walled sites, communities may provide valuable information on a record of heights of stone walls and if they had decorative motifs that have been lost as walls collapsed.

Research elsewhere has shown that integration of non-archaeologists in research is critical. Meskell (2007) argues that the historical depth of monuments and objects and their iconic value must be considered when dealing with archaeological material. Marshall (2002) has demonstrated that community archaeology is not new since people establish meaning in the present by always engaging with the past (see also Atalay, 2007, p. 252). This approach is believed to benefit both communities and archaeology (Layton, 1994; Marshall, 2002; Meskell, 2007; Atalay, 2007). Benefits of archaeology, and heritage in general, are countless and varied, and as such community-based archaeology not only empowers communities, it also contributes to the construction of their identity (Greer, 2002, p. 268). Jameson (1997, p. 11) noted that archaeology as a profession can "no longer afford to be detached from the mechanisms and programs that attempt to communicate archaeological information to the lay public". In laying the foundation for stakeholder engagement, Layton (1994, p. 12) argued that consideration of the values, aspirations and knowledge of indigenous people in archaeological research is beneficial to both archaeological theory and practice. Irrespective of the definition of community or the category of engagement, the object of community engagement in archaeological conservation and management is to allow contemporary society access to the past, and to embrace their opinions in redefining the methods and practices of archaeology as a discipline.

Who is the community?

In defining community, Marshall (2002, p. 216) states that it can be people living on or close to archaeological sites, or people who trace their descent to archaeological sites.[2] This paper utilizes the definition of community by Marshall (2002), as the four villages used in the research were 'communities' by virtue of their proximity to the development projects and archaeological sites, and that they traced their descent to the archaeological and historical resources in the project area. Review of the literature shows that community participation can be threefold:

- relinquishing partial control of projects to communities, or community archaeology (Marshall, 2002);
- engaging communities at all stages of research projects or community-based archaeology (Greer *et al*., 2002, p. 268);
- consultation where archaeologists – recognizing issues of land rights – negotiate with communities for their consent to already identified research projects (Greer *et al*., 2002, p. 267).

Challenges in community participation

Stakeholder engagement is not without challenges. Berggren and Hodder (2003) have highlighted that research designs often have to