UNDERSTANDING ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE NARRATIVES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LOCAL COMMUNITY OF LENGGONG VALLEY

YUGEETHA BALAN

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2017

UNDERSTANDING ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE NARRATIVES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LOCAL COMMUNITY OF LENGGONG VALLEY

by

YUGEETHA BALAN

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts**

November 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FIVE: DATA ANALYSIS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

PEMAHAMAN NARATIF ARKEOLOGI WARISAN DARI PERSPEKTIF PENDUDUK TEMPATAN LEMBAH LENGGONG

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini meneroka pemahaman dan penilaian terhadap warisan arkeologi di Lembah Lenggong yang kaya dengan penemuan arkeologi dan nilai-nilai sosial. Komunikasi dan interpretasi warisan arkeologi pada masa kini, kebanyakannya berasaskan pengetahuan pakar dan ianya kurang memberi penekanan terhadap konteks sosial.Oleh itu,kajian ini memfokuskan perspektif masyarakat berbanding dengan perspektif pakar dalam wacana warisan. Objektif kajian ini adalah untuk mengenalpasti makna dan nilai-nilai warisan arkeologi dalam konteks sosial dari perspektif penduduk tempatan di Lembah Lenggong yang menyumbang kepada semangat kemasyarakatan. Kajian ini mendalami dimensi sosial warisan dan warisan arkeologi melalui naratif masyarakat setempat. Satu kaedah kualitatif induktif dan analisis sistematik dilakukan melalui kajian soal selidik separa berstruktur bersama tiga puluh (30) orang responden yang mewakili masyarakat setempat. Hasil kajian mendapati, terdapat tiga tema utama wujud dalam pembinaan makna dan nilai warisan dari perspektif penduduk tempatan iaitu warisan sebagai objek sosial, warisan sebagai pengalaman sosial dan warisan sebagai persekitaraan sosial. Sementara itu, bentuk-bentuk naratif yang digunakan untuk berkomunikasi warisan arkeologi di kalangan penduduk tempatan dan dengan pihak luaran adalah *Meta stories*, Cerita Dongeng, Mitos dan Legenda.

UNDERSTANDING ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE NARRATIVES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LOCAL COMMUNITY OF LENGGONG VALLEY

ABSTRACT

This research explores the ways people understand and value archeological heritage based on the perspectives of Lenggong's local community which is rich in archaeological finding and social context. The communication and interpretation of archaeological heritage in current times mostly focuses on the expert's knowledge and much less on its social context. Therefore, this research's focus on local perspectives is considered to be imperative in heritage discourses. The objective of this research is to explore meanings and values of archaeological heritage within a social context from the local community's perspective that will contribute to sense of community. This research also acknowledges social dimensions of heritage and archaeological heritage through the narratives of the local community. Interpretive thematic analysis was used through semi structured interviews with thirty local community representatives. The findings address three main themes on the meanings and values of heritage besides archaeological heritage from the local perspectives namely social object, social experience and social surrounding as heritages. Meanwhile, the forms of narratives that are used to communicate archaeological heritage among locals and with others as Meta stories and Folklores like Folktales, Myths and Legends were identified.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Understanding archaeological heritage is important in the quest of disseminating knowledge of the heritage, understanding its history, and in making the past relevant to the current generation. The interpretation of archaeological heritage commonly comes from authorised sources like archaeologists, state sanctioned bodies or other dominant authorities. Another valuable source that has been largely overlooked is the narratives of the local community. How archaeological heritage is communicated amongst local community reflects their understanding of the archaeological heritage. The way archaeological heritage is communicated also sheds light on the social, emotional and intellectual connections that they have with the archaeological heritage. However, little attention has been paid on local community's perspectives on archaeological heritage, such as on the meanings and values of archaeological heritage to them.

Understanding the meanings and value of archaeological heritage from the local community's standpoint provide greater insights on its social significance. A single site may be valued for various reasons while carrying multiple meaning to different people. For example, the Orang Asli regards the Perak Man in Lenggong Valley as their direct ancestor. As such, the fact that Perak Man is more than 11,000 years means that their ancestors are among the first to inhabit the place. On the other hand, the other local community takes pride in having the oldest human skeleton found right in their backyard. To them, this means that the Lenggong Valley is a

significant site in understanding ancient human civilization. The archaeological heritage values associated with a place may also change over time as the understanding of its history develops and the needs and context of the community changes.

It has been emphasised that the value of a heritage site should be interpreted by the experts with the participation of local community (Mohd Isa, ZainalAbidin and Hashim, 2011). McArthur and Hall's (1996) emphasised that to get a greater sense of community, the interpretation of heritage should relate to the local custom and culture. This will encourage and ensure that the local community actively participates in the development of a heritage site.

However, the communication and interpretation of archaeological heritage today mostly focuses on the expert's knowledge and less on the sociological knowledge that arise from the perspective of local communities. Researchers have begun to develop the concept of collaborative practice in communicating heritage of late by placing an emphasis on the importance of consultation with communities (Lynott, Wylie and Lilley, 2000).As such, the focus of this research is on gaining the understanding of the Lenggong Valley World Heritage Sites (LVWHS) from the local community's perspectives by exploring their narration of the archaeological heritage at the site. The types of narratives will be explored to understand how archaeological heritage are communicated and passed on in the community. The narratives will then be examined to understand the meaning and value of the heritage to the community.

1.2   Research background

The Lenggong Valley was declared the *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization* (UNESCO)'s *World Heritage Site* (WHS) in July 2012. At the time, the historic achievement is the fourth WHS for Malaysia and the 953rd in the world. The lush Lenggong Valley on the Malay Peninsula contains archaeological artifacts in open air and cave sites along the Perak River spanning from 1.83 million years ago, making it one of the oldest archaeological sites outside of Africa. Southeast Asia's oldest and most complete human skeleton known as Perak Man was also uncovered in Lenggong. To archaeologists, the Lenggong Valley is significant because it testifies to the continuous human occupation and evidence of pre-historic artifacts and skeletons that challenge current theories on human evolution.

As how it is customary at other world heritage sites, the narratives of archaeologists dominate the communication of archaeological heritage in Lenggong Valley. Echoing at the back of these narratives are narratives of the local community featuring interpretations that are not necessarily included or highlighted in the authorised narratives. For example, anecdotal accounts indicate the indigenous local communities of Lenggong Valley are of the belief that the Perak Man found in Gua Gunung Runtuh was their ancestor. The information are passed down through word-of-mouth in the form of narratives but not documented formally. The interpretation is an important sociological aspect of the Perak Man because it brings to fore the issues of ancestral land and rights of the indigenous people. The narratives of local community indicate that the Perak Man is regarded as an archaeological heritage

highly relevant to their lives without confining its importance to solely scientific facts.

The present approach in communicating archaeological heritage at world heritage sites (WHS) such as at the Lenggong World Heritage Sites (LVWHS) tends to muffle the local communities perspectives. Archaeological heritage narratives at WHS usually revolve around the Authorized Heritage Discourse or AHD (Smith, 2006), a discourse by heritage professional and policy elite such as archaeologists with particular narratives and meanings and assumptions that tend to dominate national and international western debates about the nature, value and meaning of archaeological heritage (Smith, 2006 and Waterton, 2006). Authorised discourse prioritizes experts opinions that usually carries scientific facts which varies from local's discourse that reflects humanistic values that speak from their personal experiences and observations. The interpretations of archaeologists are not parallel to local community's interpretation. Smith (2006) has demonstrated that the community's interpretations reflect the community's needs attitudes, desires and the power over how ancient monuments and sites are communicated and made accessible rests with a small group of professionals such as heritage officials and archaeologists.

Exploring the narratives of members of the community may help highlight the sociological perspectives of the past archaeological heritage sites and allows a more comprehensive understanding of the site. The kind of folklore that relates to the site provides us with further insights into how the past is experienced, and how it is negotiated and understood in the present. Layton (2002) rightly emphasized the extent to which archaeologists research interests failed to coincide with the concerns

of local communities, and argued that taking into account the values and knowledge of indigenous peoples would benefit both archaeological theory and practice. The voice of local community would provide more multi-dimensional perspectives on the meaning and values of heritage and in making the past more relevant to the present.

This research acknowledges the significance of the social aspects of archaeological heritage through the narratives of the local community. Field (2000) explains that working with local communities not only enriches a project, but provides a broader continuity from prehistoric past to present. It has been proposed that cultural heritage is valued because it allows people to tell meta-stories (story telling on a larger canvas) that express a sense of collectively belonging to a certain community (Hogberg, 2006). In popular culture, Meta stories of archaeology are defined as stories of archaeology in which contemporary audiences themselves feature as characters engulfed in a plot about archaeology or the past that gives meaning and perspective to their present day lives (Holtorf, 2010). Meta stories connect archaeological research about the past with matters of considerable social significance for instance, what it means to be human, who we are as members of a particular group and how we might live under different circumstances. Meta stories of archaeology benefits the society by making people reflect upon what it means to be human and what they share with others in the social groups to which they belong. This would mean that people believe that they were all part of the same land and discovered some unity which bound them together. Meta stories can be in the form of narratives that give true picture of their traditional heritage values. On the regional and sometimes local level too, archaeological stories are used to express a sense of

collective belonging. Similarly, members of a given social class or a certain family may express who they are collectively by telling stories about the past.

In this research, local's narration serve as a dialogue between archaeologists and the local community and the external community (such as archaeologists and tourists), creating a relationship that shapes community and individual awareness of archaeological heritage. Narrative is both phenomenon and method (Clandenin and Connelly, 1994, p.416). Locals are the major part of research and the narratives that are collected from them can contribute to the communication of archaeological heritage. Narration brings diverse elements of experiences, thoughts and feelings together into a unified whole and is connected to a central theme or purpose (Polkinghorne, 1995). The narratives within which we live; our personal narratives, are not merely a way of describing our lives. They are the means by which we bring order, that is, if we organize our experiences and the information we encounter (Bruner, 1990). In this research, narrative refers to a story with an underlying theme. The theme is a layer added to the story to instruct, to provide an emotional connection, or to impart a deeper meaning (Vincent.L, 2002)

If archaeological heritage is understood as a representation of multiple meanings and values, then it stands to reason that locals will understand and relate to heritage and archaeology in unique ways. By exploring the range of possible meanings and values that archaeological heritage may represent to people, this research can contribute to the knowledge of both local and heritage experts' perception. The narratives of the community will help us to understand and

appreciate the community's heritage and archaeological heritage meanings, as well as values and interpretations about the archaeological heritage.

It is important to include local community's perspectives because their involvement and participation can help to build the long-term capacity of the site and improve the ability of local communities to manage and influence the outcome of the development at world heritage sites (Jamieson, 2001). Paying attention to the community's narration of archaeological heritage also gives access to the considerable amount of local knowledge concerning archaeological sites. Theinvolvement of local communities in the communication of heritage and archaeology ensures the survival of the social values of archaeological heritage sites. When defining archaeological heritage, many scholars and politicians as well as the general public perceive the archaeological record or archaeological remains (sites, objects, etc.) as heritage, recognizing only the scientific values. This dominant ideology ignores the social contemporary interpretation of heritage which requires a group of people to recognize something as their own. Only then does the concept of heritage come into play as a social value (Ballart, 1997).

In brief, the perspectives of the local community at Lenggong Valley WHS need to be given as much emphasis as those of dominant authorized parties such as archaeologists, NGO's and other state sanctioned agencies or international bodies like UNESCO. The sidelining of local community's voices may lead to the lack of local community's participation and hinder the sustainable development of the site. The research intends to underline the importance of local community as key stakeholders because the archaeological heritage belongs as much to them as it is to

the world. A stakeholder has been defined as a person who has the right and capacity to participate in the process (Gray, 2005). Critiques of the heritage industry have often revolved around the idea that visitors can only experience a false representation of history. Although valuable in many ways, such an approach does not explore the full complexity of these experiences (Breathnach, 2006). This suggests that real understanding of heritage lies in what people outside of the academic or professional sector understand what is meant by archaeological heritage. Hence, this study seeks to explore some of the complexities of archaeological heritage by focusing on the ways in which the local people understand and value archaeological heritage and the meanings it represents for them and their lives.Heritage should be about shared past, history, experiences and practices, about the stories that a community tells about itself rather than solely being focused only on the scientific aspects. If current practice continues, then community will become passive recipients of heritage products, sites and practices (ideologically engineered) based on the interpretation of dominant groups (e.g: archaeologists, historians alone).

1.3   Background - The Lenggong Valley World Heritage Site (LVWHS)

Lenggong Valley is located in Hulu Perak and was listed as world heritage site by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in July 2012. It is identified as one of the most important archaeology areas in Malaysia after the discovery of 1.83 million years old human inhabitation in Bukit Bunuh. It is believed that Bukit Bunuh was a home for early settlers after excavations revealed a Paleolithic culture. Another interesting archaeological finding is the Perak Man in Gua Gunung Runtuh, Bukit Kepala Gajah (Elephant's Head Hill) in 1991. Perak

Man is Southeast Asia's oldest most complete human skeleton ever found. It is radio-carbon dated to 10,120 BP and identified as belonging to the Australomenasoid hominid family.

Lenggong Valley is not only rich with its archaeological findings, but it is also famous for its tourist attractions. The valley is surrounded by the greenery of the Titiwangsa and Bintang ranges, being home to a multitude of flora and fauna. In addition to its natural wonders, Lenggong also boasts numerous cuisines, particularly freshwater fish dishes.

1.4 Statement of the Research Problem

This research addresses *the importance of understanding local community's perspectives in communicating archaeological heritage*. The most common approach of communicating archaeological heritage tends to highlight the scientific meanings and values of heritage and de-emphasize its sociological values and meanings. The current practice in communicating heritage focuses on experts' accounts of heritage such as archaeologists, state sanctioned bodies and UNESCO's discourse. Expert's archaeology does not incorporate substantial community participation in communicating archaeological heritage. The accounts and experience of the local community are not usually communicated or highlighted in heritage promotional materials and publications. The sociological values that reside within the concept of archaeological heritage tend to be ignored and deemphasized in official heritage communication materials. Therefore, this study will explore the local community's perspectives on archaeological heritage.

The social understanding of heritage from the perspective of the local community is usually excluded in the official websites or other medium of communication of world heritage sites. Sociological perspectives, meanings and values are de-emphasized despite UNESCO insistence on community's involvement as part of the stakeholders. While the community's involvements are featured in some initiatives such as in the management planning, technical assistance, professional training, public and youth education, and awareness-building, their participation in interpreting and communicating their perspective on archaeological heritage has yet to be highlighted. The sociological perspectives gained from these efforts have not been included as part of the cultural values of the site. Smith (2006) has challenged the traditional western idea of heritage as material fabric with cultural values given to age, monumentality and aesthetics. Instead, he argued that heritage discourse should be about involving the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings whose authenticity lies in the meanings people construct for it in their daily lives. The sharing of knowledge of local heritage and customs enriches visitors' experience, and encourages the right behavior. The authenticity of this information created by the community for community benefit is not lost on visitors and deepens their experience (Mattson, 2006). In that line, interpretation and communication of heritage should involve meanings constructed by the community who are attached with the place and experience heritage every day. As such, the study intends to understand the meaning and values of heritage from the local community's perspective.

It has been noted that it is a challenge for heritage authorities to incorporate viewpoints and interests of stakeholders such as proprietors, patrons and local

communities (Miljovern Departmental, 2002). Various academic discourses indicated that there is a real challenge for locals to communicate their viewpoints and interests to heritage authorities. The interpretations by the local people about archaeological heritage do not necessarily reflect the views of authoritative sources. To best illustrate this, in the authoritative discourse, Perak Man was described as an *Australomelanesoid,* a hominid type occupying the western part of the Indonesian archipelago and continental South-East Asia at the end of the Pleistocene and early Holocene. This is an archaeological experts' interpretation whereas not everyone (non - experts) are able to understand the meaning of such interpretation or agree to those interpretations. Perhaps for locals, Perak Man is their ancestral identity to which they are emotionally attached. Some individual representing local communities may have reservations against such dominant interpretations from authoritative sources as they may have their own interpretations based on observations or experience rather than rigorous or scientific analysis. In the long term, the inconsistency of interpretation between locals and authorities may affect the local community's participation in sharing the meanings and values of archaeological heritage. As Jonathan Wager (1995) acclaimed, listening to local communities is the beginning of the process of increasing local participation.

1.5   Research Objective and Research Questions

This research aims to explore the ways in which local community understands, make meanings and value archaeological heritage through narratives. To achieve this, the *emic* or insider perspective (local community) is given priority in order to access and understand the heritage social interpretations specifically in meaning makings and values acknowledgement that shape heritage for the society. The specific objectives are as follows:

Research Objectives

1. To understand the meanings and values of archaeological heritage from the local community's perspective.
2. To understand the process of sharing meanings and values about archaeological heritage among the local community and others.
3. To determine how sharing of meanings and values can contribute towards the sense of community amongst local community and consequently contribute towards their participation in heritage site development.

   Based on this direction of objectives, the research questions formulated are as follows:

   RQ1)   How does local community understand the meanings and values of archaeological heritage?

   RQ2)   How does a local community share these meanings and values about

archaeological heritage among themselves and others?

RQ3)   How the sharing of meanings and values can contribute to a sense of community amongst local community?

1.6   Research Significance

Archaeological heritage means different things to different people. The interpretations of archaeological heritage are a process that constructs cultural values and meanings. Smith (2006) has contended that heritage is a multilayered element that embodies acts of remembrance and commemoration while constructing a sense of place, belonging and understanding (Waterton, 2010).

This research emphasized the local community's voice in communicating archaeological heritage. The research will pave the way for archaeological heritage interpretation from the sociological point of view arising from local community's narratives. People are becoming more and more conscious of the unity of human values and regard ancient monuments as a common heritage. As Jokilehto (2003) highlighted that the common responsibility to safeguard them for future generation is recognized. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity. Imbued with a message from the past, the historic monuments represent the generation of people who are present today as living witnesses of their age-old traditions. This research emphasized the significance of sharing *emic* knowledge and interpretations that exist within a culture which is determined by local custom, meaning, and belief (Ager and Loughry, 2004).

The research acknowledges sociological perspectives of heritage and archaeological heritage from the lenses of the local community. Working with local communities not only enriches a heritage project, but provides a broader continuity from prehistoric past to present (Field, 2000). This research is expected to identify heritage and archeological heritage values that emerge from meaning making of the locals. The research is expected to provide sociological perspectives of the heritage based on how the local community experiences, make meanings and value the heritage sites.

In the long run, it is hoped that this effort will help to understand the needs of local community and encourage local participation at World Heritage Sites. Community may have different interpretations and understanding on archaeological heritage sites because each of them may perceive different meanings at similar sites.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the literature on the key domains of the research is presented. The first part provides a review on the definition of archaeological heritage to provide a general understanding of the term and context for this research. The chapter then moves on to a review on the various perspectives on how heritage has been defined and approached in the academia. The authorized heritage discourse presents the most common type of discourse in heritage research. It represents the discourses raised by the parties that have been authorized (by state and federal sanctioned bodies) or seen as the authority in conducting field heritage research, such as archaeologists and historians. The discourses from this group revolve typically around scientific data based on observable artefacts. The AHD are limited on the social responses and consequences that arise from the discovery of the heritage artefacts. Social perspectives are not given that much importance likes the scientific perspectives do. Hence, the alternate discourses are reviewed to provide a wider perspective and a more holistic understanding on heritage. Included in the review is the growing interest in bottom-up research that explores multiple meanings and values that shape heritage and archaeological heritage interpretation from local community's perspectives accessed through their narrations of different types of stories. The review focuses on perspectives in understanding heritage, the meaning of archaeological heritage and its values to them, their way of communicating heritage, their beliefs, attitudes and behaviors towards heritage and their role in heritage and

archaeological heritage interpretations. The chapter also discusses the application of theories of standpoint and sense of community in this research. Key concepts are identified and suggestion towards bridging the gap in the literature is offered.

2.2   Defining Heritage and Archaeological Heritage

In general, the term heritage refers to tangible and intangible elements that are passed on from one generation to another. Archaeological heritage is a subset that refers to the relics and remains that record past human activities (Lowenthal, 1996). Archaeological heritage past through remains and relics preserved in the ground and under water (National Board of Antiquities, 2017). This interpretation has been used as one of the guidelines for legal protection of archaeological heritage in many countries including Malaysia.

Tangible heritage include buildings, archaeological sites, monuments, landscapes, books and works of art. For tangible heritage, the interpretations focus on the physical evidences (Harun, 2011). Intangible heritage refers to the non-physical aspects of a particular culture maintained by a society or a group during a specific period in history. Non-material aspects include social values, traditions, customs, practices, aesthetic, spiritual beliefs, expression, language and other aspects of one society. Nonetheless, the significance of physical artifacts can be interpreted against the backdrop of social, cultural, spiritual, symbolic and historical values of a particular group of people.

However, the broad definition that focuses on the tangibility of heritage is problematic as it does not sufficiently reflect the multidimensionality and

contextuality of heritage. A review of the literature indicates that the perspectives on heritage has evolved over the past two decades from traditional view on heritage as objects on exhibition to one that views heritage as social experience. The first focuses on heritage objects that are being passed down such as archaeological artefacts and cultural objects including buildings, monuments, architectures and preserved objects. This approach is favoured in current archaeological heritage communication and interpretation. The advantage of expert's identification of heritage as social objects is that it helps in the categorisation of heritage such as those used by international charters including UNESCO. The categorization helps in the recognition of the tangibles and its intrinsic as heritage, exemplified in the categories used by the UNESCO in identifying World Heritage Sites. It is argued here that identifying heritage as social objects alone is insufficient to truly understand the significance of the heritage. The heritage objects need to be understood in context of the social experiences that surround it, such as how the past archaeological object (e.g. a prehistoric axe) is relevant to us in the present.

Over time, the focus has been shifted to the social experiences linked to the heritage objects such as the traditions linked to them as well as intangible social elements such as language, sacred beliefs and practices and cuisines. The perspective of social experience as heritage focuses on the social multidimensionality and contextuality of heritage. The emphasis is not solely on tangible objects but also on intangibles that are socially experienced by the locals. For instance, heritage as social experience is the traditional dance of a community. Performing the traditional dance allows one to experience the place socially through interaction and involvement. Social experience provides individuals the opportunity to know a society intimately

as a society itself is formed through a plurality of shared experiences forming norms, customs, values, traditions, social roles, symbols and languages.

One of the sources of social experience is the narratives of the local people. The narratives reveal the interpretation of heritage from the local community's perspective and may not reflect or only partially reflect the perspectives of the experts. They nevertheless expose the voices of the local community that non-community members may find difficult to grasp. Through local narratives, the public are provided the access to a more democratized definition of heritage. The local's perspectives have significant associations with local life that the public can easily relate to from their own life experiences.

In understanding heritage as a social experience, many have interpreted heritage as culturally significant elements linked to community values and expectations (Smith 2006). Places of cultural significance enrich people's lives often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community, to the past and to lived experiences (Smith 2006).

The concern that archaeological heritage should include the social experience of historical places was mentioned in a few authorized sources. UNESCO (2003) has recently (2003) recognized the importance of intangible aspects of archaeological heritage such as oral traditions, religious ceremonies and practices as a form of heritage worthy of preservation. This perspective reflects the reformation on the archaeological heritage from tangible to intangible heritage.

Holtorf (2007) explained that archaeology is often seen as the stuff of exciting stories rather than as a tool for getting answers to specific questions about

past. To him, social experience is notable through narratives from local community. Archaeologists and folklorists can work together by incorporating local folktales into public interpretation of archaeological sites, both gaining perspective and eliciting local interest in preserving these sites. Local narratives give us the opportunity to study meanings of these ancient artefacts, their roles in a given social context and about social practices that are carried out in relation to such artefacts.

Archaeology as a provider of stories can thus play a particularly significant role in 21st century society. Arguably, archaeology and archaeological heritage are not only modes of cultural production (Pearson and Shanks, 2001) but effectively they have become creative industries that providing stories in demand.   In   this view, heritage also acts as a buffer between science and society besides offering archaeologists an opportunity to communicate their discoveries and research with local communities and international public. This draws interest of local communities on archaeological heritage as they can be closely involved in the development of archaeological heritage sites. The social experience should be given attention so that both sides, so that the local community will find that their perspectives are equally represented. In this regard, as problematised in chapter one, community context and healthy dialogue between professionals are crucial.

2.3   Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD)

A review on the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) is an important starting point to provide a background on how heritage and archaeological heritage are commonly communicated to the public, and whose standpoints that those communications

represent and importantly, whose standpoints are systematically, albeit inadvertently and sidelined.

The dominant discourse on heritage has been termed AHD. The AHD represent discourses that arise from the use of recognized methodology and adoption of a set of ideas in researching heritage, the approach and discourses of which have become the canon in heritage research. The discourses typically privileges scientific interpretations linked to observable evidence. It has been argued that the AHD works to normalize a range of assumptions about the nature and meaning of heritage. The AHD favors particular practices, especially those of heritage professionals and the state and the federal bodies such as archaeologists, historians and state or federal sanctioned bodies such as the heritage department as (Harrison Rodney, 2010). For archeological heritage sites, AHD refers to the interpretation of artefacts and other relevant elements at the archaeological heritage site. The experts such as archaeologists and geologists became the key source of interpretation for the artefacts. The discourse focuses on the tangible aspects of the heritage object such as its aesthetics, artistic and intrinsic elements. The focus on AHD has allowed powerful groups (experts) to become the key sources in defining heritage and archaeological heritage. Smith (2006) observes that the uses of heritage are consequently often bound up with power relations and specifically the power to legitimize and de-legitimize cultures. He observed that powerful groups have been actively successful, over time, in defining what does and does not qualify as the nation's heritage. The literature indicates that such practices resulted in the under representation of the voices of non-dominant groups in the communication of heritage. Therefore, AHD to an extent, exclude a range of popular ideas and practices relating to heritage and archaeology. Hence, this research reflects the view of critics

of the AHD in that AHD promotes the ideas of limited groups with authority, and may be used or can become an instrument of power. AHD also limits active participation of the public in having their voice in heritage communication.

It is argued in this research that although the interpretation of the authorised parties is important, they represent only one perspective on the heritage. Important voices that tend to be excluded are the voices of the local community who are close to the heritage. The local community interprets heritage based on their own understanding and in ways that are relevant to them, such as through various types of storytelling. As argued by Terrell (1990), storytelling in science is not just created as a way to communicate complex ideas but also seen as mode of exploration to discover comparative frameworks and theories. It was considered as one of the way in which academic field of archaeology can fulfill important function in society. Past research indicate, based on interviews and discussions with community members, alternative perceptions of the past can be gained by accessing the community's comprehensive understanding of a site. Locals knowledge of archaeological sites by accessed by making them involved in the heritage investigation (Shankland, 1999). Community's involvement has created pathways to respect values of one's culture, which are commonly precluded in AHD. For example, a research found that involving the community in an archaeological excavation has brought the young and old together in exchanging stories and experiences linked to the heritage, thus highlighting the importance of community storytelling in heritage communication (Moshenska, 2007).

Hence, this study addresses how the local community's meanings and values could be included in the communication of archaeological heritage. The local community's narratives on heritage provides heritage understanding that are situated

in the local context compared to those of the AHD. Therefore, local heritage knowledge needs attention from experts.

2.4   Archaeological heritage's value to local community

A particular heritage or archaeological heritage asset may be valued differently depending on individual perspectives. Past research indicates that values are important in understanding heritage because they shape perceptions of heritage for individuals in unique ways (Howard, 2003). These values can include social, political, aesthetic, spiritual, educational and economic influences. Sociological perspective is a perspective on individual behaviour and their connection to society as a whole. It invites us to look for connections between the behaviour of individual people and structures of society in which they live. Sociological perspective helps us to understand how a society is important in shaping our everyday lives. Sociological meanings refer to how people make meanings from social context that is apart from the crowd of expert's interpretations. The qualities or an inherent characteristic of places that exist within a community and their way of life are viewed in this study as aspects of social values.

Social values derived from social meanings that are constructed by an individual. The appreciation of things of the past is meaningful to a society and translates into value in a long run. These values are believed to emerge through the heritage's significance in community affairs. Those values are not just derived based on tangible basis but also based on intangible basis such as the emotional connection that local community has with tangibles and cultural significance. It has been recognized that the values of heritage are not simply based on what is found or excavated but also based on what the locals interpret (i.e., the notion of heritage and

archaeological heritage buildings values being intrinsic). Some of the values that can be identified in the literature are discussed in the following section.

2.4.1 Tangible values (Intrinsic)

Social objects that can be felt, touched, and seen carry intrinsic values for local communities. The tangible values include the aesthetic value and artistic value that are appreciated by the local community.

Basically intrinsic values are values that an object with tangible features has within itself. Intrinsic values are now more often regarded as cultural values imposed on heritage objects (Papayannis and Howard 2007). Thus, if one can prove the authenticity of the tangible material, cultural value is indelibly established. World heritage and its values are passed on to future generations so that an understanding and appreciation will be renewed based on its intrinsic values (Von Droste, 2002). The intrinsic values are linked to socially experienced practices that could be either from cultural and symbolic practices or spiritual and religious practices and Meta stories and folklores and other cultural manifestations.

Aesthetic value is a part of intrinsic value that refers to a wide range of qualities (Mason, 2002) widely agreed to be a category of socio-cultural value through it. Aesthetic values refer to visual qualities of heritage. The evolution of a building, object or site is some of the sources of aesthetic values. It has been proposed that aesthetic values can be interpreted more widely to encompass all senses: smell, sound and feeling as well as sight. Thus, heritage or an archeological site could be seen as valuable for the sensory experiences it offers. Aesthetic value is

a strong contributor to a sense of well-being and is perhaps the most personal and individualistic of sociocultural type of values. (Randall Mason, 2002).

2.4.2 Intangible values (Extrinsic)

Intangible values that discussed in the chapter are derived from the concept of cultural significance encompasses of spiritual and religious value, cultural and symbolic value and place of attachment that introduced by Australian ICOMOS (Ahmad, 2006).

i)   Spiritual and Religious values

Heritage sites are sometimes associated with religious or other sacred meaning. Spiritual values to community can be considered as part of other values but particularly important for some communities. Johnson (2006) has noted that the term spiritual is generally used in other associated terms such as sacred, secret, and ceremonial and beliefs exclusively in association with indigenous communities. Listening to local communities is only the beginning of a process in increasing local participation. Evolution and adaptation of religious practices, rituals and festivals to contemporary circumstances should be understood as a normal part of continuity of living religious heritage and should be respected in archaeological heritage conservation decision-making.