

Sonya L. Atalay
Global Application of Indigenous Archaeology: Community Based
Participatory Research in Turkey

Author bio: Sonya L. Atalay (Ojibwe) is Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Indiana University. Her work relates to Indigenous archaeology; particularly the use of participatory research designs, Indigenous epistemologies, and the ethics of community and public collaboration. Her research in the Middle East also includes clay/ceramic analysis and an interest in foodways and cooking technologies at the Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük. Dr. Atalay maintains active archaeological fieldwork in Turkey investigating the application of Indigenous archaeology outside an Indigenous land base, and in the Great Lakes region of North America working with Anishinaabek peoples. She is currently preparing a book on applications of participatory research methods within archaeology based on fieldwork in both Turkey and North America

Abstract: What does Indigenous archaeology offer archaeologists who do not work on Native land, at Indigenous sites, or with Indigenous people? This article demonstrates the broad applicability of Indigenous archaeology and the way it can be utilized by archaeologists working in any locale. Through recent fieldwork in south central Turkey working with a non-indigenous community of local residents near the archaeological site of Çatalhöyük, I demonstrate ways that the theories and methodology of Indigenous archaeology are a useful and relevant part of practice for archaeologists working in areas that are neither on Native land nor involve sites related to indigenous heritage. It also points to the need for further investigation into collaborative methods for the development of a set of best practices within archaeological and heritage management settings.

1
2
3
4 **Global Application of Indigenous Archaeology: Community Based Participatory**
5 **Research in Turkey**
6
7
8
9

10
11 Abstract: What does Indigenous archaeology offer archaeologists who do not work on
12 Native land, at Indigenous sites, or with Indigenous people? This article demonstrates the
13 broad applicability of Indigenous archaeology and the way it can be utilized by
14 archaeologists working in any locale. Through recent fieldwork in south central Turkey
15 working with a non-indigenous community of local residents near the archaeological site
16 of Çatalhöyük, I demonstrate ways that the theories and methodology of Indigenous
17 archaeology are a useful and relevant part of practice for archaeologists working in areas
18 that are neither on Native land nor involve sites related to indigenous heritage. It also
19 points to the need for further investigation into collaborative methods for the
20 development of a set of best practices within archaeological and heritage management
21 settings.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Introduction**

28 What does Indigenous archaeology offer archaeologists who do not work on
29 Native land, at Indigenous sites, or with Indigenous people? Are its methodologies and
30 theories applicable outside such contexts? A wide range of excellent scholarship
31 demonstrates that Indigenous archaeology continues to gain momentum among those
32 who work with Native Americans, First Nations, and other Indigenous groups globally.
33 Myself (Atalay 2006) and others (Nicholas 1999) have argued that Indigenous
34 archaeology is not only relevant in Indigenous contexts, but that it also offers a valuable
35 approach to archaeologists who do not work with Indigenous communities. This article
36 demonstrates the broad applicability of Indigenous archaeology and the way it can be
37 utilized by archaeologists working in any locale. Through recent fieldwork in south
38 central Turkey working with a non-indigenous community of local residents near the
39 archaeological site of Çatalhöyük, I demonstrate ways that the theories and methodology
40 of Indigenous archaeology are a useful and relevant part of practice for archaeologists
41 working in areas that are neither on Native land nor involve sites related to indigenous
42 heritage. The research presented also demonstrates the need for further investigation into
43 collaborative methods for the development of a set of best practices that fit
44 archaeological and heritage management settings.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Archaeology at Çatalhöyük**

53 Over the past ten years I have conducted excavation and laboratory fieldwork in
54 south central Turkey as a member of an international archaeological research team at the
55 9,000 year-old site of Çatalhöyük. My research involves investigation of the production
56 and use of clay cooking devices such as clay balls, hearths, and ovens, including a series
57 of experimental and ethno-archaeology investigations (Atalay 2003, 2005). The primary
58 focus has been on the changing food preparation technologies and daily food practices
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 that took place during early plant and animal domestication at Çatalhöyük, and more
5 generally in the Mesolithic and Neolithic periods in the Middle East (Atalay and Hastorf
6 2006). In conducting this research I had a great deal of interaction with residents living
7 in the local communities surrounding Çatalhöyük. Community members have been a
8 critical resource for the ethnoarchaeology research that myself and other team members
9 conducted. There are also a number of excellent outreach programs for local children
10 held on site every summer (Sert 2005, 2006).
11
12

13 Local residents are also employed by the Çatalhöyük project – they are our cooks
14 and housekeepers on-site and are employed as site guards and day laborers for the
15 excavation. Hiring local community people as paid labor for excavations is a common
16 practice, and one that usually brings a much-needed source of income to the rural and
17 often underserved communities where archaeological sites are located. This is certainly
18 the case for many of the local communities living near Çatalhöyük. Ayfer Bartu, a
19 cultural anthropologist, has conducted very interesting research examining the effects that
20 the excavation has on the local community – including the economic changes in the local
21 village of Küçükköy, that are the result of seasonal employment at the site (Bartu 1999,
22 2000, 2005). Despite the economic benefits the excavation brings to the people in the
23 region, the lack of substantial involvement of local people in the research *process* and
24 interpretation side of the excavation was ever present in my mind over the past decade
25 that I've been involved in research at Çatalhöyük, and is something I see as very
26 problematic.
27
28
29

30 Through several years of first-hand observation and through more extensive
31 interaction during an extended 16-month stay in the region, I became increasingly
32 concerned that the local people were not involved in the research being carried out in
33 their own community. They were well-paid (by local standards) day laborers and seemed
34 to be quite happy to be employed by the excavation project – Bartu's work (1999, 2000,
35 2005) provides some of the context for this. Yet, as a Native American myself, the
36 situation in Turkey constantly reminded me of my own experience and those that Native
37 communities within the US have had with archaeologists. In the forefront of my mind
38 were critiques raised by Native American and First Nations communities in the United
39 States and Canada with respect to archaeological research that affects them but does little
40 to benefit their communities. The situation has been well documented in North America
41 (and in other Indigenous communities around the globe) – large sums of public money
42 used to investigate Indigenous heritage, disturb ancestral resting places, and conduct
43 research in sacred places. Concepts such as 'cultural resources', 'data', and '*prehistory*'
44 conflicting so harshly against Native views of the ever present connection of the past with
45 the present and the future of our people and cultures. And for the most part the research
46 has done little to benefit our communities, many of which are in great need of services
47 and funding. The difficult, yet ever present question for me as a Native American and an
48 archaeologist remains: Are the Çatalhöyük excavations that I am a part of all that
49 different?
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Applying Indigenous Archaeology Approaches in Turkey**

57 Despite my Native American heritage, as a foreigner in Turkey I am simply
58 viewed as an American, as someone who holds the power and privilege that comes with
59 being a wealthy outsider able to travel across the world and spend summers excavating,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 writing, and analyzing 9,000 year-old artifacts. To the local community, my identity is
5 that of foreign archaeologist. For myself – to be honest, at times I feel like a colonizer,
6 an intruder utilizing my privilege to study and write the heritage of someone else. The
7 imbalance of power between myself and the locals who work on-site is ever-present in
8 my mind.
9

10 Of course the situation with Native people in North America and local
11 communities in Turkey are not directly synonymous. Unlike the situation with
12 Indigenous people in North America, I knew from many conversations over the years that
13 the people living around the site of Çatalhöyük do not see themselves as being related to
14 those who lived at the nearby archaeological site 9,000 years earlier. Those living in the
15 villages surrounding the site are not descendent communities, but they are certainly
16 important stakeholders; and I strongly feel that Indigenous archaeology has just as much
17 relevance for working with the locals at Çatalhöyük as it does for working with Native
18 people at sites in North America, at Maori sites in New Zealand, or Aboriginal sites in
19 Australia.
20
21

22 Elsewhere (Atalay 2006) I have described Indigenous archaeology as
23 archaeological practice that foregrounds knowledge and experiences of Indigenous
24 people to inform and influence Western archaeologies¹ as part of the decolonization of
25 the discipline. I've argued that the approach is not marginal in its applicability, but rather
26 has implications for archaeology globally, as its concern for a socially responsible
27 practice in relation to Indigenous People is extended and applied worldwide to
28 descendent and local communities and other stakeholders and publics. Currently,
29 Indigenous archaeology is on the periphery of mainstream archaeological practice, but
30 the implications of the research outlined here are that Indigenous archaeology is one of
31 several approaches guiding the way toward a new form of mainstream archaeological
32 practice – one that is collaborative, community based, and holds greater concern for the
33 social context and impact of its research practices and outcomes.
34
35
36

37 This trend toward a concern for working collaboratively with communities and
38 viewing local people as research participants rather than subjects or as labor for research
39 ends is not only growing within archaeology, but in the broader field of anthropology as
40 well. This includes an increased interest in professional ethics and what constitutes
41 ethical practice. In her recent edited volume on anthropological ethics Fluehr-Lobban
42 (2003:226) sees a new course taking shape within anthropological research, one that
43 moves beyond the ethical premise of “do no harm” toward a practice that “does some
44 good”. With regards to anthropological ethics, she offers ways that anthropological
45 research has the potential to do something beneficial for communities and cites
46 participatory research as one method to achieve this (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 242). Does
47 this mean that archaeology that doesn't rely on participatory methods is unethical – No.
48 However there is what I consider to be a positive trend toward greater concern with the
49 ethics of our practice and with the implications of community involvement and
50 collaboration – all leading toward more socially-just research practices that have positive
51 effects on contemporary communities. In addition to the positive potential this holds for
52 communities, this type of change in research practices also has the potential to have a
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ¹Here ‘Western archaeology’ is defined as: a broad range of methodological approaches currently used in mainstream
60 archaeology in the US and elsewhere, involving aspects of processual and post-processual theoretical approaches.
61
62

1
2
3
4 positive influence on the discipline of anthropology and archaeology in a postcolonial,
5 increasingly globalized world. Fleur-Lobban argues that,
6

7
8 “The idea that constructing research strategies to do some good could help
9 redeem some of the sorrier chapter in the first century of anthropological
10 research. It would also transform anthropology, moving it decisively
11 beyond its colonial roots in the United States and the postcolonial world as
12 it shapes a new research agenda appropriate to the globalized community
13 the world has become.” (Fluehr-Lobban 2003:227)
14
15

16
17 The movement toward an archaeological practice that is concerned with
18 communities, the social context and impacts of research practices, and professional ethics
19 is not new; and it involves more than just Indigenous archaeology. Since at least the
20 1980’s the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) has been concerned with and worked
21 actively on these issues. The formation of WAC was the result of such concerns, and
22 some of its earliest publications addressed these issues on a global scale (Layton 1989,
23 1994; Bond and Gilliam 1997; Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990; Stone and Mackenzie
24 1990). Also, the ‘community archaeology’ approach continues to grow as evidenced in
25 the 2002 edition of *World Archaeology* (Marshall 2002), and the recent American
26 Anthropological Association session that focused on community archaeology in the
27 developing world (Parks and Prufer 2006). In ways similar to Indigenous archaeology,
28 Feminist archaeologists have also argued for an archaeological practice that concerns
29 itself with community and those outside the academic world (Conkey 2005).
30
31

32
33 I have argued elsewhere (Atalay forthcoming 2008) that issues of management
34 and stewardship of cultural resources and knowledge, access to such knowledge, and the
35 processes by which it is produced and reproduced within communities are being brought
36 to the center of mainstream archaeological practice. And as this happens, it is creating a
37 critical mass and a changing tide in the practice of archaeology. A change, I believe we
38 have already begun to see, in part witnessed in the publication of books and professional
39 journal articles that focus on collaboration and take seriously a concern for community
40 relationships and professional ethics that were previously disregarded, viewed as
41 unimportant, or not considered research-worthy. As change toward further collaboration
42 continues to take place, the need for further examples of collaborative methods, and for
43 alternative approaches to producing and sharing cultural knowledge are becoming ever
44 more needed and relevant. Collaborative practice and the incorporation of Indigenous
45 and other worldviews into archaeology, in my view, signal that a positive process of
46 decolonization of the discipline is underway. I believe these changes also signify the
47 start of a Kuhnian (1962) paradigm shift in archaeology, and perhaps within
48 anthropology and the social sciences more broadly. If such changes toward more
49 collaborative, inclusive, and diverse research strategies and methods in the social
50 sciences are eminent, then archaeologists are positioned to be at the forefront of such
51 change as they have developed valuable skills and experience building positive
52 relationships with communities since the passage of NAGPRA in 1991.
53
54

55
56
57 With a range of theoretical and methodological options to choose from, I found
58 the best way to address my discomfort with the limited involvement of local people in the
59 research process at Çatalhöyük was to turn to the theories and methods of Indigenous
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 archaeology - this article describes my attempt to do so. Over the past two years,
5 applying approaches from Indigenous archaeology, I have worked to establish a
6 community based participatory research (CBPR) project with local community members
7 living near the site of Çatalhöyük. This work is in progress, so there are no major
8 conclusions that can be drawn at this point. The goal of this article is therefore to present
9 some of the challenges faced thus far, to point out the definite need for such research into
10 collaborative methods and best practices, and to demonstrate the applicability of
11 Indigenous archaeology approaches for the Turkey context.
12
13

14 The community archaeology research reported in this article was carried out
15 predominantly during the 2006 summer field season at Çatalhöyük, with analysis taking
16 place in the 12 months that followed. The research is ongoing, and although the initial 2-
17 year funding for the preliminary project has ended, the aim is to continue the CBPR
18 project until it is fully community controlled and self-sufficient. The goal during the
19 initial 2-year period was to prepare the foundation for the establishment of a long-term,
20 sustainable CBPR program with local people living around Çatalhöyük.
21
22
23
24

25 **Collaborative Methodology and Community Based Participatory Research**

26 There are numerous collaborative methods, but for Indigenous archaeology I have
27 argued for the use of a Freirian model (Atalay 2003, 2006) that involves community
28 based participatory research (CBPR) (see the following for discussion of this
29 methodology Freire 1970, 1998; Strand 2003; Maguire 1987). CBPR is a method
30 practiced in medical research and in numerous disciplines within the social sciences
31 (Arcury et al. 2001; Bussink 2003; Riley and Fielding 2001; Robinson 1996; Twyman
32 2000). In brief, CBPR involves collaboration with community members to: 1) define a
33 research issue; 2) develop research strategies; 3) design research instruments; and 4)
34 collect and interpret data. This method also involves feedback between researchers and
35 community collaborators to evaluate the project's effectiveness from multiple
36 perspectives.
37
38
39

40 During the 2006 field season I attempted to put theoretical models of participatory
41 research and collaboration into practice, and to measure their effectiveness in producing
42 knowledge useful to both local stakeholders (nearby residents and community members)
43 and the archaeological community of Çatalhöyük. To gain an accurate understanding of
44 the issues, challenges, and process of participatory methods in a community archaeology
45 project I carried out this research simultaneously while continuing my long-standing
46 research on clay materials, cooking and foodways.
47

48 Building on the earlier work carried out by Dr. Ayfer Bartu with the local
49 communities around Çatalhöyük (Bartu 1999, 2000, 2005), I originally aimed to put
50 together a collaborative team of archaeologists and local community members, and
51 develop a series of regular community meetings that would create a two-way sharing of
52 information about the research at Çatalhöyük by involving the local community in
53 designing some of the research questions to be investigated by archaeologists on the
54 Çatalhöyük excavation project. The aim was to expand the concept of 'the site' (as Bartu
55 calls for 2000, 2006) and involve local communities in the Çatalhöyük research by
56 working with local people to develop and answer research questions that meet
57 community needs.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 **CBPR Fieldwork – first steps toward developing community collaboration**

7 Over a four-week period during the 2006 summer field season I worked with
8 Burcu Tung, a doctoral candidate at UC Berkeley, to carry out the initial stages of the
9 CBPR archaeology research. Tung and myself conducted a series of interviews with
10 people in local communities around the Çatalhöyük site. These interviews were meant to
11 inform us on the level of interest that community members have in archaeology and the
12 roles they might like to play in archaeological research at the site.
13

14 Utilizing long-established contacts from previous ethno-archaeology work in the
15 region, I started the 2006 field season by attempting to establish a collaborative
16 community team composed of local residents and educators. I had hoped to begin this
17 research by translating into Turkish educational materials that were created in previous
18 research (Atalay 2003) in order to further develop these materials for use in local schools
19 and at Çatalhöyük's on-site museum. I had also aimed to gain feedback (assessment and
20 evaluation) of these materials through interviews and visitor surveys. However in early
21 meetings with community members who live in local villages in the region it quickly
22 became clear that such a plan was not the prudent way to begin, as it would be
23 ineffective.
24

25
26 Through listening to local people in several initial interviews conducted by
27 myself and Tung in Kücükköy (the nearest village to the site of Çatalhöyük) I found that
28 community members felt they knew far too little to contribute to a community
29 collaboration such as the one I had initially proposed. I determined that what was needed
30 was to conduct further community interviews in order to determine the level of interest
31 people had in the research at Çatalhöyük and archaeology in general, and what they felt
32 were the appropriate next-steps for working together with archaeologists to develop a
33 collaborative, community-centered archaeology research project.
34

35
36 In ethnographic research from 1997-2000 with the local community in this region,
37 cultural anthropologist Dr. Ayfer Bartu called for an expansion of the concept of 'the
38 archaeological site' to further include local communities in the Çatalhöyük research by
39 working with local people to develop research questions that meet community needs.
40 While I agree with Bartu about the need for such action, I was unclear how to approach
41 the work after reviewing the results of the initial interviews Tung and I had conducted. I
42 had not intended the collaboration to be dependent on outside researchers, but rather had
43 aimed for it to be driven by the needs and commitment of Turkish community members. I
44 decided that in order to develop a collaborative project that was truly community driven I
45 would need to have a deeper understanding of what the community felt with regard to
46 archaeology, the site of Çatalhöyük, and working in collaboration with archaeologists.
47 The most effective way to do this was clearly through further and more detailed
48 community interviews and surveys.
49

50
51 Together Tung and I devoted the remaining three weeks of the field season to
52 conducting community interviews with residents of four nearby villages and towns
53 (Kücükköy, Abditolu, Çumra, and Dedemoğlu). We worked with local leadership, the
54 *muhtars* (similar to mayors) from each village or town, to carry out interviews with a
55 wide variety of community members. In total, we conducted twenty-five interviews in
56 local villages around the site. These interviews were conducted in Turkish, with Burcu
57 Tung (a Native Turkish speaker) taking the lead in asking the interview questions as I
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 recorded the responses and other notes and observations. The process of developing an
5 interview methodology started with my writing interview questions, after which Tung
6 and I would discuss these questions in detail and decide on any changes that needed to be
7 made prior to conducting interviews. We continually followed this process to update the
8 interview questions; deleting those that did not work well, replacing them with more
9 specific or well-suited questions.
10

11 On numerous occasions I discussed both the research questions and the aims of
12 this community archaeology project with Turkish archaeologists working at Çatalhöyük
13 in order to learn from their cultural expertise and experiences. Dr. Nurcan Yalman, who
14 has conducted extensive ethnoarchaeology research in the region, provided particularly
15 helpful comments related to the state of knowledge of local residents related to
16 archaeology. Yalman insisted that local people did not have enough background
17 archaeological knowledge to participate in a collaboration with archaeologists to develop
18 archaeological research questions. Interviews proved Yalman's assumptions to be
19 correct, and as a result of this new information, the remainder of the fieldwork in 2006
20 consisted of developing my own knowledge base about the level of archaeological
21 knowledge and interest held by the local residents. This was done through extensive
22 interviews with local people in nearby communities. These interviews were meant to
23 provide information on the level of interest that community members have in
24 archaeology, and the role they might like to play in archaeological research and heritage
25 management related to the site of Çatalhöyük.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Interview Findings and Initial Actions**

32 Everyone interviewed had been to the site of Çatalhöyük before – either as a
33 worker, visitor, or tourist. They had all seen the on-site Visitors' Center. It was clear
34 from the interviews that people are curious about the research at Çatalhöyük, yet they
35 don't feel they know enough about it, and many clearly wanted to learn more.
36

37 Repeatedly those who work on site (as laborers) told us that people in the villages
38 and towns nearby ask them about the excavations taking place at Çatalhöyük (what is
39 found, how people lived, etc.) and they feel they don't know enough to answer questions
40 effectively. They reported that they don't know about or see the finds excavated from the
41 site, although they can tell that archaeologists are excited about something on certain
42 days yet have no idea why or what has been found and why it is important. We found
43 that children in the village are particularly interested in Çatalhöyük and the archaeology
44 taking place there. Several times we were told that a regular weekly or bi-weekly visit to
45 the site for children would be very useful so that they can have regular updates of what is
46 found.
47
48

49 As with all aspects of this CBPR archaeology project, there are both short and
50 longer-term changes that can be made to improve the involvement of the local
51 community with archaeologists, and to increase the level of interaction between these two
52 communities (archaeological and local residents). I felt that before any true participatory
53 community research could take place, a learning process had to occur on *both* sides. This
54 research clearly indicates that we, as archaeologists, need to better understand the current
55 level of knowledge and interest in archaeology and the local views and perceptions about
56 the past and issues of heritage "ownership" and management. On the other side, locals
57 need a better understanding of the current state of research at the site, as well as some of
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the processes archaeologists use to create archaeological arguments and knowledge. This
5 will only happen through regular meetings and interactions that will build a common
6 foundation from which to move forward.
7

8 Working toward building this common foundation involves several short-term
9 actions that were undertaken during the 2006 field season, and others that will begin in
10 upcoming field season. During the 2006 field season, Tung and myself worked together
11 to plan a community night, in which residents from Kücükköy were invited to visit the
12 site and share a feast with the archaeologists working on-site. My time on site was over
13 before this community night took place, however Tung worked diligently and continued
14 to organize the event.
15
16

17 **Community Night**

18 In early August 2006 a successful community night was held on site at the
19 Çatalhöyük dig house. Both Turkish and non-Turkish archaeologists participated in the
20 event. Because the community night took place during harvest season, many people were
21 not able to attend the early segments of the event, although by the end of the evening
22 almost 200 people were in attendance, nearly the entire village. Guests self-separated into
23 groups of women and men and were taken on a site tour. Following the site tour, Dr.
24 Başak Boz gave a presentation about human remains found during excavation, and the
25 project director, Dr. Ian Hodder, gave a talk about future plans for the site.
26
27

28 Boz' talk on human remains was particularly important since this topic was one of
29 repeated interest amongst local residents – one that repeatedly arose in the interviews
30 Tung and I conducted during the 2006 interviews. Interviewees were curious about what
31 happened to the human remains once they were excavated. One asked where the mass
32 grave was that held the remains, assuming that archaeologists excavated the remains and
33 then reburied them in a mass grave. Others voiced their concern for the spirits of the
34 dead – we recorded several stories of people saying they felt they could get sick from
35 working with or uncovering the remains, and others saying they felt the bones of the dead
36 were “aching” because of being disturbed. One interviewee reported having gone to the
37 imam (religious leader) to see if his working at Çatalhöyük was a sin. He noted that the
38 imam said it was not a sin because the people buried at Çatalhöyük were not Muslim.
39 The importance of talking about the human remains with the local residents was made
40 clear through the interviews, and local residents showed great interest in this topic at the
41 community night.
42
43

44 In addition to the archaeological presentations, John Swogger, the site illustrator,
45 spoke to visitors about a cartoon he'd created about the site. In response to interviews
46 during the earlier part of the field season, Tung and I worked with Swogger to develop
47 the first of what is planned to be a regular cartoon series. The cartoon (See Figures 1 and
48 2) is meant to help provide educational material to both children in the local villages and
49 their parents. Also, Dr. Nurcan Yalman hosted a pottery workshop in which local
50 children were able to try their hand at producing pottery and figurines. These activities
51 were followed by a feast, which was enjoyed by both local residents and archaeologists.
52
53

54 Similar community nights are planned for future field seasons; one in the
55 beginning of the summer to kick off the field season and another at the end of the project
56 each summer to share the results of what was discovered with the community. The aim is
57 currently to hold one community night on-site and the other in one of the local villages.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The point here is to encourage sharing of cultures and to provide an opportunity for local
5 residents to feel at home without having to always visit the site to interact with
6 archaeologists. This may also help the archaeologists to learn further about the local
7 community and the issues that are important for local residents.
8
9

10 **Addressing Community Needs**

11 In interviews, Tung and I not only questioned people about archaeology and their
12 interest in research at Çatalhöyük, but we also spoke quite extensively with those
13 interviewed about a proposed museum/community center/hotel planned (with funds from
14 the European Union and UNESCO) for construction in one of the local villages.
15 Although we had interview questions prepared in advance, we let the conversation be
16 guided by interviewees' interests and concerns. Primary topics of discussion included
17 people's feelings about where the museum should be located. There was a great deal of
18 attention placed on the effects the museum, hotel, and community center might have –
19 such as a greater influx of foreigners intruding on their private lives and the different
20 ways of dressing and acting that tourists would bring to this remote, rural community.
21
22

23 Questions about the impact of the hotel were raised by myself and Tung out of a
24 concern for effecting change in this region in a responsible way. In every case we were
25 told, in one form or another, that people were not concerned about Western influence in
26 the area because they understand that tourists have a different religion and a different way
27 of life. When asked how they would feel if their children started dressing and acting like
28 Western tourists, the reactions were mixed. Several people told us that would not happen
29 – stating that they already see such things on television. Others said they wouldn't mind
30 if things changed, yet others (but clearly a minority) wanted the change. We were told
31 once that Turkey was going to be part of the EU (European Union) and thus *needed* to
32 make these changes.
33
34

35 While we as archaeologists held a great deal of concern over the impact such
36 cultural tourism and development would have on the local communities, it was clearly
37 not a primary concern of theirs. When Tung and I presented this research to the
38 archaeologists on site this topic raised some discussion, as there seems to be a great deal
39 of concern about changing the local culture. The topic of development and cultural
40 tourism in this region certainly deserves and requires a great deal of further attention.
41 However it seems unfair, perhaps even unethical, to take a paternalistic stance with this
42 community which is certainly in need of greater economic resources and desiring
43 development. This points to the need within Indigenous archaeology and other
44 community-based approaches to further consider our role as archaeologists in the
45 economic development of local communities. This has important implications for
46 community based participatory research in general, some of which have been discussed
47 in the context of development anthropology (Schonhuth 2002, Sillitoe et al. 2002)
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Native America and Turkey: Comparisons of Collaborative Research**

54 Comparing the research reported here with a CBPR project that I am conducting
55 with Native American communities in North America yields interesting results. My
56 findings thus far have pointed to the ways in which participatory collaboration can be
57 successfully in a range of archaeological and heritage management settings. I have found
58 that while there are certain similarities in collaborating with a local non-descendent
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 community (such as that in Turkey) and an indigenous community (specifically Native
5 American Anishinabek communities in the Great Lakes region of the U.S.), there are also
6 major differences that must be considered if a collaboration is to be successful. One of
7 the most notable differences is that the local community in Turkey does not feel they
8 know enough about archaeology to contribute to and develop a collaborative
9 archaeological research design. As a result, the pace and strategy of collaboration has
10 been quite different in Turkey than in my work with tribal communities in Native
11 American settings, where community members have strong feelings and confidence
12 about their knowledge base and ability to contribute to producing knowledge about the
13 past. In ongoing CBPR with Native American communities my collaborative work with
14 tribes has focused on repatriation research, and the community feels they have a critical
15 voice that must be heard. On the contrary, many residents of the villages surrounding the
16 proposed world heritage site of Çatalhöyük, Turkey feel they have little to offer in the
17 interpretation of the site. However in both cases it is overwhelmingly clear that each
18 community cares deeply, although it is expressed in very different ways, about their
19 history and heritage. In Native communities this involves regaining access to and care of
20 human remains and sacred sites; while in Turkey, community members continually
21 voiced their interest in learning more about the early history of the region.

22
23
24
25
26 The concern and interest of people in the Turkish community came as a surprise
27 both to myself and others since repeatedly information related to the villagers of that
28 region (and rural Turkey in general) report that local people are only concerned with an
29 Islamic past and nothing prior to that. In the interviews with local residents around
30 Çatalhöyük during the 2006 field season, this proved not to be the case at all. Interest in
31 the very early prehistory and the archaeology of the nearby site of Çatalhöyük was clearly
32 present in all the villages where we conducted interviews. Certainly the interest tends to
33 focus on economic concerns related to the site – such as tourism, museum funding, and a
34 community center that may be developed in the nearby village of Küçükköy -- but the
35 concern for and interest in the site is unmistakable. At this point it may be that much of
36 the interest in the community night and about the site in general is more of a social
37 interest in the activities and practices of the “foreigners” who work there, but at least it
38 signals a start in the communication process. Beyond the curiosity, there also appears to
39 be a sincere interest in what is being excavated and what it can tell us about the people
40 who once lived in the landscape they know so well.

41
42
43
44 These findings offer critical insights for those who wish to conduct future
45 archaeological projects involving local communities because they provide examples of
46 the types of research and heritage planning that a non-descendent community might be
47 interested in participating in. These findings also point to the need for archaeologists to
48 collaborate closely with a community from the start of a research project in order to
49 develop a research project that has relevance for that particular community. My results
50 clearly demonstrate that it cannot be assumed how a community feels about its history,
51 heritage and cultural resources. They must be asked, and the answers to such
52 collaborative efforts will result in better research designs that have meaning and
53 relevance within the community. This has a great deal of implications for the funding of
54 collaborative projects and the timelines and pace at which such research can be expected
55 to be carried out. There are also important implications about the role of community
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 members as project participants/collaborators; and the human subjects protocols that are
5 involved in these.

6
7 Indigenous people have, for several decades, critiqued the ways that research and
8 what has been termed by Indigenous activists as the “scientific imperative” has impacted
9 them and their communities negatively. They have called for greater involvement in the
10 decision-making processes – and in the case of archaeology, for greater control over their
11 own heritage resources. These critiques hold implications for all research practices, not
12 only those conducted with Indigenous communities, as they offer an outline of concerns
13 that may be addressed in formulating research that will be more inclusive of the general
14 public that funds such research and of the local communities within which such research
15 is conducted.
16
17

18 19 **Some Preliminary Conclusions**

20 A critical aspect to my findings in this CBPR archaeology project include the
21 realization of how truly important it is to have a research plan that is fluid and flexible,
22 changing as the local situation dictates. This can be quite challenging for archaeologists
23 who are accustomed to following a pre-designed strategy and proscribed methodology.
24 But such a research strategy is an integral part of the participatory methodology and it is
25 precisely this aspect of the work that is most necessary to test and further develop for
26 archaeological practice. The 2006 field season would not have been the success that it
27 was without a very fluid research design that was adaptable to what local people needed
28 and wanted. In each of these activities all efforts will be made to create a two-way
29 dynamic learning experience in which archaeologists and local people are sharing
30 knowledge with each other about their views and perceptions of history and the past, and
31 the ways of collaboratively creating further knowledge about the past in the present.
32

33 I cannot predict at this point what the outcome or specific direction of the
34 collaborative work will be as the nature of participatory research is to fundamentally
35 redirect the power dynamic in relationships between local communities and
36 archaeologists in order to de-center the archaeologist, in some aspects of the research
37 process, to make room for multiple views in research questions and results. What I can
38 say about the CBPR archaeology project at this point is that all efforts will be made to
39 create an open and respectful environment in which knowledge is shared in a two-way
40 process of education and collaboration between local people and archaeologists. The
41 form that takes and the specific process will follow organically, with the local community
42 taking the lead – even that means ending attempts at a CBPR project if that is what the
43 community decides.
44
45

46 Informed by the suggestions and information provided in the interviews
47 conducted during the 2006 field season, I have developed a preliminary research plan for
48 this CBPR project for future field seasons. Future plans include: 1) holding weekly
49 community meetings/slide shows about current findings on site in local villages with
50 collaborative presentations by Kücükköy residents who work on site together with
51 archaeologists; 2) conducting a weekly tour for those from local communities who work
52 at the Çatalhöyük excavation to view finds and get an update on progress; 3) providing
53 funding to the extensive children’s programs at Çatalhöyük (see Sert 2005 for what these
54 entail), to provide regular bi-weekly educational programming and on-site visits for
55 children in local villages; 4) developing and producing a regular year-round cartoon
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 series about the research, findings, and process of archaeology at Çatalhöyük; and 5)
5 integrating community members into archaeologists' discussions and site tours that take
6 place several times weekly throughout the field season to create what I think of as an
7 ethnoarchaeology at the trowels edge. As with all aspects of this community based
8 research project, these activities will be adjusted as needed to meet the needs and desires
9 of the local residents. I plan to continue conducting interviews and surveys in the coming
10 field seasons to gather further data on the community needs related to archaeology
11 research at Çatalhöyük. It is hoped that interviews and community meetings that are
12 planned for future field seasons will also help to determine the effectiveness of the
13 projects being carried out.

14
15
16 It is important to note that this work with the community is not an end unto itself,
17 or a form of 'outreach'. Rather it is part of a larger plan to develop integrative
18 collaborative research programs at Çatalhöyük. However, as in any CBPR project, the
19 development of collaborative research involves a long process that moves forward slowly
20 at times, and quickly at others – it is challenging but something I feel is an ethical
21 imperative in this setting, and something I believe mainstream archaeological practice is
22 moving toward in the discipline as a whole.

23
24
25 At Çatalhöyük, the commitment to finding mutually desired and beneficial
26 interactions between local people and archaeologists is currently strong, but maintaining
27 and funding such projects long-term, and integrating them into the daily practice of the
28 international team of archaeologists on site will likely prove to be even more challenging.
29 The current situation and interest in collaborative research and working with
30 communities at Çatalhöyük to some degree reflects where things stand in archaeology
31 more broadly. There seems to be an acknowledgement by most archaeologists that
32 wherever one works - whether in North America with Native and First Nations
33 populations, in Asia working rural communities living near sites, or with Indigenous and
34 descendent communities in Africa – collaboration and working with communities are
35 increasingly relevant approaches. Many archaeologists already have the interest and
36 desire to explore avenues of collaborative research to some degree. What remains is for
37 there to be further investigation into the methods and best practices of collaborative
38 research that are most fit for archaeology and heritage management, allowing for
39 development of a sustainable archaeological practice.

40
41
42 To this end, the CBPR archaeology project at Çatalhöyük addresses issues of
43 greater community scientific literacy and further democratization of research through its
44 examination of participatory research methods that involve local people in the research
45 process. Rather than attempting to do a sort of one-way outreach of information that
46 shares only the results of the research with *the* community, I am attempting to develop a
47 collaborative method for archaeological research that involves non-scientists in the
48 research process from the beginning – including the design of a research project and
49 sharing the educational results. The methods that prove most effective from this work
50 with local residents in Turkey hold significance for further developing research practices
51 that are understood by and involve both Indigenous people and a range of diverse
52 communities globally.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Acknowledgements: This research was conducted with the generous support of the National Science Foundation (Grant # 0512031). The Turkish government and the Turkish Ministry of Culture have always been kind and generous hosts during my time in their beautiful country. My appreciation and thanks to them for their hospitality and support. The local communities around Catalhoyuk have also been an inspiration to me in this work and my eternal gratitude is extended to them for allowing me to be part of their community, even if for a short time. I would also like to thank Claire Smith and Darren Modzelewski for their editing work and inviting me to be part of this collection of articles on Indigenous archaeology. My sincere thanks go to the two anonymous reviewers who provided me with very helpful comments that improved the quality of this article.

1
2
3
4 **References Cited**
5

6 Arcury, Thomas A.; Sara A. Quandt and Allen Dearry. 2001 Farmworker Pesticide
7
8 Exposure and Community-Based Participatory Research: Rationale and Practical
9 Applications. *Environmental Health Perspectives, Vol. 109, Supplement 3. (Jun.,*
10 *2001), pp. 429-434.*
11
12
13
14

15
16 Atalay, Sonya. 2003 Domesticating Clay: Engaging with 'They': The Social Life of Clay
17 Balls from Çatalhöyük, Turkey and Public Archaeology for Indigenous
18 Communities. *Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Department*
19 *of Anthropology, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan.*
20
21
22
23

24 Atalay, Sonya. 2005 Domesticating Clay: the Role of Clay Balls, Mini Balls, and
25 Geometric Objects in Daily Life at Çatalhöyük. *In Changing Materialities at*
26 *Çatalhöyük: reports from the 1995-99 seasons. Ian Hodder (ed.), Chapter 6, p.*
27 *139-168. Çatalhöyük Project Volume 5. McDonald Institute Monographs/British*
28 *Institute of Archaeology at Ankara.*
29
30
31
32
33

34 Atalay, Sonya. 2006. Indigenous archaeology as decolonizing practice. *American Indian*
35 *Quarterly, 30(3), 280-310.*
36
37

38 Atalay, Sonya. Forthcoming 2008. Pedagogy of decolonization: advancing archaeological
39 practice through education. *In Collaborative Indigenous Archaeology at the*
40 *Trowel's Edge: Exploring Methodology and Education in North American*
41 *Archaeology*, edited by Stephen Silliman, Tucson: University of Arizona Press
42 and the Amerind Foundation.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Atalay, Sonya and Christine Hastorf. 2006 Food, Meals, and Daily Activities: The
5
6 Habitus of Food Practices at Neolithic, Çatalhöyük. *American Antiquity* 71(2):
7
8 283-319.
9
- 10
11 Bartu, Ayfer. 1999 Archaeological Practice as Guerilla Activity in Late Modernity"
12
13 Journal of Mediterreanean Archaeology. June 1999, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 91-95.
14
15
- 16 Bartu, Ayfer. 2000 Where is Çatalhöyük? Multiple Sites in the Construction of an
17
18 Archaeological Site. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example*
19
20 *at Çatalhöyük* (McDonald Institute Monographs) (British Institute of Archaeology
21
22 at Ankara, BIAA Monograph, No 28).
23
24
- 25
26 Bartu, Ayfer. 2005 Entanglements/Encounters/Engagements with Prehistory: Çatalhöyük
27
28 and Its Publics. In I. Hodder (ed.) Çatalhöyük Study Season Publications.
29
30 McDonald Institute Monographs.
31
32
- 33 Bond, George C. and A. Gilliam. (eds.) 1997 *Social Construction of the Past:*
34
35 *representation as power*. Routledge: London.
36
37
- 38 Bussink, Coen. 2003 GIS as a Tool in Participatory Natural Resource Management:
39
40 Examples from the Peruvian Andes. *Mountain Research and Development*, Vol.
41
42 23, No. 4. November, 2003, pp. 320-323.
43
44
- 45 Conkey, Margaret. 2005 Dwelling at the Margins, Action at the Intersection? Feminist
46
47 and Indigenous. *Archaeologies* 1(1):9-59.
48
49
- 50 Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 2003 Dialogue for Ethically Concious Practice. In *Ethics and*
51
52 *the Profession of Anthropology: A Dialogue for Ethically Concious Practice*.
53
54 (2nd Edition) edited by Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban. Ch. 10, pp.225-246. AltaMira
55
56 Press: Walnut Creek.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Freire, Paulo. 1970 *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder and Herder: New York.
5
6 Gathercole, Peter and David Lowenthal (eds.) 1990. *The Politics of the past*. Unwin-
7
8 Hyman: London.
9
10 Kuhn, Thomas. 1962 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago
11
12 Press: Chicago.
13
14 Layton, Robert (ed.) 1989 *Who needs the past? :indigenous values and archaeology*.
15
16 Unwin Hyman: London.
17
18 Layton, Robert (ed.) 1994 *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*. Routledge:
19
20 London.
21
22 Maguire, Patricia. 1987 *Doing Participatory Research: A Feminist Approach*. Center for
23
24 International Education: Amherst.
25
26 Marshall, Yvonne (ed.) 2002. Community Archaeology. *World Archaeology* 34(2).
27
28 October 2002.
29
30 Nicholas, George P. 1997 Education and Empowerment: Archaeology with, for and by
31
32 the Shuswap Nation, British Columbia. In *At a Crossroads : Archaeology and*
33
34 *First Peoples in Canada*, edited by George P. Nicholas and Thomas D. Andrews,
35
36 85-104. Archaeology Press: Burnaby, B.C.
37
38 Parks, Shoshaunna and Keith Prufer. 2006 *The intersection between archaeology and the*
39
40 *community in the developing world*. Session Organized for the American
41
42 Anthropological Association Annual Meetings. San Jose, CA. November 2006.
43
44 Riley, Janet and William J. Fielding. 2001 An Illustrated Review of Some Farmer
45
46 Participatory Research Techniques. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and*
47
48 *Environmental Statistics*, Vol. 6, No. 1. March, 2001, pp. 5-18.
49
50 Robinson, Michael P. 1996 Shampoo Archaeology: Towards a Participatory Action
51
52 Research in Civil Society. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, XVI, 1, 1996,
53
54 pp.125-138.
55
56 Schönhuth, Michael (2002) Negotiating with knowledge at development interfaces:
57
58 Anthropology and the quest for participation. In *Participating in Development:*
59
60 *Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge*. Edited by Paul Sillitoe, Alan Bicker and
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Johan Pottier. Routledge: London. Chapter 7, pp.139-161.
5

6 Sert, Gülay. 2005 Summer School Workshop. Çatalhöyük Archive Report. pp. 274-276.
7
8 http://www.Çatalhöyük.com/archive_reports/
9

10 Sert, Gülay. 2006 Childrens' Archaeological Summer School. *Çatalhöyük Archive*
11 *Report*. pp. 360-362. http://www.Çatalhöyük.com/archive_reports/
12

13 Sillitoe, Paul, Alan Bicker and Johan Pottier (eds.) 2002 *Participating in Development:*
14 *Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge*. Routledge: London.
15

16 Strand, Kerry J., Nicholas Cutforth, Randy Stoecker, Sam Marullo, and Patrick Donohue
17 *2003 Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and*
18 *Practices*. Jossey Bass Publishing: San Francisco.
19

20 Stone, Peter and Robert MacKenzie (eds.) 1990. *The Excluded past: archaeology in*
21 *education*. Unwin Hyman: Boston.
22

23 Twyman, Chasca. 2000 Participatory Conservation? Community-Based Natural Resource
24
25 Management in Botswana. *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 166, No. 4.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
December, 2000, pp. 323-335.

Figure 1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



