The Hague: Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving (PBL).
- Van Londen, H., N. Vossen, M. Schlaman and K. Scharringhausen 2014. *Discovering the Archaeologists of the Netherlands 2012-14*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- (http://www.discoveringarchaeologists.eu/national_reports/2014/NL%20DISCO%202014%20Netherlands%20national%20report%20english.pdf)
- Van Vuuren, M. 2010. *What to dig? Selection in Dutch municipal archaeological policies*. Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).
- Wasmus, F. 2010. The Past is Alive: An Analysis of Public Opinion about Archaeology in The Hague. In: A. Degenhardt en S. Lampe (eds), *Out in the Field, Internships Master Students Archaeological Heritage Management 2009-2010*. Leiden: Sidestone Press (Graduate School of Archaeology Occasional Papers 5), 49-55.
- Wu, I. 2013. *I want to hear you! The things we can learn from public surveys on the issue of community archaeology and community involvement*, Leiden (Unpublished Master thesis Leiden University).
- Monique H. van den Dries and Krijn Boom
Faculty of Archaeology
Leiden University
PO Box 9514
2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands
m.h.van.den.dries@arch.leidenuniv.nl
k.h.j.boom@arch.leidenuniv.nl