Introduction

Heritage as Community Research

Jo Vergunst and Helen Graham

It seems that the past is not the same as it used to be. The promises of both history, in which the past is written from documentary evidence into a single authoritative narrative, and archaeology, in which the truth of the past can be revealed layer by layer in a site, have been redeemed by the figures of the historian and the archaeologist as experts on the past. Both have stood their own tests of time and it is not our purpose to undermine them here. Instead, this book explores how not all accounts of the past are created by those means and by those figures. We consider the ways that the past can become something different: more akin to a journey in which the destination is uncertain than a pre-existing set of facts that is waiting to be discovered by the historian or archaeologist. The single expert figure of the historian or archaeologist no longer of necessity takes precedence in finding the way and is replaced by a looser collective made up of interested amateurs, 'communities' and 'the public', and professionals who may contribute their own skills and resources but by no means 'own' the research.

In this regard the rise and proliferation of discourses around heritage are a positive development. The meanings of heritage shifted in the 1970s and 80s from the medieval sense of inheritable property to the now mainstream form of historical narrative or material that resonates – somehow – into the present. Associating heritage with the present might feel counterintuitive, and yet the ways that heritage opens on to questions of past, present and future has proved to be both powerful and useful. In one way, heritage can be said to differ from history by way of the latter's fixation on the past compared to the former's emphasis on bringing the past into the present. Through the process of bringing the past into the present the notion of inheritance is broadened from the individual to the communal, and from the legal to the symbolic.

Dictionary definitions of heritage are perhaps unsurprisingly behind the curve in this respect. Webster-Merriman give us 'legacy', 'inheritance' and 'tradition' (Webster Merriman, 'heritage'), and following a list of 'inheritance' definitions, the Oxford English Dictionary provides a further sense of heritage as follows: 'Characterized by or pertaining to the preservation or exploitation of local and national features of historical, cultural, or scenic interest, esp. as tourist attractions' (OED 'heritage'). A crucial insight of the newly cohering field of Critical Heritage Studies, by contrast, has been to characterise heritage not as fixed in specific buildings or objects, or focused narrowly on preservation and then exploitation, but more broadly as a social process of meaning making (e.g. Harvey, 2001: 320; Lowenthal, 1998: 226; Kirshenblatt Gimblett, 1995: 369; Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996: 6; Smith 2006: 3).

A central theme of the book is that neither 'preservation' nor 'exploitation' – nor, indeed, simply claiming heritage as a process – adequately conveys the active nature of *inquiry* that seems so significant in much community-based heritage. In the cases presented in this book – and which form our contribution to the ongoing

exploration of the processes that make heritage – what enlivens relations with the past is more an ongoing process of finding out, sharing, debating and undertaking small-scale acts of stewardship. These are stories that are worked on and pieced together collectively and with meaning for current circumstances, not simply uncovered, retold and 'used' in straightforward historical or archaeological modes or directly taken into institutional forms of governance. So 'heritage' as we understand it in this book is about relationships created through inquiry; between past, present and future; between people and between people and things.

In noting the processual nature of heritage, a discursive turn has been a crucial feature of Critical Heritage Studies. Laurajane Smith (2006) opens her influential book *The Uses of Heritage* with a discussion of heritage as discourse, noting how 'heritage' has become part of Romantic and nationalist ideas of the past as a source of meaning and interpretation of the present. Many other scholars have explored how discursive processes shape the past and how the past is understood in the present (e.g. Kirshenblatt Gimblett, 1995; Lowenthal, 1998), deconstructing what Smith terms the 'Authorised Heritage Discourse' of professional museums and official heritage sites. One response has been to critically unpack the meanings behind such renderings of the past and the politics that underlie them, revealing inequities and exclusions (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). Another, as noted by Smith (2006, Ch. 7) and powerfully articulated by Raphael Samuel in *Theatres of Memory* (1994) and which is the focus of this collection, is to fully recognise that there are other ways of producing accounts of the past. What happens when communities, or collectives of people interested in exploring their own pasts or those of the places around them, actively create their own heritage that links between past and present?

For us, one implication is that the methodological focus can be usefully shifted from a discursive analysis of heritage in the critical tradition, which tends to look back in order to diagnose and unveil power and inequality, to more appreciatively noticing, enacting and creating different kinds of knowledge through doing heritage. This is what we describe throughout this book as 'Ways of Knowing'. From the point of view of the communities involved with heritage through research, it is not simply about discursively arguing against a mainstream interpretation of the past, but of making their own way into an exploration of the past. While the cases here function on the 'local' level in one sense, they are considerably more than just local history. Instead they locate what may be much broader processes in specific situations of places and people. Framing this work as 'inquiry' also draws attention to the ways in which 'ways of knowing'; are also *ways of acting* in the world, ways of creating change and using the past for future-making, what we call, in the second part of the collection, 'Heritage as Action'.

Cross-cutting these themes, a further facet of virtually all research is that things do not go as planned and unexpected turns, changes and outcomes will occur. Some of these are problematic in the short term but turn out to be significant in a different way later – points of learning or crossroads in which the direction of research changed. Our exploration of community heritage research feeds back into reflections on the nature of research and inquiry, including the role of the university and the possibilities of more democratic relationships of knowledge.

This, then, is the agenda for our book. *Heritage as Community Research: Legacies of Co-Production* explores the nature of contemporary heritage research in the UK involving communities. It puts forward a new view of heritage as a process of research and involvement with the past, undertaken with or by communities for whom it is relevant. Rather than just reflecting on existing discourses *about* heritage, the book's contributors present community-based research *into* heritage in which histories are explored through new modes of production: crossing disciplines, sustaining partnerships, and evaluating legacies. The process of research itself, the contributors show, can be an empowering force by which communities stake a claim in the places they live.

Drawing on their experience of collaborative heritage research, contributors to the book focus on both the substance and the legacies of their work. Community-based historical narratives are combined with explorations of the outcomes, benefits or disbenefits, sustainability and value of heritage research. All of these processes feed into its legacies, a key term for us. In this book legacies are understood as the ways in which research or its outcomes continue into the future and have effects amongst people and places. Seeing synergies with our approach to heritage we read legacy – deliberately distinct from 'impact' – as about relationships too, between past, present and future; between people and between people, things and the world. We see legacy as the difference that is made – the potential that is opened up – when we treat not only research and heritage, but our places, our politics and our democracies, as collaborative inquiries.

Programmes of participatory and collaborative research are now being supported by public research funding, including the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council's Connected Communities programme. This has supported a wide range of projects with the aim of working with communities in social science and humanities-based research, including work focused on heritage from which most of the material in this book is drawn (Facer and Enright, 2016).

Conceptually, we want to bring into dialogue traditions of anthropology, critical heritage studies, and participatory and action research, as well as debates concerning community engagement in universities, museums and heritage. Working at this intersection allows us to explore the way concepts such as time, memory and materiality can illuminate participatory and action research. Equally, it allows learning from participatory and action research contexts to be brought to bear on the ongoing concerns of critical heritage studies and museum and heritage practice. The rest of this introduction illuminates these themes and sets them within three main thematic threads of 'ways of knowing', 'heritage as action', and the 'unexpected in heritage research'.

Ways of Knowing

Part 1 of the book focuses on 'ways of knowing'. These chapters explore both the distinctive processes by which collaborative and community-led heritage research takes place, and the distinctive forms of knowledge that emerge – often based in the sharing of skills, collective understanding and involvement with materials. We borrow the term 'ways of knowing' from a number of previous scholarly uses, including Mark Harris's edited collection (Harris, 2007) that explores alternatives to

the Western concepts of objectivity and positivism that have become associated with research in a scientific paradigm. These include embodied and implicit forms of understanding. As Harris notes, the phrase reminds us that 'any knowledge is inevitably situated in a particular place and moment; that it is inhabited by individual knowers and that it is always changing and emergent' (Harris, 2007: 4). Moving from the individual to the collective, Helen Graham et al. (2014) also use 'ways of knowing', in this case to refer to the distinctive 'registers, values and subjectivities of collaborative research', exploring the means by which disparate perspectives can find common ground in research. A crucial starting point here – in keeping with our approach to heritage – is that approaching knowing as a process is very different to approaching knowledge as an object, which is an underpinning precept of participatory and action research (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood and Maguire 2003; Fals-Boda 1991).

A distinction leading on from a focus on process is that our work is not about 'engagement' in heritage, if by that we mean an exercise undertaken by heritage professionals to involve communities or the public in their work. As Watson and Waterton (2011: 1) note, there has been 'a growing recognition on the part of practitioners that community engagement helps them to achieve their own objectives by marshalling public support for their otherwise arcane activities'. Such a model of engagement is predicated upon the resources to understand the past – whether substantive, methodological, or logistical – being held by experts who subsequently construct an entity (the community) with which to 'engage' in their work. Through this mode of working both 'heritage' and 'community' are fixed as different, as pre-existing each other and to be brought together via professional facilitation. In a university research context, this idea is close to those of knowledge transfer, dissemination or impact, in which the body of work pre-exists and can be conveyed relatively unproblematically to an audience upon whom is has an effect. Often those arguing against this model of 'community engagement' emphasise instead an alternative, more process-orientated, way of working, as indeed we are: one where knowing is always needing to be actively reworked, ripped up, reconstituted and created by those using it in order to be meaningful. While the growing literature on community engagement in museums and heritage provides an important grounding for this book (e.g. Lang et al., 2006; Lynch, 2011; Lynch and Alberti, 2010; Golding and Modest, 2013; Waterton and Watson, 2013; Hawke et al., 2017), the trajectory we take is to open up the distinctive contributions that thinking of heritage *as research* might offer.

To take an example at the intersection of heritage and anthropology, Alison Brown shows how a network centring on museum and archival collections of indigenous Blackfoot material inverts the usual model of 'engagement' that begins with academic and professional expertise in favour of indigenous concepts of consensus and relationship-building (Brown, 2017). Museums staff in the UK followed Blackfoot protocol for handling objects, while pre-existing modes of collaboration amongst Blackfoot partners were respected. Staff also took part in visits to the places in North America connected with the collections. Brown identifies how the very relationships of the research came to be 'co-authored' in ways not at first apparent to museum colleagues (Brown, 2017: 123) – suggesting that the

standard model of community engagement can be subverted even from within the midst of collaboration.

We might usefully explore the more diverse forms by which heritage as an inquiry and an encounter take place – beyond the sharing of a resource from professional 'centre' to community 'periphery'. In many projects it seems likely that work will proceed in a variety of ways over time. At times, heritage professionals from museums or universities may bring specialist expertise to the work but at others it may be communities who take the lead and set the agenda. Jo Vergunst et al.'s chapter (Ch. 1) describing landscape heritage research in rural Aberdeenshire is an example here, as various specialists have contributed skills in archaeology and exhibitions even as community members have set the overall agenda and methodology for the research. In the context of digital reconstructions of historic buildings, Nick Higgett and Jenny Wilkinson (Ch. 4) show how the expertise of university-based computer specialists is harnessed by communities to their own ends, even as the reconstructions themselves take on a wide range of roles once released to the communities.

Heritage as community research therefore involves particular ways of knowing that go beyond forms of engagement. This principle has guided much of the work in this book, and yet we can pursue the dynamics of such processes in more detail. How can we critically think through the distinctive social relations and the distinctive outcomes of heritage as a community research practice?

Co-production and enskilment

The notions of co-production and collaboration in research offer ways forward here. Keri Facer and Kate Pahl argue that collaborative research that involves universities with communities and other organisations has been valued in a variety of ways, including but going beyond the engagement model. They write: 'Such research is seen by some as a means of creating greater "impact" on the social world and by others as a way of enhancing the quality of knowledge; by some as a form of democratic recalibration of knowledge production and others as a way of generating more robust products and services' (Facer and Pahl, 2017: 2). Our agenda is perhaps not so broad but this does open onto the diverse and unexpected outcomes of community heritage research, which we will return to later in this introduction. Research in this form is a journey usually without usually a clear destination, at least at the start. Facer and Pahl choose 'collaborative' as their key descriptive term, but they recognise that it is not sufficient simply to claim and demonstrate collaboration in itself. There is, we might say, a danger of fetishising collaboration in the same way as engagement, and for all these processes we need ask with whom, for what purpose, and with what outcome or legacy?

Collaboration comes of course in many forms, from 'lip-service' or small in-kind contribution to joint and sustained work throughout a research process. For us, however, the co-production of research is a useful and challenging notion that adds a distinctive flavour to these debates. Research cannot be said to be co-produced by way of tokenistic participation from any partner, and if the central idea is of jointly making the research and its outcomes happen there can be no sense of hierarchy in

the various contributions that may be made. No quantitative ethical test is needed either – co-production either happens together, or not at all. So defining co-production is not a case of setting a bar at any particular level (e.g. more and more 'engagement' finally equals 'good' 'co-production'), but rather that co-production is qualitatively different and a reckoning of the creative processes of research itself. The cases in this book are not intended as exemplars of co-production in a simple positive sense, but rather as honest and reflexive accounts of heritage inquiries. Co-production becomes a means by which relationships can be traced and participation valued in a critical way.

Angie Hart et al. (2013) formulate university and community co-production as operating through 'communities of practice' (drawing on the work of Lave and Wenger), or groups that come together in joint enterprises. In their case study of groups to support disadvantaged children and families in the south of England, while seeking to demonstrate an equality of participation, and being concerned with the ethics of the process, what seems most crucial was the making of a functioning and meaningful community of practice to support activity.

A vital aspect of the community heritage research projects that we document in this book is indeed the skills that are developed amongst participants through what we could think of as their communities of practice. While the 'soft skills' or 'people skills' of communication, negotiation, project leadership and so on are all relevant and well-documented in these chapters, it is the also the range of practical research skills that are striking – even though the distinction between the two may not always be apparent. These are stories of people learning not just how to trowel in the bottom of a trench in an archaeological excavation (the common experience of amateur archaeologists joining a summer dig), but, as Vergunst et al. show, learning how to develop a project in the first place, how to carry out the full range of archaeological, archival and history tasks alongside many partners. Also using an archaeological case study, Elizabeth Curtis et al. (Ch. 9) describe how school children can be more than able to take part and take 'responsibility' in this work too. Oliver Davies et al. (Ch. 6) indicate how involvement in a dig create a pathway into higher education. For Karen Brookfield et al in Stoke-on-Trent, meanwhile, knowing is enabled through distributed community networks and the kind of social support and innovations in funding models that mean participants can 'get on with it' (Ch. 7).

To think through this conceptually, Tim Ingold's notion of 'enskilment' as a form of inhabitation and dwelling is useful. Skillful practice is not about conforming to rules, Ingold argues, and neither is skill merely an innate capacity for a task that some happen to have. Instead, it is through a matrix of social relations that skill develops and is expressed, in conjunction with specific material forms of tools and technology. Then more specifically, we can think of dexterity as being gained through 'the gradual attunement of movement and perception' – through bodily practice and improvisation (Ingold, 2000: 357). Novice archaeologists would certainly attest this as they learn to distinguish soil types and classify pot sherds as they trowel and take part in finds processing (Holtorf, 2002), but the point also stands for those reading handwritten documents in an archive, for example, where reading and translating are highly developed skills. And we could think along these lines of the confidence that is engendered in participants as research progresses and they become more skillful in both tasks requiring manual dexterity and those involving

the social relations of research (e.g. negotiating research questions, methods and outcomes). Community heritage as research, then, surely happens through enskilment more than it does through engagement.

Considering the ways of representing the research described here, it is tempting to imagine a continuum of participation from the relatively weak 'engagement' at one end, to 'collaboration' in the middle, and the relatively strong 'co-production' at the other, along the lines of Sherrie Arnstein's 'ladder of participation' (Arnstein, 1969, Facer and Pahl, 2017: 4). Attributing these labels however suggests a competitive ranking that does a disservice to what are commonly more democratic ethics of research with and by communities. From community perspectives things can look different in the sense that the professional, university-based researchers who are the starting point for the ladder of participation may actually be just one partner amongst others. More fruitful might be to explore how different ways of working together entail different sorts of social relationships, and can enable different forms of representation as well. Our chapters explore how these relations lead to different outcomes – different legacies – that are meaningful to those involved in different ways.

Dialogical approaches

To push even the idea of co-production in research a little further, it may be worth reflecting on the forms of single and multiple voicing that we present in this book. Our chapters have been created together by academics and community partners, often explicitly using dialogue as a form of writing. In so doing they find a way of allowing multiple voices and perspectives to be present. This is a challenge to models of historical, sociological or critical interpretation that privilege the individual observer of, or about, others' practices. All the research on which this book is based has been carried out collectively in various ways, although the configuration of the research teams and participants varies.

The sole single-authored chapter by Jodie Matthews (Ch. 3) still takes part in dialogue – or rather, group conversations – through social media comments and debate in the field of Roma Studies and the circulation of images of Roma people. Higgett and Wilkinson (Ch. 4), as a further example, go beyond just the provision of digital building reconstructions to community heritage projects, in order to seek out what the responses of those communities have been to the digital work. This contribution shares the authorial voice, as do Vergunst et al. (Ch. 1) and Kimberly Marwood et al. (Ch. 8), but others have kept their voices apart although very much in conversation and dialogue. Ball et al (Ch. 2) use dialogue in their chapter to explore complementary perspectives, including that of Kate Pahl as anthropologist-researcher and others as musicians-researchers. Curtis et al (Ch. 9) also keep distinct their insights as community archaeologist, school headteacher and education academic respectively, and the same is true in different ways for the chapters by Brookfield et al (Ch. 7), Davis et al, (Ch. 6) and Helen Smith and Mark Hope (Ch. 5).

The theme of dialogue in community heritage is, perhaps surprisingly, lacking in recent scholarship. Where notions of co-production sometimes tend to emphasise a molding of perspectives into a single outcome (in other words, 'the' research or 'the' exhibition), we argue that co-production in a dialogic vein enables distinctions

to be maintained, alternative views to be respected and a position from which diversity of outcomes may be welcomed. Robert Baron (2016) locates a tradition of dialogism within public folklore as a discipline in North America in the way that oral history and other performative aspects of culture have led folklorists to maintain a wide range of voices in their research rather than attempting to combine into a single authoritative account. Drawing on examples from the Smithsonian Folklife Festival and other public arts events, he writes: 'Dialogically constructed modes of presentation mutually engage folklorists, community members and audiences in representations of heritage to the public' (Baron, 2016: 593).

Baron draws on the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, and for many other humanities scholars too Bakhtin provides a key starting point for thinking about dialogue and multiplicity. His studies in philosophy and literature develop ideas that play out in many ways in this book and in particular for the contributors noted above who have chosen to present their work through more than one voice. For Bakhtin, dialogism is the study of language as it is performed, which is always with another listener or conversation partner in mind (even one's inner self): 'language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and other. The word in language is half someone else's' (Bakhtin, 1981: 293). Bakhtin also coins the notion of heteroglossia to describe the incorporation of many subjectivities into the language of a novel, and Bakhtin takes this to be the fundamental and primordial mode of linguistic communication as opposed to the monoglossic voice of the single author.

The point for our work in this book is that presenting an explicitly dialogic account of how heritage is created recognises that this basic quality of language as also a facet of sociality more generally, and the parallels between the two are striking. Anthropologists Nicholas J. Long and Henrietta L. Moore approach sociality as 'a dynamic relational matrix within which human subjects are constantly interacting in ways that are coproductive, continually plastic and malleable, and through which they come to know the world they live in and find their purpose and meaning within it' (2012: 41). We might argue that such subject relations happen between the past and present, and indeed the future, as well as just within the present.

There is, as Robert Baron also notes, a distinction between a dialogical approach and the generations of anthropologists who worked within a positivist framework to describe diverse cultures as static ideal types, usually from the singular perspective of the anthropologist (Baron, 2016: 591). While the cultural turn in anthropology began to address issues of writing and representation in the discipline (Clifford and Marcus 1986), it was the later interest in critically rethinking notions of the field and research methods that stimulated more overt reflection on and valuing of collaborative and participative forms of research. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson challenged the assumptions that fieldwork in anthropology should take place by way of the sciences model of 'the field' as a bounded area within which unbiased observation can take place (1997), and since the 1990s a new interest in collaborative research has developed in anthropology.

It is partly, therefore, with this contemporary anthropological sensibility that our contributors are reflecting, from the midst of their endeavours rather than as detached observers and evaluators. Luke Lassiter has put the process of working

together with participants on the outcomes of research as follows: 'Collaborative reading and writing emerges, like collaborative ethnography itself, as a *dialogue about* a particular ethnographic topic (...) not as a final *statement on* any particular ethnographic topic' (Lassiter 2005: 141, emphasis in original). An important point to take from dialogical texts and reflect back into our reading of co-production is that they are never the last word, and we might say they are 'unfinished' in the sense of leaving open further interaction and outcomes.

Metaphors and materials

The point of the chapters herein – both those that are explicitly dialogical and those that take a more traditional form – is in part to reflect more accurately the nature of the research process in community heritage. They have not followed the rigid plan and methodology of a laboratory experiment, but the work has rather been improvised. This might take the form of a journey through a landscape that doubles as fieldwork, which Vergunst et al (Ch. 1) develop as a metaphor. A different vision might be that of the studio which Pahl et al. (2017: 146) describe powerfully as a metaphorical – and sometimes actual – space for collaborative research inspired by practice in the creative arts 'that can hold difference, permeate boundaries, and be robust enough to collapse and reform.' Both the ideas of fieldwork journey and studio collectivity grounds research in a socially-oriented process, where shared or dialogical learning and improvisation are key.

Finding useful metaphors is always significant for this kind of research, but this is not to displace the material realities of things, sites, places and so on. Both landscapes and studios can be, after all, material as well as metaphoric entities. A further approach that underpins much of the work in this book is thus the attention to these material qualities of research in heritage. We might argue that the subjective relations that create sociality are not just between humans, as Long and Moore (2012) suggest, but also include entanglements with materials, things and places (Hodder, 2012).

Here we mesh with our theme of enskilment, in that skill is frequently enacted through materials and things that include archaeological finds, historical documents and images, and landscapes and places that bring forth the past into the present. All of these are described in different ways throughout this book. Conversely, community heritage projects are also notable for the qualities of the things they produce, such as exhibition and interpretive materials, 'new' places that are made available for others through heritage work: a library basement or an architectural ceramic door well in the Potteries in the case of work described in Brookfield et al (Ch. 7). The seemingly 'intangible' outcomes of the research presented here, such as Higgett and Wilkinson's digital building reconstructions (Ch. 4), the music of Ball and colleagues (Ch. 2), and the art and film work of Smith and Hope (Ch. 5) all operate through material forms as well. In such ways, the commonly-held boundaries between tangible and intangible cultural heritage become blurred (Vergunst et al. 2017). This allows us to note that 'doing' – inquiry – is also a 'making' with the world, and its materials are active participants. The chapter by Brookfield et al (Ch. 7) shows that learning-through-doing, specifically how to scrape wallpaper off tiles in a

basement, is a co-production of new meaning and a new material space at the same time.

There is of course no single 'way of knowing' that emerges from all this work, but while we emphasise the plurality of knowledges, the chapters in this book collectively stand for a recognition that no single account of the past, or at least of what we are describing here as heritage, can claim authority by virtue of a narrow claim to historical resource or expertise. Other dialogues need to be started up and listened to. Indeed, we might argue, drawing on Donna Haraway's work, that shared, positioned and partial knowing is even more powerful, because of the acknowledgement of the reality of where and how the knowledge has been produced (Haraway 1986). Heritage as co-productive inquiry – a way of knowing – is therefore configured quite differently to engagement, and its ethics and politics can be judged best from within and from the capacities and legacies the processes create.

Heritage as Action

Part 2 of the book focuses on heritage as action. There is a particular reason for this. Thinking of heritage as a dialogic and relational process – as we have done above – immediately requires more from us in terms of delineating and illuminating the nature of that process. In this book we have been using use 'research' – more specifically inquiry – as a way of opening up certain ways of thinking heritage-as-a-process. Yet in the same way as heritage-as-a-process, thinking research-as-a-process only takes us so far and also opens up further questions.

We note an unhelpful elision at work in the turn to process. This critical move has had the effect that collaborative work is often judged primarily by is relationships, by its ethics not the quality of the outcome. As Clare Bishop has put it in a participatory arts context: 'today, political, moral, and ethical judgments have come to fill the vacuum of aesthetic judgment in a way that was unthinkable forty years ago' (Bishop 2004: 77). An allied concern has led Facer and Pahl (2017: 5) to argue for the need 'to move away from the assumption that collaborative research is to be judged only by the degree and quality of public/community engagement at all stages'. The crucial shift enabled by framing heritage and community collaboration as inquiry is to see 'knowing' not as static but as future-making; where quality is not judged either by only its ethics – *have you been 'good'* – or by peer-review ideas of quality – *is it good quality* (which arguably this is where Bishop's aesthetics lies) – but by whether the 'knowledge' produced leads to action. Is the collaboration productive of meaningful potential for those involved? In response to our interest in delineating further 'process' as a critical descriptor, the theme emphasized in the second half of the book is that of 'action', with traditions of 'action research' and 'participatory action research' being mobilized in different ways through the chapters. Drawing on these traditions allows us to identify a variety of different processes at work in community heritage.

A key aspect in this – which enables the link between our themes 'ways of knowing' and 'heritage as action' – is to see, in the words of action researcher Danny Burns, that research is not only produced afterwards or only through a process of reflection but can also be understand as a process of meaning-making

that is 'derived in action' (2006: 3); that is seeking to know and to understand is 'part of everyday practices' (2006: 4) (see also Brydon-Miller, Greenwood and Maguire 2003).

Yet this also allows us to see that meaning making is also world making. Collaborative heritage is not only about making pasts but making futures (Harrison 2012; 2015). Framing community heritage as *action* inquiry invites us to extend our ideas about participation and to think more fully about how heritage is a process by which people, landscapes, things and tools interact in co-producing the world, a 'participatory ontology'. On this view, world making is always underway and can always be linked to meaning making, just as together building understanding of pasts is also in itself an act of making the future.

Participatory Action Research as community heritage

Critical voices have often been concerned that community heritage is a manipulation, a cosy category that co-opts radical energies within professional structures (Wateron and Smith, 2010; Lynch and Alberti, 2010). Part of the move offered by yoking community heritage and action research is to more clearly articulate and contest the politics of knowledge production and world-making at play in community heritage. An early reference point for work combining action research, participatory practice and community heritage is Colin Ward and Anthony Fyson's development of 'the exploded school', published as *Street Work* (1973). Based on their work as educational officers for the Town and Country Planning Association, Ward and Fyson developed methods through which young people work to build knowledge about and, through this, come to be active participants in shaping the places they live. If read through the terms of participatory action research, this ethos could be summarized as: 'Understand your world, make sense of your life and develop new and creative ways of looking at things' (Heron and Reason, 2001: 1). Participatory Action Research traditions see radical epistemologies – what we have called 'ways of knowing' – as enabled by the 'full range of human capacities and sensibilities' being 'available as an instrument of inquiry', that is intuition, feelings, senses, movement, physical work as well as language. This connection of the 'full range of capacities and sensibilities' is a characteristic of the chapters included in this volume where feelings, fun and food (Smith and Hope, Ch 9), physical work and talk (Vergunst et al, Ch 1; Brookfield et al, Ch 6), conversation and laugher (Marwood et al, Ch 7) or litter picking and archaeological knowledge (Davies et al, Ch 5) combine.

A theme of 'participatory action research' has been creating change, the 'A' over the 'R' in the PAR of Participatory Action Research, as Chatterton, Fuller and Routledge put it (2007: 218). This concept of action and change has been framed in quite a variety of ways in the action research literature from a sense of learning 'how to act to change things you may want to change and find out how to do things better' (Heron and Reason 2001: 1) to revoluntionary traditions contesting imperialist forms of 'development' and modes of capitalist economy that sustain poverty and fail to address pressing environmental concerns (e.g. Fals-Boda and Rahman 1991; Gavanta 1991; Mathie and Gavanta 2015). Smith and Hope's chapter (Ch. 5) on a small-scale lavender oil production industry in the 1960s shows how it

was a central part of the lives of those closely involved in the work and the local community in Aberdeenshire, but it also speaks to changing economies and social relationships in that community and, therefore, the role and future of the arts organization who initiated the heritage project. The siting of heritage work in arts organisation just reinforces that shared endeavours in heritage and research are always creative process what was being known was not only 'what happened' but through these processes emerged a shared sense of what the organization might become. Whereas for Vergunst et al (Ch. 1), drawing on Ingold, the activity in their heritage project offers a mode of living creatively in 'a world that is itself crescent, always in formation' (Ingold, 2012: 3). This points to the ways in which action, knowing and change are not separable but intimately connected and socially dynamic processes. They are what key theorist of participatory action research Orlando Fals-Borda terms the 'slow rhythm of reflection and action' (2013 [2007]: 159).

Local and responsive (not parochial)

A common theme to all the chapters is a concern with specific local circumstances. That heritage, knowledge and change are not abstract or distant categories but ones that arise from particular social and material capacities, of musical instruments, musical traditions and improvisation (Ball et al, Ch 2), of memories and scapbooks (Marwood et al, Ch 7), of social media dialogue (Matthews, Ch 3), of tiles and digital photography (Brookfield et al, Ch 6). Taken together, we suggest that these examples show the significance of the local as a site for productive interventions in a time when the world seems complex and expansive and where political agency seems always vested elsewhere.

Many of the chapters here indicate a sense of acting in small ways – what participatory urban planner Nabeel Hamid calls 'small change' (2010) – as a corrective to paralysis many people feel in terms of their ability of influence institutional forms of decision making. The potentials of this are clearly shown in Marwood et al.'s 'Action Heritage' as a mode of working (Ch. 8). They draw on radical pedagogy, which through inquiry, through personal stories being shared, shifts and creates what they call 'participatory parity'. For Marwood et al., however, action heritage is 'active not activist' in that the projects they supported did not necessarily work towards achieving wider, large-scale social change.

Yet for others this distinction is not clear cut. Taking action through and with archives is, as Matthews shows quoting Leeds Gate (Ch. 3), for the purpose of offering 'a challenge to stereotypes of what Gypsies were like in the past' (@GATEArchive, 5 July 2016). For Davies et al (Ch. 6) the conceptual work enabled by the contrast between the iron age hill fort being at the heart of political power then but the marginalisation political voices of those living on the Ely estate today is highly significant. Small acts of co-production reflect communities of past and bring into being a new community. Brookfield et al (Ch. 7) evoke the energy created through distributed capacity, where 'pings' of connection, are able to make things happen and help create the belief that change is possible. In the project described in Curtis et al's (Ch. 9) chapter, school students expected to take on not just jobs, but *responsibility* and leadership for the archaeological research.

There is a spirit here of politics that is about 'making change from where you are' (Bashforth et al. 2015) and seeing power and politics not as solid structures but as open to new possibilities through small adjustments, conversations and new energies. Emma Goldman, in her explanation of anarchism, poetically captures this approach to politics that is attentive to, and emerges from, specific local circumstances: change 'is a living force in the affairs of our life, constantly creating new conditions' and where 'methods must grow out of the economic needs of each place and clime' (2008: 29). Or we can return to Colin Ward (1973: 23) to reinforce Goldman's point: 'Far from being a speculative vision of a future society, [anarchism] is a description of a mode of human organisation, rooted in the experience of everyday life, which operates side by side with, and in spite of, the dominant authoritarian trends of our society.' While many of these chapters may not see themselves as anarchist as such, there is a certain anarchic spirit, the ethos of Fyson and Ward's *Streetwork,* which can be traced through many of these collectives of people working together, enthusing each other, and transforming the places and social conditions they are part of through acts of collaborative inquiry.

Words and worlds: participatory ontologies

Though thinking community heritage and Participatory Action Research together it is possible here to link two different ideas of co-production, the first use of the co-production in the sense we used it above professionals, academics and other interested people working together to research and create heritage. Yet there is another significant use of co-production too: co-production been widely elaborated to argue that 'the realities of human experience emerge as the joint achievements of scientific, technical, and social enterprise: science and society, in a word, are co-produced, each underwriting the other's existence' (Jasanoff, 2004: 33).

Many disciplines, notably anthropology, geography, and Science and Technology Studies (STS) have been concerned to develop alternative ways of conceiving the world based on how things and people, nature and culture and the material and the semiotic are mutually productive, drawing on epistemologies which recognise the knower as intimately bound up in, and affecting, any 'object' of study. The notion of co-production, therefore, has become one way of articulating this relationality, 'the conjoined production of one nature-culture' (Latour, 1993: 107). An aspect of this approach has been to radically extend the number of 'participants' involved in any phenomena to 'more-than-human' participation (Abram, 1996; Bastian et al, 2015), things, plants and animals (Star and Griesemer, 1989; see also Reason, 2005). In an action research context this insight has been framed as a 'participatory worldview' (Reason 2005) or a 'participatory ontology'. One could see participatory action research – inquiry in the way we are using it – as a method seeking to be adequate to these philosophical insights.

In our chapters the sense that the world is being made through 'more-than-human' participation is very present. Vergunst et al. evoke the iterative relationship between activities such as digging soil, clearing sites, writing text labels and imagining the past and future, arguing that such temporal openness enables the possibility of change in relationships with landscape. 'More-than-human' participation is present also in the ways in which the chapters signal alternative

enactments of key heritage practices such as 'conservation'. In the most traditional readings, heritage is identified and named as such and then it is subject to professional conservation practices, whether of collection and designation and/or material conservation practices such as treating building fabric or keeping the object in stable climatic conditions. Yet taking up conservation as an action inquiry – and as participatory in the full ontological sense – opens up alternatives. Brookfield et al. (Ch. 7) show how DIY heritage approaches create sustainable contexts for material forms – in this case architectural tiles in the potteries – through social networks.

Heritage as action, therefore, calls to mind how knowing comes to be actionable, how working from the midst of the local is by no means parochial but rather enables a sense of agency in a complex world, and how more-than-human entanglements shape both the course and outcomes of heritage and underpin a form of research. It sees itself not just as knowing about the world, but as taking part in making the world and helping to shape its future.

The unexpected in research

Throughout our reflections on community and co-produced heritage research we have been struck by the importance of things not going according to plan, and sometimes actually going wrong. It might be to do with the nature of the projects described in this book, which were driven as much by curiosity and even happenstance as they were by a detailed schedule or formal research proposal. It might also be to do with the different configuration of skills and experience amongst those carrying out the work, going well beyond the standardised research methods of professional university researchers (Brown 2017). This is not to say that unexpected events happen more commonly in this kind of research, or are more severe in their effects. It is a truism to say that researchers in virtually any discipline need to be flexible enough to respond to the circumstances thrown up by the research. If we take ethnography to be emblematic here, Judith Okely (2012: 48) writes: 'The unplanned character of ethnography is precisely its value'. The occurrence of the unexpected in community heritage research seems to provide a distinctive liveliness that animates the whole process in a way that closely sticking to the original research proposal (even if there was one written) cannot so easily achieve. Where problems occur, they often speak to more fundamental issues about the relationship between past and present, the authority to find and use resources that narrate the past, and, sometimes if only in hindsight, they become the pivot points around which heritage – as community research – emerges.

A number of the chapters in this book develop this theme. Marwood et al's (Ch. 8) experience of what was intended to be research on the history of a young people's hostel in Sheffield was that it only really came alive when the focus shifted from the building itself to how it was connected with the personal stories of those who used it. This felt like a failure at first, as the research aim of telling the history of the building was not being met, and only later came to be recognised as productive because of the intertwining of the story of the building with those who were inhabiting it. Writing on images of gypsy travellers circulating in the nineteenth and the twenty-first centuries, Matthews conveys the contestation and diversity of representations that continue to be shared as connections between names, places

and people are made (Ch. 3). Working with the Romani community to develop an exhibition, she writes that 'the very idea of the archive moves from being a closed-off repository to a resource for a community to preserve and share its heritage – for those within and without a Romani identity'. Opening up an archive to unexpected uses is emblematic of the course of community heritage research, in that improvisation and animation become central to the process rather than just following a pre-determined route. Other chapters develop their sense of the unexpected and problematic in different ways: Curtis et al (Ch 9) on the 'problem' of involving school pupils in archaeological research, Ball et al (Ch. 2) on translating between co-produced music and co-written text, Smith and Hope (Ch. 5) on the realisation that a heritage project could itself enable a new kind of conversation to emerge for a community arts organisation.

A clearer valuing of the unexpected could help to think through processes of research in this mode much more widely. It would, for example, go beyond the notion of subservience to an original plan – required more and more, we would argue, by professional research administrators as part of their 'audit culture' (Strathern, 2000) – and towards recognising the significance of the unexpected in the ways of knowing and the action that results. And more broadly, it might enable scholarship on collaboration and co-production such as that we have reviewed here to imagine looser and more flexible forms of working together that could even be *designed* for the unexpected. An example can be found in the chapter by Brookfield et al (Ch. 7) where a key funder, the Heritage Lottery Fund, responds to very small scale funding needs by limiting the need for plans and a heavy layer of audit. In research on heritage specifically we can emphasise again the sense of movement and journeying in regard to the past, as a contrast to attempting to reach the 'destination' of history produced by the figure of the professional historian. The conclusion to this book returns to some of the implications of this thought, where we develop future directions for practice, policy and funders in relation to community heritage research.

References

Abram, D. (1996) *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Amit, V. and Rapport, N. (2002) *The Trouble With Community. Anthropological Reflections on Movement, Identity and Collectivity*. London: Pluto Press.

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Arnstein, S. (1969) 'A ladder of citizen participation' *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216-225.

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baron, R. (2016) 'Public folklore dialogism and critical heritage studies' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22(8): 588-606.

Bashforth, M., Benson, M., Boon, T., Brigham, L., Brigham, R., Brookfield, K., Brown P., Callaghan, D., Calvin, J., Courtney, R., Cremin, K., Furness, P., Graham, H., Hale, A., Hodgkiss, P., Lawson, J., Madgin, R., Manners, P., Robinson, D., Stanley, J., Swan, M., Timothy, J., Turner, R. (2015) *How should heritage*

decision be made?: Increasing participation from where you are? Available at: *http://heritagedecisions.leeds.ac.uk/publications/*

Brown, A. (2017) 'Co-authoring relationships: Blackfoot collections, UK museums, and collaborative practice' *Collaborative Anthropologies* 9(1/2): 117-148.

Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D., and Maguire, P. (2003) 'Why action research?', Action Research, 1(1): 9–28.

Burns, B. (2007) *Systemic Action Research: A Strategy for Whole System Change*. Bristol: Policy Press

Chatterton, P., Fuller, D. and Routledge: (2007). 'Relating action to activism: Theoretical and methodological reflections'. In: S Kindon, R Pain and M Kesby, eds, *Participatory Action Research: Approaches and Methods: Connected People, Participation and Place*. London: Routledge, pp 216-222.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (eds) (1986) *Writing Culture. The Politics and Poetics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Facer, K. and Enright, B. (2016) *Creating Living Knowledge: The Connected Communities Programme, community-university partnerships and the participatory turn in the production of knowledge*. Bristol: Arts and Humanities Research Council.

Facer, K. and Pahl, K. (2017) 'Introduction' in K. Facer and K. Pahl (eds) *Valuing the Impact of Collaborative Research: Theory, Methods and Tools*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp 1-21.

Fals-Borda, O. and Rahman, M. A., (eds.) (1991) *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action Research*. New York: The Apex Press.

Fals-Borda, O. (1991) 'Re-making Knowledge' in Fals-Borda, O. and Rahman, M. A., (eds.) *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action Research*. New York: The Apex Press.

Fals-Borda, O. (2013 [2007]). 'Action research in the convergence of disciplines', *International Journal of Action Research* 9(2): 155-167.

Fyson, A. and Ward, C. (1973) *Streetwork: The Exploding School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gavanta, J (1991) 'Toward a knowledge democracy: viewpoints on participatory research in North America', in Action and Knowledge', in Fals-Borda, O. (1991) 'Re-making Knowledge' in Fals-Borda, O. and Rahman, M. A., (eds.) *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action Research*. New York: The Apex Press, pp 121–3.

Golding, V. and Modest, W. (2013) (eds) *Collaborative Museums: Communities, Curators, Collections*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Graham, H., Banks, S., Bastian, M., Durose, C., Hill, K., Holland, T., McNulty, A., Moore, N., Pahl, K., Pool, S. and Siebers, J. (2014) *Ways of Knowing: Exploring the Different Registers, Values and Subjectivities of Collaborative Research*. Report. Available at: http://waysofknowing.leeds.ac.uk/

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1997) 'Discipline and practice: 'The Field' as site, method, and location in anthropology'. In A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (eds.) *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp 1-47.

Hamdi, N. (2010) *Small Change: About the Art of Practice and the Limits of Planning in Cities*. London: Earthscan.

Hawke, S., Stefano, M., Onculi, B. (eds) (2017) *Engaging Heritage, Engaging Communities.* Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Haraway, D. (1988) 'Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective' *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599.

Hart, A., Davies, C., Aumann, K., Wenger, E., Arandaa, K., Heaver, B. and Wolff, D. (2013) Mobilising knowledge in community–university partnerships: what does a community of practice approach contribute? *Contemporary Social Science* 8(3): 278-291.

Harvey, D. C. (2001) 'Heritage pasts and heritage presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(4): 319-338.

Heron, J. and Reason, P. (2001) 'The Practice of Co-operative Inquiry: Research with rather than on people', P. Reason and H. Bradbury, eds., *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. London: Sage, pp 179-188. Available from: *www.peterreason.eu/Papers/Handbook_Co-operative_Inquiry.pdf*

Hodder, I. (2012) *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships Between Humans and Things*. London: Wiley.

Holtorf, C. (2002) 'Notes on the life history of a pot sherd' *Journal of Material Culture* 7(1): 49-71.

Ingold, T. (2000) *The Perception of the Environment*. London: Routledge.

Jasanoff, S., 2004, 'Ordering Knowledge, Ordering Society', in Jasanoff, S (ed) *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and the Social Order*. London: Routledge, pp 13–45

Kirshenblatt Gimblett, B. (1995) 'Theorizing heritage', *Ethnomusicology*, 39(3): 367-380.

Lang, C., Reeve, J. and Woollard, V. (2006) *The Responsive Museum: Working with Audiences in the Twenty-First Century*. Ashgate: Aldershot.

Lassiter, L. (2005) *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Long, N. and Moore, H. (2012) 'Sociality revisited. Setting a new agenda', *Cambridge Anthropology* 30(1): 40–47.

Lowenthal, D. (1998) *The Heritage crusade and the Curse of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, B. T. and Alberti. S. J.M.M. (2010) 'Legacies of prejudice: racism, co-production and radical trust in the museum', *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 25(1): 13-35.

Lynch, B. (2011) 'Collaboration, contestation, and creative conflict: On the efficacy of museum/community partnership' in *The Routledge companion to museum ethics : redefining ethics for the twenty-first-century museum* (ed) Marstine, J. London and New York: Routledge, pp 146-163.

Mathie, A. and Gavanta. J. (2015) *Citizen-led Innovation for a New Economy*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.

Okely, J. (2012) *Anthropological practice. Fieldwork and the ethnographic method*. Oxford: Berg.

Pahl, K., Escott, H., Graham, H., Marwood, K., Pool, S. and Ravetz, A. (2017) 'What is the role of artists in interdisciplinary collaborative projects with universities

and communities?' in K. Facer and K. Pahl (eds) *Valuing the Impact of Collaborative Research: Theory, Methods and Tools*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp 131-152.

Reason, P. (2005) 'Living as part of the whole: the implications of participation' *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy* 2(2): 35–41.

Samuel, R. (1994) *Theatres of Memory. Volume 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture.* London: Verso.

Smith, L. (2006) *The Uses of Heritage*: London Routledge.

Star, S. L. and Griesemer, J. R. (1989) 'Institutional ecology, 'translations' and boundary objects: amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39' *Social Studies of Science* 19: 387–420.

Strathern, M. (ed.) (2000) *Audit Cultures. Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*. London: Routledge.

Tunbridge, G. and Ashworth, J. (1996) *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.

Vergunst, J., Curtis, E., Davis, O., Johnston, R. Graham, H. and Shepherd, C. (2017) 'Material legacies: shaping things and places through heritage' in K. Facer and K. Pahl (eds) *Valuing the Impact of Collaborative Research: Theory, Methods and Tools*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp 153-172.

Ward, C. (1973) *Anarchy in action.* London: Freedom Press.

Waterton, E. and Watson, S. (eds) (2013) *Heritage and community engagement. Collaboration or contestation?* London: Routledge.

Waterton, E. and Smith, L. (2010) 'The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage' *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16:1-2, pp 4-15.

Watson, S. (2007) (ed.) *Museums and their communities*. London: Routledge.