Mark Oldham

INTRODUCING CHILDREN TO ARCHAEOLOGY – ON SITE AND IN THE CLASSROOM

Abstract

This paper introduces a case study from Oslo, Norway, where two outreach programmes aimed at local children have been carried out by the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU) as part of development-led archaeological investigations relating to the construction of the new Medieval Park (Middelalderparken). The first programme involved inviting younger children from four local kindergartens to site, whereas the second programme involved archaeologists visiting fourth graders at school. Both programmes had a clear pedagogical element at their core. The programmes are discussed in relation to both previous work we have done with children, and to the broader literature on archaeology, history and education.

Keywords: children, archaeology, education, Oslo

Mark Oldham, Norsk institutt for kulturminneforskning, Postboks 736 Sentrum, 0105 Oslo, Norway
mark.oldham@niku.no, ORCID ID 0000-0002-5226-9971

Received: 6 June 2023; Revised: 24 August 2023; Accepted: 25 August 2023

Oldham, M. 2023. Introducing Children to Archaeology – On Site and in the Classroom. *Fennoscandia archaeologica* XL: 26–38. https://doi.org/10.61258/fa.130633

INTRODUCTION

In 2021 and 2022, the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU) carried out development-led archaeological investigations in Oslo in relation to the construction of a new park (Middelalderparken, the Medieval Park) in the area where the medieval city lay. Norwegian regulations provide for that the developer pays for a certain amount of dissemination in connection with archaeological projects and, in this case, we designed and carried out two programmes aimed at giving local children a taste of archaeology. The first programme was aimed at kindergarten children and was conducted on site while the excavation was being undertaken. The second was aimed at fourth graders at school and was undertaken during the post-excavation stage. While different in both content and target audience, the programmes can be considered linked and based on shared pedagogical principles and the overarching goal of bringing children and archaeology together and activating learning about the past through sensory learning – visual, auditory, kinesthetic (Scott 2010) – whereby feelings and emotions are an integral part of historical meaning-making (Stolare et al. 2021: 266).

In this paper, I present the two programmes and place them within the broader context of archaeology and education, before reflecting on the possibilities and opportunities to connect local children with archaeology through development-led archaeology.

The development-led archaeology can be defined as the legally regulated (for example, in Norway, through Lov om kulturminner, https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1978-06-09-50) professional archaeology that is most often practiced as part of the planning process. It is the main source of archaeological information and employment, and arguably the form of archaeology that

people encounter most frequently (Beck 2022: 83).

Högberg has reflected on how development-led archaeology, as a 'contemporary activity' (2004: 14), has a responsibility for the past that it creates – and that we need to be conscious of the past that we are telling (2007: 44). MacKenzie and Stone have also remarked on this responsibility that archaeologists have towards the past 'in all its manifestations and in its relations with the present' (1990: 5). This is especially the case when we are telling of pasts in an educational setting, where there is also an emphasis on getting the children to see *how* pasts are created as well as the historical narrative about the past. In designing our programmes, we were conscious that archaeology is a contemporary activity, exists in the present, and is a resource for society.

Archaeology and education

Henson has noted that 'Archaeology as practised seems to have four basic aims: to learn about the past, to learn from the past, to manage the heritage of the past, [and] to enable public engagement with the past' (2017: 45), and education has often been seen to be a key factor in achieving these aims

Archaeology has long tried to find its way into the affections and curriculums of children, and there is a long and growing literature about archaeology and education – especially in formal settings such as schools and museums. However, there has at times been a tension between, on the one side, the need to stress the mutability of interpretations and the multiplicity of histories, and on the other, the urge to teach history as facts.

As Molyneaux (1994: 3) wrote in one of the classic texts on archaeology and education:

> The integration of archaeology and education might seem to be a simple task, but as material evidence takes its meaning from its perception and use, what it represents varies according to the agenda within which it is used. In spite of what may be empirically known about an object, site or prehistoric society, the material past and the ideological past may come into conflict.

This is a task we have grappled with previously, when in a previous phase of the Follo Line excavation project, we arranged a programme of site visits for children in collaboration with Bane NOR, Oslo municipality's Office of Culture and financed by Sparebankstiftelsen DNB (see Oldham 2017). This previous work was used as an inspiration and starting point for these programmes, but the aim was to make something new and different rather than a copy. We thus found that we could make two programmes from the ideas first taken up in this previous project: the site visit could form the core of a programme for kindergarten children, while the close connection to the curriculum and combination of discussions and object-based learning would be the core for the fourth graders.

In the following, I will firstly introduce the programme for kindergarten children and then

KINDERGARTEN KIDS ON SITE

As Högberg has remarked (2004: 9), the excavation site is a key arena for the production of heritage, and an important meeting place for archaeology and wider society. On development-led projects, it is not always possible to give the wider public access, often due to health and safety concerns and liabilities, time pressures, project priorities and accessibility. However, through good co-operation with the developer, Bane NOR, we were able to facilitate for site visits for kindergartens, school groups and adult visitors.

As noted above, this is not the first time we have invited children to site. This time, however, we decided to aim for even younger children – those in the older groups at kindergarten (3–5 years old). This would be a different challenge, to connect with children without a formal curriculum upon which to base our programme, but instead to focus on the curiosity, excitement and experiential learning of younger children, whose understanding of time is 'embryonic' (Cooper 1995: 16) and very much under development.

Henson has commented that the 'processes of archaeology are twofold: discovery and interpretation' (2017: 44), and this focus was at the heart of our project; young children are almost constantly in a mode of discovery and interpretation, and we wanted to direct this natural inquisitiveness towards thinking about the past – and its connections with the present. This

linkage between the past and the present, that 'archaeology cannot be separated from its audience', as Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley (1992: 67) put it, is often particularly clear when it comes to children, who tend to want to know more about things that are important to them in the present (Stone 1994: 195). Hence, in our project we wanted to let the conversations, interpretations and discoveries develop in a fluid and natural way – within the structure we had designed for the visit. Through 'enactive representation' (Bruner 1966), children can learn new concepts through experiences, sensation, and language (Cooper 1995: 43), and so providing an experience was to be at the core of our programme.

Upon reflection, the goals of our project echoed what Henson (2017: 45) has written about time, places and people.

> Through our understanding of time, we can learn about the origins of our present-day world and its features, how human society is not static but develops through time, and we can focus on analogies in the past for present situations and issues. Our understanding of places in the past helps us to appreciate the enormous cultural variety and ways of expression of human societies. We also begin to understand the interactive relationship we have with our changing physical environment, landscapes and climate. Our investigations of human behaviour can lead us towards a feeling of common humanity with others and a more empathetic understanding of human experience.

We wanted the children to start to think about development over time, cultural variety and expression, similarities, and differences, and empathetically consider how life in Oslo was in the past. As Cooper (1995: 9) has written:

> Understanding the relationship between subjective time and measured time develops through understanding other dimensions of the concept of time – chronological sequences, duration,

Figure 1. Children at the timeline (Photo: NIKU).

> changes over time, similarities and differences between now and past times – and the vocabulary of time.

The site visit involved the children visiting three stations set up next to the excavation area. These three stations had different but complementary themes and learning goals, and each aimed to give the children a specific learning experience. The programme for kindergarten children was developed and carried out by archaeologists Maja Bredal Hauan, Ingeborg Marie Hornkjøl and the author.

Chronology

The first station was a simple timeline, showing five time periods: 'now', 'when one's grandparents were young', 'the Middle Ages', 'the Stone Age', and 'the time of the dinosaurs' (Fig. 1). The learning goal for this station was to give the children an understanding of time and older history; that what they see on site is from quite distant from our own in terms of generational time, but also quite recent in terms of both human history and the earth's history. Although the kindergarten children are young, they have nevertheless started to acquire an understanding of time, as Cooper (1995: 9) has identified:

> … before they start school children are becoming able to sequence events in their own lives, and possibly artefacts and photographs related to their own experience, and to retell stories in chronological sequence, recognising conventions such as 'once upon a time' and 'they all lived happily ever after'.

An idea of chronology and the depth of time is important for historical learning but should not be read as promoting the simplistic idea of a linear historical narrative. Instead, through having an understanding of chronology, one can begin to appreciate that history is more than just events, and that historical interpretations are also contingent on who, when and why they are being made; 'The past is too multiform and reflexive to be wholly conveyed in one-dimensional story lines.' (Lowenthal 2015: 357).

The decision to add in 'when one's grandparents were young' was made to provide the children with a generational hook upon which to attach their understanding of time – and to extend it to the Middle Ages and the Stone Age. As both Owen and Steele (2005: 66) and Lowenthal (2015: 356) have noted, young children struggle to understand the datable past or timeframes that go further than 3-4 generations. Hence, such recognisable and knowable concepts as 'when one's grandparents were young' can help to familiarise and anchor their understanding of time.

To start with, the archaeologists would talk a little about the time periods, starting with the present day:

- Where would you place yourself here? What about your kindergarten?
- Where would you place these (modern) things?
- Discuss the picture of grandma and why she is on the timeline.
    - What sort of things did grandma have when she was young?
    - Discuss the idea of generational time – for example by asking whether anyone has a great-grandma.
    - Move the conception of the past back 2-3 generations.

The next stop on the timeline would often be the time of the dinosaurs. It is almost a Law of Nature that as an archaeologist one will be asked about dinosaurs and whether one has ever found one. For the benefit of future archaeologists, but mainly as a way to both bookend the timeline and to explain that there was a time before people, we decided to include dinosaurs in the timeline; both familiarity with dinosaurs and the clear divergence between the time of dinosaurs and the time of humans would help in this initial timeline task. As Zarmatti (2015: 185) has noted in an Australian case:

> We have found it especially important to emphasise the chronological context of the site (in its simplest form) with pre-literate children aged 5-7 years who come to the programme with the

pre-conceived notion that archaeology is 'all about digging up dinosaurs'. Educators make a special point of emphasising that, although they will be 'digging', the children will not be digging up dinosaurs, but rather finding evidence of what life was like for children who lived on the site a 'long, long time ago', when their great-great-grandparents were children. This supports research that found young children have difficulty understanding concepts of long-span time and are better able to comprehend concepts of time expressed in short time spans that relate to their own experiences.

We would ask questions such as:

- Who likes dinosaurs? What do you know about dinosaurs?
- When did they live? Did they live at the same time as people?

We would then move forward in time to the Stone Age, where we could start to introduce a time with people, but beyond our conception of generational time. This also enabled us to discuss how archaeologists are concerned with humanity and things, and not dinosaurs.

- What do we know about the Stone Age?
- It was so long ago that not even great-grandma's great-great-great grandma was born.
- What sort of things did people have in the Stone Age? What were they made of?
- What did people do in the Stone Age?

The final stop on the timeline would be the Middle Ages, the time that the remains discovered during the excavation were from. We would connect this period with the ongoing excavation and the finds that we would be looking at later. This is a period that is perhaps somewhat beyond the children's conception of generational time, but that is more 'knowable' than for example the Stone Age, as one can easily see remains from the Middle Ages in the landscape (ruins, castles, other buildings), is maybe more visible in popular culture, and even familial connections can sometimes be traced back this far.

- What do the children know about the Middle Ages?
- How long ago was it?
- What was life like then?

Once the initial introduction and discussion was over, the children were given the different pictures relating to the different time periods to place on the timeline. This would then be discussed once all the children had had their turn. Questions such as what was on the picture, and why was it placed there would be asked to stimulate discussion. The role of the archaeologist here was to guide, support and encourage questions and comments about time.

We found that the timeline was a good means of introducing the concept of time and the past, and the comparative element – i.e., that 'before' can be classified into the more recent past and the more distant past, such as 'a while ago', 'a long time ago', 'a very long time ago' and so on. This is something that younger children do not fully grasp, so a timeline with visual help is a useful tool in helping them order and organise time. As Lowenthal has remarked, 'The pearls of history accrue value not merely from being many and lustrous, but from being sequentially strung' (2015: 357). By giving the kindergarten children an introduction to the idea of chronology, or perhaps more pertinently the difference between generational time and the 'long time' of history and archaeology, we had a foundation to build upon at the other stations.

Excavation

The second section was inside one of our two excavation tents, and here the children could see the ongoing excavation work (Fig. 2). We would explain what being an archaeologist involves, the tools that are used, and also show them what we had found – streets, buildings, and so on. The learning goal here was to gain an understanding of what an archaeologist does and what archaeology is, and to keep in mind what was discussed at the timeline.

Figure 2. Inside the excavation tent (Photo: NIKU).

In connection with this station, we filled pallet frames with soil and added artefacts such as shoe soles, pottery and animal bones so that the children could undertake a mock excavation. This was considered to be the best way to facilitate the experience of 'finding', given health and safety concerns in the excavation area – such as polluted soil, the possibility for falls and other injuries, and the need to avoid hazards. The aim here was to allow the children to use the same tools as archaeologists, to discover artefacts, and for them to try to work out what the artefacts are from and what they may be able to tell us about the past.

This excavation was an example of Henson's description of archaeology as 'discovery and interpretation', as mentioned above (2017: 44). The children's responses to finding things in the soil was one of wonder and excitement, with the thrill of the treasure hunt outweighing the loss of authenticity (cf. Toftdal et al. 2018): the controlled situation of digging in the boxes, where there were enough artefacts for everyone to find anything, and where digging was easy, made the experience positive and memorable for the children. As Zarmatti (2015: 185-186) has discussed, this form of active learning is often something that children remember for a long time:

> Memories are shaped by somatic experiences and the environment, and our senses play a key part in memory creation. Motivation and emotion also play a role in determining the strength of a memory. When an experience is novel or unusual, when it is personally meaningful or elicits an emotional connection, then it is more likely to be stored in the long-term memory.

Feedback from the kindergartens indicates that this experience on site was a memorable one, which the children took up again spontaneously a while after their visit – both in conversation and in free play, and as such is comparative to other places these children might visit, such as the farm, a museum, or a musical performance.

Artefacts and object-based learning

The third section aimed to allow the children to compare objects from daily life in the Middle Ages with their equivalents today and see changes and similarities over time. For example, we compared modern cooking utensils and equipment with medieval finds, today's ice skates with animal bone skates, and plastic combs from the present day with medieval combs made from antler or bone; often quite similar or knowable, but in different materials. The tangibility of finds is their great strength as disseminators of history. As Lowenthal (2015: 389) has stated, 'The supreme merit of tangible remains is the ready access they afford to the past's ubiquitous traces. Relics and remnants viewable by all offer unmediated impressions free to any passer-by.' Objects are a particularly useful tool for learning, and operate in a completely different way to texts, as Durbin, Morris and Wilkinson (1990: 4-5) note:

> Objects also provide creative and emotional stimulus. They provide material for art, imaginative writing and drama. They provide examples of how ideas can be expressed in ways other than words. Objects are real rather than abstract, and thus they aid the memory: physical sensations, experiences and emotions may remain much longer in the mind than word-gained facts or ideas.

Object-based learning is an important way for children to explore, enquire and reason through a very sensory experience (e.g., Ludvigsson et al. 2022: 684); how artefacts feel, look, sound and smell are key clues for understanding what they might be (see, e.g., Cooper 1995: 23). By asking questions about these objects – either to themselves or to an archaeologist – they find out about the past and also actively and reflexively participate in knowledge creation (Arias-Ferrer & Egea-Vivancos 2017: 92). Object handling is also a form of active learning, like the excavation, and engages children in a way that 'sparks children's interest, then their curiosity or creativity … [and] provide[s] a concrete experience that aids or illuminates abstract thought' (Durbin et al. 1990: 4). Through using objects – and looking at both past objects and modern parallels – children relate to the world around them and gain an appreciation of the role and significance of things in their own lives. Indeed, even for these young children, objects help to develop a number of skills, as identified by Durbin, Morris and Wilkinson (1990: 18):

> learning to look, learning to describe, learning to record, learning to ask questions, learning to classify, learning to relate structure to function, learning to formulate and test hypotheses, learning to use fragments.

At the end of the visit, the visiting children were gathered together at the timeline, and we summed up what had been discussed at the three stations, and encouraged reflections, comments and questions about the archaeology, archaeologists and the past.

Reflections from the kindergartens

Following the site visits, we asked the kindergartens for their feedback and evaluation of the programme. However, only one kindergarten replied. Their reflections, while not possible to generalize of extrapolate from, give us an indication of how the programme was experienced by the children and the pedagogical staff.

This response indicates that this kindergarten had a positive experience on site, and shows the value of objects, a variety of activities and treating the children with respect and as important visitors. The key going forward is maintaining the link and the memory of the site visit, and the suggestion of being able to take something (e.g. finds) back with them is worth keeping in mind for future projects; although one takes an object out of the normal route of excavation -> conservation -> museum, one arguably increases its effect among the children from kindergarten as lieu de mémoire, which can be used as a spark for memory, activity and further discussion.

TAKING ARCHAEOLOGY INTO THE CLASSROOM

This programme was designed by the author and Vilde Christoffersen Rønning from the University of Oslo, who was on placement at NIKU as part of her master's degree in museology and

cultural heritage studies. We were joined in the classroom by archaeologists Stine Urke Brunstad and Therese Marie Edman.

In contrast to the programme for kindergarten children, the programme for schools was directly and explicitly connected to the curriculum. The reasoning for this was so that teachers could easily see that it would be relevant and that it would be a good accompaniment to regular teaching; as such it was tailored to both children's and teachers' needs. Feedback was sought from teachers, and a pilot version was tested out at one school before the programme was finalised.

The session would last for about 2 hours (with a break) and would involve two archaeologists/disseminators in each class of around 20-25 children. Much of the time spent would be related to the learning goal of 'exploring how people lived in the past and comparing with how we live today' (SAF01-04, Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d.). The session also explored concepts such as nature and culture in relation to heritage and parks (and Middelalderparken in particular), sustainability and the sustainable use of resources (NAT01-04, Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d.), ideas of conservation, preservation and listing, and why we have archaeological investigations. We also connected these discussions to the overarching part of the curriculum (1.5, Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d.), especially: 'Humans are part of nature and have a responsibility to manage nature in a responsible way. Through education, pupils will gain knowledge about and develop respect for nature' and 'Pupils shall develop an understanding of how humanity's actions affect nature and the climate and thus also our society'.

We had seen with the children from kindergarten that the timeline worked well as an activity, and so we decided to use it again in our sessions with the fourth graders. These children had

Table 1. Responses from the kindergarten.

Q1	How do you think the children experienced the visit to the excavation?	A1	We were there with two groups, and both had a positive experience. They got to do practical tasks and got a good explanation of what archaeologists work with and what we saw. It was very cold the days we came, but that didn't matter. It seemed like the children really enjoyed themselves.
Q2	Do you think that the programme was appropriate for the age of the children?	A2	The two guides adapted the programme to the two groups. The first group was really interested, knew things from before and had a lot of questions. They received more "advanced" information, which suited them. The other group was also interested, but not to the same extent as the first. They had a similar programme, but one which was more adapted to their needs. It was good that the guides could adapt to the needs of the children that were there.
Q3	To what extent has the visit been built upon or taken up again at kindergarten afterwards?	A3	We have talked a lot about the visit afterwards. One child said immediately that he wanted to be an archaeologist when he was older. We have talked about the visit to site whenever we have visited the open area of the part and hope to keep the experience vivid going forward too.
Q4	Do you think that the children gained an understanding of time and the past?	A4	There was a good illustration on the timeline where the children could place the pictures at the right time period. It was a good task, where the children could together find the right answer. When we got to see the practical work that the archaeologists were doing, the children could see the old things in reality. This gave them an insight in how things could have been in the past.

Q5	Do you think that the children gained an understanding of what an archaeologist does and what archaeology is?	A5	Yes, it was exciting for both the children and the adults to see the archaeologists at work. To see their tools, the precision with which they work, their teamwork and so on. We got answers to lots of spontaneous questions and learnt a lot. It was good that the children could touch bones and other things that they were interested in.
Q6	Do you think that the children gained an understanding of objects and their development over time?	A6	Yes, they understood that it was a long time ago, but it is difficult to say the extent to which they understood. It can be difficult to introduce the time concept to small children, but with the connection to dinosaurs and other things I think they gained a good understanding.
Q7	Have you any other comments (positive or negative)?	A7	I think that the two guides we had were very good at leading the groups of children. They took the time to explain and treated the children with respect. They faced the children and I think that the children really felt like they were seen as competent people. Sometimes they didn't understand everything, but the most important for them was to be treated so well by the guides. They have a good experience together and learnt a lot. It was exciting for them to dig themselves and it was a highlight to find the bones and other finds. A suggestion for next time is that the children can take something with them from the excavation, to maintain the link between the excavation and what we can work further with in the kindergarten.

an understanding of chronology and the various time periods pictured, so it was much more of an icebreaker and starting point for our discussions about the medieval period than was the case for the kindergarten children. We also altered the pictures used to make the assigning of time period more difficult or ambiguous – such as reenactors and medieval buildings that are still standing – to encourage reflection and engagement with the concept of time and with the idea that archaeology exists in the present rather than the past.

In the subsequent discussion, we would talk about the past in general and the medieval period in particular. How long ago was it? What do you think Oslo was like then? What did children do in the medieval period? Here, we encouraged the children to talk between themselves and then discuss in plenum; we allowed them to take time to think, ask questions and talk – they would be active participants rather than passive recipients of information.

Children of this age (9-10 years old) need pauses from thinking and talking, and so one of the ways in which we broke up the session was by using a wordsearch. This involved the children finding words relating to archaeology and the medieval period hidden in a grid – either alone or in teams – for about 10-15 minutes, before we went through the answers in plenum. We then moved on to the next discussion theme, which would be prompted by one of the words in the wordsearch: *kulturarv* (cultural heritage).

We would ask 'did anyone find kulturarv?' and then follow up by asking what it meant. This was a difficult one, as while heritage is a term that is used frequently, for example, in the media and popular discourse, it is something that the children found hard to pin down. *Kulturarv* in Norwegian is a composite word formed of the word for culture (*kultur*) and the word for inheritance (*arv*). Responses were often focused on the inheritance element, and in particular on inheriting something when someone dies. There was a clear personal and individual aspect to the children's understanding of heritage, which

stood in contrast to concepts such as World Heritage or national heritage registers. We attempted to bridge this gap between the personal and the supraindividual by reflecting on the concepts of importance and value and an element of scale. Heritage such as the Viking ships, or medieval ruins in Middelalderparken, are considered heritage because they have value and importance for society in general, rather than people as individuals.

The scale of heritage was something that we explored in the next part of the session, when looking at archaeological artefacts. Medieval artefacts are protected by law, and as such can be connected to the ideas of national registers, significance and so on – yet are often small, everyday objects, the remains of daily life. Different artefacts were distributed among the children, who could then examine them and think about what these fragments might have once been, what they say about life in the medieval period, and how similar or different they are to objects we use today. The starting point for this part of the session was the learning goal in the curriculum (SAF01-04, Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d.): 'Explore how people in the past subsisted, and talk about how significant changes in the basis for life and technology have affected and continue to affect demography, living conditions and settlement patterns'.

After looking at archaeological finds, we looked more closely at the archaeological method and how we use – among other things – artefacts to create a narrative and an interpretation of a site. We looked at a picture that showed an imagined scene from a building excavated a few years ago (Fig. 3). In the picture are a number of things found on site – chess pieces, dice and gaming pieces, chicken bones, plates and drinking vessels, musical instruments – and so we asked the children to think about what may have taken place here. Many commented on the fact that the scene looks abandoned, and that it is untidy, and the groups generally came to the conclusion that there had been a party or a feast here, with food and drink and games and music; this is the same conclusion that we have come to as archaeologists (Berge et al. in prep.).

Figure 3. A reconstructed medieval scene (Illustration: Hege Vatnaland).

At this point, it was time for the children to take a break from thinking and talking, and so our final activity was more creative – we asked the children to draw either one of the finds they had examined, a scene from Oslo in the medieval period, or what they would like the new Middelalderparken to look like. This part of the session was also linked to a learning goal from the overarching part of the curriculum (1.4, Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d.): 'Pupils are to learn and develop themselves through sensing and thinking, aesthetic expressions and practical activities'. This was a good way to end the session in the classroom, allowing the children to take inspiration from what we had discussed and turn it into a creative result.

As a follow-up to the school visits, we have designed a poster based on some of the drawings from one of the schools and colleagues from Oslo municipality are arranging for others to be displayed in a gallery at Oslo Ladegård. Our poster of the children's drawings is placed prominently on the fence around the Middelalderparken building site, near the ruin of St. Clement's Church where there is a good number of visitors each day – kindergarten classes, dog walkers and neighbours – giving the children's artwork a real audience.

CONCLUSIONS

These two programmes, in connection with one development-led archaeological investigation, brought archaeologists and young children together to discuss and explore archaeology in two different settings – on site and in the classroom. Although there are a number of additional differences regarding the specifics of the programmes and who was involved, there is a shared goal from the archaeologists' perspective of enabling the children to better understand the past and how it is managed in the present day, as well as how archaeologists operate both on a methodological and theoretical plane.

As Cooper has written (1995: 1):

> the past is a dimension of children's social and physical environment and they interact with it from birth. They hear and use the vocabulary of time and change: old, new, yesterday, tomorrow, last year, before you were born, when mummy was little, a long time ago, once upon a time. They ask questions about the sequence and causes of events: when did we move here? Why? What happened in the story next?

Hence, discussing the past with children is something that is familiar and known, even if it not known in the same manner as among adults. Archaeology, with its materiality and tangibility provides an alternative way in to thinking about the past. This was especially the case with the kindergarten children, who have not been schooled in history yet, but was also apparent for the older children, who appreciated the non-textual aspect of our programme.

As mentioned at the start of this article, there is a clear element of social responsibility to the work we do in development-led archaeology, arguably stemming from the legal basis of the investigations and the implicit need to justify our work in terms of public benefit (e.g., Watson 2021). These programmes bringing archaeology and children closer to each other show the benefits that can be provided through development-led archaeology when the social mission of archaeology is given a central role and we allow ourselves to think about the bigger picture and ask, 'What can we learn about ourselves by studying the past?' (Henson 2017: 54). Hence, a goal for archaeologists in their encounters with children ought to be to provide a 'set of themes and concepts for handling the past' (Cooper 1995: 27), that is, the tools by which children can create their own 'map' of the past. Inspiration can be taken from the Australian case discussed by Zarmatti (2015: 184), who shows how to:

> use archaeology as the means of connecting knowledge, the educator, and the student to produce learning. Archaeology not only provides 'content' and 'knowledge' but its inherent heuristic of inquiry drives the pedagogical process of constructing knowledge and facilitating learning.

Our experience in providing the space and framework for children to interact with archaeology has been a positive one, and it has been important also on a democratic level to discuss themes such as the historical narrative, multivo-

cality and cultural heritage management with young citizens. However, it has been difficult to obtain detailed feedback and evaluation of our programmes from teachers and pedagogical staff at the kindergartens, with the exception of one kindergarten. This is most likely due to a lack of time and a heavy workload on their part; the responses received both immediately on site or at school and in subsequent brief e-mail correspondence have been positive, if lacking in detail – for example:

> Thanks for a great visit! The children said that they thought it was really exciting and informative. It was especially fun to experience real archaeological finds!

This is not by any means unexpected, as we experienced the same when approaching them in advance of the visits – our proposal and the draft programme was accepted without any comments or changes from the teachers and pedagogical staff. This article therefore makes no attempt to be an evaluation of the programmes, but rather presents them as cases that connect archaeology and educational theories in a practical manner, and which show how development-led archaeology can provide interesting learning experiences both on and off site (see, e.g., Stolare et al. 2021 for a case study with more detailed feedback from teachers who took schoolchildren to heritage sites).

There are many considerations that need to be taken into account when creating projects like these, relating to both how we present archaeology, to whom, and in what setting. Each case will need to be tailored to the specifics, but we see that development-led archaeology has both the capability and opportunity to play a role in increasing the links between archaeology, heritage management and children, increasing both awareness about the past and how it is managed and interpreted in the present day.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Bane NOR for enabling the children to come on to site and to colleagues at NIKU for their contributions in developing and implementing the programmes both on site and in the schools. Thanks also to the children involved and their teachers for their enthusiasm, interest and good humour!

Translations from Norwegian are by the author.

REFERENCES

Arias-Ferrer, L. & Egea-Vivancos, A. Thinking Like an Archaeologist: Raising Awareness of Cultural Heritage Through the Use of Archaeology and Artefacts in Education. *Public Archaeology* 16(2): 90–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2017.1479558

Beck, A. S. 2022. An Overlooked Frontier? Scenes from Development-led Archaeology Today. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 55(1): 81–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/00293652.2021.2010124

Berge, S. L., Haugan, K. Ø., Holmen, K. O., Derrick, M., Hovd, L. & Helstad, M. (in prep.) Follobanen Bispegata. Arkeologisk utgravning i Bispegata, Gamlebyen, Oslo. NIKU Rapport. Oslo: Norsk institutt for kulturminneforskning.

Bruner, J. S. 1966. *Towards a theory of instruction*. Harvard: Belknap Press.

Cooper, H. 1995. *History in the Early Years: Teaching and learning in the first three years of school*. London: Routledge.

Durbin, G., Morris, S. & Wilkinson, S. 1990. *A Teacher's Guide to Learning from Objects.* English Heritage.

Henson, D. 2017. Archaeology and education. In G. Moshenska (ed.) *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*: 43–59. London: UCL Press. https://www.uclpress.co.uk/products/84625 Read 25 August 2023.

Högberg, A. 2004. 'Historiemedvetande och uppdragsarkeologi – tankar om alternativa kunskapsmål', *META* 3: 3–18. http://www.histark.se/files/getfile/META-2004-3.pdf Read 25 August 2023.

Högberg, A. 2007. The Past is the Present – Prehistory and Preservation from a Children's Point of View. *Public Archaeology* 6(1): 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1179/175355307X202820

Lowenthal, D. 2015. *The Past is a Foreign Country Revisited.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ludvigsson, D., Stolare, M. & Trenter, C. 2022. Primary school pupils learning through haptics at historical sites. *Education 3–13* 50(5): 684–695. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2021.1899260

MacKenzie, R. & Stone, P. G. 1990. Introduc-

tion: the concept of the excluded past. In R. MacKenzie & P. G. Stone (eds.) *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*: 1–11. London: Routledge.
Molyneaux, B. L. 1994. Introduction: the represented past. In P. G. Stone & B. L. Molyneaux (eds) T*he presented past: Heritage, museums and education*: 1–12. London: Routledge.
Oldham, M. 2017. Bridging the Gap: Classification, Theory and Practice in Public Archaeology. *Public Archaeology* 16(3–4): 214229. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2017.1499398
Owen, T. & Steel, J. 2005. Perceptions of archaeology amongst primary school aged children, Adelaide, South Australia. *Australian Archaeology* 61(1): 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/03122417.2005.11681822
Scott, C. 2010. The enduring appeal of 'learning styles'. *Australian Journal of Education* 54: 5–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/000494411005400102
Shanks, M. & Tilley, C. 1992. *Re-Constructing Archaeology.* London and New York: Routledge.
Stolare, M., Ludvigsson, D. & Trenter, C. 2021. The educational power of heritage sites. *History Education Research Journal* 18(2): 264–279. https://doi.org/10.14324/HERJ.18.2.08
Stone, P. G. 1994. The re-display of the Alexander Keiller Museum, Avebury, and the National Curriculum in England. In P. G. Stone & B. L, Molyneaux (eds) *The presented past: Heritage, museums and education*: 190–205. London: Routledge.
Toftdal, M., Kirk, S. & Pécseli, B. 2018. 'Once upon a time ago': An Interdisciplinary Collaboration Between Archaeology, Museology and Pedagogy. *Public Archaeology* 17(4): 193–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2019.1680033
Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d. SAF01-04 https://www.udir.no/lk20/saf01-04 Read 5 June 2023.
Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d. NAT01-04 https://www.udir.no/lk20/nat01-04 Read 5 June 2023.
Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d. Overordnet de 1.5l https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/1.5-respekt-for-naturen-og-miljobevissthet/?kode=saf01-04&lang=nob Read 5 June 2023.
Utdanningsdirektoratet n.d. Overordnet del 1.4 https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/1.4-skaperglede-engasjement-og-utforskertrang/?kode=saf01-04&lang=nob Read 5 June 2023.
Watson, S. (ed.) 2021. Archaeology and Public Benefit. EAC symposium proceedings. I*nternet Archaeology* 57.
Zarmatti, L. 2015. Archaeology as Pedagogy at Sydney's 'The Big Dig'. The Historic Environment: *Policy and Practice* 6(2): 177–191. https://doi.org/10.1179/1756750515Z.00000000082