

DATA PAPER

Data from Archaeology for the People? Greek Archaeology and its Public: An Analysis of the Socio-Political and Economic Role of Archaeology in Greece

Anastasia Sakellariadi¹

¹ Honorary Research Associate, UCL Institute of Archaeology, London, United Kingdom

The interview transcripts and survey data in this dataset originate from an investigation of the role of archaeology in local communities in Greece today. The communities of Krenides (Kavala), Dispilio (Kastoria) and Delphi (Phokida) were used as case studies. Members of these communities, local archaeologists and archaeologists of the central services of the Ministry of Culture were interviewed while the local populations were surveyed using structured questionnaires. The data is stored in textual and tabular formats and it is likely to be of use to anyone who is interested in public archaeology, heritage management or socio-anthropological and sociological research regarding perceptions about the past, archaeology and heritage.

Keywords: Archaeology; Public archaeology; Greece; Public perceptions; Philippi; Dispilio; Delphi

Funding Statement: This research project was funded by grants from the UCL Institute of Archaeology and the Graduate School, the J.F. Costopoulos Foundation, the Propondis Foundation and personal resources.

(1) Overview

Context

In the last forty years, various developments have rendered archaeology around the world increasingly aware of the socio-political and economic context within which it operates. One can refer to the human rights movement in postcolonial contexts and the emergence of fields such as public, indigenous and community archaeology, post-processual archaeological theories influenced by post-modern theories, increased awareness of archaeological ethics expressed in professional codes of practice, research in archaeology and nationalism, as well as the influence of international charters and conventions regarding archaeological heritage management.

The above can be contrasted with Greek archaeology, which has been based on the academic elitism of foreign scholars and schools of archaeology since its beginning, and on the newly-founded state's (1830) need to build a national identity. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] The dominant national narrative and the limitations of the Archaeological Service, the exclusive responsible authority, have constrained Greek archaeology. As a result the latter has barely followed a path of self-awareness and social reciprocity and has become less relevant to both the state and the people of Greece. [6] [7] [8] [9] [10]

This research project investigated the relationship between archaeology, as a discipline, a state authority as well as the remains of the past, and local communities through the examination of three case studies: the local

community of Krenides, next to the archaeological site of Philippi and of Dikili Tash in Kavala, the local community of Dispilio, next to the archaeological site with the same name in Kastoria, in northern Greece, and the local community of Delphi, next to the archaeological site of Delphi in central Greece.

The project aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What has the relationship between archaeology and local communities been in Greece in terms of its social, economic and political impact? How and why has this relationship developed?
2. What are the public values of archaeology in Greece and how have they altered under the influence of socio-political and economic change?
3. What are the current aims and the objectives of Greek archaeology as identified in the priorities of the Archaeological Service?
4. What strategies might archaeology implement in Greece in order to reinforce its socio-political and economic role and become more reciprocal and relevant?

The ultimate question this research project raised is: 'for whom is archaeology practiced in Greece?' [11] The publication of this study as a monograph is underway. [12]

Spatial coverage

Description: Krenides, Prefecture of Kavala, Greece
Northern boundary: 41.029799/24.294073

Southern boundary: 41.008852/24.292488
 Eastern boundary: 41.015988/24.313635
 Western boundary: 41.011458/24.288978
 Description: Dispilio, Prefecture of Kastoria, Greece
 Northern boundary: 40.484633/21.288511
 Southern boundary: 40.477713/21.288639
 Eastern boundary: 40.480732/21.295527
 Western boundary: 40.484001/21.284021
 Description: Delphi, Prefecture of Phokida, Greece
 Northern boundary: 38.48162/22.491428,
 Southern boundary: 38.478059/22.494131
 Eastern boundary: 38.477946/22.497645,
 Western boundary: 38.480394/22.490784

Temporal coverage

Krenides: September 2007 and 2008
 Dispilio: August 2008
 Delphi: May 2009
 Athens: December 2009

(2) Methods

Qualitative and quantitative data was collected from the local communities of Krenides (next to the archaeological sites of Philippi and of Dikili Tash, Kavala) and of Dispilio (next to the archaeological site of Dispilio, Kastoria) in northern Greece, and mainly quantitative data from the local community of Delphi in central Greece. Data collected but not used in the PhD thesis or the copyright of which does not belong to the author will not be included in this discussion (e.g. newspaper articles, etc.) All research for this project was conducted in Greek and all data was collected in Greek, with the exception of the questionnaire of one English-speaking participant.

Steps

Questionnaire surveys

Questionnaire surveys were conducted among the populations of the three local communities through structured interviews (98 in Krenides, 102 in Dispilio and 84 in Delphi). A pilot survey of 1% of the population of Krenides took place in September 2007. A shorter version of the preliminary questionnaire was finally adopted and used throughout the survey.

The questionnaire included both open-ended and closed questions and was divided into four parts: demographic data; perceptions of archaeology and its relevance to contemporary life; relationship with local archaeology and level of engagement with it' and engagement with other local cultural stimuli. Demographic data included: gender; six age groups [13]; employment by sector [14] and groups for unemployed, undergraduate/graduate students, retired and housewives; education attainment in four groups and years of living in the local community into three groups. Finally, a grouping of visitor types was included according to similar research [15]. Similar research conducted in the United States, Canada, Britain, Italy and Greece was consulted and questions from them were intentionally incorporated so that the results are comparable. [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] The data was analysed

using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 14 and 17.

Data is presented in its most raw form and in any other grouping that is used in the thesis for the purposes of running statistical tests with meaningful outcomes. Tables of metadata explain the content of each column included in the spreadsheets.

In-depth Interviews

Twenty-eight semi-structured interviews were conducted with archaeologists from the local and the central services of the Ministry of Culture, archaeologists from other institutions that conducted research in the areas, influential members of the local communities, such as mayors and other members of the municipal council, representatives of the church, members of research associations and educational centres. All interviews were conducted in person except for one, which was returned by email.

Interview scenarios were drafted according to each interviewee's role. Interviews lasted for approximately one hour. Interviewees were given an information sheet and a copyright consent form at the beginning of the interview. Participants' personal data have been retained under the provisions of the UK Data Protection Act. Descriptive qualifiers have replaced names and other biographical information have been removed for purposes of confidentiality where possible. Question marks in square brackets [?] indicate transcription gaps. Three full-stops in a row in square brackets [...] indicate removal of irrelevant information or information that would allow the identification of the interviewee. Words in square brackets indicate replacement of mainly names by the researcher for the purpose of confidentiality. Only features relevant to the analysis have been disclosed. Initials refer to names of individuals whose role is deemed to fall outside the remit of this piece of research.

Concealment of the archaeological sites and the local communities was rejected because it was deemed that it would compromise the analytic potential of the case studies by rendering unusable a series of their features. Three interviews were recorded on an analogue cassette recorder and the rest by an Olympus DM 20 digital recorder. Recordings were downloaded and replayed over the Olympus DSS Player computer software and transcribed in Word documents. All qualitative data was analysed in Nvivo 7.

Documentary Data

Archival data from the Municipalities of Makednon and Philippi was also included.

Sampling strategy

Case Studies

The case studies were chosen because the author's personal work experience indicated them to be appropriate for eliciting the topic of investigation. First, they represent all periods of ancient Greek history: Dispilio is a Neolithic site, Delphi is mainly dated to the Classical times and Philippi to the Roman and Early Christian ones. Their

archaeological remains differ accordingly from less to more monumental ones, and the type of archaeology practiced ranges from theoretically informed archaeology to history of ancient art and architectural history. Consequently, their role as archaeological sites in Greek and world archaeology, in the national imagination and in domestic and international tourism, and the level of intervention by the archaeological service also vary. The above features additionally influence to a certain degree social, economic and political features of the local communities. Delphi was chosen for the additional reason of extending the scope of research in geographical terms to southern Greece, the older part of the modern state (northern Greece was annexed in 1912). Therefore, the three cases present contrasting characteristics and it was presumed that they would elicit a wide range of attitudes and perceptions and thus presented the project with unique potentials.

Questionnaire Surveys

Stratified random sampling was used on the basis of gender and age groups according to the population profile of the local communities from the last national census. [21] [13] Every second person that walked by after the end of an interview was approached. The survey was conducted in open public spaces at all times of the day in all three communities: streets, cafes, taxi stands, bars, supermarkets, produce markets, bus stops but also back roads. A strict geographical definition of a 'local community' was applied and so only people who lived in the modern settlement next to each archaeological site were included. Potential participants were approached by asking them the question whether they permanently lived in Dispilio, Krenides or Delphi accordingly. If they turned out to be members of the local community, the researcher went on to explain that she was a research student and that she was conducting a survey regarding the relationship of the local community with the archaeological site and the archaeologists for the purposes of her studies.

In-depth Interviews

Interviewees were selected according to the role they played in the local communities and in local and central management of archaeology.

Quality Control

This dataset was collected and produced by a single researcher. This has contributed to its consistency. Advice from experienced members of staff, especially in relation to quantitative research, was sought. The data and the research project as a whole has been through three reviews (first year review, upgrade, viva voce examination).

Constraints

Questionnaire Surveys

A refusal rate was not recorded because its importance was underestimated at the beginning of the survey. However, it is the author's conviction that local community members' refusal rate was very low either because of

the originality of and high interest in the survey (Delphi), according to participants' own comments, or because the local communities were unaccustomed to the presence of a social researcher and willingly agreed to participate. It proved to be extremely difficult to include immigrants in all areas except for Delphi. Immigrants were approached in Krenides but refused to participate for reasons of understanding and expressing themselves in Greek.

(3) Dataset description

Object name

Study: Data from Archaeology for the People? Greek Archaeology and its Public: An Analysis of the Socio-Political and Economic Role of Archaeology in Greece
Files:

ArchivalMaterial_Metadata.csv
ArchivalMaterial_Metadata.docx
DemosMakednon_1_2003a.pdf
DemosMakednon_1_2003b.pdf
Ephorate_21051974.pdf
Ephorate_02021972.pdf
Ephorate_24011975.pdf
Ephorate_28081974.pdf
KoinotitaDispiliou_04021972.pdf
KoinotitaDispiliou_06061974.pdf
KoinotitaDispiliou_28011975.pdf
NomarhiaKastorias_27051968.pdf
YPPO_24011972.pdf
Dispilio_Archaeologist.txt
Dispilio_Archaeologist.docx
Dispilio_Archaeologist1.txt
Dispilio_Archaeologist1.docx
Dispilio_Archaeologist2.txt
Dispilio_Archaeologist2.docx
Dispilio_ExcavationWorker.txt
Dispilio_ExcavationWorker.docx
Dispilio_FormerLocalAdministrationRepresentative1.txt
Dispilio_FormerLocalAdministrationRepresentative1.docx
Dispilio_FormerLocalAdministrationRepresentative2.txt
Dispilio_FormerLocalAdministrationRepresentative2.docx
Dispilio_HeadOfRegionalService.txt
Dispilio_HeadOfRegionalService.docx
Dispilio_Mayor.txt
Dispilio_Mayor.docx
Dispilio_RepresentativeOfTheAssociationOfFriends.txt
Dispilio_RepresentativeOfTheAssociationOfFriends.docx
Dispilio_RepresentativeOfTheLocalChurch.txt
Dispilio_RepresentativeOfTheLocalChurch.docx
Dispilio_UniversityExcavationAssociate1.txt
Dispilio_UniversityExcavationAssociate1.docx
Dispilio_UniversityExcavationAssociate2.txt
Dispilio_UniversityExcavationAssociate2.docx
Dispilio_UniversityExcavationAssociate3.txt
Dispilio_UniversityExcavationAssociate3.docx
Kavala_LocalAdministrationRepresentative.txt
Kavala_LocalAdministrationRepresentative.docx
Krenides_ExcavationWorkersConservator.txt

Krenides_ExcavationWorkersConservator.docx
 Krenides_FormerExcavationWorker.txt
 Krenides_FormerExcavationWorker.docx
 Krenides_HeadOfRegionalService.txt
 Krenides_HeadOfRegionalService.docx
 Krenides_Mayor.txt
 Krenides_Mayor.docx
 Krenides_RepresentativeOfHERAC.txt
 Krenides_RepresentativeOfHERAC.docx
 Krenides_RepresentativeOfTheBishopry.txt
 Krenides_RepresentativeOfTheBishopry.docx
 Krenides_RepresentativeOfTheEnvironmentalEducation Centre.txt
 Krenides_RepresentativeOfTheEnvironmentalEducation Centre.docx
 Krenides_SecondLocalAdministrationRepresentative.txt
 Krenides_SecondLocalAdministrationRepresentative.docx
 Krenides_Archaeologist.txt
 Krenides_Archaeologist.docx
 Krenides_ViceHeadOfRegionalService.txt
 Krenides_ViceHeadOfRegionalService.docx
 MoC_Archaeologist.txt
 MoC_Archaeologist.docx
 MoC_HeadOfDirectorate.txt
 MoC_HeadOfDirectorate.docx
 MoC_HeadOfSector.txt
 MoC_HeadOfSector.docx
 SEA_RepresentativeOfManagementCommittee.txt
 SEA_RepresentativeOfManagementCommittee.docx
 Delphi.csv
 Delphi.xlsx
 Delphi_Metadata.csv
 Delphi_Metadata.docx
 Dispilio.csv
 Dispilio.xlsx
 Dispilio_Metadata.csv
 Dispilio_Metadata.docx
 Krenides.csv
 Krenides.xlsx
 Krenides_Metadata.csv
 Krenides_Metadata.docx

Data type

Primary and secondary data

Format names and versions

Adobe Reader PDF, txt, csv

Creation dates

04/08/2008 – 09/12/2009

Dataset Creators

Anastasia Sakellariadi

Language

Greek (interview transcripts) and Greek with English translation (questionnaires)

License

CC-BY

Repository location

DOI: 10.7910/DVN/27040

Publication date

(09/02/2015)

(4) Reuse potential

This is the first dataset on public perceptions about the past, heritage and archaeology in local communities in Greece and the role of archaeology in such communities to be published. It is likely to be of use to anyone who is interested in public archaeology, heritage studies, heritage management or socio-anthropological and sociological research regarding perceptions about the past, heritage and archaeology in society today. It can also be referenced within broader research projects on the role of heritage and culture in society. Finally, it can be an excellent teaching tool for courses in public archaeology and heritage studies and in public archaeology/heritage studies research methods.

In addition, the methodology of this research project has unique reuse potential. Although interviews [7], ethnography [6] [9] [22] [23] [24] [25] and questionnaire surveys [8] [15] [16] [18] [19] [20] have been independently used in the investigation of public perceptions about the past, heritage and archaeology, their combination widens the scope of analysis. When they are independently applied, quantitative surveys only offer superficial understandings while qualitative methods lack representativeness and generalizability. When they are combined, general patterns identified and explained through population-wide quantitative surveys complement in-depth and nuanced understandings drawn from individual perspectives through qualitative methods. [17]

Therefore, although it might be challenging to fully replicate such a combined methodology and thus only partially possible, the greatest reuse potential of this dataset is the replication of the study in other contexts and its aggregation with other datasets that will allow for further comparative analysis to validate or not the results and for conclusions to be drawn at a greater scale. The potential for collaborations for further research in the field is indeed open.

Acknowledgements

This research project benefited from the supervision of Tim Schadla-Hall, Theano Moussouri and Corinna Riva at the UCL Institute of Archaeology. Prof. Em. Clive Orton (UCL Institute of Archaeology) kindly offered invaluable advice on the use of statistical methods. My former professors at the Department of Archaeology of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece) kindly allowed me to focus my investigations in the areas they had been working on for many years. I owe a big thank you to all participants who gave up their time to share with me their thoughts and concerns on the subject. I would also like to thank Brian Hole for his crucial support throughout the duration of the project and at its critical final stages and, finally, my family for the financial, psychological and intellectual support.

References

1. **Skopetea, E** 1988 *The “Model Kingdom” and the Great Idea (in Greek)*. Athens: Polytypo.
2. **Athanassopoulou, E F** 2002 An ‘Ancient’ Landscape: European Ideals, Archaeology and Nation Building in Early Modern Greece. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 20(2): 273–305. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/mgs.2002.0018>
3. **Kotsakis, K** 2003 Ideological Aspects of Contemporary Archaeology in Greece. In: Haagsma, M, Den Boer, P, Moormann, E M and Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H (eds.) *The Impact of Classical Greece on European and National Identities, 2-4 October 2000*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, Publications of the Netherlands Institute at Athens, 55–70.
4. **Kokkinidou, D** 2005 *Past and Power: Aspects of Archaeology in Greek Society and Education (in Greek)*. Thessaloniki: Vanias.
5. **Hamilakis, Y** 2007 *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. **Herzfeld, M** 1991 *A Place in History: Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
7. **Caftanzoglou, R** 2001 *In the Shadow of the Sacred Rock (in Greek)*. Athens: Ellenika Grammata.
8. **Dassiou, O N** 2005 *Archaeology and Society: Archaeology Through the Eyes of Adolescent Students (in Greek)*. Thessaloniki: Adelphoi Kuriakide.
9. **Deltsou, E** 2009 Researching Biographies of Archaeological Sites: The Case of Sikyon, *Public Archaeology* 8 (2–3): 176–90. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175355309X457213>
10. **Stroulia, A and Sutton, S B** (eds.) 2010 *Archaeology in Situ. Sites, Archaeology, and Communities in Greece*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
11. **Sakellariadi, A** 2011 *Archaeology for the People? Greek Archaeology and its Public: An Analysis of the Socio-Political and Economic Role of Archaeology in Greece*. PhD Dissertation. UCL: London.
12. **Sakellariadi, A** (in preparation, expected in 2015). *Antiquities for the People? The Role of Archaeology in Local Communities in Greece*. London: Ubiquity Press.
13. **National Statistical Service of Greece** 2014 *Statistical Database, Population*. Available at: http://dlib.statistics.gr/Book/GRESYE_02_0101_00098%20.pdf [Accessed 24 May 2014]
14. **European Community** 2014 *Statistical Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community*. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/index/nace_all.html [Accessed 24 May 2014]
15. **Merriman, N** 2000 (1991) *Beyond the Glass Case: the Past, the Heritage, and the Public*. London: Institute of Archaeology, UCL.
16. **Balme, J and Wilson, M** 2004 Perceptions of Archaeology in Australia Amongst Educated Young Australians. *Australian Archaeology* 58: 19–24.
17. **Matsuda, A** 2009 *Engaging with Archaeology: A Study on the Relationship between Local People and the Excavation of the “Villa of Augustus” in Somma Vesuviana (Italy)*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University College London.
18. **Pokotylo, D and Guppy, N** 1999 Public Opinion and Archaeological Heritage: Views from Outside the Profession. *American Antiquity* 64 (3): 400–416. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2694141>
19. **Prince, D R and Schadla-Hall, T** 1985 The Image of the Museum: A Case-Study of Kingston upon Hull. *Museums Journal* 85 (2): 39–45.
20. **Ramos, M and Duganne, D** 2000 *Exploring Public Perceptions and Attitudes about Archaeology*. Available at: www.saa.org/portals/0/SAA/pubedu/nrpt-draft4.pdf [Accessed 24 May 2014]
21. **Nardi, P M** 2003 *Doing Survey Research: A Guide to Quantitative Methods*. Boston, London: Allyn and Bacon.
22. **Bartu Candan, A** 2005 Entanglements/Encounters/Engagements with Prehistory: Catalhöyük and its Publics. In: Hodder, I (ed.) *Catalhöyük Perspectives: Reports from the 1995–99 Seasons*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute of Archaeological Research, London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 27–37.
23. **Shankland, D** 2000 Villagers and the Distant Past: Three Seasons’ Work at Kücüköy, Catalhöyük. In: Hodder, I (ed.) *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example of Catalhöyük*. Oxford: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 167–176.
24. **Edgeworth, M** (ed.) 2006 *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*. Lanham, New York, Toronto and Oxford: Altamira Press, 1–19.
25. **Hamilakis, Y and Anagnostopoulos, A** 2009 What Is Archaeological Ethnography? *Public Archaeology* 8 (2–3): 65–87. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175355309X457150>

How to cite this article: Sakellariadi, A 2015 Data from Archaeology for the People? Greek Archaeology and its Public: An Analysis of the Socio-Political and Economic Role of Archaeology in Greece. *Journal of Open Archaeology Data*, 4: e1, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/joad.af>

Published: 12 February 2015

Copyright: © 2015 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License (CC-BY 3.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>.

 *Journal of Open Archaeology Data* is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by Ubiquity Press.

OPEN ACCESS 