Archaeological Heritage as a Resource for Development: Definitions, Issues, and Opportunities for Evaluation

Agathe Dupeyron, School of International Development, University of East Anglia.

a.dupeyron@uea.ac.uk

ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3336-6175

Abstract

Archaeological heritage has significant impacts on development in the Global South. Projects have informed environmental policies or improved local communities' prospects in managing their heritage resources, and sites promote local economic development through tourism. However, many of these development impacts are short-lived or disappointing due to a lack of critical awareness and tracing of how the project fits with local objectives and its consequences over time. This is related to inadequate or insufficient evaluation.

This paper argues that the heritage sector has much to gain from considering evaluation problems through a development lens. It reviews how archaeology contributes to development, the successes and shortcomings of past efforts, and how evaluation can help. The paper then discusses public archaeology as a natural theoretical and methodological bridge between archaeology and international development, and examines the limits of current evaluation methods, which are not systematic or focus on a limited number of impacts.

Looking ahead, the review recommends testing development evaluation methods in the context of archaeological projects to develop the toolbox of evaluation methods available in the heritage sector.

Key words: public archaeology, development, evaluation, impact, methods

Note on contributor

Agathe Dupeyron is a PhD candidate in International Development at the University of East Anglia, UK. Her main research interest is in evaluation and she focuses on testing methods that are appropriate for understanding and monitoring the social, economic and environmental impacts of archaeological projects on three communities in Peru and Ecuador. She previously volunteered in archaeological projects in the UK and Latin America.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Acknowledgements

This article was significantly reworked thanks to the comments and suggestions of two anonymous reviewers. I also thank Laura Camfield, George Lau, Tim Schadla-Hall, Jonathan Franklin and Jacob Bongers for providing insightful comments on this paper.

Word count

8877 words

Introduction: Aims of this review

Archaeology is the study of the human past through material remains, but this definition arguably understates the complex role that the past has to play in the present. The discipline is rooted in its colonial legacy, and many of its most representative sites are located in what is sometimes called the 'developing world', or 'Global South'. In the 21st century, the role archaeological heritage plays in modern politics, economics, and society cannot be denied. Take into consideration, for example, the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan (2001), Evo Morales's inauguration ceremony in the ruins of Tiwanaku (2006), and the recent mass exodus of Siam Reap residents due to price increases generated by Angkor Wat's close proximity. Archaeological sites are critical, yet underrated resources for development efforts because they play key roles in heritage tourism, effectively teach us about past land use, and foster local identities and community building. And yet, paradoxically, the discipline of archaeology tends to advocate for pristine site preservation, which finds itself in direct opposition to the idea of development.

Many heritage professionals have attempted to channel the potential of archaeology into development ventures, but these have failed to produce the expected benefits:

> Archaeologists have littered the globe with failed site museums, handicrafts projects, and tourism ventures at every scale, leaving local populations disaffected by promises undelivered and local entrepreneurs carrying investments in heritage tourism that yield no returns. (Gould, 2018: 4).

This assertion indicates the need to examine the relationship between archaeological projects and development, and to evaluate the impacts of such archaeological projects for development purposes. This paper addresses three questions. Why have previous attempts for archaeological projects to contribute to development yielded such mixed results? What are the

current limits of evaluation in the archaeology and heritage sector? Is development compatible enough with archaeological projects to provide new perspectives for evaluation?

This paper will present a brief overview of the ways in which archaeology may contribute to development objectives. I argue that the subdiscipline of public archaeology is the closest theoretical fit to development, as one of its priorities is to understand the positive and negative impacts of archaeological heritage and projects. This review observes that efforts by archaeologists and heritage practitioners to participate in development initiatives have been abundant and well-intentioned, but are characterized by a lack of rigour in learning from past mistakes. This is a serious challenge to their longevity. A closer integration of development evaluation discourse within public archaeology might open new avenues to solve persistent methodological problems.

Development in context

Recent trends

‘Development’ is difficult to define. The concept emergedwith the idea of 'catching up with the advanced industrialized countries' (Pieterse, 2010: 5),as US President Truman sought to promote the ‘growth of underdeveloped areas’ (Truman, 1949) in the wake of the Second World War (Esteva, 2010: 1). Intellectually, the field of development can be seen as the successor of colonial economics (Pieterse, 2010: 6). The idea of development then became synonymous with economic growth or capital accumulation (Pieterse, 2010: 6) and was measured using indicators such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita.

However, the concept evolved significantly in recent decades. More holistic definitions exist, describing development as ‘making a better life for everyone’ (Peet & Hartwick, 2009: 1), or acknowledging that improvements in the economic, social, political and cultural spheres

are interconnected (Peet & Hartwick, 2009: 3). In the 1970-1980s, various approaches attempted to moderate development's focus on income and growth: these consisted in considering agriculture and rural development, acknowledging the importance of the informal sector, as well as incorporating insights about gender equity and equal opportunities (Ravallion, 2015: 117-118). The notion of 'human development', which emerged in the 1980-90s, recognizes the need to move beyond purely economic indicators (Haynes, 2008:12) and see development as the enlargement of one's options in life (Sen, 1983). In parallel, 'post development' approaches have criticized the hegemonic power relations normalized by the development discourse (Escobar, 1999).

In the 21st century, development is acknowledged to be multifaceted, reflected in the myriad of approaches to understand and measure human wellbeing and quality of life (Alkire, 2002). Local and grassroots approaches emerged to counterbalance top-down, state-led initiatives, under the umbrella of 'alternative development' (Pieterse, 2010: 107), driving the need for more inclusive and participatory approaches. These argue that the beneficiaries of development programmes are the best-placed to identify their needs (Ravallion, 2015: 120).

Evaluating development: recent methodological debates

Another significant trend in recent decades is the growing concern with evidence-based policy and accountability for public funds, driving the demand for rigorous evaluation. It comprises Impact Evaluation, and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).

Impact Evaluation seeks to determine the effect of a programme on an outcome of interest (Gertler et al., 2016: 8) after a programme's implementation. It is often conducted alongside Monitoring activities, which routinely collect data on indicators tracking a programme's performance during implementation, and analyses the processes affecting this performance (Gertler et al, 2016: 7). Measuring the impact of development programmes

provides feedback on which approaches are working, helps improve the implementation of future programmes and allocation of budgets, and informs policy decisions (Gertler et al, 2016: 4). Thus, evaluation aims to render development projects more accountable and sustainable.

Methodologically, the concern with evaluation has led development practitioners to deploy large-scale approaches derived from the clinical sciences, such as the Randomized Control Trial (Duflo et al, 2007). This trend can sometimes be directly at odds with more participatory approaches, and development practitioners also question the extent to which methods involving a high degree of control can effectively be implemented in the field (Camfield & Duvendack, 2014). In light of the human-centric and participatory turn in development practice, evaluators increasingly recognize the importance of evaluating small-scale, or 'small-n' projects such as interventions to shift social norms or changes in policy, for which qualitative techniques or mixed methods are often more appropriate than statistical methods (White & Phillips, 2012). 'Small-n' evaluation techniques are designed to explore the causal links between a project and its observable consequences on the ground and are particularly suited to smaller-scale interventions and bottom-up approaches.

In this context of rapidly changing definitions and new methodological adaptations, can archaeology projects operating in developing countries and aiming to benefit local populations be construed as development?

Archaeology and development: an uneasy relationship?

Most archaeologists and heritage practitioners view the relationship between development and their activities as problematic. The title of Gould and Pyburn's recent volume (2017) discussing this interplay in a range of case studies, *Collision or Collaboration*, encapsulates these tensions. Development often comes with a cost, especially when associated with infrastructural expansion and a surge in industrial activities. As early as the 1980s,

Keatinge (1980) illustrates the threat posed to seventeen archaeological sites by the construction of a large dam and associated reservoir in Peru's Jequetepeque Valley. The creation of the World Heritage List was a response to the threat posed by the Aswan High Dam to the Abu Simbel temples (Labadi, 2017: 47). The growth of urban areas often translate to a surge in encroachment, looting and other human activities that are detrimental to the archaeological record (Gould & Burtenshaw, 2014: 3). Thus, development is sometimes conceived as an unstoppable capitalist force, the consequences of which need to be mitigated (Herrera, 2013: 77). Archaeologists are often reluctant to engage with ideas related to economics, regarding the entire field as diametrically opposed to the cultural values they uphold (for a summary of this attitude, see Burtenshaw, 2014).

This opposition between preservation and development is driven by a reductive view of the latter, whereby development is only considered in terms of economic growth, urban expansion and infrastructural proliferation. Archaeologists and anthropologists have also criticized the neo-colonial undertones of the development sector (Hutchings, 2013), a position that is hypocritical considering the intellectual history of their disciplines, but fits well with the post-development critiques. Nevertheless, more nuanced perspectives emerge, as exemplified by Basu and Modest's recent edited volume (2015) recognising the complex layering of positive and negative consequences of development. This recognition has also driven governments and international bodies to enforce legal provisions to protect archaeological heritage (a historical perspective and examples can be found in Labadi, 2017). Meanwhile, in developing countries, there is an emerging awareness that archaeology ought to collaborate with development efforts, especially with regards to enhancing quality of life (Bazán Pérez et al, 2008: 246). The reconsideration of the aims and means of development described earlier, such as the focus on human development, quality of life and wellbeing, are more compatible with the objectives and temporalities of heritage work (Basu & Modest 2015, 14-15).

Another dimension of 'development' that has received a lot of attention from archaeologists is the 'sustainable development' agenda, which is easier to accommodate to heritage preservation objectives. Sustainable development can be defined as 'meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987: 43). It has been articulated around three mutually reinforcing pillars: economic development, social development and environmental protection (United Nations General Assembly, 2005: 12). Although culture was proposed as a fourth pillar since 2002 and backed by institutions such as United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG, 2010), the change was rejected (Labadi & Gould 2015, 200). 'Sustainable Development' was broad enough at its inception to generate consensus, but gave way to a range of diverging interpretations ranging from neo-liberal approaches in which value was only ascribed in monetary terms, to concerns about environmental justice (Redclift, 2005). In spite of these debates, large-scale heritage organisations such as UNESCO have embraced the Sustainable Development approach to orientate their policies (UNESCO, 2013). The 2015 'Sustainable Development Goals' now inform much of the policy-making discourse in development and although the role played by culture is not explicitly stated in any of the 17, it is woven through several[1] (UNESCO 2018, practical links are explicit in UCLG 2018). The concept of sustainability has been incorporated and critiqued in the archaeology and heritage discourse (summaries of these debates can be found in Labadi & Gould 2015, Basu & Modest 2015, Howard 2013).

The contribution of this paper is to look at archaeology through a development lens and consider the ways in which it might benefit from the forms of evaluation used in this field.

[1] See, for example, Sustainable Goal 8.9: "By 2030, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products" (UN, 2020).

The following section explores the main opportunities and challenges in using archaeology as a resource for development and key ways by which archaeological projects have attempted to address them in relation to environmental, economic and social impacts.

Archaeology as a resource for Development

Environmental Impacts

Archaeology can present solutions to global climate change both in terms of adaptation, by providing a long-term record of how humans have faced environmental challenges (Lane, 2015), but also in terms of mitigation, by making changes visible at a scale the public can integrate (Lafrenz Samuels, 2016). Archaeological projects have also sought to influence agricultural development through the study of past landscapes and adaptive indigenous techniques. The interdisciplinary endeavour of historical ecology focuses on the study of past ecosystems and the changes they experience over time. It considers humans as an integral part of this landscape, who are seen as mobile, communicative and adapted (Crumley, 1994: 6). Applied archaeology often works in conjunction with the historical ecology framework, particularly to address contemporary human problems (Neusius, 2009:19). Together, they aim to promote local environmental sustainability through reinstating agricultural techniques that are more adapted to the local natural and human geography.

The longevity of historical ecology and applied archaeology is perhaps greatest in South America, where academics have partnered with local NGOs to implement such projects since the 1980s (Herrera 2013, 81). Examples include the Cusichaca project in Peru, which seeks to re-establish the Inka terracing system with bi-annual cropping of maize and potatoes (Kendall, 2005, 2013) or efforts to develop community-managed raised-field agricultural systems in Bolivia (Isendahl et al, 2013; Swartley, 2002).

In the long-term, these projects have only known limited success. CARE Peru encouraged the implementation of terraces in the 1980s, following methods devised by Clark Erickson, but abandoned the project due to a lack of funding (Herrera, 2013: 82). Fifty percent of the raised field projects were abandoned as of 2013 (Herrera, 2013: 83).

How to explain the unsustainability of these projects? Many of them were over-optimistic and riddled with technical mistakes, such as the lack of appropriate hydric management or the lack of focus on local plants (Herrera 2013, 84). But more importantly, Swartley (2002: 6) describes the raised field agriculture method as an 'invented tradition'. The project foundations, imported from Western NGOs and academics found no resonance in modern Bolivian communities, who resisted the notion of indigeneity attached to it. Management was conducted away from communities, in foreign languages, and without respecting their internal organisation (Herrera, 2013: 84).

The record of applied archaeology in South America highlights the importance of considering the interplay of social, economic and political factors and how they affect the conduct of a project. Three decades later, perceptions of development and sustainability have changed; locally led grassroots projects might be more successful than previous attempts managed by foreign academics. The popularity of participatory approaches might ensure that local communities are fully integrated in a project's management and that it caters to their needs. Recent attempts at carrying out historical ecology projects in Eastern Africa follow a more holistic perspective, taking these past trajectories into account. They analyse environmental stressors and human adaptation and resilience through time, rather than focusing on rehabilitation (Lane, 2015; Davies, 2010; Stump, 2010). Only time will test their long-term contribution to mitigating the practical challenges they have identified. This underlines the need for practical and flexible evaluation methods, which could help these projects correct their

course if needed and be more able to integrate their findings to local development needs and policies

Economic impacts

Archaeological sites have also had an impact on livelihoods and sources of income from tourism, a 'social, cultural and economic phenomenon, which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes' (UNWTO, 2015). It can be an important asset for development: in 2004, tourism was the most important source of foreign exchange earnings for the 49 least developed countries (Robinson & Picard, 2006: 24). Mass tourism is generally unsustainable, as it drives the degradation of sites themselves: in the Valley of the Kings in Egypt, the alteration of air conditions has led to Nefertari's tomb being closed to the public (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009: 58). Government efforts to regulate tourism, such as establishing a cap of 2,500 visitors per day in the Peruvian site of Machu Picchu, might not be sufficient to guarantee the preservation of archaeological monuments as a resource (Larson & Poudyal, 2012: 925). The socio-economic repercussions of tourism on local populations are far ranging and not always positive. For example, the overcrowding of the World Heritage Site of Pingyao (China) led to the government's decision to displace and relocate two thirds of its 40,000 inhabitants (Lim 2004).

These challenges have encouraged new movements, such as ecotourism, community-based tourism, ethical or 'fair-trade' tourism or 'pro-poor tourism' (Mowforth & Munt, 2009: 103, Ashley et al, 2000). The tenets of 'sustainable tourism', emerging from experience and best practice, include the participation of locals, support for conservation, and an increased focus on education (Mowforth & Munt, 2009: 104). These fit with the principles of pro-poor tourism as defined by Ashley et al (2000, 6), whose approach shows that 'pro-poor tourism' can have more positive impacts if employment opportunities are considered holistically and

partnerships increased, and if interventions are taken at the local, national and international levels.

Various NGOs have sought to promote sustainable economic development in communities living close to archaeological sites. These include the Global Heritage Fund (GHF, 2010), the World Monuments Fund (Ackerman, 2014) and the Sustainable Preservation Initiative (Coben, 2014). The latter is a capacity-building programme aiming to foster local entrepreneurship by training members of the community as artisans, operating in Peru, Guatemala, Jordan and expanding to Bulgaria and Tanzania (a fuller description is available in Dupeyron, 2018). Burtenshaw (2013, 115-116) refers to these projects as archaeological 'Integrated Conservation and Development projects' (ICDPs), harking back to similar initiatives in the ecological conservation sector.

Yet, there is a growing recognition that the longest-living, and thus most sustainable projects are the ones rooted in local systems of governance and less subject to foreign oversight. Gould's work on four heritage projects that operate as common pool resources, following the ideas of economist Ostrom, has identified several key aspects to explain longevity, including transparency in management, democratic institutions, and devolution to local forms of authority (Gould, 2018: 141). Again, more analyses are necessary to evaluate these projects and their contribution to sustainability in the long-term.

Social impacts

Archaeological sites can have a strong social and cultural impact on local populations through increasing their 'heritage awareness' (Apaydin, 2016: 829), and strengthening local identities. Benefits include building 'strong, self-reliant communities' (UNESCO, 2010: 14), which fits with development attempts to improve quality of life. Education is often a key vector through which projects seek to foster locals' identification to, and appropriation of their

heritage. The Çatalhöyük research project in Turkey is an example of the long-term involvement of a community in a site's running and interpretation, and has featured an informal education programme since 2002 (Apaydin, 2016: 832). Skills training also happens through other vectors. In Quseir, Egypt, a team of archaeologists from Southampton trained participants in excavation methods, heritage management and museum displays (Moser et al, 2002). IT skills and languages were also taught as part of the project, and a few years later, one of the project members had become an archaeologist (Tully, 2009: 70).

The preservation of cultural heritage for its own sake is only possible when the ties between communities and their past are reinforced. With a renewed sense of ownership and responsibility, local people will care more about the site and its associated materials more generally. Leventhal's project in Tihosuco, Mexico, has highlighted the need for greater empowerment of communities (Leventhal et al, 2014). By talking to the local population, Leventhal and his team realized that they were not interested in their Classic Maya past, but in the more recent 'Caste War' of the 19th century, to which they could directly relate. This bond was used to generate a stronger community project: local villagers are immediately involved in its management. Due to their emotional attachment, the project is likely to carry on long after Leventhal's involvement.

The long-term effects of these community projects are hard to assess, however. In the last twenty years, the practice of community archaeology in the developing world has led to many debates (for a greater articulation of those, see Pyburn, 2017). These centre around questions such as the extent to which they replicate neo-colonial power relations, or contribute to the commodification of heritage, or if they can be relevant to local needs. Pyburn is critical of the touristic development efforts at the site of Chau Hiix in Belize, which were mainly driven by her own efforts (2017: 194), with limited local responsibility and no governmental support.

After a few years without her involvement, the project had waned. Local identification with the site was so low that villagers stopped protecting it, and the site's storage house was broken into and destroyed (Pyburn, 2017: 194). However, some projects can successfully make the transition to sole management by local participants, such as in the village of Agua Blanca in Ecuador. In the 1990s, McEwan and Silva spearheaded a community archaeology project which led to the villagers creating their own museum and community centre with the help of Hudson, an exhibit designer (Hudson & McEwan, 1987). Beyond the mere economic benefits generated by a surge in touristic activity, the Agua Blanca project has fostered pride in the past through a process of 'cultural identity and confidence building' (Hudson et al, 2016: 84). This is seen in the community's current membership in national indigenous tourism networks such as the Federación Plurinacional de Turismo Comunitario del Ecuador, which gave the people of Agua Blanca the opportunity to discuss the project and their achievements at national and international conferences (Hudson et al, 2016: 78). The village now has its own archaeological committee which occupies a prominent place in village life as it makes decisions regarding the site, elects its own officers, and decides who get to be trained as a guide (Hudson et al, 2016: 69-70). The community has grown in cohesion and political clout: for instance, it was able to successfully negotiate with a company that wished to extract oil from its Palo Santo trees (Hudson et al, 2016: 80).

Challenges in evaluating the development impacts of archaeology

Discussing the ways in which archaeological projects intersect with development objectives shows that social, economic and environmental impacts are closely integrated and should be considered in a holistic manner. However, the various disciplines aiming to foster these impacts are disconnected: for instance, there could be more dialogue between historical ecology and community/public archaeology. Besides, the stakeholders undertaking these

archaeology-based development endeavours range in scale from local to national or even international, and cover a variety of statuses including academic, non-profit or governmental. In some cases, no development specialists are involved. While certain projects see their development component as a major aim, others treat it as an afterthought of archaeological research, or a way to prove 'impact' as a requirement of specific funding schemes.

A greater problem is the lack of accountability in most of these projects (Gould, 2016). In several instances, we have seen that unsuccessful attempts were repeated, seemingly without learning from other projects' mistakes. Evaluation is necessary, but considering how scattered these projects are, how can it happen beyond the scope of anecdotal case studies? Can there be rigorous guidelines to evaluate the potentials of archaeology for development, or even agreement regarding what to measure and how?

The next section details how the discipline of public archaeology is uniquely situated in its ability to accommodate this range of views and projects. It fosters critical and ethical reflections on the challenges besetting archaeology-based development projects, and is making promising methodological inroads in dealing with the evaluation problem.

Theoretical framework: enter Public Archaeology

What is public archaeology?

Public archaeology is 'both a disciplinary practice and a theoretical position' (Richardson & Almansa-Sanchez 2015: 194), focusing on the role of archaeology in the modern world. This framework is helpful in finding disciplinary resonance for ideas about development. In broader terms, public archaeology refers to 'any area of archaeological activity that interacted or had the potential to interact with the public' (Schadla-Hall, 1999: 147). This is a controversial definition that has led some of its advocates to argue that all archaeological

activity should be aware of its potential consequences on modern society (Grima, 2016: 6). Gould's recent analysis of papers published in the *Public Archaeology* journal between 2000 and 2015 has shown that the proponents of this approach have studied topics as wide-ranging as ethics, identity and politics, indigenous issues and postcolonial critiques, relations with communities, political engagement, repatriation, economic impact, or the practice of public-oriented projects (Gould, 2016: 10).

Public archaeology focuses on the practical aspects in which archaeology affects, and is affected by, non-archaeologists. It cannot be divorced from archaeological research, and there are significant overlaps with debates within the field of critical heritage studies (see Figure 1) and applied archaeology (as defined by Neusius, 2009: 19).

Public archaeology theory is characterized by its reflexivity, notably regarding whether the justification of archaeological activity in economic terms is forcing the discipline to conform to neo-liberal standards (Matsuda, 2016: 6). The questions prompted by this discipline fit well with some of the debates encountered within international development, such as the re-centering on ethics and criticality. Public archaeology seems to be an appropriate framework to discuss the role played by archaeology in the context of development, and thus evaluate projects in those terms.

Figure 1 near here

Figure 1: Public archaeology typology (Moshenska: 2017, 8).

Public archaeology and development

Many public archaeology projects fit within the broad category of development-oriented projects. The examples of projects with economic, social and environmental impacts mentioned above broadly fit within Moshenska's typology (Figure 1): community archaeology

projects (type 1), projects that explicitly seek to develop resources for economic development (public sector archaeology, type 3), and educational projects (type 4). Academic public archaeology (type 7) seeks to disentangle the implications and ethical concerns of these projects, and put them into a wider critical and theoretical perspective. Yet, some academics propose a distinction between 'public archaeology' and 'archaeology for development' (Saucedo Segami, 2011). They argue that while public archaeology is rooted in participatory ethics, 'archaeology for development' projects tend to be top-down, and are managed by heritage professionals who do not take into account local perceptions regarding archaeological heritage (Saucedo Segami, 2011: 7). In the light of unsuccessful attempts to be involved in local development, some public archaeologists have also advocated a retreat from these efforts, arguing that the profession should focus on producing knowledge about the human past and show how this knowledge affects relations of power in the present (Pyburn, 2017).

Considering the variety of archaeological projects aiming to have a stake in driving local development, this retreat seems unlikely. On the other hand, critically engaging with them through the use of public archaeology as a theoretical approach might mitigate some of these roadblocks. Public archaeology can challenge the assumptions behind these projects and formulate a critique of their possible consequences and ethical implications, which can only strengthen their long-term success.

In recent years, public archaeology has seen a surge in methodological discussions, notably regarding what counts as a successful programme, and how this can be evaluated (Gould, 2018). As we have seen, this concern is also at the core of development endeavours rooted within archaeology and heritage.

Evaluating public archaeology: why, how?

Purpose of evaluation

Attempts to use archaeological heritage as a resource for development have been marked by many unconvincing results: the case of Andean raised field systems (Herrera, 2013), or efforts to promote community-managed archaeological tourism in Belize (Pyburn, 2017) are examples showing that these projects tend to have low sustainability in the long term.

Evaluation has become a necessity in the field of public archaeology. Not only do funders such as the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF, 2018) increasingly require projects to demonstrate impact – particularly economic – in order to justify the allocation of funds; evaluation is a tool for projects to improve and ensure they are meeting their goals (Gould & Burtenshaw, 2014: 8). Furthermore, evaluation would provide a much-needed critical eye to ensure that projects aiming to increase public engagement do not end up replicating pre-existing power structures (Ellenberger & Richardson, 2018: 77).

The complex entanglement of ethical issues and notions of human development also show that evaluation needs to be conducted in a reflective and critical manner. The alternative would be a box-ticking approach, whereby evaluation would only serve as a formality, enabling funders to wash their hands of other questionable practices since they can prove a supposedly positive social impact through their sponsorship of heritage (Ellenberger & Richardson, 2018: 81). This may not ultimately satisfy the aims of public archaeology.

Attempts at evaluation

Many of the studies around impact in archaeology have centred on the idea of social or economic value and how it needs to be quantified in order for policymakers to understand the

relevance of a given site or project (Burtenshaw 2013; Boom 2018). Few studies have focused on evaluation itself, which is more concerned with attributing specific impacts to a project (Gould 2016; Ellenberger & Richardson, 2018). The distinction between 'valuing' archaeology, or understanding the set of values assigned to the archaeological resource, and 'evaluating' institutions and their abilities to meet their objectives has already been pointed out by Carman et al (1999, 146). Similarly, I argue that evaluating projects and their impacts is a different endeavour, one that has not received the attention it deserves considering the potentials of archaeology for local development as highlighted above. In this section, I will detail the work that has been conducted in both areas of valuation and evaluation, which have informed each other.

Attempts to adapt Economic Impact Assessments to the heritage context in order to elicit the economic value of archaeological assets are noteworthy: Burtenshaw has conducted a study measuring the economic capital of the site of Feynan in Jordan (2013, 2014) and that of the site and museum of Kilmartin Glen in Scotland (2008). Douglas (2010) tested a range of methods to ascribe an economic value to the impacts of the Çatalhöyük project in Turkey, including a travel-cost method[2], a contingent valuation survey[3] and an expenditure multiplier method[4]. Such attempts are inspired from the fields of cultural economics as pioneered by Throsby (2001) and ecological economics, which have introduced methods to quantify the benefits and value of environmental and cultural assets (Burtenshaw, 2014 provides an

[2] The travel cost is estimated based on the distance visitors had to cover, as well as money spent on food, drinks, accommodation, and opportunity costs. It is used as a proxy for how much people are willing to spend to visit the site (Douglas, 2014: 46).
[3] Contingent Valuation usually consists in assessing survey participants' 'willingness-to-pay' (WTP) to prevent the destruction of an asset, in this case the site of Çatalhöyük (Douglas, 2014: 46). In other cases, their 'willingness-to-accept' (WTA) a compensation for the destruction of an asset can also be measured (Burtenshaw, 2014: 26).
[4] The expenditure multiplier method tracks how much extra income is generated from each dollar invested in the project (Douglas, 2014: 47).

overview of such methods). While the ambition of Douglas's project is admirable, the sample sizes are small, and not statistically significant (Burtenshaw, 2013: 200). More research is needed to adapt economics-rooted methods to small-scale archaeological endeavours.

Some of that work on economic capital has informed research on evaluation. More recently, Burtenshaw has promoted the collection of rigorous economic monitoring and evaluation methods within the Sustainable Preservation Initiative (for more details on the SPI programme and how its impacts could be measured, see Dupeyron, 2018). Glassup's work (2011) in San José de Moro, Peru, attempts to collect data on the economic, socio-cultural and conservation impacts of the Sustainable Preservation Initiative project through questionnaires and surveys, but the lack of a baseline against which to compare the results of the intervention was a significant obstacle in demonstrating that the impacts were caused by SPI.

Other methodological advances have come from attempts to measure non-economic values and impacts in the heritage sector. As early as 1996, Carnegie and Wolnizer made significant inroads on accountability in museums focusing on non-financial outcomes, urging professionals to measure viability and vitality as seen in the levels of activity, participation, interaction and representation (1996, 89). They advocated for the inclusion of non-financial indicators looking at performance such as uses of the collection, visitor numbers and satisfaction (Carnegie & Wolnizer, 1996: 90-92).

Mason's typology of sociocultural values attached to heritage disaggregates them into historical, cultural/symbolic, social, spiritual/religious and aesthetic (2002, 10). This distinction is a starting point to help decision makers take all dimensions into account but also to think about indicators for impact. In this vein, the NEARCH project, funded by the European Union, has conducted research on values by conducting a broad survey on a sample of 4516 Europeans to elicit how they relate to their archaeological heritage (Kajda et al, 2018). Ongoing

research by van den Dries, Boom and colleagues (van den Dries et al, 2015; Boom, 2018) is channelling those insights into appropriate methods related to the measurement of social values. However, this system of values remains mostly limited to a European context. A notable exception is Ginzarly et al's (2019) analysis using social media (most photographed viewpoints, tags) in Tripoli, Lebanon, to understand how people value heritage, and the changes in these perceptions over time. This study provides an interesting methodological foray into obtaining large-scale data. Anthropological investigations remain a common method for elucidating the social impact of archaeological projects on local communities. Stauß's work with the women of Pachacamac, Peru, who have been capacitated as artisans by the Sustainable Preservation Initiative, is one step in that direction (Stauß, 2016). More recently, Gürsu and the British Institute in Ankara have conducted research on the social and economic impacts of their 'Living Amid the ruins' project, collecting qualitative data on the responses to heritage and community development in 7 villages (Schadla-Hall 2019, pers. Comm.). The same team has pioneered the use of a large-scale (n=3601) survey of public opinion on the value of archaeological heritage as part of the the **S**afeguarding **AR**chaeological **A**ssets of **T**urkey project (Schadla-Hall 2019, pers. Comm.).

Another area in which significant methodological advances have been made is in measuring the outcomes of public archaeology projects for education. The Higher Education Field Academy is a programme inviting secondary school students to participate in archaeological excavations in the East of England. Over eight years, they have tracked the impact on educational aspirations through rigorous surveys administered to all students (Lewis, 2014). Similar approaches have been tested in non-Western settings, such as in the site of Çatalhöyük in Turkey (Apaydin, 2016). A questionnaire administered to a group of children who took part in the education programme and a control group revealed that their answers differed very little, and that most of their knowledge derived from the formal Turkish education

system (Apaydin, 2016: 838). Similar methods were used by Guilfoyle and Hogg, who have advocated the use of a single framework obtaining evaluation data based on surveys and bespoke indicators in their study of public outreach, or 'collaborative archaeology' projects in Canada and Australia (2015).

Gould advocates a move beyond single case study reports, which is currently the norm within evaluation in the heritage sector, and towards practical guidelines for evaluation (2017: 7). He encourages the borrowing of methods from economics and political sciences, and mentions rigorous evaluation protocols of the type advocated by the Heritage Lottery Fund (2017a): meta-analyses, randomized control trials, and systematic 'small-n' case study approaches (Gould, 2016: 13). The Heritage Lottery Fund is a major source of funding for UK-based heritage projects (HLF, 2018), and its core requirement to evaluate funded projects has compelled stakeholders to consider impacts. Recently, the organisation issued a methodological guide explaining how to conduct appropriate evaluation (HLF, 2017). Three major outcomes are measured: outcomes for heritage, for people and for communities. The evaluation is based on a logic model of a type that is commonplace in the field of international development, articulating how activities (inputs) are translated into outputs and longer-term outcomes, as well as outlining the assumptions underlying the project's logic, and the external factors likely to influence it (HLF, 2017: 4). The HLF encourages projects to monitor specific aspects related to the outcomes such as 'financial spend in the local economy' (HLF, 2017: 16) but provides little guidance on what methods can be used to access this data. The other approaches recommended by Gould (2016), such as meta-analyses or randomized control trials, appear practically impossible due to the lack of easily collectable quantitative data in a vast majority of heritage projects, and the small numbers of participants with which these projects usually operate. However, his suggestion to explore small-n evaluation methods has potential while he mentions the application of these methods in the field of International

Relations (Gould, 2016: 14-15), I would propose looking at their use in International Development, a field whose aims are more closely related to those of heritage and archaeology projects in the developing world.

The state of evaluation: challenges and looking ahead

This brief review of methodological approaches has shown that the state of evaluation for archaeology or heritage based development projects is inadequate, and most of the major advances take place in industrialized Western countries, such as in the case of the HLF (UK). Evaluations have not often been systematically conducted, and when they occur, they tend to focus on one single aspect of a project, such as education, engagement or economic impact. A noteworthy exception is Glassup's work in Peru (2011), but it concluded that the feasibility of evaluation was low. Our previous discussion framing archaeology in terms of development has shown that several of its dimensions (social, economic, environmental and cultural) were tightly integrated; hence, restricting the analysis to a single aspect underplays the full potential of these projects. What public archaeologists usually evaluate is not the development potential of their project, but only one or two of its facets; and the lack of dialogue with the development sector means that 'evaluation' takes on quite a different meaning. When methods are borrowed, such as Economic Impact Assessments, they only demonstrate part of an archaeological site's potential value, and methods for the monitoring and evaluation of projects are not yet routinely established. Were the objectives clearly articulated from the outset and evaluated against a rigorous framework, the outcomes might be very different; but as Gould's study has shown (2016), most projects do not even clearly establish what their objectives are. The potential impacts of public archaeology projects in the developing world are thus understated and understudied. In short, a tighter integration of public archaeology projects is needed within a development intervention framework is needed to facilitate evaluation.

Conclusion: Towards an integrated framework.

This synthesis indicates the necessity of charting the development impacts of archaeological projects to foster more rigorous evaluation. Archaeology and international development can have a mutually beneficial relationship: not only is archaeological heritage proving to be a nexus for development at the local level, but development could teach archaeology how to demonstrate the impacts of development in a more rigorous methodological fashion. However, this fruitful connection is only possible if both disciplines establish a dialogue based on clarity and transparency.

Archaeological projects seeking to foster local development are manifold, but their self-reflection is rarely rigorous enough for their impacts to persist in the long term. Understanding what they share with development interventions and how their impacts can be defined under a development framework might help increase the possibilities of evaluation.

Of course, this road is not without challenges. Few heritage projects in the developing world have a budget on a par with development initiatives, let alone the resources to conduct evaluations on a similar scale. Archaeological projects usually happen at the community level, with small numbers of participants, which preclude most of the traditional quantitative methods favoured by evaluation professionals. Projects backed by more significant resources, at the national or international level, might however find these suitable.

Fortunately, development evaluation is currently spearheading efforts in designing techniques adapted to small-scale projects. These 'small-n' evaluation approaches, which include participatory research methods, would suit the ethos underpinning most public archaeology interventions. The outcomes that evaluators would strive to measure would thus be defined by the beneficiaries themselves. Archaeology as development can also take place

from the bottom up, which fits recent calls for locally governed projects (Gould, 2018). Participatory evaluation methods might be precisely what these initiatives need to be sustainable in the long term.

To test whether development techniques can be appropriate for public archaeology projects, and if so, which ones, research needs to be conducted on their feasibility in specific contexts.

A more rigorous framework documenting the appropriateness of various evaluation methods in a range of contexts is necessary. More case studies of evaluation practice within this sector would help exemplify new ways of tackling the evaluation problem and ensure that development-oriented archaeology projects have the desired outcomes. With better evaluation, stakeholders would be empowered in shaping and adapting projects to fulfill their goals.

References

Ackerman, L. 2014. The evolution of heritage management: Thinking beyond site boundaries and buffer zones. *Public Archaeology,* 13 (1-3): 113-122.

Alkire, S. 2002. Dimensions of human development. *World development*, 30 (2): 181-205.

Apaydin, V. 2016. Effective or not? Success or failure? Assessing heritage and archaeological education programmes–the case of Çatalhöyük. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22 (10): 828-843.

Ashley, C., Boyd, C. & Goodwin, H. 2000. Pro-poor Tourism: Putting Poverty at the Heart of the Tourism Agenda. Natural Resource Perspectives, 50: 1-6.

Basu, P. & Modest, W. 2015. *Museums, Heritage and International Development*. *Museums, Heritage and International Development*. New York, London: Routledge.

Bazán Pérez, A., Gonzáles, A., Cruzado, E. & Zegarra, M. 2008. Semana de Arqueología 2005: "Arqueología para el Desarrollo": Propuestas, perspectivas y conclusiones. *Supay*, 10 (6): 242-246.

Boom, K. 2018. *Imprint of Action: The Sociocultural Impact of Public Activities in Archaeology*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.

Burtenshaw, P. 2008. *Archaeology, Economic and Tourism: The economic use-value of archaeology with the case study of Kilmartin Glen and Kilmartin House Museum*. Masters Thesis, University College London.

Burtenshaw, P. 2013. *The Economic Capital of Archaeology: Measurement and Management.* PhD Thesis, University College London.

Burtenshaw, P. 2014. Mind the Gap: Cultural and Economic Values in Archaeology. *Public Archaeology*, 13(1-3): 48-58.

Camfield, L. & Duvendack, M. 2014. Impact Evaluation–Are We 'Off the Gold Standard'? *The European Journal of Development Research*, 26(1): 1-11.

Carman, J., Carnegie, G. D. & Wolnizer, P. W. 1999. Is Archaeological Valuation an Accounting Matter? *Antiquity* 73 (279): 143–48.

Carnegie, G. D. & Wolnizer, P. W. 1996. Enabling Accountability in Museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 15 (4): 371–86.

Coben, L.S. 2014. Sustainable Preservation: Creating Entrepreneurs, Opportunities, and Measurable Results. *Public Archaeology*, 13(1-3): 278-287.

Crumley, C.L. ed. 1994. *Historical ecology: cultural knowledge and changing landscapes.* Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Davies, M. 2010. A View from the East: An Interdisciplinary 'Historical Ecology' Approach to a Contemporary Agricultural Landscape in Northwest Kenya. *African Studies,* 69 (2): 279-297.

Douglas, M. 2010. *Evaluating Çatalhöyük: Economic and Ethnographic Approaches to Understanding the Impact of Cultural Heritage*. Masters Thesis, Stanford University.

Douglas, M. 2014. *Evaluating Çatalhöyük: Economic and Ethnographic Approaches to Understanding the Impact of Cultural Heritage*. In I. Hodder, ed. *Integrating Catalhöyük: Themes from the 2000–2008 seasons. Catalhöyük Research Project*. Ankara: British Institute for Archaeology at Ankara Monograph, 49, pp. 45-54.

van den Dries, M.H., Boom, K.H.J., & van der Linden, S.J. 2015. Exploring archaeology's social values for present day society. *Analecta Praehistoria Leidensia,* 45: 221-234.

Duflo, E., Glennerster, R. & Kremer, M. 2007. Using randomization in development economics research: A toolkit. In T. P. Schultz and J. A. Strauss, eds. *Handbook of Development Economics*, Volume 4, pp.3895-3962. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Dupeyron, A. 2018. Capturing the impacts of Archaeology for Development: Evaluating the Sustainable Preservation Initiative (SPI) in Peru. Masters Thesis, University of East Anglia.

Ellenberger, K. H. & Richardson, L. 2018. Reflecting on Evaluation in Public Archaeology. *AP: Online Journal in Public Archaeology* 8: 65–94.

Escobar, A. 1999. The invention of development. *Current History* 98 (631): 382-386.

Esteva, C. 2010. Development. In W. Sachs, ed. *The Development Dictionary*. *A Guide to knowledge as power.* London: ZED books, pp. 1-23.

Gertler, P.J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L.B. & Vermeersch, C.M. 2016. *Impact evaluation in practice*, 2nd ed. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

Ginzarly, M., Roders, A. P., & Teller, J. 2019. Mapping Historic Urban Landscape Values through Social Media. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 36: 1–11.

Global Heritage Fund (GHF), 2010. *Saving our vanishing heritage: Safeguarding endangered cultural heritage sites in the developing world.* Palo Alto: Global Heritage Fund.

Glassup, N. 2011. *Assessing the impact of touristic archaeological site development in the developing world.* Masters Thesis, University College London.

Gould, P. G. & Burtenshaw, P. 2014. Archaeology and Economic Development. *Public Archaeology,* 13 (1-3): 3-9.

Gould, P. G. & Pyburn, A. eds. 2017. *Collision or Collaboration: Archaeology Encounters Economic Development*. New York, London: Springer.

Gould, P. G. 2016. On the Case: Method in Public and Community Archaeology. *Public Archaeology*, 15(1): 5-22.

Gould, P. G. 2017. Collision or Collaboration? Archaeology Encounters Economic Development: An Introduction. In P. G. Gould and A. Pyburn, eds. *Collision or Collaboration: Archaeology Encounters Economic Development*. New York, London: Springer, pp. 1-13.

Gould, P. G. 2018. *Empowering Communities Through Archaeology and Heritage: The Role of Local Governance in Economic Development*. London: Bloomsbury.

Grima, R. 2016. But Isn't All Archaeology 'Public'Archaeology? *Public Archaeology*, 15(1): 50-58.

Guilfoyle, D. R., & Hogg, E. A. 2015. Towards an Evaluation Based Framework of Collaborative Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 3(2): 107-23.

Haynes, J. 2008. *Development studies*. Cambridge: Polity.

Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), 2017. Evaluation: Good Practice Guidance. London: Heritage Lottery Fund.

Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). 2018. Heritage Lottery Fund Annual Report 2017/18 [Online] [Accessed 03 August 2020]. Available at: https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/hlf-annual-report-2017-2018

Herrera, A. 2013. Arqueología y desarrollo en el Perú. In A. Herrera, ed. *Arqueología y desarrollo en América del Sur. De la práctica a la teoría.* Bogotá: Uniandes, pp. 73-95.

Howard, S. 2013. Understanding the Concept of Sustainability as Applied to Archaeological Heritage. *Rosetta,* 14: 1-19.

Hudson, C. & McEwan, C. 1987. Focussing pride in the past: Agua Blanca, Ecuador. *Museum International*, 39(2): 125-128.

Hudson, C., Silva, M. I. & McEwan, C. 2016. Tourism and Community: An Ecuadorian Village Builds on its Past. *Public Archaeology,* 15 (2-3): 65-86.

Hutchings, R. 2013. "Hard times bring hard questions": Is archaeology pro-development? Is it classist? Colonialist? Imperialist? Racist? [Online] [Accessed 25 August 2018]. Available at: http://ubc.academia.edu/RichardHutchings

Isendahl, C., Sánchez, W., Calla, S., Irahola, M., Salvatierra, D., & Ticona, M. 2013. Archaeology's Potential Contribution to Pools of Agronomic Knowledge: A Case of Applied Agro-Archaeology in the Bolivian Yungas. In: M. Davies and F. Nkirote, eds. Humans and the Environment: New Archaeological Perspectives for the Twenty-First Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 135-152.

Kajda, K., Marx, A., Wright, H., Richards, J., Marciniak, A., Rossenbach, K.S., Pawleta, M., van den Dries, M.H., Boom, K., Guermandi, M.P., Criado-Boado, F., Barreiro, D., Synnestvedt, A., Kotsakis, K., Kasvikis, K., Theodoroudi, E., Lüth, F., Issa, M. & Frase, I., 2018. Archaeology, Heritage, and Social Value: Public Perspectives on European Archaeology. *European Journal of Archaeology*, 21(1): 96-117.

Keatinge, R.W. 1980. Archaeology and development: the Tembladera sites of the Peruvian North Coast. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 7(4): 467-477.

Kendall, A. 2005. Applied archaeology: revitalizing indigenous agricultural technology within an Andean community. *Public Archaeology*, 4(2-3): 205-221.

Kendall, A. 2013. Applied archaeology in the Andes: The contribution of pre-Hispanic agricultural terracing to environmental and rural development strategies. In M. Davies & F. N. M'Mbogori, eds. *Humans and the Environment: New Archaeological Perspectives for the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 153-170.

Labadi, S. 2017. UNESCO, World Heritage, and Sustainable Development: International Discourses and Local Impacts. In P. G. Gould and K. A. Pyburn, eds. *Collision or Collaboration: Archaeology Encounters Economic Development*. New York, London: Springer, pp. 45–60.

Labadi, S. & Gould, P. 2015. Sustainable Development: Heritage, Community, Economics. In L. Meskell, ed. *Global Heritage: A Reader.* Malden, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 196-216.

Lafrenz Samuels, K. 2016. The cadence of climate: Heritage proxies and social change. Journal of Social Archaeology, 16(2): 142–163.

Lane, P. J. 2015. Archaeology in the age of the anthropocene: A critical assessment of its scope and societal contributions. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 40(5): 485–498.

Larson, L.R. & Poudyal, N.C. 2012. Developing sustainable tourism through adaptive resource management: A case study of Machu Picchu, Peru. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 20(7): 917-938.

Leventhal, R.M., Chan Espinosa, C., Moo Pat, E. & Poot Cahun, D. 2014. The Community Heritage Project in Tihosuco, Quintana Roo, Mexico. *Public Archaeology*, 13(1-3): 213-225.

Lewis, C. 2014. 'Cooler than a trip to Alton Towers': Assessing the impact of the Higher Education Field Academy, 2005–13. *Public Archaeology*, 13(4): 295–322.

Lim, L. 2004. China tourist town's culture clash. *BBC*, 28 June. [Online] [Accessed 18 March 2013]. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/3839443.stm.

Mason, R. 2002. Assessing values in conservation planning: methodological issues and choice. In M. De la Torre, ed. *Assessing the values of cultural heritage*. Los Angeles, The Getty Conservation Institute, pp. 5-30. [Online] [Accessed 25 May 2020]. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/10020/gci_pubs/values_cultural_heritage

Matsuda, A. 2016. A Consideration of Public Archaeology Theories. *Public Archaeology*, 15(1): 40-49.

Moser, S., Glazier, D., Phillips, J.E., El Nemr, L.N., Mousa, M.S., Aiesh, R.N., Richardson, S., Conner, A. & Seymour, M. 2002. Transforming archaeology through

practice: strategies for collaborative archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt. *World Archaeology*, 34(2): 220-248.

Moshenska, G. 2017. Introduction: public archaeology as practice and scholarship where archaeology meets the world. In G. Moshenska, ed. Key concepts in Public Archaeology. London: UCL Press, pp. 1-13.

Mowforth, M. & Munt, I. 2009. *Tourism and sustainability. Development and new tourism in the third world*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

Neusius, S.W. 2009. Changing the curriculum: Preparing archaeologists for careers in applied archaeology. *SAA Archaeological Record*, 9(1): 18-22.

Peet, R. & Hartwick, E. 2009. *Theories of development: Contentions, arguments, alternatives,* 2nd ed. New York, London: Guilford Press.

Pieterse, J.N. 2010. *Development Theory*. Second Edition. London: Sage.

Pyburn, A. 2017. Developing Archaeology. In P. G. Gould & A. Pyburn, eds. *Collision or Collaboration: Archaeology Encounters Economic Development*. New York, London: Springer, pp. 189-199.

Ravallion, M. 2015. *The economics of poverty: History, measurement, and policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Redclift, M. 2005. Sustainable development (1987–2005): an oxymoron comes of age. *Sustainable development*, 13(4): 212-227.

Richardson, L.J. & Almansa-Sánchez, J. 2015. Do you even know what public archaeology is? Trends, theory, practice, ethics. *World Archaeology*, 47(2): 194-211.

Robinson, R. & Picard, D. 2006. *Tourism, Culture and Sustainable Development.* Paris: UNESCO.

Saucedo Segami, D. D. 2011. Trabajando para el Público: Algunas perspectivas de cómo adaptar la Arqueología Pública al contexto peruano. *Arkeos: Revista Electronica de Arqueologia,* 6(13): 1-12.

Schadla-Hall, T. 1999. Editorial: Public archaeology. *European Journal of Archaeology,* 2(2): 147–58.

Sen, A. 1983. Poor, relatively speaking. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 35(2): 153-169.

Stauß, E. 2016. *Die vielen Gesichter Pachacamacs Konstruktionen von Zugehörigkeiten der Lokalbevölkerung*. Undergraduate Dissertation, University of Bonn.

Stump, D. 2010. "Ancient and backward or long-lived and sustainable?" The role of the past in debates concerning rural livelihoods and resource conservation in Eastern Africa. *World Development*, 38(9): 1251-1262.

Swartley, L. 2002. *Inventing Indigenous Knowledge: Archaeology, Rural Development, and the Raised Field Rehabilitation Project in Bolivia*. New York: Routledge.

Timothy, D.J. & Nyaupane, G.P. 2009. *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world*. London: Routledge.

Throsby, D. 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Truman, H.S. 1949. Inaugural Address: Thursday, January 20, 1949. [Online] [Accessed 25 August 2018]. Available at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/truman.asp

Tully, G. 2009. Ten Years On: The Community Archaeology Project Quseir, Egypt. *Treballs d'Arqueologia*, 15: 63-78.

United Nations, 2020. Sustainable Development Goals: Decent Work and Economic Growth. [Online] [Accessed 12 July 2020]. Available at: https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/economic-growth/

UNESCO, 2010. *The Power of Culture for Development*. [Online] [Accessed 25 August 2018]. Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001893/189382e.pdf

UNESCO. 2013. *The Hangzhou Declaration: Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2018. *Culture for the 2030 Agenda*. [Online] [Accessed 18 May 2020]. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/culture/flipbook/culture-2030/en/Brochure-UNESCO-Culture-SDGs-EN2.pdf

United Nations General Assembly. 2005. *2005 World Summit Outcome, Resolution A/60/1, adopted by the General Assembly on 15 September 2005*. [Online] [Accessed 28 January 2016]. Available at: http://data.unaids.org/Topics/UniversalAccess/worldsummitoutcome_resolution_24oct2005_en.pdf

United Cities and Local Governments. 2010. *Culture: Fourth Pillar of Sustainable Development*. [Online] [Accessed 18 May 2020]. Available at: http://www.agenda21culture.net/sites/default/files/files/documents/en/zz_culture4pillarsd_eng.pdf

United Cities and Local Governments. 2018. *Culture in the Sustainable Development Goals: A Guide for Local Action.* [Online] [Accessed 18 May 2020]. Available at: https://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/culture_in_the_sdgs.pdf

United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), 2015. *Understanding Tourism: Basic Glossary*. [Online] [Accessed 25 May 2015]. Available at: http://media.unwto.org/en/content/understanding-tourism-basic-glossary.

White, H. & Phillips, D. 2012. *Addressing Attribution of Cause Effect in Small n Impact Evaluations: Towards an Integrated Framework.* 3ie Working Paper No. 15. [Online] [Accessed 28 December 2017]. Available at: http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer/2012/06/29/working_paper_15.pdf

World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. *Our common future: the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.