The United States Forest Service's Passport In Time program is designed to involve the public in archaeology on National Forest land. Three of the program's goals are: 1) allow archaeologists to conduct research they would not otherwise have the time or the budget to conduct; 2) teach the public about history and prehistory, as well as how and why archaeologists study them; and 3) create a constituency of advocates for archaeology. This study evaluates these three goals based on interviews with volunteers who worked on excavation projects and archaeologists who led excavation projects.

Research is not a priority for archaeologists leading excavation projects. PIT accomplishes the latter goals by physically involving volunteers in archaeological work. The volunteers become a labor force as well as students for the archaeologists. The archaeologists teach the volunteers effectively through a combination of experiential and more traditional classroom techniques. The volunteers gain an understanding of what archaeological resources are and why they are important. They take this knowledge away with them and share it with their friends and family. This increased knowledge in the public achieves the goals of federal legislation to reduce damage to archaeological resources through public education. PIT could greatly enhance the effect of volunteer enthusiasm by providing them with other appropriate outlets for their energy.
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Sharing the Past Effectively: An Evaluation of Excavations in the Passport In Time Program

Introduction

The Passport In Time (PIT) program began in 1988 in the Superior National Forest (Osborn and Peters 1991) as a way to involve the public in archaeology on United States Forest Service land. By 1991 it was adopted nationwide. PIT projects reflect the many facets of archaeology, including archival research, survey, recording, excavation, analysis, interpretation, stabilization and rehabilitation of standing structures. Excavations are the most popular projects (Osborn and Peters 1991).

The program is an outgrowth of legislation regarding cultural resources (this legislation will be discussed in more detail below), and its goals reflect this fact. According to Osborn and Peters (1991), “the primary PIT goal is to provide education and to build resource awareness for volunteers.” Other goals include research, especially as mandated by section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Osborn et al. 1993), protection of cultural resources through the creation of a constituency advocating for archaeology (Osborn 1991; Osborn et al. 1993), environmentalism, and improved public relations between the volunteers and the Forest Service (Osborn and Peters 1991).

Passport In Time, as it has existed since it was adopted nationwide, consists of a National Coordinator, Jill Osborn, who provides overall supervision and management of the program. Archaeologists on the National Forest or Ranger District level choose to have a project, based on the “Philosophy and Guidelines” laid out by Osborn (1991).
They submit their proposal (see Appendix A) to the National Coordinator, who reviews it and forwards it to Statistical Research, Incorporated (SRI) to be published in the PIT Traveler. SRI publishes the Traveler twice a year, sending it to the approximately 10,000 volunteers on the mailing list. (This job was formerly held by CEHP, Incorporated, another clearinghouse.) The volunteers choose which project(s) they would like to participate in and submit an application (see Appendix B) to SRI. SRI forwards the applications to the project leaders, who then choose and contact volunteers. After a project, each volunteer is given a passport in which the project leader has recorded the number of hours donated and the skills learned or utilized. This information is also submitted to SRI, which maintains a database of volunteers’ experiences. Summaries of selected previous projects are published in the winter PIT Traveler.

Passport In Time has experienced phenomenal growth in its six years on the national scene. In 1990, 66 volunteers worked on fifteen projects (Simmons 1996:7). In the summer of 1996 approximately 1200 volunteers worked on 113 projects. Altogether, 7200 volunteers have donated 330,000 hours on 6000 different projects. The Forest Service estimates this donated labor to be worth $4,240,000 (Osborn, personal communication).

The question remains, just what are the volunteers taking away from their experience? Is the Forest Service achieving its goals for Passport In Time? This study is a goal-based formative evaluation (Jensen 1993) of how successfully Passport In Time is meeting three of its goals (for a discussion of all of PIT’s goals, see the Methodology chapter): 1) PIT allows archaeologists to conduct research they would not otherwise have
the time or the budget to conduct; 2) PIT teaches the public about history and prehistory, as well as how and why archaeologists study it; and 3) PIT creates a constituency of advocates for archaeology. To do this, a sample of volunteers who served on crews and archaeologists who led PIT projects were interviewed about their experiences with PIT.

Figure 1 Volunteers and staff on the Peace Valley Test Excavation, 1995

A formative program evaluation provides information to help improve the program in the future (Jensen 1993). Aronson and Sherwood (1972) see evaluation as the last and crucial step in designing a program dealing with a social problem. PIT has been operating for six years now, and it is an established part of the Forest Service’s plan for managing
heritage resources. Based on theories of experiential education and ways to protect resources, PIT should be successful. Before making this judgment it will be helpful to know how PIT evolved out of federal legislation designed to protect and manage archaeological resources.

**Legislation**

In the twentieth century, tracing the development of legislation pertaining to archaeological resources is in many ways equivalent to tracing public interest in archaeology (Chapman 1985). The Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431-433) was the first law in the United States to protect the archaeological record. In general, when "a threat is perceived to resources that a constituency holds dear... legislative enactment of protective structures follows" (Fowler 1991:21). In the case of the Antiquities Act, the resources were archaeological sites in the southwestern United States and the constituencies were the scientific anthropological community and wealthy patrons of archaeology (McManamon 1991). Unfortunately, the act was declared unconstitutionally vague by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1974 (Schmidt 1994). In response to this and other inadequacies—especially lack of enforcement authority and minimal fines (Cheek 1991)—Congress passed amendments to the Antiquities Act and new laws.

Despite the existing legislation, in 1966 both archaeological sites and standing historic structures were still being destroyed. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470-470x-6) was passed to protect these sites. It set up a system for determining which sites to protect and how to protect them. It was also the first law to
discuss the role the public plays in protecting its archaeological resources. This law declares archaeology a worthwhile pursuit: “the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people” (Section 1(b)(2)). It creates many new programs to meet this goal. One element of the plan is education:

- Section 101(b)(3)(G): It shall be the responsibility of the State Historic Preservation Officer to administer the State Historic Preservation Program and to provide public information, education and training, and technical assistance in historic preservation.
- Section 101(j): The Secretary [of the Interior] shall, in consultation with the Council and other appropriate Federal, tribal, Native Hawaiian, and non-Federal organizations, develop and implement a comprehensive preservation education and training program.
- Section 401: The Congress finds and declares that, given the complexity of technical problems encountered in preserving historic properties and the lack of adequate distribution of technical information to preserve such properties, a national initiative to coordinate and promote research, distribute information, and provide training about preservation skills and technologies would be beneficial.

Although the result of this education should be the protection of archaeological sites, this law holds that teaching people about the past and its material manifestations is a goal in and of itself.

In 1974 Congress passed the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act, or Moss-Bennett Act (16 U.S.C. 469-469c). This law does not specifically mention education, but without it there probably would never have been a Passport In Time program. This law expanded the kinds of projects requiring archaeological survey. Most importantly for PIT it also allowed individual land managing agencies, such as the Forest Service, to conduct archaeological investigations on their lands by themselves. Prior to
this, the National Park Service had responsibility for all archaeological compliance work. Finally, the law showed its teeth by making specific budget allocations to assure the work was done.

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA; 16 U.S.C. 470aa-470ll), as amended in 1988, was designed to strengthen penalties for criminal destruction of archaeological sites. ARPA reinforces the importance of informing the public about archaeological resources, specifically through education: “Each Federal land manager shall establish a program to increase public awareness of the significance of the archaeological resources located on public lands and Indian lands and the need to protect such resources” (Section 10(c)). Thus federal legislation recognizes the connection between education and the elimination of criminal looting.

**Looting and Vandalism**

Many archaeologists agree that there are different kinds of looters of archaeological sites. Des Jean (1991:233) believes there are three categories: “(1) opportunists, (2) those who collect for personal acquisition, and (3) those who collect for profit.” King (1991:90) feels that there are only two categories of looters: those who do it for pleasure and those who do it for profit “either because he or she has little or no choice...or because it is easier or more fun or more remunerative than other available lines of work.” Nickens (1991) adds one more category--the malicious or predatory vandal who destroys with no apparent motive. All recognize that very different tactics are needed to stop each group.
Gramann and Vander Stoep (1987) as well as Vander Stoep and Gramann (1987) have studied vandalism against natural and cultural resources. Based on the person's reasons for damaging the resource, they divide vandalism into six categories: (1) unintentional violations; (2) releaser-cue violations ("cues in the physical environment can reduce normal social inhibitions against some types of unconventional behavior, leading to resource damage"); (3) uninformed violations (people don't realize their behavior damages the resource); (4) responsibility-denial violations (obeying the rule is felt to be unreasonable or impossible); (5) status-confirming violations (trying to fit into a deviant group); and (6) willful violations (akin to the malicious and predatory vandals discussed above) (Vander Stoep and Gramann 1987:72-3). They suggest that prosocial behavior, which is "helping behavior that is not motivated by the expectation of a tangible reward for helping, or a tangible punishment for not helping" (Vander Stoep and Gramann 1987:70), can be promoted by resource managers in place of destructive behavior.

Gramann and Vander Stoep tested this hypothesis on groups of Boy Scouts hiking through Shiloh National Military Park (Vander Stoep and Gramann 1987). Each group, upon arrival, was met by a ranger who delivered a message. Control groups were simply greeted. One experimental group was told of damage typically caused by visitors. The next group received the damage message and instructions on how they could help prevent damage to cultural resources. A third group was given the same message as the second, but was also told they would receive a reward for their help. All the messages reduced "depreciative acts." The latter two messages encouraged the Boy Scouts to identify with the Park staff and its goals. These messages took care of unintentional, releaser-cue,
uninformed, responsibility-denial, and status-confirming violations by educating the
visitors about resource damage.

Archaeologists alone cannot stop the profiteers or the vandals from looting
archaeological sites. We can, however, do something about the opportunists and pleasure
seekers. Most of these people engage in looting behavior without knowing that they are
both breaking the law and forever destroying valuable information about the past (Knoll
1991). “Both the sheer force of their numbers and the intensity of their activities cause the
cumulative effect of hobbyist looting to be one of the most destructive factors affecting
archaeological resources today” (McAllister 1991:97). These people will benefit from
education programs about archaeological resources (Des Jean 1991). Such programs are
a long-term prevention measure (McManamon 1991). They also enrich the lives of the
people they reach (16 U.S.C. 470-470x-6).

Public Education

As indicated earlier, the public (at least a portion of it) has long had an interest in
archaeology (see also Friedman 1991). The current increase in interest in public
involvement in federal archaeology is reflected in the 1986 creation of the Public
Archaeology Working Group (PAWG) (McManamon et al. 1993) whose goals were to

(1) foster a feeling of ownership and responsibility for America’s
archaeological heritage among members of the public; (2) increase public
understanding and appreciation of archaeology; (3) enhance public
awareness of current problems involving archaeological resources, such as
looting and vandalism; (4) increase understanding of how the public’s
actions affect archaeological resources; and (5) increase public involvement
in legitimate archaeological activities (McManamon et al. 1993:65-6).
In 1990 then Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan, Jr. developed “Objectives of the National Strategy for Federal Archaeology.” One of these is Public Education and Participation—“we need more and better public education in archaeology” (Lujan 1990).

As a result, public education and participation programs are appearing in many places. Many programs are directed solely at children primarily through school curriculum (Hawkins 1991; Knoll 1992; McNutt 1991; Rogers and Grant 1991; Rogge 1991; Smith and McManamon 1991; Tisdale et al. 1991). Some programs are directed at adults, such as state archaeology weeks (Greengrass 1993) and volunteer programs (Bense 1991; Hoffman 1991; Hume and Boisvert 1992; Lewis 1992; for other ideas see Brook 1992 and Schuyler 1991). The most noteworthy of these grew out of amateur archaeological societies on the state level. Both Arkansas’ (Davis 1990) and Missouri’s (Chapman 1985) groups have teamed up with professional archaeologists for hands-on participation. While Missouri’s program works with the University of Missouri, Arkansas’ society led to the creation of the Arkansas Archaeological Survey. This organization provides many services to members of the society through its training program which teaches all levels of archaeology, from excavation to analysis and interpretation. Although results are generally positive, “the ability to do a final analysis and write a report on this work is often curtailed by the Survey archaeologist’s normal duties during the year” (Davis 1990:6). Fagan (1984:181) believes, “clearly the amateur archaeologist is a critical interface between the world of professional scholarship and the ‘real world’ in which contemporary archaeology flourishes. In many cases, properly trained amateur archaeologists are the
people who will bear the burden of changing popular social attitudes toward our
discipline.”

What is the best way to teach people about archaeology? According to Caffarella
and Barnett (1994:35), there are “three major forms of knowledge--theoretical, empirical,
and experiential.” Brockett and Knox (1994) believe that experiential education is
particularly effective for adult learners. Coleman (1976:58) points out that people are
more likely to remember what they do, both because of brain structure and because
feelings accompany the action; feelings and actions are easier to remember than “general
principles expressed in abstract symbols.” Therefore a program such as PIT which allows
people to actively participate in archaeology should be successful.
Methodology

Passport In Time is an extremely varied program. It encompasses all aspects of archaeological work, including archival research, surface survey, excavation, rock art documentation, site recording, building restoration, and laboratory analysis. Most popular, however, are the excavations. Because of their popularity, and because of their irreversible effect on the archaeological record, only excavation projects were evaluated in this study. In addition, the geographic scope was limited to Oregon and Washington, the Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service. This region was chosen because of ease of access to both volunteers and archaeologists. Excavations in these states comprised 20% of all PIT excavations between 1991 and 1996.

Goals To Be Evaluated

When conducting an evaluation of a program, it is first necessary to determine the program’s goals (Weiss 1972:21, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon 1978a:12). In order to do that for the Passport In Time program, I read papers authored by Jill Osborn, the National Coordinator for PIT (Osborn 1991; 1995), and others associated with the program (Osborn and Peters 1991; Osborn et al. 1993; Thomas 1995). From these documents I gleaned the following PIT program goals, in no particular order:

1. PIT allows archaeologists to conduct research they otherwise do not have the time or budget to undertake;
2. PIT teaches the public about history and prehistory, as well as how and why archaeologists study them;
3. PIT builds a constituency of advocates for archaeology;
4. PIT encourages volunteers to learn more about caring for the environment; and
5. PIT improves public relations between the Forest Service and the public.

I confirmed these goals with Jill Osborn, who agreed that they were correct.

Only the first three goals relate to archaeology. In 1994 Passport In Time, in conjunction with The Ecotourism Society, organized a nationwide survey of PIT volunteers. The main goal of that study was to determine how “green” PIT project are, or how well they convey the tenets of environmentalism. Basically, the study evaluated the PIT program’s success in meeting goal number four above. The fifth goal, of improving the relationship between the Forest Service and the public, is certainly admirable, but not in and of itself relevant to this study. Because this study is primarily concerned with archaeology and how best to bring the public to a finer understanding of cultural resources, only goals one through three outlined above were investigated.

Because these goals involve behavior changes in both archaeologists and volunteers, clearly both groups needed to be involved in the evaluation. After considering various data collection techniques (surveys, questionnaires, etc.) I concluded that because I hoped to obtain more qualitative than quantitative data, interviews were the most suitable (Bernard 1994). Because of time and funding constraints, interviews were conducted by telephone rather than in person.

**Selection of Informants**

Next it was necessary to more precisely identify the populations to be interviewed. From Passport In Time I obtained a list of all of the excavation projects ever run and the leaders of each project. I narrowed this list down to projects held in Oregon and
Washington between 1991 and 1993. It was necessary to limit the dates because one question involved the production of a report on the excavation, a process that often takes several years. The resulting list contained 28 projects with 19 project leaders in ten different National Forests. The project leaders were arranged in random order and the first ten on the list contacted. One of these had joined the Peace Corps, two had left the Forest Service for new jobs, and one had retired. When such a case was encountered, the next name on the list was contacted.

Because of the Privacy Act, it proved impossible to get a list of all volunteers. Therefore, all project leaders heading PIT excavation projects in the summer of 1996 in Oregon were contacted. Each agreed to distribute to volunteers a letter requesting participation in this project (see Appendix C). Over 150 volunteers on five different projects on four National Forests were thus reached. Interested volunteers were to return the form to their project leader or directly to me. The project leaders agreed to mail responses back to me. I received a total of 15 usable responses from two projects on two forests. This number was supplemented by a list of six members of the Oregon Archaeological Society collected by Cathy Poetschat in the Spring of 1996. These people had all volunteered on PIT excavations and were willing to participate in this study. Five were interviewed, bringing the total number of volunteers contacted to 20.

**Designing Interview Questions**

Having ascertained the goals to be tested, the populations which would provide the data, and what form of data collection instrument to use, the next step was to determine
how to measure the attainment of the goals (Morris and Fitz-Gibbon 1978a:12). In this case, it was a matter of designing questions to evaluate each of the goals. For a complete list of questions for both archaeologists and volunteers, see Appendix D.

To determine whether PIT meets its goal of allowing archaeologists to conduct more research, I asked the archaeologists a series of questions. Most directly, I asked if they felt the PIT program allowed them to conduct research they would not otherwise have been able to do. To gain more insight into the kind of research they were doing, I asked why they excavated at a particular site. Excavation is an early step in the research process, though. It is only with the publication of a report, which allows the archaeological community to share in the knowledge gained from the excavation, that a project can be considered useful and completed. Therefore I asked each archaeologist about the status of the report on the site they had excavated. Finally I asked whether they felt the volunteers were sufficiently qualified to avoid compromising the integrity of the data and thus keep the research valid.

One would not expect volunteers to be able to answer a question of whether the PIT program allows archaeologists to conduct research they would not otherwise be able to do. However, the volunteers, who are participating in a phase of a research project, should know quite a bit about that particular project. Therefore each was asked why the site they worked on was excavated. Their answers could reveal knowledge of how and why the Forest Service undertakes archaeological research.

To evaluate whether the PIT program allows the public to learn about history and prehistory as well as how and why archaeologists study it, it was necessary to ask the
volunteers about what they learned and ask the archaeologists about what and how they taught. I asked the volunteers how they were trained in the skills they needed for the work of the project. Next I asked each volunteer just what archaeological skills they had learned, prompting them as necessary by asking about individual skills such as excavation, mapping, survey, laboratory work, etc. Finally the question mentioned above as to why the Forest Service was excavating a particular site showed whether they could put their project into the context of archaeological research in general.

I asked the archaeologists how they trained their volunteers to get insight into what they wanted volunteers to learn and how they expected them to learn it. (Remember that these volunteers did not participate in projects led by these archaeologists.) Another question was whether the project leaders provided lectures or other activities for the volunteers to learn even more about the project they were participating in. Finally I asked if the archaeologists had trouble using all of the volunteers. If volunteers aren’t participating they are probably not learning, and possibly becoming angry and bored.

The final goal tested in this study is whether the Passport In Time program is building a constituency advocating for archaeology. This involves teaching volunteers the value and limited nature of archaeological or cultural resources, conveying the idea that the artifacts found in a site are only a means to an end; it is the information they can yield about the past that makes them significant. It also means that the volunteers put this knowledge to use; they actively share their new-found knowledge and fight to save these resources.
Each volunteer was asked what they were told about looting and laws that protect archaeological resources. Since most archaeological resources on private land are the property of the landowner to do with what they will, volunteers were asked what they would do with a site if they found one on their property. The goal of this question was to determine whether they would obey laws merely out of fear of repercussions or if they had really internalized the informational, rather than artifactual, potential of archaeological resources. Finally, I asked volunteers what they had done with the skills and information they had learned as a PIT volunteer and whether the project leaders had suggested different ways for them to support archaeology.

I asked archaeologists somewhat analogous questions. How did they address preservation and protection issues? Also, did they provide volunteers with other ways to support archaeology? This latter question was followed up with specific suggestions of different groups they might have told volunteers about.

I asked a few additional questions that did not explicitly pertain to an individual goal, but provided valuable information. Volunteers were asked about other avocational archaeological experience so that it would be clear whether or not their answers were based on more knowledge than that provided by PIT. They were, however, asked to draw on their PIT experience(s) when answering questions. I also asked them what they hoped to learn by participating in a PIT project. Finally, I asked if they had any ideas on how to improve the PIT program.

Archaeologists were asked two extra questions. First, I asked what they wanted volunteers to take away from their experience with PIT. This, I hoped, would elicit each
of the three goals I was testing. If it didn’t, then I would know that specific goal was probably not being emphasized on that particular project. This group, too, was asked how they would improve the program.

**Interview Procedures and Analysis**

I contacted members of both groups by telephone. I asked each about a convenient time to set up an interview, which would also be by telephone. We scheduled and conducted interviews between November 1996 and January 1997. After obtaining permission from the informant, I tape recorded each interview. One interview with an archaeologist failed to record. One archaeologist was interviewed in person in my office. I transcribed each tape, generally leaving out “ums”, “you knows”, and other filler words. The tapes and transcripts remain in my possession.

I then analyzed the transcripts. I considered each question and each participant individually. What follows is a formative evaluation (Jensen 1993) of how well the Passport In Time’s excavation projects in Oregon and Washington are meeting the goals of conducting research, public education about archaeology, and creating a constituency of advocates for the resource.
The Archaeologists

The Passport In Time program prides itself on decentralization. Forest and District Archaeologists receive a binder of information that takes them through the necessary steps of listing a project in the PIT Traveler. They receive suggestions on how to run a successful project, but they retain ultimate control of the project. There are no absolute rules on which volunteers to accept, how many to accept, how many days to keep them, how to train them, etc. The archaeologist has remarkable freedom to tailor the individual project to her or his needs. Therefore, whether or not Passport In Time meets its goals is tremendously impacted by the input of the archeologist leading the project. It would be impossible to accurately evaluate PIT without getting the perspective of this crucial group of people.

The ten archaeologists interviewed for this study were asked eleven questions (for a list of the questions, see Appendix D). Four of these questions pertain to the goal of using the PIT program to conduct research. Three questions involve teaching volunteers about archaeology, and two concern building a constituency of advocates for archaeology. One question covered all three of the goals, and the final question asked for ideas on improving the program. Each goal will be considered individually, and a final analysis will be provided in the concluding chapter.

To get a sense of how the archaeologists viewed the goals of the program, each was asked, “What did you want the volunteers to take away from their experience?” A perfect fit between the archaeologists’ answers and PIT’s goals would indicate that the
overall management of PIT and the archaeologists in the field agree about what they are trying to do through the program. Therefore each archaeologist ideally should have answered that the volunteers would gain an understanding of the research they make possible, they would gain knowledge about the past and how and why to study it, and the volunteers would become advocates for archaeology.

These archaeologists had four main messages they wanted the volunteers to take away. First was a knowledge of archaeology, including skills, "an appreciation for the complexity of archaeological sites," "a feel for what doing real archaeology was, and what kinds of methods we follow, and how rigorous it needs to be." Eight archaeologists wanted volunteers to learn this. Second was knowledge of the prehistory or history of the area, which five archaeologists wanted the volunteers to learn. Five archaeologists also wanted the volunteers to learn about "the goals of preservation and protection." The archaeologists felt that these three ideas were integrally related to one another; for a volunteer to learn about one he or she would have to learn about the others. Finally, three of the archaeologists stated they wanted the volunteers "to go away and be advocates for archaeology in society."

How do these answers fit with the goals to be evaluated here? Two of the goals are clearly important to the archaeologists. They want volunteers to learn all about archaeology and history and prehistory. They hope to enhance the protection of sites by getting the "message out at a grassroots level." Research was not mentioned, but was implied in the answers dealing with knowledge of archaeology in general.
Goal 1: PIT Allows Archaeologists to Conduct Research

Each project leader was asked, "Do you feel the PIT program has allowed you to conduct research you would not otherwise have been able to do?" The answers to this question were eight resounding yeses, one qualified yes, and one no. The archaeologists brought up several important points as to why the program allows (or does not allow) research.

Perhaps the most obvious way the PIT program can allow research is by providing a volunteer work force. As one archaeologist put it, "...I think it's a really economical way of getting the work done that we just would not have been able to afford otherwise." Three other project leaders agreed with her, although one acknowledged that PIT excavations do take longer to get the same amount of work done. The lone dissenter to this question, though, felt that using volunteers actually costs more: "...the one we did here last year...for probably...2/3 of the money that we spent on PIT projects, I could have accomplished the testing in-house with labor that I already had for the summer."

Four of the archaeologists feel that PIT allows them to conduct research because it allows them more choice in projects. In the beginning of the PIT program, forests received money in their budgets that was earmarked for PIT. After several years the money started coming with the rest of the Heritage Resources budget, but forests were still expected to spend a certain number of hours involving the public in archaeology. Thus, a portion of a forest's or a district's budget is to be dedicated to public archaeology, with the rest to be spent on their usual compliance work. As one archaeologist put it, "...the money dedicated to the Passport In Time program is able to be aimed toward
research as opposed to projects, which often other federal funds are directed for, and other funds don’t always come up in the research arena.”

Six of the archaeologists, however, do not see research as the primary goal or focus of the PIT program. In fact, the one archaeologist who answered “no” to this question said, “The way I understand the program and its goals... if I answered yes to that question I would be kind of outside the framework of the project.” He felt that PIT was not designed to allow archaeologists to do research. Although the other archaeologists did not go that far, they did feel that public education is a much higher priority. For one archaeologist, “the most important thing that we get out of it is what the stewards themselves both bring to the experience and take away from, and then spread the word in terms of research stewardship and the importance of preservation of the past and how archaeology is conducted and what its conservation ethics are.”

Reasons for Excavation

Each archaeologist was asked, “Why did you excavate that particular site?” to determine whether the goal of research was playing a role in that decision. (The “particular site” was one of the excavations conducted between 1991 and 1993. These ten archaeologists had worked on fourteen different PIT excavation projects in that time frame. One archaeologist talked about both projects he had worked on, so for this question explanations for eleven sites are provided.) The archaeologists gave three different answers to this question. Four of the eleven sites were excavated to answer
research oriented problems or, as another archaeologist put it, “originally I just wanted to clarify what the heck was going on there archaeologically.”

The second answer to this question was resource protection. Two of the sites were being damaged by looters. For one project, “it was kind of an attempt not so much to salvage, but to determine if there were indeed intact deposits remaining and should any other additional protection measures be instituted.” Another site excavated as a PIT project was eroding out of a river bank following a flood. The archaeologist determined that excavation was the only way to salvage the information the site contained, and the PIT program was the only way she could afford to do it.

Finally, archaeologists excavated sites for the PIT program as compliance projects. Before any ground disturbing work can take place on federal land, cultural resources must be evaluated. This evaluation involves determining whether an archaeological site is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Four of the projects were done “largely because we had potential development scheduled...[and] we needed to find out what we had there.” None of the archaeologists explained why these projects were done through PIT rather than with regular staff.

**Volunteer Qualifications**

When an archaeological site is excavated, it is destroyed. The excavation cannot be repeated by another scientist to confirm or dispute results. Only the artifacts and the notes of the archaeologists about the excavation remain. Therefore it is vitally important that the excavators know what they are doing and use methods internally consistent with
one another. Without good methodology and careful work, an excavation is simply vandalism. To discover how the archaeologists in this study felt about the abilities of their volunteers, each was asked, “Do you feel that the volunteers were sufficiently qualified to dig, or did they compromise the integrity of the data in any way?”

Every project leader felt his or her volunteers were qualified to dig. They offered several key reasons for this. Most important was supervision. The document each PIT leader receives from the National Coordinator suggests a volunteer to archaeologist ratio of 4:1 (Osborn 1991). This is consistent with what the archaeologists in this study had, although one managed to get a 1:1 ratio. They preferred to have one archaeologist or archaeological technician per excavation unit of volunteers. Five archaeologists recognized the varying experience levels of the volunteers and paired the more experienced with the less experienced. Considering “...some of the more seasoned [volunteers]...are as experienced as any of the archaeologists around,” this is certainly a reasonable way to go. Another common pairing done to assure more accurate work is that between a volunteer and a field school student. (Seven out of the fourteen 1991-1993 PIT projects were run in conjunction with a field school. With the exception of the presence of a professor and students with background knowledge of archaeological method and theory, the experience for the volunteers in terms of training and skills learned was no different than other projects.) The field school students generally had taken classes in anthropology and archaeology, giving them “at least...the methodological, philosophical background...” of the discipline. The archaeologists were clearly concerned that the newest volunteers have immediate access to someone more knowledgeable.
Another important point is that most archaeologists leading excavations at some point learned how to excavate, often by attending a field school. Three archaeologists in this study felt that the quality of work on PIT projects is no less than that on field schools. In both, one finds “a steep learning curve.” One archaeologist acknowledged that “the error rate...[is] definitely greater compared to a professional contracting company that hires only experienced archaeologists for a dig.” This same project leader felt that the focused information on archaeology that most field school students have served to make the error rate on field schools slightly less than that on PIT projects. One archaeologist solved this by requiring volunteers to take a class at the community college prior to participating in the project: “having that educational component prior was real helpful, just to have a better understanding of the goals and methods of archaeology, and field archaeology in particular.” On the other hand, one archaeologist found, “these people generally have a real keen interest in it and usually they’re pretty well read up on the subject ahead of time.”

Naturally, mistakes have been made by volunteers on PIT projects. According to these archaeologists, no major problems were caused by volunteers on their projects. One archaeologist had volunteers he termed “steam shovels” who simply dug too deep, too fast, too carelessly. He dealt with this by moving them to a unit where a great deal of overburden needed to be removed. Another project leader found that some of the older volunteers had trouble seeing very small artifacts. She addressed this by pairing them with younger, less far-sighted people. Another archaeologist provided a cautionary message: “I still feel that you are running a bit of a risk, and I know for a fact that a lot of mistakes
were found afterwards. Most of them were correctable, but even with a correctable error you still have to wonder...."

Three archaeologists acknowledged that volunteers cannot dig sites as well as more experienced professional archaeologists. This does not mean that volunteers should never excavate a site however. As one archaeologists put it, “I don’t see how anyone could say they weren’t qualified because then you did not have a properly designed project. We designed our work to the expertise we had available.” Another archaeologist felt that a site with simple stratigraphy requiring basic skills was certainly within the grasp of inexperienced volunteer excavators. On one project the volunteers “added to the level of research by finding new archival sources and things like that” on their days off.

**Status of the Report**

These ten archaeologists were chosen because they led a PIT project between 1991 and 1993. (Some had lead more than one, bringing the total number of projects to fourteen.) They have had at least three years to complete the report on the project. Each was asked, “What is that status of the report?” Until a report is completed and accessible to other researchers, the archaeologist’s job is not done. Non-completion of reports is a rampant problem in archaeology, definitely not limited to the Forest Service in general or to the Passport In Time program specifically. However, PIT is designed to teach the public the difference between scientific excavation and site vandalism. It hopes to show that the excavation and the artifacts are simply a means to an end—the information shared
in the report. For these reasons the project report takes on even more meaning and importance.

Of the fourteen projects discussed specifically in this question, seven reports are done. Four of these were done by the Forest Service alone, two were done by professional contracting companies, and one by a university and a contracting company. Seven reports have not been completed. Six of these reports were contracted to universities, whose projects were done in conjunction with a field school, and one is the responsibility of the Forest Service alone. One archaeologist did not mind that the university she is working with is not done with three reports: "does take more time to finish the final report than if we had a contract, definitely. But to me, that's OK, as long as it gets done eventually, because it's certainly done in a way that educates a lot more people and does provide a report. So you have to be patient... and you don't have as many strings to pull to hurry these people along in these kinds of agreements." Another archaeologist provided an explanation for why the projects the Forest Service is responsible for writing up don't get done: "...if you pressure the district archaeologist to finish, it's not their main job. Their bosses don't care, and in fact tell them on a regular basis, 'we're not in the business of doing research,' and that's a valid point, they're not."

Does the Passport In Time program meet its first goal; does it allow archaeologists to conduct research they would not otherwise have the time or budget to conduct? As a group, these archaeologists say yes. However, it is not their highest priority. Perhaps this explains why all of them are not choosing PIT excavation projects on the basis of research questions. Perhaps this lack of emphasis on research explains why only fifty percent of the
reports are complete. Even if their goal is not research, however, they all do want to do good science on the excavation. Volunteers are carefully supervised and paired up to create a balance of skill levels. Projects are selected with these skill levels in mind. The data are not compromised on PIT projects. It appears that although research is not a primary goal of the archaeologists leading projects, it is a by-product.

**Goal 2: PIT Teaches About History and Prehistory, How and Why Archaeology is Done**

Whether or not the Passport In Time program teaches volunteers about history, prehistory, how, and why archaeologists study them is the second goal to be examined in this study. Only the volunteers can say what they have learned, but the archaeologists leading PIT projects play an important role, as volunteers can only learn what they are taught. The questions posed to the archaeologists pertaining to this goal explore different ways of teaching, what was taught, and how archaeologists managed volunteers.

**Lectures About Archaeology or Other Subjects**

As indicated in the discussion of research, PIT is a decentralized program. Project leaders have a great deal of freedom in determining what to include. All archaeologists interviewed answered yes to the question, “Did you have any lectures or anything like that at night or at lunch about archaeology or other related subjects?” This question was asked to get a sense of what volunteers were learning, and how they were learning it.

These archaeologists used a variety of educational techniques to teach the volunteers about the bigger picture of archaeology. Formal, regular lectures were
common, but two archaeologists recognized that information could be passed on informally as well. Informal information sharing methods included “rants and *ad hominem* attacks by the archaeologist,” and “constant chatter as the day went on.” For one of the archaeologists, “we had more of a sitting around talking about it than we had lectures.”
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*Figure 2* Volunteers at a flintknapping demonstration

Other types of programs were used to get various messages across about archaeology. Visual media such as slide shows and videos were common, although conditions such as lack of appropriate space, electricity, and general site location limited their use. Three projects included a demonstration of flintknapping. One archaeologist brought interpretive displays to the site for the volunteers.
Topics covered by this supplementary education varied. Seven covered the general prehistory and/or history of the area. Seven got into more specific aspects of archaeology, such as soil stratigraphy, ethics, and looting. Three archaeologists used guests to lecture about “things related to various aspects of forest management, kinds of issues that were related to the culture history, things about forest change in regard to human impact, fire history, that kind of thing.” Other topics included botany, ethnobotany, wildlife biology, soil science, geology, and presentations by American Indian tribes. As one archaeologist pointed out, “the Forest Service is a great pool of scientists, ologists of various sorts who can just come out and share their knowledge.”

This question elicited a couple of elements that go into the archaeologists’ decision-making process in regards to lectures or other activities. One archaeologist felt that aside from furthering volunteers’ knowledge of archaeology, lectures met his goal of “bringing people together throughout the week, not just during working hours.” A couple of project leaders recognized that there can be too many lectures: “Sometimes they were so tired, dusty, and dirty they just wanted to go to the nearest shower.”

Training Volunteers

Integrally related to the question of supplementary education is one about the primary education of training volunteers for the activities associated with excavation. Each project leader was asked, “How do you train your volunteers?” Again, the answers to this question reveal that there is no PIT-wide protocol. Each archaeologist had her or
his own way of getting the volunteers to the point where they could work effectively, and many were unable to really describe the process.

A few elements were common to all projects. For some amount of time on the first day volunteers received orientation and training. The time varied from two hours to two days, with the whole first day being typical. One archaeologist complained that volunteer turnover necessitated starting over in the middle of the week. The period of time a volunteer was required to commit to the project influenced training time for some leaders, but had no effect for others. One summed it up: “Probably the main part of their methods training was to just pair them up and get hands-on experience and to watch and learn. There just wasn’t enough time to teach archaeology.”

Orientation included a variety of activities. Two archaeologists took the volunteers to other sites in the area. Three showed them the types of artifacts to look for, using artifacts previously excavated from the site to be dug. Four used “a combination of classroom and the field.” Volunteers were lectured on the background of the site and general archaeological methods. The next step often involved watching either more experienced volunteers or the staff work: “It’s just gradually breaking them in, letting them see what’s happening, get a feel for the questions we’re asking, then stepping into the activities.”

Once it came time to actually put the volunteers to work, three archaeologists started them off where they could do the least harm. Mapping surface artifacts serves many purposes—it familiarizes the volunteers with the material culture on the site, it introduces them to how to map, and it does so in a non-threatening (because it is not
destructive) way. One project leader had volunteers watch as the staff set up the grid on the site, hoping this would deepen their appreciation for how and why artifacts need to be mapped into three dimensions. One archaeologist summarized the gradual non-destructive to destructive progress of his training:

We usually...laid the site out, mapped the site initially, looked at any surface manifestations that were present, either in terms of house pit depressions, surface artifacts, mapped those. That would be followed by, say, shovel probe testing to determine where the greatest concentrations of materials were located and that did two things. It enabled us to better understand the horizontal stratigraphy and at the same time it got our excavators and volunteers familiar with cultural materials, how to identify flakes, how to identify bone, and so forth.

Another important element in putting the volunteers to work excavating has already been discussed. Once the volunteers were in the pits, they received “on the job training.” “Peer training,” where inexperienced volunteers were paired with experienced volunteers or field school students was a common technique, supplemented by intense staff supervision. Two archaeologists pointed out that the training was also useful to Cultural Resource Technicians within the Forest Service and students trying to decide whether to pursue an education in archaeology.

Using All of the Volunteers

The final question relating to the goal of teaching volunteers about the hows and whys of archaeology is “Did you find that you had trouble using all of the volunteers?” My original intention in asking this question was to learn if many of the archaeologists had encountered volunteers who were not physically able to do the work the archaeologist
wanted them to. Two of the archaeologists were informed up front that this is what I meant. The others, however, were allowed to take the question where they wanted, and most interpreted it to mean, "Did you have enough work for the volunteers to do?" After letting them answer that question I asked all of them but one about the physical abilities of the volunteers. The question was asked because of the belief that the primary way in which the Passport In Time program teaches volunteers about archaeology is experiential. If the volunteers are unable to participate in the experience (because of physical limitations or lack of work), they will not learn as effectively.

None of the project leaders had trouble with the physical abilities of the volunteers. As mentioned earlier, one archaeologist encountered older volunteers with poor vision for small things, but she solved that problem by pairing the older set of eyes with a younger set of eyes. Otherwise, archaeologists "made accommodations" or "arrangements." As one archaeologist said, "some folks...couldn’t...get down into the units to bend over and trowel and do that sort of thing, but they still wanted to come, so we just had them work on the screen and doing feature notes and level notes and that sort of thing." Two archaeologists summarized the general feeling of the group. "...we were able to find them meaningful tasks within their abilities" and "...there’s always a job for somebody."

The alternate interpretation of the question brought up a common complaint. The first problem is to figure out how many people are needed for the project so one does not "end up with a bunch of people standing around with their hands in their pockets." Next, the project leader has to get that number of people to the project: "You still have to
almost in a sense overbook because there’s always that last minute cancellation or what I call no-shows who don’t bother to tell you they can’t come.”

This is related to another problem: on an excavation “there [are] some things that really can’t be done by a lot of people.” At these points, archaeologists may feel like they are “spending a lot of time making sure that everyone [feels] busy and contributing fully.” Some archaeologists solved this problem by having extra activities. One had volunteers pin flag surface artifacts during down times, another had an endless shake-splitting job, another moved backdirt, and one did archival research.

Are PIT volunteers learning history and prehistory, how and why archaeologists study it? They should be. They receive training through lectures, slide shows, videos, demonstrations, interpretive displays, observation, and hands-on experience. These mixed media appeal to all different types of learners. They are kept busy with a variety of activities. Perhaps most importantly, the archaeologists recognize that they are not teaching volunteers about and training them for one excavation. They are introducing them to the broader interdisciplinary concept of archaeology, and how it is used both to answer questions about the past and teach us about the present.

**Goal 3: PIT Creates a Constituency Advocating for Archaeology**

To determine whether Passport In Time is meeting its third goal, each archaeologist in this study was asked two questions. Like the second goal, only the volunteers themselves can really provide the answer. However, these two questions were
designed to elicit information on whether or not the project leaders were trying to create this constituency, whether it was a priority for them.

**Preservation/Protection Issues**

Archaeologists were asked, “How do you address preservation/protection issues on your PIT projects?” The rationale behind this question involves a belief that when volunteers are introduced to the laws that protect archaeological resources, and receive an explanation as to why the laws are necessary, they will begin to understand that archaeological resources are non-renewable. If that message is internalized, volunteers are more likely to actively protect resources themselves.

Two of the archaeologists did not specifically talk to the volunteers about the laws. One felt that it was not necessary because the volunteers are not looters: “I don’t think we emphasized [the laws]. People that we get participating on these projects aren’t the ones that are collecting and breaking the law.” Other archaeologists, though, told of reformed looters who are now PIT volunteers. The other archaeologist who did not discuss the laws felt that the message of protecting sites could be conveyed effectively without a “systematic lecture about the goals of preservation.”

A discussion of looting or site vandalism often came up because the site the volunteers were excavating had been looted. In one case, a road had been built before tough cultural resource laws were enacted: “When the construction crews went through there building that road...they recovered all kinds of tools and whatnot....We talked about how that would go today, in terms of the types of survey and mitigation that would have
to be done before that kind of project could be implemented.” Another springboard for
the topic was visiting local sites that had been damaged. As one archaeologist said,
“...part of all of our PIT projects involved taking people to other sites so that they could
see examples of house pits, examples of rock shelters, and in all cases there were examples
of site theft. Maybe it might have been ten, fifteen years old, but...basically protection and
preservation always came up in one way or another.”

Six archaeologists did talk to volunteers specifically about laws, especially the
Archaeological Resources Protection Act and the National Historic Preservation Act.
After getting across that “there are laws against it and there’s fines and there’s potential
for jail time and stuff” and “if you find something leave it in place,” the archaeologists
found that they could reach the volunteers even more effectively with a discussion of why
these laws exist. They felt there were two main reasons for these laws. First is that
archaeology is about information, not artifacts. The information only exists in the
relationship the artifacts have to each other in the ground. Looting a site destroys the
information forever. As one archaeologist said, “we try to use examples of how
excavation is done and then how that information is later analyzed and later reported on as
the responsible way to deal with the past as opposed to...pothunting and site vandalism,
and why that destroys information and is essentially affecting a non-renewable resource in
a very negative way.” Related to that is why archaeology is worth time and money: We
“delve into what archaeology is really all about in terms of managing information and
using that information to reconstruct the past and not just for culture history, but use it to
address issues as they relate to human ecology and human economics and you can actually
address research questions and therefore why it’s really important for all the data to be intact and properly recorded and articulated.”

For these archaeologists the second reason for the existence of laws to protect cultural resources is more philosophical. First, if a site is on public land, “it’s really not appropriate to pick something up and decide it’s yours; it belongs to everybody.” Another archaeologist expanded on the idea of preservation, suggesting it can mean different things to different constituencies, especially American Indian tribes. Perhaps the best expression of why preservation is worthwhile came from a discussion of the built environment:

The historic preservation specialist from Region Six [came] out and talk[ed] to people about the value of preserving historic structures and did a wonderful job of kind of imparting a philosophical sense of not only maintaining our historic connection through maintaining these structures but also when building new recreation structures building them with a sense of history, bearing in mind that we are building things that will have historic significance in the future.

Finally, two archaeologists mentioned the relationship between archaeological ethics and site protection laws. Archaeologists can be looters if they do not write up their findings from an excavation. The information the in situ artifacts provide must be shared with the wider community. One archaeologist summarized the general feeling about talking about preservation/protection issues: “It’s just an ongoing discussion all the time. One of the reasons why we’re doing the PIT projects is for preservation.”
Other Ways to Support Archaeology

Having given the volunteers a reason to want to advocate for archaeology (whether it was information, ethics, respect for the law, or a philosophical desire for connection with the past), how did the archaeologists capitalize on the motivation? Did they turn the volunteers’ knowledge into action? Each archaeologist was asked, “Did you provide volunteers with other ways to support archaeology?” If they needed clarification, they were asked, “How do you, through PIT, help build a constituency advocating for archaeology? Do you tell them about avocational groups, the National Trust, the Archaeological Conservancy?”

The answers to this question reveal that there is no consensus as to exactly what constitutes advocating for archaeology. Three archaeologists felt that simply making sure “they were aware of other opportunities in the PIT program” was enough. One felt that repeat volunteerism was evidence: “If they weren’t advocates for archaeology, they wouldn’t come back year after year.”

Another archaeologist began his participation in PIT with that same point of view, but the volunteers changed his mind: “We were ready to send them off with the idea of doing Passport In Time projects in the future and that was about it. And they were ready to bite off a bit more than that.” As a result, “we gave them names and addresses of organizations they could join as well as government officials they could write and say, ‘Hey, heritage resources are important. I did this project and this is an appropriate way to spend federal money.’” Another archaeologist allowed other volunteers to “make that information available. I did not specifically push it. I did not feel that would be
appropriate.” Four of the other archaeologists also seemed concerned about what their role in actively creating a political constituency should be.

Giving information about avocational archaeological groups was the most popular way to encourage volunteers to continue involvement in archaeology outside of PIT. The Oregon Archaeological Society was the most popular program, but information about the Friends of PIT (an organization created to lobby for the continued existence of PIT) was also made available, either by the archaeologist or by one of the volunteers with the archaeologist’s permission. One archaeologist “let people know about the Association of Oregon Archaeologists, the Oregon Archaeological Society, and then the local archaeological society in Central Oregon, and then the Society for American Archaeology as ways to get involved, and maybe attend regional meetings like the Northwest Anthropological Conference.” An example of dramatic success in mobilizing a group of advocates came from one archaeologist. He, and others in the area, had helped create an avocational group from people participating on PIT and other volunteer projects: “A little over two years ago, almost three years ago, actually, the Archaeological Society of Central Oregon was born and now it’s going very strong with over 100 members.”

Aside from simply getting volunteers to continue their participation in archaeology or encouraging them to join organizations or write politicians, three of the archaeologists hope the volunteers will share their knowledge with friends and acquaintances, thereby building the constituency by word of mouth:

I think the forest’s objectives have been to have them go home as missionaries and stewards for the protection of the past and understand that preservation can take many forms, and in some cases for archaeology preservation involves scientific excavation, and that excavation is not an
end in itself... But I think more important than that is just an appreciation for the prehistory of an area and send out ambassadors for support to protecting and managing cultural resources.

Two archaeologists recognized a way to multiply the effect of word of mouth testimonials: teachers. One had a specific teacher workshop, while another simply noted that "...a large portion of our volunteers are teachers.... They really appreciate having gained that knowledge and then they hopefully will spread that out to their students."

By introducing people to laws about archaeological resources, why these laws exist, and why looting is so damaging, the PIT program should be creating a group willing to advocate for archaeology. The problem with this goal is operationalizing the variables — how much advocacy is enough? If simple participation in archaeology is sufficient, project leaders are doing very well. If, on the other hand, PIT wants a more empowered constituency of volunteers actively advocating to protect archaeological resources and to encourage further research, the archaeologists need to understand what sort of a role they are allowed to play, and then make it easy for volunteers to act. Introducing the volunteers to avocational groups is certainly a positive first step.

This chapter has investigated the role archaeologists are playing in Passport In Time reaching three of its goals. First, does the PIT program further archaeological research? From these archaeologists we have learned that it does, almost in spite of itself. Research is not a high priority. Second, is PIT teaching volunteers not only about history and prehistory, but how and why archaeologists study it? These archaeologists are doing their best to ensure that it does. They appeal to various learning styles and cover a wide variety of subjects, knowing that the volunteers should learn not only skills, but gain an
understanding of the discipline. Finally we considered the building of a constituency advocating for archaeology. The archaeologists provide information on why archaeology is important and why it must be done in a certain way, creating a motivation for supporting archaeological activities over unsupervised digging. They are not, however, taking full advantage of the motivation by consistently directing it into useful activities, such as avocational or perhaps even lobbying groups.

The archaeologists, however, are only part of the picture. Passport In Time’s goals cannot be evaluated in depth until the volunteers’ viewpoints have been considered. Further analysis of the effectiveness of the archaeologists activities on behalf of PIT’s goals will be presented after the data from the volunteers are presented.
The Volunteers

Volunteers are the reason the Passport In Time program exists. Two of the three goals tested in this study are phrased in terms of a change in the volunteers’ behavior and knowledge. If the program is to be successful in meeting its goals, the volunteers must learn about history and prehistory, how and why archaeologists study it and then become a constituency of advocates for archaeology because of their PIT project. The third goal, of conducting research, is made possible by the volunteers—they are the reason projects are held and the labor pool. Clearly, this population must be surveyed if one is going to determine the efficacy of the program.

The selection of the volunteer pool has been outlined in the Methodology chapter. I do not claim that the respondents are representative of the entire population of volunteers on PIT excavation projects or even Oregon PIT excavation projects. (For a demographic profile of a typical PIT project volunteer in 1994, see Appendix E.) These volunteers are, however, people who felt that they had something to say about the program. The information they provide gives a good idea of what at least some PIT volunteers are getting from their experience.

Of the twenty volunteers interviewed, only three had no prior experience with archaeology. One had taken courses in college and worked in her school’s archaeology laboratory. The other sixteen had been on PIT projects before; several volunteered multiple years on the same project. For four of these sixteen, this was their second project. The other twelve had participated in five to twenty-four prior projects. Nine had
other experience with archaeology, including volunteering with universities or professional contracting companies, participation in the lobbying group Friends of PIT, membership in archaeological organizations such as the American Institute of Archaeology and the Society for American Archaeology. A few volunteers had attended regional or national meetings, and one had presented papers. All of the volunteers with archaeological experience outside of PIT belonged to avocational archaeological societies. (This includes the six volunteers identified because of their membership in the Oregon Archaeological Society.) One had joined after participating in a PIT project. This group was asked to do their best to draw on their experience with PIT when answering questions.

After determining each volunteer’s prior experience, each was asked, “What did you hope to learn by participating in a PIT project?” The purpose of this question was to determine the volunteers’ goals going into the program. What were their expectations? The answers will give an idea as to how well PIT is projecting its goals to the public before they volunteer. Ideally, volunteers would want from PIT exactly what PIT wants volunteers to get from PIT. There should at least be some overlap. A good fit between the goals of the organizers and the participants should mean a positive experience for both.

These volunteers wanted to learn about three main subject areas through their participation in a PIT excavation. Twelve of the volunteers hoped to learn about the prehistory and history of a particular area, or the country in general. Learning archaeological methods was the second most popular answer to this question, seven volunteers wanted to learn “the excavation techniques and all of the techniques in looking
for artifacts and learning something,” or specific skills, such as “excavation and cataloguing, processing, profiling, surveying.” One wanted to put skills learned elsewhere “to work so that they wouldn’t fly out of [her] brain and body.” Five volunteers wanted to learn about archaeology in general. This answer ranged from the relatively simple “I was going to learn how archaeological digs worked” to a more sophisticated desire to learn “about the archaeological areas within the forest and why they are important and why they need to be concerned about them and put on various forms and so on and what’s important about learning about the history of archaeological sites.” Other reasons for participating on PIT projects included a desire to meet people, an interest in a particular culture, travel to new places, family considerations, trying to determine whether to pursue archaeology as a career, and a desire to involve one’s self “in something that was more giving than taking.”

If one considers the three goals tested in this study loosely, an argument can be made that they fit the volunteers’ hopes going in. The volunteers unequivocally want to learn about history and prehistory, and how and why archaeologists study it. Although not one volunteer mentioned the word “research,” the desire to contribute to public service can be interpreted as contributing to research, and wanting to learn more is in this case accomplished through research. They want to learn how to do research, and in the process, they help the Forest Service do it. One would not expect the volunteers to say that they wanted to donate their time to PIT in order to become advocates for archaeology. However, they have identified an interest within themselves, and are trying to develop it and channel it into a useful venue.
Goal 1: PIT Allows Archaeologists to Conduct Research

The question of whether the PIT program allows archaeologists to conduct research they would not otherwise have had the time or money to do cannot be answered by the volunteers. Therefore, this goal is covered more thoroughly in the chapter dealing with the archaeologists’ responses. It is not unreasonable, however, to believe that project leaders would let volunteers know that they personally, and the PIT program in general, were both contributing to and perhaps making possible archaeological research. To see whether volunteers knew the goals of the excavations they worked on, each was asked, “Why was the Forest Service excavating that particular site?” Because the Oregon Archaeological Society volunteers in this study were not chosen because of their participation in an excavation of a particular site, I chose one site they had worked on in the summer of 1996 and asked them why it was excavated. I followed that question up by asking whether such information was typically covered on other PIT projects they had participated in.

Six of the volunteers understood this question to be, “How did the archaeologist know that there was a site there to excavate?” A typical answer was, “I think they were looking around there. I think somebody just happened to see a large concentration of flakes when they were camping out or something there in that spot.” Volunteers who provided answers like this were further prodded with questions like, “Do you know if they were planning to build a road in the area, or have a timber sale?” This question did not generally help. What these answers indicate is that the volunteers are interested in how archaeologists recognize sites from their surface manifestations. Two volunteers seemed
particularly impressed that sites could be found at all: "Somebody had very good
knowledge of what we were doing. We weren't wasting any time." Six, however, were
not very well informed, saying that the archaeologist had made a "pretty good guess" that
there would be a site in that particular location.

Ten of the volunteers were working on excavations that were either testing a site
to determine its significance (whether or not it is eligible for the National Register of
Historic Places) or to mitigate negative effects that a ground disturbing project will have
on a site. These projects help bring the Forest Service into compliance with the federal
legislation protecting archaeological resources. Ten volunteers showed good
understanding of how the Forest Service deals with the Section 106 (of the National
Historic Preservation Act) process both on a general level ("I see the Forest Service being
required to protect the cultural history of an area" and the PIT projects are part of doing
that) and quite specifically: "...They were excavating some test areas because there was a
big forest project. It was a logging project that was going to go on in that area, and so we
were assisting in some of the testing that had to be done to see how destroyed or how
valuable the area was as to the amount of things that could be destroyed." Three
expressed concern about potential looting of a site if a complete data recovery project had
not been done.

Five volunteers gave the impression research was the goal of the excavation, even
if they did not use the word. Four answers resembled the archaeologists' vaguer answers,
for example they excavated the site for "the obvious reason of gaining more information
about the area." Four volunteers provided specific questions that were to be answered
through excavation; all of these questions involved who lived at the site and what they were doing. A general answer was the excavation took place “mainly just to get it on record and provide historic documentation of...Oregon’s first official years of land use and how that plays a part in the Forest Service.” Two volunteers specifically said they were guessing, providing what they thought was a good reason to have conducted that excavation.

The volunteers’ knowledge of why the excavation they worked on was conducted can be interpreted in three ways. First, perhaps they once knew the answer to this question but they have since forgotten. These interviews were conducted four to six months after the specific projects. As one volunteer said, “I probably could have told you that last summer. I don’t recall now the situation on that.” Another possibility is that they never knew the answer to this question. One seasoned volunteer indicates that this may be the case:

There generally is a difficulty in saying, ‘We’re doing this because we have a question to answer.’ And I’ve objected to that. In some cases it seems a little cloudy on what the question is you’re trying to answer....[Research questions] may be a little more important to me and my wife simply because we’re, maybe we’re a little more critical of the archaeological field itself....Maybe we’re a little more critical of the discussion centering around what the science is involved in this than is necessary for most of the people who are involved. They may not be interested.

Another long-term volunteer has had a different experience: “In general, I have not seen a project that I’ve been on that has not been explained at least within an hour’s period of time why the work was being done and what they expected to get out of it, for what purpose.” That brings up the third interpretation: it was a poorly phrased question.
get a truer sense of whether volunteers understand that research is happening, a better question would have been, “What specific questions was the archaeologists trying to answer by excavating this particular site?”

**Goal 2: PIT Teaches About History and Prehistory, How and Why Archaeology is Done**

The question of why the site was excavated does provide some information about another issue. The answers the volunteers gave contribute to the evaluation of the second goal of Passport In Time. These volunteers are clearly learning how and why archaeologists study the past. Ten understand that ground disturbing activities, including timber sales and grazing, require the evaluation of sites. Twelve are learning how to recognize archaeological sites through survey. Four even know the types of questions archaeologists ask of the archaeological record.

**Training**

Another question aimed at determining what the volunteers learned about archaeology and history/prehistory was, “How were you trained?” The volunteers’ answers to this question are reminiscent of the archaeologists’ and once again emphasize the variety of training methods within Passport In Time’s excavation projects. One volunteer summed up the situation: “There was a fairly wide range as far as training is concerned.” Many volunteers were unable to come up with answers beyond “Trained? Well, I kind of wasn’t. I just went up there and...the anthropologist there just sort of put us to work.” Answers such as these were followed by further questions drawn from
answers given in earlier interviews, such as “Did they tend to pair less experienced
volunteers with more experienced volunteers?” and “Did they have lectures or spend time
in a classroom?” Volunteers with extensive experience were asked to tell about their best
training experience and a more typical one.

All projects began with some sort of overview or orientation to the site. For four
volunteers, this meant receiving “reading material that explained to us about the local
Indians and so forth” or “literature on exactly how to dig test pits” before they even came
to the site. Training started at the site and could last for a half an hour or up to three days.
One repeat volunteer found, “the introduction on each of the projects we’ve been on has
talked about who the people were, what the evidence was so far that lead the
archaeologists to feel like this was an important thing to look at.” Other topics generally
covered included typical artifacts the volunteers might find, use of tools, how to fill out
paperwork, and an overview of excavation techniques. Five orientations included lectures
by people other than the archaeologists, including geologists, biologists, and fish and
wildlife specialists.

Another common theme in orientations was touring sites. For a large excavation,
a tour of the site the volunteer was to work on was enough: “The whole hike up they
pointed out...areas and explained the history. Even before we got up there they had
explained the general site and the history of the site and what they had known. And when
we got up there they gave us a tour and went over the maps with us and the sites
themselves.” Five drove around to sites in the area to get a better sense of both the
history and prehistory of the area, and what was happening in the archaeological record:
"We went around and we saw everything of what was going on, and previous projects, and previous digs, and things like that."

When it came down to actually digging, eleven volunteers felt they got the bulk of their training on the job. One volunteer’s experience was typical, “I guess it’s just by participation and they tell you how to do it and when it comes to the excavating part, well, there are certain rules you have to follow, certain things that you have to put down as you’re going down.” Another volunteer’s description, “it’s just hands-on experience....A lot of the people in OAS and also the older PIT people are very, very helpful in helping you....It isn’t a competitive thing, it’s a team thing,” brings up another important aspect of on the job training: pairing more experienced volunteers with less experienced volunteers. One volunteer found that the archaeologists would “get you started properly and then expect the person who’s had some experience to carry on.”

Supervision by the archaeologists was also important. These volunteers emphasize that the archaeologists did not withdraw after the specific time allotted for orientation or training was up. Perhaps the fact that the entire experience was viewed as a training exercise explains the relative inability of archaeologists and volunteers to explain how it happened. A volunteer on his first project found, “it was pretty open so if you felt like you weren’t quite capable of handling the situation...they would still work with you, to help you get caught up,” a situation similar to that found by a man on his eighth project. He said that a two hour introduction, “doesn’t mean that they would not help you in training all the way along if you had questions and that sort of thing. If you wanted help on anything, why they were right there.” More intense supervision makes for a better
experience for the volunteer: “The fairly good ones involved having pit supervisors who were fairly careful about making sure that volunteers knew exactly what was expected and checking back on a constant basis to make sure that people were doing things the way that was desired.” One volunteer felt the best project he had been on had staff at every pit and screen, and another said, “that one-on-one sort of stuff really helps.”

The volunteers who contrasted their best training experience with a more typical one brought up several key points. For every one of them, the best training was a longer one—at least one full day, and up to three. It also involved a mix of teaching styles, including classroom time (on a variety of subjects), site tours, hands-on work, and demonstrations: “The archaeologist got down and he said, ‘OK, we’ve laid out these units and this is how you do trowelling, how you pour stuff into the bucket, this is how you do screening. You watch out for walls that you have, you don’t dig down into things’, and all these kinds of things related to actually how you do the physical work of an excavation.” One volunteer provided an outline of a good training program: it provides an understanding to the volunteers of what they are expected to be able to do, and what they might not be able to do and when they need to call upon the supervisors for help....[It] make[s] the volunteers aware of how they are going to be used, and how they are best going to help the professionals ...collect the information....I’m finding that archaeologists can benefit from using experienced volunteers that have been on other projects with them, who know the ropes, being coupled with other people who don’t know the ropes. And that works very well as a training aspect.
Archaeological Skills Learned

Although some volunteers had trouble expressing just how they were trained, they certainly knew what they had been trained in. Each was asked, "What archaeological skills did you learn on your PIT project?" Some answers, such as "how to go about it" were considered insufficient, so I asked about specific skills, including excavation, screening, mapping, survey, and laboratory work were asked about. Members of the Oregon Archaeological Society and other avocational archaeological societies were asked to limit their answers to skills they had learned or put into practice on PIT projects.

Every volunteer had excavated on their PIT project. This included screening. Fourteen had done paperwork associated with excavating (mapping, level forms, feature forms, etc.: "They expected you to do the mapping of your own pit"). Seven had done other types of activities, but one couple serves as a shining example of what volunteers can learn through PIT:

We've done excavation, and that includes the entire gamut from setting out an excavation site, laying it out, doing all the related paperwork, mapping, stratigraphy, reporting of artifacts, in some cases soils, samples, the basic Munsell sample test, soil testing, through the digging that has ranged from mattock and shovels, large-scale earth moving, to trowel and broom work. The screening. A lot of the reporting that goes along with it, the various level reports, daily reports. Artifacts, including drawing the artifacts. Photography, setting up the photograph and doing the photography of sites....We have done shovel testing on a PIT project. We have done just the general walk-over type surveys. We have done mapping of sites and areas. We have done winter projects that included research, artifact curation, anywhere from washing rocks to sorting and doing some preliminary analysis, flake analysis and that kind of thing. Lots more paperwork, inputting into the computer....The general handling of site materials, and let's see, what else? I have been working on transcription, oral transcription from oral interviews into written documentation.
One way to ensure that people get experience doing a variety of activities is to rotate them through all of the jobs, a technique used by some project leaders.

Figure 3 A volunteer shares knowledge of stereoscopes with an archaeologist

Three volunteers brought up a problem with training and the skills one can learn on a PIT project:

Different people in different areas have different requirements, and consequently if you go over there with a set idea of what you’re going to be doing and how you’re going to fill out the forms, well you better have another think coming, because each individual place has their own requirements and they want it done in a certain way and so forth, so you pretty much have to learn all over again as far as filling out the information. It’s all generally the same, but specifically it could be quite different by different archaeologists.
Volunteers who brought this up were asked if they found this situation frustrating or confusing. One indicated that there was nothing that could be done about it, so it wasn’t worth worrying. Another, however, took great pleasure in introducing different ideas to different archaeologists, who sometimes took advantage of them and put them to use.

**Cultural Group Which Occupied the Site**

The final question volunteers were asked under the category of the second goal was, “What cultural group occupied the site you worked on and when?” This was something about the site that every volunteer should have known before they started digging, except when those were the very questions the excavation was trying to answer, which was the case for two of the projects. Of the twenty volunteers, ten were able to tell both who and when. One knew when but had forgotten who. Four knew who but had forgotten when. Two had forgotten both. One did not answer when. (He was asked but went on to another subject and forgot to answer when.) All who had forgotten had been told at the time of the excavation (“I should remember that, but, no, I don’t”), and many had literature in which they could have looked it up.

A few interesting points were brought up during the interviews. Four volunteers dealing with prehistoric sites showed good knowledge of dating, both through projectile points and radiocarbon tests. One noted that “some of the things that we found were 6000, 7000 years old. So whether that was still the same Indian group is questionable, whether that was the Paiutes, but we know that the Paiute were there during the
homesteading time. Along with an understanding that climate change and other factors may have influenced migrations among the people, the volunteers understood that most American Indian groups of today are associated with a geographic region, but that they are not ruled by it: "I believe that we found artifacts, as far as projectile points and so on, that include several cultures from that central Columbia Plateau area, indicating that it's kind of a transition area between some of the northern bands, perhaps the Shoshone and Bannock, and some of those on down into the more central southern eastern Nevada type of Ute."

There can be no doubt that volunteers are learning from their participation in PIT projects. They are learning about the history and/or prehistory of the area through the literature sent to them, from the lectures and orientation they receive, and by learning who lived in the site, when, and in many cases what they were doing there. PIT excavation projects are also teaching volunteers how archaeologists study the past. The long and varied list of skills they have learned proves it. Perhaps the only part of this goal left wanting is why archaeologists study the past. Part of this is covered in the answers to why a site is being excavated, and what sorts of questions it will answer. Many archaeologists have trouble answering why archaeology is important, but the answer to it can be the key to achieving PIT's third goal.

**Goal 3: PIT Creates a Constituency Advocating for Archaeology**

To determine whether or not PIT is building a constituency of advocates for archaeology, volunteers were asked three questions. Two are the same questions asked of
the archaeologists. These should tell how well the message is getting through. The third question is a somewhat objective measure of an important aspect of supporting archaeology.

**Looting and Cultural Resource Law**

Each volunteer was asked, “What were you told about looting and laws that protect archaeological resources?” As with the archaeologists, the idea behind this question is that an understanding of the laws and why they exist will create a more active constituency. This hypothesis was supported by the fact that many volunteers used this question as a springboard to jump into different ways the public can get involved in protecting archaeological sites. These ideas will be discussed more fully under another question. As one volunteer put it, “all of the projects we’ve been on have encouraged...the idea of public awareness to...try to help guarantee a little more safety and protection for some of those areas.”

Site protection was addressed in some form on all projects. As the volunteer who has been on twenty-four PIT projects said, “I can’t think of anybody who didn’t say something.” Nine specified that the archaeologists covered the subject in the orientation to the site. Two volunteers said discussions were more casual: “I guess the bottom line is that there was a great deal of awareness on the part of the staff and consequently it was extended to the volunteers, of the need to preserve and protect artifacts.” A looted site is the perfect visual aid for this discussion, and six volunteers were either excavating a site which had been damaged, or visited nearby looted sites. As one particularly upset man
said, “Every place we go we find looting....It’s just unbelievable the damage they’ve caused. And that’s been in every, every site,...and I’ve been on...seven or eight or nine sites.”

In general, it seems that the archaeologists tailored discussion of laws and proper behavior around archaeological sites to the individual projects and volunteers. “They did make certain that we knew we couldn’t take any artifacts out of the site on our own and that they all needed to be left in place or bagged and mapped and taken out under archaeological methods” was typical of how the issue was handled. Three volunteers noted that most of what they knew about cultural resource law came from involvement in avocational archaeological societies or college classes rather than from PIT projects.

Five volunteers showed greater understanding of the bigger picture behind these laws. One saw the loss of knowledge that sites exist because of illegal collecting of artifacts removes the surface manifestation of the site: “They’ve said that [looting] is a problem because every surface artifact picked up you lose information because a lot of times, like if you have a timber sale,...you’ll have to walk the area and just look for areas of artifacts on the surface. If everybody goes in and takes one, there’s going to be nothing left.” Another volunteer knew that collecting can destroy more than just the surface manifestation of a site: “It’s against the law and there’s a lot of information lost when something’s taken out of context. These tin cans are pretty worthless, but where they lie there’s a wealth of information.” The philosophy behind the laws seems a helpful way to get this messages across. Two volunteers noted that visits by American Indian tribes, who
expressed why the sites are important to them, made them even more adamant that sites must be protected.

When one volunteer was asked whether the archaeologists told him about laws, he said laconically, “Oh certainly. But you’re preaching to the converted.” Another volunteer, however, provided an anecdote which suggests that perhaps the converted can reach out to the heathens:

Most of these people learn in that process that there is a better way to do it, and in fact, in one particular case, I was at a survey and excavation and this guy said he had gone out with somebody else who was out digging and he said, “Well, I kind of felt uncomfortable with it, but the guy seemed to know what he was doing, but he wasn’t really an archaeologist,” and he said, “Now that I know what’s going on, and where things are at, I would never have gone out with that [guy].”

Archaeological Sites on Private Property

To see just how converted all the volunteers were, each was asked, “If you found an archaeological site on your property, what would you do?” In most places, archaeological sites that are not burials on private property can be treated as the owners see fit, unless the property is undergoing a development supported by federal funds. Therefore, fear that someone would know they would potentially break the law should not have given them an incentive to lie. However, each volunteer knew that I am an archaeologist, and may have learned enough to know that archaeologists don’t care for the idea of amateurs digging sites without adequate supervision. The placement of the question may also contribute to dishonest answers, by asking it right after the question
about laws that protect archaeological resources, an indication was given as to what the
correct answer should be. These answers did sound sincere, and show that at least the
volunteers have learned enough to know what will be perceived as the “right” answer to
the question.

Seventeen volunteers said they would “notify the proper authorities.” Twelve did
not specify who this archaeological authority was. Three felt it was the Forest Service,
one would find one at the nearest university, and four knew to contact the State Historic
Preservation Office (SHPO). They all knew they “wouldn’t have any of the skills and
knowledge of how to handle it;” one said emphatically, “I certainly wouldn’t go digging it
up myself.” Two, however, felt, “it would be very tempting,” but decided “I would
probably feel guilty if I didn’t” tell somebody about it.

Three volunteers progressed immediately from finding the site to excavating it: “I
would want it to be unearthed and see what we could get from it.” Four, however,
recognized that not all sites need to be excavated. Five, however, were ready to start
elsewhere. For one, “I would probably try to determine first of all, has it been recorded?
Second of all, I would, if it hasn’t been recorded, determine to what effort we need to go
to record it.” For another couple, “the first thing we would probably do would be to map
it, survey it and map it. And get a report in to the State archaeologist’s office....Neither of
us is too hot on the idea of digging just to dig....[We] would see if there is a value or if it
just stays put for a future time.” The other three would also record first. These six
volunteers all have extensive experience and belong to avocational archaeological
societies. Perhaps volunteers who only know PIT excavations do not know about
recording sites and other ways to manage sites and learn from them without excavating them.

The three volunteers who did not immediately state that they would call an archaeologist showed a deeper understanding of some of the issues involved. One noted, “I could probably do what I wanted to with it as long as it wasn’t a human burial, but regardless of what it was I would still notify SHPO because of the impact on the area. There’s not much known about the Tualatin Indians.” For another, “I think it would depend a little bit on how you defined archaeological sites.” She knew that some sites have more to them than others, and if she found one that had “serious archaeological implications” she would call in an archaeologist. The third volunteer recognized that his answer would have repercussions for his property: “Now personally for myself, it would depend... Now let’s say I had a hundred acres and I had found a mammoth or an Indian long house, or something like that. I’d try to work something out with one of the universities to investigate it further. But as far as my little 75x125’ lot, that remains to be questioned. I’m walking both sides of the line, you know.”

On the whole, the answers to this question are very encouraging. Rather than making volunteers feel that they are archaeologists after a few days of digging, participating in a PIT excavation is clearly giving them an understanding and appreciation for the complexity of the job.

Finally, volunteers were asked, “What have you done with what you learned as a PIT volunteer? Did the project leaders provide you with other ways to support archaeology? Did they tell you about avocational archaeological societies, the National
Trust, or the Archaeological Conservancy?" Eight were told about various organizations, primarily avocational groups or the Friends of PIT, although as one said, "the only group that I have heard talked about at any of the projects is the Oregon Archaeological Society, and that's because on at least half of the projects that I have been on have been members....I guess I've just heard it talked up by the other volunteers, as opposed to the archaeologists." Three volunteers specifically said they were not told about other organizations, and at least one felt "as far as pushing it, no, I don't think they do it as much as they should." A contrast to this is the creation of the Archaeological Society of Central Oregon largely out of former PIT volunteers, including one in this group, as was discussed in the archaeologists' answer to this question.

The main thing that volunteers are doing with their PIT experience is talking about it. Friends, family, associates, and co-workers are all targets. Volunteers talk about different aspects of the program. One says, "I think what we've tried to do is to let other people have some understanding and appreciation so that they have a feeling, so that they have some, at least through us, some degree of participation in a subject that is interesting to everybody." Another takes a different tack:

From my insight into the looting aspect I've been able to educate other people on not going down to the forest and saying, 'Oh, here's an Indian arrowhead! I'll pick it up and put it in my pocket.' And a lot of it is just being able to educate other people as far as the laws of ARPA and some of the other laws, and also realizing that we can learn from our past, whether it's historic, which in the western US is, what, about 150, 200 years, but also learn about the Native Americans and appreciate what these people had to go through to exist.
Two volunteers are likely to do plenty of talking in the future; their experience on PIT projects has inspired them to major in anthropology in college, in preparation for careers as archaeologists.

The PIT experience has prompted some of the volunteers to organize. Two formed the lobbying organization Friends of PIT, which works to keep funding for the program, so that people can continue to learn more about archaeology. The others are rallying around stewardship. One couple believes that public participation in general will foster stewardship: “We had first lobbied pretty loudly, through our archaeological group and in talks that we’ve had personally, my husband and I, in visiting various state archaeologists, the importance of trying to enlist the aid of the general public to enhance awareness and encourage people’s appreciation of archaeological sites, so that they may take a stronger stewardship-type of attitude about sites and artifacts.” In some places, the professional community has not been receptive to their ideas. Another volunteer wants a program where volunteers check on sites, monitoring them for damage. He has “been talking to...the archaeologists for the BLM and Forestry [sic] Service up there in the Umpqua National Forest about starting a, like a stewardship like they have in Arizona.” Another couple indicated their willingness to participate in such a program should it come into existence. Finally, a volunteer with a success story of a constituency of advocates: PIT “has led to the formation of the Archaeological Society of Central Oregon, and as such, within a year and a half they were deeply involved in starting up a stewardship program for sites. That gives you some way in which PIT leads and gives people information that allows them to go on and form other things that can help.”
PIT is teaching its volunteers that archaeological sites need to be protected. Volunteers know of the information that can be lost both through reckless digging and surface collection. The volunteers appreciate that it takes years of training to be able to excavate a site and recover all the information it contains. They are taking this knowledge and spreading it, most effectively through informal conversations. It is mainly a grassroots constituency of advocates for archaeology because “the PIT program helps a great deal in involving the general public, because what you know about and hear about you’re going to be more careful about.” Those who know and have heard even more are working even harder to advocate for archaeology, through the Friends of PIT, avocational archaeological societies, and nascent stewardship programs.

This chapter has investigated the volunteers’ role in helping PIT achieve three of its goals. First, is the PIT program furthering archaeological research? The volunteers cannot really answer that question, but they do indicate that the research aspect is not overly emphasized to them. The PIT program receives very high marks for its second goal. The volunteers certainly know a fair amount about the history/prehistory of the area they worked in. They know an extraordinary amount about how archaeologists study the past. Some show better understanding than others about why archaeologists study it. Finally, the volunteers are a constituency of advocates for archaeology; they want to protect sites, and are telling everyone about it. Some are even trying to mobilize others into active protection through stewardship programs.

Once again, the volunteers are only part of the picture of what makes up a PIT program. To truly understand how well PIT meets its goals, one will have to consider the
interaction between the two populations that go into PIT: the volunteers and the archaeologists. Each has so far been considered individually. The following chapter will explore both why and to what degree PIT’s goals are being met, and provide suggestions for improving the success of the program in meeting them.
Conclusion

As discussed in the introduction, there is no doubt that the Passport In Time program is involving people in archaeology. It is a natural outgrowth of legislation that sought to protect archaeological sites by teaching people about them. PIT has grown from its modest beginning in the Superior National Forest to a nationwide program involving thousands of people. We have explored the theory behind PIT and seen that the program should be successful in teaching people about archaeology. PIT has more than just that one goal, though. The purpose of this study has been to evaluate how well PIT, through its excavation projects, is meeting three of its goals: 1) PIT allows archaeologists to conduct research they would otherwise not have the time or the money to conduct; 2) PIT teaches the public about history and prehistory, as well as how and why archaeologists study them; and 3) PIT builds a constituency of advocates for archaeology.

To this end, both volunteers and archaeologists were interviewed. The questions and answers have been presented in previous chapters. This chapter addresses what the answers reveal about the attainment of these goals. Recommendations for more successfully meeting the goals and an exploration of the future of PIT will follow.

The bulk of the information on the goal of allowing research comes from the archaeologists. They were questioned about whether they felt the project allowed them to conduct research, whether the volunteers were qualified to do that research, why they excavated the site, and whether a report had been completed. Volunteers were asked why the site they were working on had been excavated. The answers brought up a number of
interesting points. First is the question of money. The volunteers felt that they were saving taxpayer dollars through their work. Nine of the archaeologists agreed. The question of what exactly a PIT project costs versus the returns should be explored. PIT keeps track of volunteer hours, and then transforms them into a dollar amount. Jack Ward Thomas, then Chief of the Forest Service, noted in a 1995 memo that the Forest Service had received "a 160 percent return on [its] investment in PIT." He did not, however, specify what constituted that investment.

Closely related to the question of money is that of project choice. If a project that would be done anyway is done differently or more thoroughly as a PIT project than otherwise, then research is probably being done. If an archaeologist is able to excavate a site to answer specific research questions solely because there is a need to conduct a PIT project, then surely the program is allowing research to be done. The latter is not saving taxpayer dollars because it is not a project that has to be done. That does not mean it is not valuable; rather it is an expansion of the Forest Service archaeologist's duties in a direction that most archaeologists would support. Rather than letting compliance projects dictate work, the archaeologist is allowed to investigate a problem that will contribute to a better understanding of the archaeological record. This is, in fact, the type of project advocated in PIT's "Philosophy and Guidelines" (Osborn 1991). It should, however, be made clear to the volunteers that the project would not take place without them. They are not, in the strictest sense, saving the Forest Service any money.

Another important point in the goal of research is the qualification of the volunteers. On some level all archaeologists felt they were able to dig without
compromising the integrity of the data. Some, however, recognized that it was helpful for volunteers to have more background on the methodology, philosophy, and theories of archaeology. This kind of information comes through in classes—field school students have it, as well as those required to take a class before excavating. The knowledge makes for better excavators, which contributes to better research. There is not time to impart more than a kernel of this information in training and orientation sessions before excavations begin.

One way to address this problem would be to develop a sequence of projects. PIT projects today often require volunteers to have experience in a particular skill. These skills could be carefully taught on special PIT projects. Projects could be labeled beginning, intermediate, and advanced. The projects for beginners would have longer and more general training periods, and a higher archaeologist to volunteer ratio. The advanced projects would be assured of well-trained and knowledgeable volunteers. The archaeologist leading an advanced project could design a more complicated project and save time on training.

Whether an excavation is taking place ahead of a ground disturbing project or it is simply to answer a specific question, a site is being destroyed. Information is coming out of the site, but unless it is shared, it does no good. Archaeologists share information through the publication of reports. Fifty percent of the projects asked about in this study have finished reports; the other half are in progress. An interesting lesson is that if it is necessary to have the report soon, the Forest Service is better off writing it itself or
contracting the work to a private company. Universities, all of which conducted PIT projects in conjunction with a field school, are very slow to finish.

Whenever the report gets done, it or a summary should be sent to volunteers as recommended in PIT's "Philosophy and Guidelines" (Osborn 1991). This shows them that the project did not end with the removal of artifacts from the ground. It gives them a much better understanding of what questions were answered by their work. They see the process of research. Finally, it is an ideal way to thank them for their time. One archaeologist expressed a desire to have a special forum for the publication of reports of PIT projects. Volunteers could subscribe to such a journal and learn about other projects.

To really understand how well PIT is meeting the goal of conducting research, it is necessary to know just what the program's organizers mean by research. Are excavations ahead of compliance projects enough? PIT specifically indicates that compliance projects are inappropriate for volunteers (Osborn 1991). Is research in physically managing cultural resources on the ground (versus answering specific questions about the past) acceptable? Is the simple fact that excavations are being done and reports eventually are written sufficient? Once these questions are answered, PIT can decide what to do.

Currently, research is not a priority with the archaeologists leading projects. Rather, it is a by-product of the work they are doing educating the public about archaeology. This attitude would have to change if the importance of research is to come through in the projects and to the volunteers.

The interviews with the archaeologists showed that they are doing their best to teach volunteers about the past, and how and why archaeologists study it. They do this
through training and lectures, and by providing plenty of work for the volunteers. In answering questions about their training, skills, and the particular excavations they worked on, volunteers proved that they have learned a great deal.

The most interesting aspect to the answers to these questions is how the archaeologists are trying to teach the volunteers. These archaeologists, who presumably have little or no training in education theory, have recognized that different people have different learning styles. Because of these styles, people learn more effectively in different ways. Kolb (1984:68-69) recognizes four distinct learning modes: concrete experience, which emphasizes feeling over thinking; reflective observation, which highlights ideas through watching; abstract conceptualization, which stresses thinking over feeling; and active experimentation, which focuses on practical applications (see also DeFalco1995). All of these modes are addressed on PIT projects, although some get more emphasis than others.

Hands-on experience works well for those who learn best through concrete experience and active experimentation. These people should be particularly happy on PIT projects because they get to excavate, screen, map, use metal detectors, etc. This is experiential learning—"learning by doing" (Lewis and Williams 1994:5). Experiential education "can deepen and extend the nature of knowing" (Hutchings and Wutzdorf 1988:6), and is especially effective when its goal is affective in nature (Smith 1976). This is true because people are learning from the feelings they experience as they participate (Huron 1989). PIT hopes to evoke protective feelings toward archaeological resources (Osborn et al. 1993) from its volunteers, so its experiential format is doubly effective.
But PIT does not stop at experiential education. When the archaeologists have volunteers watch others perform skills before the volunteers perform themselves, or bring in flintknappers to demonstrate how flakes are created, they are reaching the people who understand through reflective observation. The lectures, or classroom learning, provide "a broad fundamental structure of a field of knowledge" (Hooks 1994), giving the background information on archaeology which appeals to the abstract conceptualists. The volunteer who learns best this way is able to put the ideas together into theories.

It is important to remember, though, that even though people may highly identify with one of the above learning modes, different situations call for different ways of learning (Bruner 1985). Thus "the combination of all four of the elementary learning forms produces the highest level of learning, emphasizing and developing all four modes of the learning process" (Kolb 1984:66). By providing videos, demonstrations, lectures, and on the job training the archaeologists are teaching more fully about archaeology. They also recognize that experience, in and of itself, does not guarantee that learning has taken place (Washbourn 1996; DeFalco 1995; Chickering 1977).

The volunteers are learning. They enjoy the different activities, and in fact want even more. Different volunteers identified different events that particularly reached them. They want even more time spent on orientation so that they can have a fuller understanding of how what they are about to do fits into the discipline of archaeology as a whole. They like the lectures by non-archaeologists, who give them a sense of the multi-disciplinary aspect of archaeology.
Both the volunteers and the archaeologists see the entire period of the excavation as training. Rather than teaching volunteers how to work on one site, archaeologists want them to be able to apply their skills to any excavation. Many volunteers are learning more about the history and prehistory of the area, and the skills to get at that information, than why archaeology is important. They all feel it is important or they would not be donating their time, but there does not seem to be a very coherent explanation for why. This is probably a reflection of what they’re getting from the archaeologists. Therefore, archaeologists should work on incorporating this message more clearly and explicitly into their overall training. Such a message is difficult to convey experientially, so extra effort needs to be made to reach everyone.

PIT projects could in fact have themes. Rather than just skills and culture groups, a project could promise to teach about a certain aspect of archaeology as well. Volunteers could sign up for an intermediate prehistoric excavation with a special emphasis on cultural resource legislation, or archaeological theory, or some other aspect of the discipline. Volunteers could discuss the subject while working and during lunch, and gradually obtain the background knowledge the archaeologists wish the volunteers had.

The question of why archaeology is important becomes crucial when it comes to the third goal. In order to advocate for archaeology, one must care passionately about it. An analysis of this goal is made difficult by the imprecision of language. What exactly makes an advocate? Is it enough to just care? Is participation in PIT enough? Or do volunteers need to reach beyond their friends and family, to the people who make
decisions that impact archaeological resources? The answers to these questions affect the analysis of the success of this goal.

As expressed in the body of the text, an understanding of looting and laws that protect archaeological resources can help motivate people to want to advocate for archaeological sites. As discussed in the introduction, a full understanding of what sort of damage is often done to sites, how people can help prevent it, and identification with the managers of resources will reduce damage to archaeological sites (Gramann and Vander Stoep 1987; Vander Stoep and Gramann 1987). Archaeologists are talking about site damage and they are taking volunteers to see damaged sites. Volunteers learn how to modify their behavior to prevent damage to the sites. By working side by side with the archaeologists and by learning what archaeologists study, and how and why they do it, the volunteers identify with the archaeologists' goals of managing and protecting archaeological sites. The volunteers are internalizing this message; none would dig a site on their own property without help from an archaeologist. Some volunteers are clearly ready for more ways that they can help prevent damage to archaeological sites than simply modification of their own behavior.

Some archaeologists are providing volunteers with other ways to get involved in archaeology. Generally this is through avocational archaeological groups, but some provide information on national organizations, and some give names and addresses of people who control archaeological sites on public land. Others feel that this is inappropriate. Clearly, what role the Forest Service can play in disseminating information on lobbying for protection of archaeological sites needs to be explored and explained to
project leaders. Many volunteers expressed a desire for such information to be made easily available.

The subject of stewardship came up many times in the interviews with the more experienced and involved volunteers. One archaeologist had worked to put together an avocational group and start a stewardship program. Clearly there is a base of support for other such programs. The volunteers are motivated; they are just not sure where besides PIT they can put their energy. To solve this problem, a packet of information on how to create a stewardship program could be put together. The information would be based on the knowledge drawn from programs already in existence, such as that in Arizona (Hoffman 1991). When a volunteer approached an archaeologist with a desire to organize something on behalf of archaeological resources, they would be given the packet. The Forest Service and other organizations that manage or work with archaeological resources would reap the rewards of the program, and the volunteers would continue to contribute.

In the final analysis, is PIT meeting these goals? The short answer is some more than others. All are somewhat attained, and not surprisingly, the goal that the archaeologists hold as the most important is the most successful. Is this good enough to declare PIT a successful program? As Jensen (1993:15) says, “seldom will any program achieve all objectives equally well. The success of a program is more than the accomplishment of individual objectives.” PIT is reaching a great many people and teaching them about archaeology. This is success. There is always room for improvement, through.
Both volunteers and archaeologists were asked if they had any ideas for improving the program. Both groups wanted more money for the program. Volunteers want more people involved and more projects. They would also like to see some standardization in what PIT projects offer. Finally they would like an easy way to know other ways to participate in archaeology. This final suggestion was echoed by the archaeologists, who would also like to see some regionalization or other localization of the program. For a more thorough consideration of their answers, see Appendix F.

One archaeologist indicated that he would like to get more feedback on what makes a good program, both from archaeologists and volunteers. Currently PIT distributes a questionnaire to project leaders for volunteers to fill out after each project (see Appendix G). With a few changes, this document could produce a wealth of information. PIT could get demographic information on volunteers which would indicate where energy should be put for further recruitment. Questions similar to those asked in this study could be included to get a sense of how well goals are being met. People could indicate if they are interested in being contacted for participation in stewardship or other archaeological programs. Project leaders could also answer questions about the goals of the program and ways they feel they could attain them more successfully. This questionnaire could be a very powerful evaluation tool. The information could be collected and stored in a database until someone is prepared to study and interpret it.

This study has shown that PIT is successful in getting information across to these volunteers. They are learning a lot and enjoying themselves in the process. These archaeologists are working hard on the projects and enjoying their interaction with the
volunteers. Please remember that these conclusions are based on discussions with a very limited number of people representing only the excavation aspect of the program. The volunteers were not randomly selected and cannot be assumed to represent the entire population of PIT volunteers. However, they are people who felt they had something to say about the program. Their feedback, as well as that of the project leaders, can certainly be used in formulating more specific and intensive surveys. If PIT is to continue to get funding, it needs to know its goals and exactly to what extent they are being met.
Bibliography

Aronson, Sidney H. and Clarence C. Sherwood

Bense, Judith A.

Bernard, H. Russell

Brockett, Ralph G. and Alan B. Knox, editors

Brook, Richard A.

Bruner, Jerome

Caffarella, Rosemary S. and Bruce G. Barnett

Chapman, C.H.

Cheek, Anetta L.
Chickering, Arthur W.  
1977 Experience and Learning: An Introduction to Experiential Learning, Change Magazine Press.

Coleman, James S.  

Davis, Hester A.  

DeFalco, Anthony A.  

Des Jean, Tom  

Fagan, Brian M.  

Fowler, John M.  

Friedman, Edward  

Gramann, J.H. and G.A. Vander Stoep  

Greengrass, Mara  
Hawkins, Nancy W.

Heron, John

Hoffman, Teresa L.

Hooks, Jon A.

Hume, Gary W. and Richard A. Boisvert

Hutchings, Pat and Allen Wutzdorff

Jensen, Edward C.

King, Thomas F.

Knoll, Patricia C.

Kolb, David A.

Lewis, George S.

Lewis, Linda H. and Carol J. Williams

McAllister, Martin E.

McManamon, Francis P.

McManamon, Francis P., Patricia C. Knoll, Ruthann Knudson, George S. Smith, and Richard C. Waldbauer

McNutt, Nan

Morris, Lynn Lyons and Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon

Nickens, Paul R.

Osborn, Jill A.
Osborn, Jill A. and Gordon Peters

Osborn, Jill A., Gordon Peters, and Carl M. Davis

Rogers, Kristine Olson and Elizabeth Grant

Rogge, A. E. (Gene)

Schmidt, Chester Allan

Schuyler, Robert L.

Simmons, Alexy

Smith, K.C. and McManamon, Francis P. (eds)

Smith, Virginia B.

Thomas, Jack Ward, Forest Service Chief
1995 May 8 letter to Regional Foresters and Forest Supervisors re: Passport in Time Call For Proposals.
Tisdale, Mary, Richard Brook, Bob King, Shela McFarlen, Shelley Smith, and Gary Stumpf

Vander Stoep, G.A. and J.H. Gramann

Washbourn, Penelope

Weiss, Carol H.


APPENDICES
Appendix A: Project Proposal Form

PASSPORT IN TIME PROPOSAL

(Please, complete this form on the DG, inserting your information at the '*' and using 'indent' rather than 'tab'. Delete all instructions in parentheses, after you follow them, of course! Thank you.)

STATE

PROJECT NAME

FOREST NAME

PROJECT DATES

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(Please limit to 1/2 page - the shorter, the better!)

SKILLS

(Identify any special skills you are seeking. If you aren't requiring special skills, leave this blank.)

MINIMUM AGE

TIME COMMITMENT

FACILITIES AVAILABLE

(List campgrounds, hotels, other options, and include the distance from the site)

COUNTY

NEAREST TOWN

(Nearest town to the project. Include the distance to the site)

ADDITIONAL DIRECTIONS

PROJECT LEADER'S NAME

(This MUST be a FS person)

ADDRESS

(Include PO box AND Street address please)

TELEPHONE NUMBER

FAX NUMBER

DG ADDRESS

NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS

LINE OFFICER’S APPROVAL: NAME

TITLE
Appendix B: Volunteer Application Form

Application for Winter 1996–Spring 1997
PIT Opportunities

If you are applying with family members or with a friend, please list all names of those who will be volunteering. If they are at the same address, you may list them on the same application. If they are at different addresses, please fill out individual forms, indicating all coapplicants’ names so that we can consider your applications together. This form may be reproduced!

Name: __________________________________________________________________________
Age (if under 18): __________________________________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________________________
City: __________ State: __________ Zip: __________
Day phone: (________) __________ Evening phone: (________) __________
Special interests, skills, relevant courses, past experiences (e.g., archaeology, geology, soils, computers, drafting, public speaking, etc.):
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Have you ever applied for a PIT project before?    ☐ Yes  ☐ No
Have you ever worked on a PIT project before?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

First Choice
Forest name: __________________________________________________________________________
State: __________________________________________________________________________
Project name: __________________________________________________________________________
Dates: __________________________________________________________________________

Second Choice (For the best chance of acceptance, your second choice should fall on the same dates as or follow your first choice.)
☐ Submit my application to both projects.
☐ Consider my second choice only if I am not accepted to my first choice.

Forest name: __________________________________________________________________________
Project name: __________________________________________________________________________
Dates: __________________________________________________________________________

Return to:   Passport in Time Clearinghouse, P.O. 31315, Tucson, AZ 85751-1315
            (520) 722-2716, (800) 281-9176 voice, TTY; (520) 298-7044 fax

PIT Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 31315
Tucson, AZ 85751-1315
Appendix C: Letter Soliciting Volunteer Participation in This Study

Dear PIT volunteer:

I am working on my Master’s degree at Oregon State University. Last year I worked on two PIT excavation projects in the Boise National Forest. I am impressed by the Passport In Time program and interested in exploring how to make it an even more effective way to involve people in archaeology. Therefore, for my thesis I am conducting an evaluation of PIT excavation projects. In order to better understand how the program impacts the volunteers, I am collecting a list of participants who are willing to be interviewed about their experience. The interview will take place by telephone and last about one hour.

If you are willing to be interviewed about PIT by telephone, please fill out the bottom portion of this piece of paper and return it to the project director, who will send it to me.

Thank you very much for your help. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the address/telephone number below.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dickson
913 NW Tyler Ave
Corvallis, OR 97330
(541)753-7025
dicksonc@ucr.orst.edu

Name:
Address:
Telephone Number:

Is there a day of the week/time of day most convenient for you to be reached by phone?
Appendix D: Interview Questions

Questions for Volunteers
1. Please list all the PIT projects you have participated in, as well as any other avocational archaeological experience.
2. What did you hope to learn by participating in a PIT project?
3. How were you trained?
4. What archaeological skills did you learn?
5. What cultural group occupied the site you worked on and when did they occupy it?
6. Why was the Forest Service excavating that particular site?
7. What were you told about looting and laws that protect archaeological resources?
8. If you found an archaeological site on your property, what would you do?
9. What have you done with what you learned as a PIT volunteer? Did they project leaders provide you with other ways to support archaeology?
10. How would you improve the program?

Questions for Archaeologists
1. Why did you excavate that site?
2. What is the status of the report?
3. Do you feel the PIT program has allowed you to conduct research you would not otherwise have been able to do?
4. Do you feel that the volunteers were sufficiently qualified to dig? Did they compromise the integrity of the data?
5. What did you want volunteers to take away from their experience?
6. Did you have any lectures or anything like that at night or at lunch about archaeology or other related subjects?
7. How do you train volunteers?
8. Did you find that you had trouble using all the volunteers?
9. How do you address preservation/protection issues on your PIT projects?
10. Did you provide volunteers with other ways to support archaeology? (How do you, through PIT, help build a constituency advocating for archaeology? avocational groups, the National Trust, the Archaeological Conservancy)
11. Do you have any ideas on how to improve the program?
Appendix E: Volunteer Profile

The Ecotourism Society conducted a survey in the summer of 1994 of approximately 400 PIT volunteers on 92 different project throughout the country. Their goal was to learn what individual PIT projects bring economically to a community. They asked several questions which provide demographic information on the volunteers.

Males and females were split right down the middle. There were some problems with the grouping of age data (ages one through thirty were lumped into one category), but overall the survey shows that people fall mainly into the oldest group (51-60, 33%) and the youngest group (1-30, 28%; see Figure 1). In terms of ethnicity, PIT volunteers are overwhelmingly Caucasian (90%; see Figure 2). The largest non-Caucasian group is Native Americans, who comprise 5% of the PIT volunteer population. Figure 3 illustrates the education level of volunteers—they are very well educated. 77% of volunteers have at least some college. In terms of occupation, the largest percentage of volunteers is in the oldest age category. Figure 4 shows other popular occupations among PIT volunteers. A typical volunteer is male or female, in their twenties or fifties, of European descent, and has been to college.
Figure 1  Age of Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Percentage of Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 30</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2  Ethnicity of Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Percentage of Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 Volunteers' Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Percentage of Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades one through eight</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Volunteers' Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Percentage of Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Suggestions for Improvement

The most consistent answer from both volunteers and archaeologists on how to improve the program was to provide more funding for PIT projects. This is tied up with a program called Heritage Adventures, wherein participants will have to pay for the experience. The volunteers who mentioned this program were adamantly against it. For now, both programs will exist concurrently and separately. PIT needs to be prepared for change, though. According to one archaeologist, the Director of Recreation in the Washington Office wants PIT to pay for itself. One archaeologist suggested that a way this could happen is for volunteers to pay an annual membership to PIT. They can then volunteer on as many projects as they want. Another idea is a subscription fee for the PIT Traveler.

Another idea for saving money on the individual forest or district level is to move away from excavation projects. Several archaeologists recognized this would save both money and time. At least one volunteer wants to see multi-year PIT projects, which would take volunteers through the whole process of archaeology, from pre-field research to survey to site recording to excavation and analysis, and finally to report writing.

Next, all different types of public archaeology projects need to be given credit by supervisors in the Forest. This includes teacher in-services, but also projects that look like PIT projects but are not advertised nationally. In fact, many archaeologists hope for a regionalization of the PIT program, noting that they have a core constituency of volunteers they can call upon. Going through the clearinghouse makes for more
paperwork. This idea is fine for people who live near National Forests, but would take the opportunity for participation away from many volunteers and potential volunteers. A combination of national and local projects is the best solution. One good thing about localization is that if PIT can no longer receive funding on a national level, some form of it will continue to exist on a local level.

Archaeologists came up with a few other suggestions. One would like to create a brochure to be given to volunteers with a list of further readings and names of organizations they could join. This is echoed by some volunteers who would also like a list of people to write to in order to express their feelings about PIT specifically and cultural resources in general. One suggested the list be distributed with a blank postcard to each volunteer at the end of the project. Another problem recognized by both volunteers and archaeologists is that of volunteers who don’t show up, but don’t call to cancel. The archaeologists work hard to get just the right number of volunteers, and no-shows can really upset their plans. Perhaps people who do this could be flagged in the database so that if they apply for another project the archaeologist will know they are taking a risk.

The volunteers have many more ideas. They would like PIT to advertise more. Many wish they had known of the program sooner. In order to get more projects to accommodate the added volunteers the additional advertising would bring in, these volunteers want PIT to expand to other federal land managing agencies, especially the Bureau of Land Management. They also would like some standardization of what will be covered on projects, perhaps a list of skills that must be taught on each type of project.
Finally, volunteers feel that they learn a lot from each other. They want archaeologists to bring the group together at times outside of their normal day of work.
Appendix G: Project Critique Form

PASSPORT IN TIME
CRITIQUE

Your National Forest managers want you to have an enjoyable Passport in Time experience. Please help us improve the program by taking a few moments to summarize your PIT experience.

National Forest __________________________ Date __________________________

1. How did you learn about the Passport in Time program?

2. Did you receive an orientation to the project? Was it adequate?

3. What were your duties? Was the supervision adequate?

4. What specific things did you learn?

5. Were accommodations/amenities adequate?

6. In general, was this a positive experience? What did you enjoy most?

7. What didn't you like about your Passport In Time experience? What would have improved your experience?

8. Additional Comments?

Thank you for your comments and suggestions!

Please mail to: Passport in Time Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 18364
Washington, D.C. 20036