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Abstract

The Internet has become an important medium for disseminating information about archaeology to the public. Research by archaeologists on how they can use the Internet is in its infancy. This thesis examines an Indigenous group's perspectives on the delivery of archaeological content through websites. The Spirit Camp archaeological site is located in Stó:lō Territory in the Fraser Valley, British Columbia. The Spirit Camp website project was created to explore the Stó:lō people's preference regarding graphic design and interactivity in two otherwise identical websites. Understanding Indigenous perspectives is essential for collaborative projects and is beneficial to both archaeology and Indigenous communities if done with respect and trust, as this can lead to a better understanding of history. This thesis discusses and analyzes feedback obtained from the Stó:lō about the two Spirit Camp websites and the dissemination of knowledge about their ancestors via the Internet. The more graphical website guides the viewer with a storybook-like interface while the other website allows readers to view material in plain text with a standard menu and scrollbar. Feedback from 24 participants was collected through an individual survey questionnaire, and three age-based focus groups: youths, adults, and Elders. This research shows that enhanced graphic design and increased levels of interactivity in websites do influence website preference. Elders telling stories, colour, photos, games, music and moving objects are examples cited by Stó:lō members as additions to future websites which enhance their experience. All the male participants preferred the more graphic website, while women's preferences were 53% in favour of the more graphical website. Data from the focus groups demonstrates that viewers' opinions vary by gender and age. This research informs us how to effectively work with and respect Indigenous peoples. It does so by suggesting the use of culturally sensitive methods, such as interviews and focus groups, to acquire Indigenous perspectives on the presentation and dissemination of archaeological information.
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1. **Introduction**

The Internet is a recent method of communication that has risen exponentially in use. For many people, it has become their default source of information (Richards 2006). Archaeologists have long seen the need to connect computers and archaeology as demonstrated by the first conference held by the Computer Applications in Archaeology organization in 1973. McDavid (2000) and Zubrow (2006) list two views on the relevance of the Internet in disseminating information: the "utopist" view (Bolter 1991; Landow 1992; Rheingold 1993) and the "apocalyptic" view (Kester 1994; Kroker and Weinstein 1991; Postman 1992). The utopist view is that the Internet will lead to equal access of knowledge. Carey (1992) discusses the 'mythos' about digital technology (130), which he identifies in North American as the phenomenon that "identifies electricity and electrical power, electronics and cybernetics, computers and information with a new birth of community, decentralization, ecological balance, and social harmony" (114). Further, Zubrow (2006) states that "one hopes that the 'new' will provide where the old has failed" (14). These views suggest the Internet demystifies by providing knowledge to all. The apocalyptic view is that the Internet will ruin society by destroying social networks. Researchers remain divided on the importance of the Internet in archaeology, as seen by recent debates on whether or not to use the Internet extensively for disseminating information to the general public in sessions at the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA) annual meetings in 2003 and 2004. The Internet provides archaeologists with a venue to educate, to teach and to inform the general public about archaeology. By doing this we may create a public that is aware and concerned with protecting the nonrenewable resource we call the archaeological record. This is one further step in the dissemination of information and in the preservation of the past, two valuable considerations when doing archaeological research.

Archaeology as a Western discipline needs to be sensitive when studying Indigenous populations (Watkins 2000; Trigger 1980; Mihesuah 1998). Many Indigenous people view archaeology as the "grave robber profession," a stereotype unfortunately promoted by popular culture in movies and novels (Nichols et al. 1999). While this is an overly negative stereotype, archaeologists must recognize that they still maintain authority as the interpreters of ancient cultures. McKee (1994) and McDavid (2000) both discuss how archaeologists are uncomfortable with sharing decisions regarding research directions, particularly with people outside of archaeology. However, there are others who are comfortable with this collaborative and public work. Examples include Trigger (1980), Yellowhorn (1996), Zimmerman (1998, 2003) and
Watkins (2000). Although there are challenges to collaborative work, the advantages outweigh any disadvantage. This idea is not new but is referred to by Zimmerman (1998) as "ethnocritical archaeology":

(1)his approach directly involves indigenous people (or any other affected group) in the archaeological process, working together with archaeologists to set research agendas and perhaps even getting involved in the excavation and analyses (83).

This type of work can be scientific in nature, and still be accountable to a "specific public" (Zimmerman 1998: 83). Further, this approach can be seen in Echo-Hawk’s research where he discusses the successful integration of archaeology and oral tradition as a path to reshape ancient human history (1997). Although, this project does not directly use oral tradition, focus groups are similar to the traditional discussion style used by many Indigenous groups.

This research project is the first to discuss archaeological websites based on the opinions and perceptions of Indigenous people. It informs the debate on the use of the Internet in public archaeology from the academic perspective and gives voice to Indigenous perspectives.

It is the responsibility of those producing an archaeological website to be ethically accountable to the people whom the website represents. The Canadian Archaeological Association’s (CAA) Statement of Principles for Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal Peoples encourages partnerships with Aboriginal communities, and states archaeologists should “respect the cultural significance of oral history and traditional knowledge in the interpretation and presentation of the archaeological record of Aboriginal peoples” (Nicholson et al. 1996). Although, the CAA does not specifically state how this is to be done, websites are clearly one means of interpreting and presenting information, and therefore, fall under these guidelines.

Further to this discussion of ethical accountability is the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) and the Canadian Museums Associations (CMA) joint development of an "ethical framework and strategies for Aboriginal Nations to represent their history and culture in concert with cultural institutions" titled Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples (Hill & Nicks 1992: 12). Three major issues were identified to redress the imbalances between museums and First Peoples:

1) increased involvement of Aboriginal peoples in the interpretation of their culture and history by cultural institutions;
2) improved access to museum collections by Aboriginal peoples; and
3) the repatriation of artifacts and human remains (ibid.).
This research project addresses aspects of all these issues. It increases the involvement of the Stó:lō people of the Fraser Valley in British Columbia in the interpretation of their culture by providing them with an opportunity to comment on two websites presenting the Spirit Camp archaeological site. Access to collections is improved by bringing information to the Stó:lō people through the website. Finally, some of the artifacts are visually repatriated through their portrayal in the site.

Indigenous archaeology has grown as archaeologists accept Indigenous peoples’ right to a voice in the interpretation of their past (Watkins 2000). This thesis was motivated by the increasing popularity of both Indigenous archaeology and the Internet. This stimulated a desire to create a website working with a local Indigenous community and to attain feedback about the final product. This project promotes increased communication between archaeologists and Indigenous people.

Stó:lō ancestors are portrayed in this website. Therefore, Stó:lō descendants (from three distinct generations—Elders, adults and youths) were approached to inquire how graphics affect their perceptions and opinions of the two websites presented. By speaking directly to the Stó:lō (or people living in Stó:lō traditional territory who participate regularly in Stó:lō heritage), insight and feedback was gained as to their preferences for and responses to the presentation of their heritage, specifically related to website graphic design and interactivity. This feedback gave community members a chance to influence the final version of the website. This process recognizes their unique perspective, voice and cultural rights to their heritage and its interpretation. Equal partnerships are necessary for ethically and socially conscious bodies of work, and these partnerships have a direct impact not only on past histories, but also on our present and future relationships. While both positive and negative aspects of this collaborative process will be discussed throughout this thesis, it is important to note at the outset that the positives outweigh negatives. Listening to communities and responding to their feedback is critical to creating lasting relationships built on trust.

The purpose of this research is three-fold: (1) to explore Stó:lō perceptions of an archaeological website presented in two different formats: the River Site and the Heron Site; (2) to investigate how gender and age affect opinions and (3) to compare Stó:lō perspectives to more general data about website preference.

In 2001, Professors Susan Rowley and David Pokotylo received a UBC Faculty of Arts Instructional Support & Information Technology grant to create a website based on the Spirit Camp archaeological site and field school (see discussion below). The website was to be used as a teaching
and information tool for UBC students studying archaeology, and be accessible to the general public. It also presented an opportunity to investigate responses and elicit feedback from an Indigenous perspective about the use of website graphics. The driving interest behind this research connects three areas of archaeology: digital archaeology, Indigenous archaeology, and public archaeology. Digital archaeology "uses future technology to understand past behaviour" (Zubrow 2006:27). This graphic design comparison project seemed to be a bridge between these three areas of study. Two websites designed in two different graphic formats, with identical content about an archaeological site in Stó:lō territory, were created. These websites will then be presented to Stó:lō people in order to determine their preferences. Do Stó:lō people view one as more culturally appropriate, more interesting, more informative, more aesthetically pleasing, and more entertaining than the other, and if so why? These questions are addressed in more detail in the discussion section (see section 5.1).

Under the CAA ethical guidelines, Indigenous people should be respected. One way of demonstrating this respect is through involving them in discussion and analyzes of their own cultural heritage—an approach followed throughout this research. First, permission was obtained from Stó:lō Nation and from the Chehalis Band Office to conduct research in their communities. Second, consent forms were sent to all participants. Participants under the age of 18 were sent both student assent forms and parent/guardian consent forms. Following Stó:lō Nation protocols, copies of the thesis will be deposited in the Stó:lō Nation Archives. In addition, copies will also be given to the Chehalis Community School, Stó:lō Education Centre, and the Lalems Ye Siyolexwe (House of Elders). Additionally, as required by UBC policy, the project also received certification from the UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board (Appendix A). Following through on the philosophy of inclusion in the project, one website will be forwarded to Stó:lō Nation/Tribal Council for approval before being made available to the public on the Internet. This project is a small piece of a long standing relationship between the UBC Laboratory of Archaeology (LOA) and the Stó:lō people.

1.1. Background

1.1.1. Stó:lō

Stó:lō traditional territory, known as S’ólh Témxw, extends from Langley to north of Yale (British Columbia) and includes about 5000 people who identify themselves as Stó:lō. "Stó:lō Nation," the political body, that came together originally for treaty purposes contained 21 of the 24 bands classified culturally
as Stó:lo people (Stó:lo Nation 2002). The original plan for this project was to work with Stó:lo Nation, through contacts made from a previous ethnographic field school during which I interviewed six Stó:lo Nation Councillors about their perspectives on archaeology. However, during the undertaking of this project Stó:lo Nation split into two bodies: Stó:lo Nation (14 bands) and Stó:lo Tribal Council (8 bands). Two (Chehalis and Yale) of the 24 bands are currently going through the treaty process under their own terms and are not part of Stó:lo Nation or Stó:lo Tribal Council. Although culturally Stó:lo, some members of these two bands do not call themselves Stó:lo, but prefer to refer to themselves by their own name. This is the case with Chehalis.

1.1.2. Spirit Camp

Spirit Camp (DhRI-25) is a cultural and archaeological site located at Calamity Point on the north bank of the Fraser River near the confluence of the Harrison and Fraser Rivers, northwest of Chilliwack. Human occupation at Spirit Camp goes back approximately 5000 to 7000 years (Morrison 1994; Pokotylo 2004). It was first recorded as an archaeological site in the 1970s (BC Archaeology Branch 1974).

In 1994, Stó:lo community members planned a 'spiritual retreat' with a summer cultural program for children. They required a location close to both Chilliwack and Scowlitz communities, and yet remote enough so that people coming and going would not disrupt cultural events. Calamity Point was considered an ideal location, as it was remote with no car access, but near both Chilliwack and Scowlitz. Community members decided the retreat would be used specifically as a summer cultural program for children to learn traditional knowledge and values from Stó:lo Elders (G. Mohs pers. com. 2005). They called it Spirit Camp. As part of the program, they planned to build a traditional pit house. The property owner, June Keevil, was contacted and permission was obtained to use the property for the camp.

Gordon Mohs, the Stó:lo Nation Archaeologist at the time, asked the people in charge of building the pit house, which involved digging a circular pit over a metre deep, to avoid the area near the river, as this was classified as a high potential archaeological zone (G. Mohs pers. com. 2005). Despite following these guidelines, artifacts were uncovered almost immediately. The project was stopped and an assessment of the exposed archaeological deposits was undertaken. This emergency reconnaissance was limited to one day. The test cuts revealed six continuous cultural layers; 59 tools and 407 flakes were recovered (Morrison et al. 1994). This work indicated the potential of Spirit Camp to make a significant contribution to our understanding of Stó:lo heritage.
In summer 2001, a joint archaeological field school was planned between Stó:lō Nation, specifically the Scowlitz First Nation, and the Laboratory of Archaeology at the University of British Columbia (UBC). The basic questions posed were how and when did people use Spirit Camp? (D. Pokotylo pers. com. 2005).

1.1.3. The Research Project

Two websites were created using identical textual and photographic content about the Spirit Camp archaeological site. The first website—the Heron Site—is more graphically enhanced and is more interactive. Collene Armstrong of Points North, a website company, was contracted to create the Heron Site. As funds were limited, this was in large part a labour of love for both her and her team. The second website, called the River Site, is similar to most websites on the Internet. It was created once the first was completed; I constructed the River Site with identical text and photographic content, but with a different presentation format. It contains photos and text with minimal graphics and colour. Stó:lō members participated in focus groups to view, and discuss the two websites. Both open-ended and closed questions were asked of the participants, after which, the responses were compared and contrasted, across, within, and between the groups as well as by age and gender.

1.1.4. General Public Opinions of Websites

Computers intrigue the public as a new technology and media to learn and entertain. This interest gives designers the consumer base to experiment with different formats including graphically rich websites. Of course, it is also important that graphics enhance, not detract from, the intended message. Studies have shown that the most important aspect of a website is clear and concise content presentation in a manner that flows (Reed et al. 2000; Kaye & Johnson 1999; Pollock & Wilson 2002; Davis & Hantula 2001). It is almost as important for designers to listen to their audience(s) and err on the side of caution by selecting the hypertext and visual format likely to reach the largest target audience.

When websites were a new technology, researchers viewed their development in opposite ways, either positive (Bolter 1991; Landow 1992, Rheingold 1993) or negative (Kester 1991; Kroker and Weinstein 1991; Postman 1992). The positive position viewed websites as the new media that would aid in the democratization of knowledge through equal availability of information. The negative position suggested that websites would cause degradation of our social, economic or political institutions. We
know from further research that neither position was completely accurate (McDavid 2000; Bolter 1991; Landow 1992; Rheingold 1993; Kester 1994; Kroker and Weinstein 1991; Postman 1992; Zubrow 2006). While websites have untapped potential to bring content to the masses, we have no proof that this will result in equal access to knowledge. As Deloria (1995) notes, professionals of all kinds like to control content to protect not only the written product but also their position in society.

A survey in 2000 examined the Canadian public's "perception, knowledge, and attitudes toward archaeological heritage" (Pokotylo 2002: 91). According to Pokotylo's (2002:102) question "How effective are each of the following ways of learning about archaeology?" the perceived effectiveness of the Internet decreased with the increasing age of the respondents. However, "women rated the effectiveness ... significantly higher then men", although, overall "respondents considered it to be the least effective way of learning about archaeology" (Pokotylo 2002: 101, 102). These results however, may not represent the perspective of youths. The survey included people 18 years of age or older and missed the younger generation who grew up using the Internet. Additionally, the survey results may be outdated in this area, as Internet use habits have changed dramatically in only a few years (NUA 2003).

Further evidence to support the idea of a technological lag in the survey results comes from responses of a mixed age cluster class of students (aged 9-12) in 2002. A group of Anthropology graduate students (including myself) at UBC developed and delivered an archaeological component to elementary students as part of a course requirement for Anthropology 541 – Public Archaeology. We observed that the students used the Internet prior to using "traditional" means of acquiring information, such as written texts. This corresponds to Richard's (2007) findings. The students also ranked websites. Students regard websites ending in ".edu", those run by universities, and other educational facilities in the United States, as being highly valuable and accurate. Graphically enhanced websites were also viewed as more accurate because the students perceived that more time and money had been put into their design. They argued that you would not put time and money into producing a website that was inaccurate. Reliance on the Internet by younger people means a significant age group are not included in surveys on public archaeology (Ramos & Duganne 2000; Pokotylo 2002, 2007; Pokotylo and Guppy 1999), because of their age.

2. Theoretical Perspectives and Relevance to Literature

An increasing body of literature discusses the Internet, cyberspace, media, and computers in archaeology. Prior to 2000 most research focused on the survey and resource variety (lists of data or
archaeological website resources) (Richards & Ryan 1985; Durusau 1998; Lock 2003; Richards 2007, Zubrow 2007), GIS, and/or virtual recreations of sites (McPherron & Dibble 2001). With our growing reliance on the Internet it is easy to forget that the Internet is only at most 38 years old (Wikipedia 2007). Thus, archaeology-specific literature is limited in its discussion of the Internet. It is important to note that organizations such as *Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods* have had an impact on archaeology as discussed at their 1997 conference entitled *Archaeology in the age of the Internet* (Dingwall 1999). The web journal *Internet Archaeology*, which has been publishing since 1996, has added considerably to the body of literature in this area of study. I suggest that the publication of such texts as: *Using Computers in Archaeology* (Lock 2003), *Digital Archaeology: bridging method and theory* (Evans & Daly 2006), and *Archaeology and the Media* (Clack & Brittain 2007), is one sign that the Internet is popular for disseminating information among archaeologists, and contributes both methodologically and theoretically to the discipline (Zubrow 2006).

Zimmerman (2003) advocates working with Indigenous people in presenting the past to the public. My work for this project strives to further this type of collaboration by revisiting Indigenous people after the project, in this case the archaeological website, has been completed. The purpose of this next step is to attain feedback from community members to determine our effectiveness at delivering archaeological information and working collaboratively, and to give communities a venue for presenting their opinions and advice on how to improve. Follow-up exploration of Indigenous peoples' website preferences is necessary for building stable and healthy working relationships. This evolving process will make websites more accessible and relevant to Indigenous people. I suggest that Indigenous people should be active in all aspects (from start to finish) of the project where possible.

While designers of archaeological websites may want to educate their audience, the motivations of the audience may not be educational. Kaye and Johnson (2002) identify three major personal motivations for accessing websites: information, entertainment and socializing. These motivations are further influenced by factors such as personality, age, gender, educational background and cultural background (Kaye & Johnson 2002). These motivations affect how one views websites and website preferences (Schumacher & Morahan-Martin 2001). Although these are all interesting factors, only age and gender was tested in this research project. Simon (2001), Schumacher & Morahan-Martin (2001) and Saunders (2006) demonstrate that gender affects website preference. There is also evidence that age
The creation of an archaeological website is a complex process with multi-layered perspectives. While a website is written by one person or group, the creators; the opinions/interests of the Indigenous group represented and/or the general public are important to consider in website development. The perspectives of the creators, the Indigenous group and/or the general public may not be discrete and can overlap. In a best-case scenario, the creators and Indigenous people should have an open dialogue and partnership when creating a website. This subsequent partnership provides a richer, more complex experience for all audiences. It is also important that the needs of all groups be balanced against costs (both time and money).

2.1. Research Question

The research question for this thesis is: Do Stó:lō community members perceive two websites with the same archaeological content but visually different as equal, or do they favour one over the other and, if so, why? The null hypothesis is that there is no difference in preference between the two websites. The alternative hypothesis is that viewers will prefer one or the other. Factors such as age and gender were taken into consideration as part of the general testing framework. While there are many different groups within Stó:lō, most people identify themselves as Stó:lō thus making culture a constant in this study. To evaluate these hypotheses, community members were asked to participate in focus groups to identify their opinions and preferences. Each participant also completed a short survey with questions about their background and computer experience.

3. Methodology

This project is a case study bounded by time (two month data collection) and place (Stó:lō territory). This project was developed as a structured inquiry. The research question was posed. The two websites were developed to test the question. Focus groups and short surveys provide the data for analysis. Finally, observations were expanded beyond the specific groups to include comparisons with the general public where available.

Focus groups were considered the most appropriate method to: 1) obtain information; 2) provide flexibility to both participants and moderators; 3) study age and gender 4) work with people of differing technological skills; and 5) attain feedback from marginalized peoples.
Marginalized and/or colonized peoples are reclaiming their rightful place in history by demanding to be heard. Focus groups provide a culturally appropriate method for eliciting information from marginalized populations because I think that they create an environment closest to traditional Indigenous discussions within Western methodologies, and are conducive to the sharing and exchange of ideas. Sharing circles, as used by Goudreau (2006), are appropriate, especially in circumstances involving sensitive material as they are culturally defined methods. However, not all Indigenous people choose to use this method of research. Focus groups provide a great potential for voicing a wide range of perspectives and allow people to give their own point of view, without being led by a set pattern of questions. Some participants have their memories triggered by other speakers and are able to use these ideas as stepping-stones to participate more fully. This often takes them in directions that were not anticipated.

Three focus groups were convened. Focus groups often involve professional moderators. However, this was not possible due to funding constraints. A professional moderator may claim objectivity for a project. The main reason for using focus groups is to elicit subtle hidden answers (Fowler Jr. 1995). Acknowledging my inexperience, I moderated two of the focus groups with a colleague, Ditta Cross, (BA BEd), acting as recorder. The third focus group was moderated and recorded by Ditta Cross, an Innu/Mohawk who agreed to help and was invaluable in making community members feel more comfortable with the academic process. I believe the Indigenous ancestry of Ditta and myself may have led to the overall comfort level felt by participants.

The focus group methods employed were derived from the Focus Group Kit (Morgan et al. 1998), a series of instructional texts. Focus groups enable discussion of more than one issue. In addition, giving participants the opportunity to formulate thoughts prior to the actual focus group keeps the group grounded, and acknowledges that participants have a certain amount of control over information (Morgan et al. 1998). Focus groups are also a good way of getting to know and share information. The flexible questioning style of focus groups acknowledges more diverse and interesting dialogue than closed questions (Morgan et al. 1998). This was considered a more appropriate way of gauging attitudes towards the two websites. Further, divergent thoughts emerge naturally when the format of the focus group is kept informal and inviting.

In a previous research project using interview sessions in Stô:lô Nation territory (Lafleur 2003), some informants stated that survey questions: (1) made people feel that they were not being listened to;
(2) were sometimes irrelevant and forced; and (3) did not permit participants to control the information that they shared. These three statements are justification alone for using focus groups. Therefore, only a small survey was used to collect more personal data on individuals, which was administered prior to the start of the focus group.

The initial research plan was to involve only people of Stó:lō descent. However, it soon became clear that this was too closed a concept. Many reserves include people from other Indigenous communities, as well as non-Indigenous people who work, live in, and are an integral part of the network and makeup of the community. The participants in this project had a wide range of education and lived in Stó:lō traditional territory.

There were two major alterations to the original research plan:

1) The Stó:lō Nation went through political restructuring in August of 2004, splitting into two main groups: Stó:lō Nation and Stó:lō Tribal Council. As a result of the changing political landscape, I decided to deal directly with bands geographically closest in proximity to the Spirit Camp archaeological site: Scowlitz First Nation, and Chehalis First Nation. However, this does necessarily imply that these bands were the most involved throughout the process.

2) The original research had intended to look at several groups divided by age. However, after several months of phone calls, e-mails and more political changeovers, it became clear that I would have to focus on local schools, as well as Lalems Ye Siyolexwe (House of Elders) at Stó:lō Nation. This allowed the study to include youths, adults and Elders. In the end, three focus groups were facilitated with the Chehalis Community School, the Stó:lō Education Centre, and the Lalems Ye Siyolexwe (House of Elders).

3.1. Websites

3.1.1. The Heron Site

The Heron Site is structured to take the reader on a journey. It has an animated introduction with a heron (red, white and black) fishing on a dark blue and black background with river audio (see Figure 1 – Appendix B). Each page of the Heron Site fills the screen. The pages are blue with white writing and a brown header (Figure 2 – Appendix B). Graphics and designs are used to control the website environment, creating a linear (chronological) interaction with the website whereby the viewer can only access one page at a time. The absence of a pull down menu on each page serves to keep viewers in
the section and is designed to focuses their attention on the content. For representative Heron Site sample pages see Appendix B.

Moreover, there is little potential for the viewer to get sidetracked by other information. The Heron Site uses Arial 15pt font for most of its text and 20pt Papyrus font for the headers, which makes the text large and readable.

### 3.1.2. The River Site

The River Site has minimal graphics, most evident in the home page – Figure 3 (see Appendix B - for more examples of pages from this website). The River Site allows the viewer to skip sections. The background is stone grey and there are no moving graphics.

The text font size in the River Site varies and uses Dreamweaver default pixel and percentage measures rather than point font. The first page uses Arial 12 pixels font (roughly the same size as 9pt font); the following pages use Arial 80% font (basically smaller text); the headers are Arial – bold 114% (bigger than 12pt font); and the masthead is 100 pixels (a larger header, ca. half an inch high depending on screen size).

The River Site has two menus, one at the top, and one on the left hand side of the screen. There are few graphics; instead the focus is on the text and photos. Mobility is relatively unrestricted and the viewer can switch from section to section with ease. This website contains the exact same text content, including the spelling errors (which had not been corrected at the time of the focus groups), as the Heron Site.

### 3.1.3. Comparison of the River and Heron Websites

The most obvious difference between the River and Heron Sites is in viewer interaction. For this project, "Interactive" is defined as:

the degree to which two or more communication parties can act on each other, on the communication medium, and on the messages and the degree to which such influences are synchronized (Liu and Shrum 2002: 2).

Neither website can be classified as highly interactive, as neither requires input from the viewer. Rather the focus is on what can be termed navigational interactivity (links, menus, animations, video clips – all passive). Examples of high interactivity could include a “talk to the archaeologist” section (functional
interactivity), or a section where viewer choices change the outcome (adaptive interactivity) (see McDavid 2000: 165). I consider the Heron Site a medium interactivity site. An example of this level of interactivity is the “Explore the Dig” section, where the viewer explores different layers of the excavation and in situ artifacts by clicking on different parts of the dig (see Figures 4 and 5 in Appendix B). The River Site, in contrast, is considered a low interactivity site, since the viewer only reads and looks at pictures.

Figure 6 (in Appendix B) shows part of the “Explore the Dig” section from the River Site. The page is photo heavy and the only possible visitor interaction is page scrolling. Thus, while the dig section is highlighted in the Heron Site, it blends into the River Site. Another aspect of interactivity in the Heron Site is the way it reads like a story, whereas the River Site is segmented into sections.

The Heron Site also has larger text than the River Site. While, there are more pages in the Heron Site, they are shorter in length. The River Site has a top and left navigation bar, whereas the Heron Site has navigation buttons located at the bottom of each page. The Heron Site buttons allow one to do less and often direct you the viewer to move forward, rather than allowing constant section changes. The Heron Site has a balance between text and white space, whereas the River Site has an obvious imbalance between text and white space with text predominant. These design differences were purposefully selected to investigate the question of how two websites, identical in text-based content, yet visually very different, affect viewer perceptions of the site.

3.2. Participants

Three focus groups were held. Focus Group A consisted of 13-15 year olds attending the Chehalis Community School; Focus Group B comprised adults 18-49 years old at the Stó:lō Education Centre; and Focus Group C members were from the Lalems Ye Siyolexwe and were between 58-79 years old. All participants received a small gift (a mug with a salmon motif designed by Haisla artist Lyle Wilson) and a snack. A total of 31 (16 females and 15 males) subjects participated in this study, and 27 (15 females and 12 males) of them completed the survey. However, one individual who completed the survey is non-Indigenous, and has been dropped from the analysis. These three focus groups were delivered in slightly different ways to the participants. However, each focus group member received the survey questionnaire prior to the group meeting.

The Chehalis Community School group (Focus Group A) viewed the websites for one hour in their computer class two days prior to the focus group. This allowed the youths to explore the websites at their own pace and allowed the teacher to prepare them to participate in a compare/contrast dialogue. A
common focus group practice is to review some of the results with the group prior to departure. Unfortunately, this was not possible, as the focus group had already taken up the entire hour allotted for the discussion.

The Stó:lō Education Centre Group (Focus Group B) did not view the websites prior to the focus group. The adults spent 20 minutes looking at each website, after which they came together to discuss the websites for a total of about one hour and 15 minutes. Limited computer availability (due to Internet connection difficulties) resulted in some adults pairing up to look at the websites. Time constraints restricted this group's access to the websites. At the end of the focus group, feedback was provided as to how Focus Group B answers compared to those of Focus Group A.

The Lalems Ye Siyolexwe (House of Elders) from Stó:lō Nation (Focus Group C) did not view the websites ahead of time, as the receptionist advised that few Elders had home computers. As there were no computers in the assigned room, the websites were presented in PowerPoint format. The River Site was read to the Elders, as the small text size was not visible even with the LCD projector. The focus group took approximately two hours from start to finish. Further, the moderator realized that the reading of the site was necessary to accommodate one gentleman who was going blind. No feedback was given to the Elders at the end, as it was not made clear to the moderator that this should occur.

3.3. Research Methods

3.3.1. Survey Questionnaire

The questionnaire was divided into two sections: Background Information and Computer Experience. It was designed to take five to ten minutes to complete, which was accomplished.

Two slightly different questionnaires were used in this study. Group A received the survey form in Appendix C - Version 1, and Groups B and C received the survey in Appendix C - Version 2. Changes to the questionnaire were made following preliminary analysis of responses from Focus Group A. In the Background Information section Question 7 “Do you believe that you have a higher than average interest in the subject of archaeology/history? Yes or No” was added to the two later focus groups to help determine peoples’ general interest in archaeology. In the Computer Experience section, Focus Group A results indicated that questions 6 and 7 were unclear and vague. Question 6 originally had an error. It stated, “Do you use a Low speed or Hi speed Internet service? Yes or No” suggesting that if one used either Low or Hi speed, the response would be “yes”, when in actual fact, it was intended to identify which
type they used. It was modified to differentiate more clearly between Low and Hi speed Internet: "Do you use a Low speed or Hi speed Internet service? Low or Hi". Question 7 originally asked "Which website do you prefer and why?" Respondents answered with their favourite website, often a game or music website. The intent was to ask, "Which of the two websites that you just viewed did you prefer and why?" This became Question 8 in the revised survey. In addition, an extra question was added, as a new Question 7: "Do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the Internet and Web surfing? Yes or No." It was asked to determine the users' perceptions of their computer skills.

3.3.2. Focus Group Questions

The questions presented to each focus group are listed in Table 1. Focus Group A received questions 1-6 and Focus Groups B and C received questions 1-8. As with the survey, two questions were added to increase clarity, minimize misunderstanding, and re-emphasize some of the earlier questions.

Table 1. Focus group questions.

1. What do you like about the two websites?
2. What do you dislike about the two websites?
3. What do you see as the differences/similarities between the two sites?
4. What was one thing that you learned from each site?
5. We designed these two sites to be very different and are only going to have the opportunity to put one of these websites up. Which would you prefer to see put up?
6. We are trying to understand how to make websites of interest to Stó:lō and to other First Nations. What advice do you have for us?
7. Do you think archaeology websites are relevant in Stó:lō Territory?
8. Do you feel that you could have learnt more from the websites? If so, how?

4. Results: Survey & Focus Groups

4.1. Survey Questionnaire Results

This section presents the results of the survey. Table 2 presents background information; Table 3 lists computer experience. The tables include additional focus group information, since some participants were transitory and did not complete the survey. The effect is most noticeable in regards to participant numbers, which do not fluctuate in Table 2, but vary in the text. The small size of the sample did not allow for valid tests of statistical significance. The focus group results do not have discrete numbers as it was often quite difficult to count heads during the actual sessions. Percentages calculated where possible. However, in the absence of such data rank values (few = less then 25% of participants, some = between 25% and 50%, many = between 50% and 75%, most =more than 75%) are used to designate the relative
number of people who agreed or disagreed with a statement. The results for the three focus groups (youth, adults, and Elders) are discussed in succession.

Table 2. Focus group participants' background information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background information</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language spoken at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halq'emeylem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highest grade of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIHi(^1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How Have you learned about History?(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders/family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural centers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological excavation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Higher than average interest in archaeology/history?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Collected</td>
<td>3 - yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6 - yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Collected</td>
<td>3 - no</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3 - no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Elementary and High school (EIHi)
\(^2\) Percentages for Question 6 add up to more than 100% as respondents listed multiple choices.
Table 3. Focus group participants’ computer experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Experience</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you own a computer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you use your own computer or any computer regularly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. If yes, what do you use your computer for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (music &amp; games)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you use the Internet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. About how much time do you spend on the Internet each week?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 3 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 9 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 9 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What tasks do you use the Internet for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you use a Low speed or Hi speed Internet service? Low or Hi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW speed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI speed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the Internet and Web surfing? Yes or No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Collected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Collected</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/NA</td>
<td>Not Collected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which of the two websites that you just viewed did you prefer and why? (info from focus group &amp; survey compiled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron Site</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1. Group A: Chehalis Community School

This group of 11 Indigenous participants from a grade 7/8 class consisted of six males and five females between ages 13-15. English was the main language spoken at home. Ten of eleven students indicated

---

5 Percentages for Questions 2b and 5 add up to more than 100% as respondents listed multiple uses or tasks.

4 The replies for research/school differ between questions 2b and 5 – this may be due to participants having different understandings of the terms “use” and “task.”
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Elders in response to the question “where have you learned about your history?” This demonstrates the continued importance of Elders in Indigenous communities as sources of knowledge about the past. The second highest response was school and teachers with six of eleven responding affirmatively. This illustrates that educators (whether formal or informal) are important in the lives of youths.

Although the question “Do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the Internet and web surfing?” was not asked of this group, none of the students had a problem finding the two websites. These youth were obviously adept at using the Internet.

Responses to “which of the two websites that you just viewed did you prefer and why?” demonstrate why this question was changed for subsequent focus groups. The answers fell into three main website categories: music, games, and research. None of the responses referred to the Heron or the River websites. However, the answer to this question emerged during the focus group, with nine of eleven students (81%) preferring the Heron Site.

4.1.2. Group B: Stó:lō Education Centre

The second group consisted of six full-time participants, four males and two females. One male was non-Indigenous. Four other individuals came and went during the focus group, causing fluctuations in the number of participants. As a result, the number of responses to the questions varies. Participants’ ages ranged 18-49, all except one were aged 40-49. Education level completed varied; however, all but one were enrolled in the Education Centre. Only four answered the question “where have you learned about your history (circle all that apply)?” and all listed Elders and family. The majority (75%, 3 of 4) also stated museums, school, TV, and books. This suggests a wide range of sources are being used for attaining information about history in general. Answers to “do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the subject of archaeology/history? Yes or No” were split evenly among the six respondents. Four of the six Group B participants owned home computers, and five said they used a computer on a regular basis. Overall, 67% (4) preferred the Heron Site, and 20% (1) did not provide an answer on the survey questionnaire.

4.1.3. Group C: Lalems Ye Siyolexwe (House of Elders)

Group C consisted of ten Stó:lō Elders, five males and five females, with an age range of 58-79. All said they spoke English at home normally, and one also mentioned speaking Halq'emeylem. In response to
“where have you learned about your history?” (see Table 3) the pattern again suggests that those interested in their history are likely to seek out a variety of media. It also demonstrates the importance of Elders and family within an Indigenous worldview. When asked “do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the subject of archaeology/history?” 60% of the participants indicated a higher than average interest in the subject. Five participants (50%) had home computers, while another (10%) had regular access to a computer. Only 40% stated they used the Internet, but 50% gave responses for actually spending time on the Internet. This group had a slightly higher interest in archaeology (60%) than their usage of the Internet (40-50%).

In response to “which of the two websites that you just viewed did you prefer and why?” eight did not provide an answer on the survey questionnaire. However, when asked during the focus group, which of the two websites they preferred, two chose the River Site, six preferred the Heron Site, and two were not available having stepped outside the room.

4.2. Focus Group Results
The answers to the focus group questions (see Table 1) often came about in a roundabout way, possibly due to the questioning style of the novice moderators, or possibly because participants did not see the question as important to them. Group A and B participants focused on likes and dislikes about the two websites (questions 1 and 2) and found it quite easy to talk about the similarities and differences (question 3). All participants from the first two groups stated that they had and could learn (question 4 and 8) something from the website and that the websites were about Stó:lō culture. A more in-depth testing mechanism would be needed to identify whether something was learned or not. Question 5, regarding “Which website would you like to see put up?” was responded in favour of one website, the Heron Site, although, there was some indecision amongst the younger female participants to be discussed more fully in the Focus Group A results. Participants responded to giving advice (question 6) in an intriguing fashion, as they suggested that even if they themselves were not personally interested in viewing these websites, others in the community and/or other Indigenous communities would be, and that the information provided was important. Question 7 on relevance was asked in Focus Groups B and C, and the majority thought that the website would be relevant in their territory. Few stated they could necessarily have learned more. They had informative ideas on how to improve the websites.
4.2.1. Group A: Chehalis Community School

The first question asked during the focus group was “What do you like about the two websites?” The students liked the *Heron Site*’s “animated stuff”, “stuff moving”, “cultural stuff”, “pictures”, “boats, zooming boats,” “zooming buttons, sub-buttons,” “background, logo,” “cool diagrams”, along with the “info,” “lots of exploring,” “lots of digging.”, “few words.” Students were in agreement (95%) with the participants who made these statements. These preferences can be divided into three major categories: information, graphics and technology. Most statements (90%) involved graphics or technology, few (10%) related directly to information. The second question asked was “What do you dislike about the two websites?” Some responders (i.e., 25 - 50%) said “lots of digging – kind of bland,” “I don’t like those buttons,” “I don’t like the window delay”, and “archaeology looks boring”. In some cases, I recorded the number of students who responded affirmatively to a statement. However, there were many questions where I was unable to monitor the precise level of agreement or disagreement within the group. Most (over 75%), if not all, students tended to agree with each other. The students often freely volunteered information. During the discussion of question two one student volunteered that he liked the colours “black, red and white” and all the other students agreed. Red was their preferred theme colour for the website, although neither of the sites had a red theme.

The third question asked, “What do you see as the differences/similarities between the two sites?” All noted that the *River Site* pictures were good. Statements given about the *River Site* were that “it was about Native culture,” “links click on right to paragraph”, “the house stuff”, “better with menu”, and it was “cleaner – more detail.” At least 80% of the participants agreed with each of these statements. Two girls said they thought, “The whole website was good.” All students disliked the fact that there were “too many words”, and “felt that it needed more colour, and more pictures.” Comments about the *Heron Site* included that “we like the birdie,” “the birdie is better,” “needs colour,” and “we like the house stuff”.

The fourth question “What was the one thing that you learned from each of the sites?” was not posed, as we ran out of our allotted time. However, the students did mention that the *River Site* “was about Native culture,” suggesting they learned something. Question 5 states “We designed these two sites to be very different and are only going to have the opportunity to put one of these websites up. Which would you prefer to see put up?” The initial response was that seven of the eleven participants preferred the *Heron Site*; however, two of the female participants changed their responses. Thus, the final tally was nine of the eleven participants stated that they preferred to see “the birdie” (*Heron Site*) up on
the Internet. The sixth question states "We are trying to understand how to make websites of interest to Stó:lō and to other First Nations. What advice do you have for us?" This question was responded to avidly. The students commenced by telling us what should be added to both sites. Discussion focused on the preferred Heron Site. They recommended music in the background, perhaps a women’s warrior song or drumming. They also thought that Elders, Chiefs or "grandmas" talking would be a nice touch. One student felt the whole site should be narrated, so that they would not have to read it. The inclusion of an animated version of Slahal (a gambling game), and translations into their traditional language (Halq'eméylem) were also suggested. All students wanted more pictures and more graphics on the front page, such as “the crane moving around more, more birds up top, and maybe an eagle in the background.”

The final two focus group questions 7 and 8 on relevance to Stó:lō and learning more, were not posed at the time Focus Group A was held. Although neither question was asked in the focus group, the students did make statements suggesting affirmative responses to both questions. Furthermore, three of the 11 students said they would have checked the websites out on their own, while the rest said that they spend most of their time playing computer games.

4.2.2. Group B: Stó:lō Education Centre

The first question asked during the focus group was “What do you like about the two websites?” followed by “What do you dislike about the two websites?” These two questions, however, were not kept discrete during the focus group session and often merged into the third question, "What do you see as the differences/similarities between the two sites?" Question 3 was often used as a way of keeping ideas distinct about the two sites. The Heron Site was preferred during the focus group session by 75% (six of eight) of the participants. People stated that it “was more professional,” “had more background detail”, and gave the viewer “feelings of exploration”. Participants stated that the “print size was good” because “their aunties would be able to read it”, “there was lots of colour”, which showed “creativity”, and the “pictures were funny”. The “content was good-relatively, fairly in-depth” according to one participant. All thought the dig section would be enhanced by the addition of buttons or information bubbles to tell you what to do. This was an important constructive criticism.

Focus Group B participants considered the River Site a good venue for quick, easy information. However, all felt it was “too chronological”. Further, they all agreed that the River Site “does not have
enough life; it was too stale” and that the “printing needed to be larger” so that their moms and grandmas
could read it. Finally, they added that there was too much text—“pages go on and on.”

Question 6, “We are trying to understand how to make websites of interest to Stó:lo and to other
First Nations. What advice do you have for us?”, elicited responses which focused on what they would
add to the Heron Site. All suggested music but that it did not need to be thematic. Anything from classical
music to rap or traditional music and maybe even ”music videos” could work. They said, while the content
was good, they wanted more detailed information, all agreed. One participant noted, and the rest agreed,
that websites give “our young people access to our culture, [which is] sometimes miss[ed] growing up”,
and that “our culture is shrouded in mystery [and] websites help”. This led to further discussion about how
the website was “very user friendly... nice colour ... maybe... more depth, but [overall it] covered all the
bases.”

Questions 4 and 8 were unintentionally blended into the following question “What would you have
liked to learn from the website, if there was something you wanted to know about archaeology – was it on
the site, or would you have wanted to know something else about archaeology?” One response to this
question was that “I would have liked to see the actual dig ...I liked the graphics of where you went down
a little (the Explore the Dig section).” When asked the question “We designed these two sites to be very
different and are only going to have the opportunity to put one of these websites up. Which would you
prefer to see put up?” the responses were clearly in favour of the Heron Site. Other respondents
mentioned that “there’s a lot more on one page, for the River,” “I found...the information was valuable.”

One respondent said, “I didn’t get to finish it” and suggested 20 minutes to view a website is too
brief. In addition, an interesting discussion arose from this question with one participant stating:

White society, I find when they’re reading our culture, I don’t think they’re grasping the exact
flavour of what the Native people are today, and even back then of what we value...They’re
mystified by ...the longhouse or tipi ceremony...they get so involved that they don’t realize that
we pray, sing and celebrate life. I don’t think they grasp that, because, as Natives myself being in
the white community and having white friends a lot of time they’re scared of the mystical, they
don’t want to get to know our culture, I guess it scares them, because it’s shrouded in mystery
and politics.

The adults in particular seemed quite keen on being understood by outsiders, which is why many agreed
with this gentleman’s discussion. The participants seemed to believe that websites could be created to
have a positive effect on their lives and non-Indigenous peoples' lives. This is quite interesting since websites themselves tend to be shrouded in mystery (Zubrow 2006). It is important to take this kind of feedback seriously, because it reminds us that we (archaeologists) still have work to do. Further it suggests that websites are viewed as potentially useful tools for communicating to audiences inside and outside the community. The final question asked was “Do you think archaeology websites are relevant in Stó:lō territory?” One response was that “sure, yes, in any territory, as far as Native culture is concerned, I think it is very important, because it gives our people, especially our young people access to it, to what’s there – and they sometimes miss this growing up”. All participants agreed with this statement. Thus, archaeologists should be encouraged to create websites.

4.2.3. Group C: Lalems Ye Siyolexwe (House of Elders)

Six of the eight questions (see Table 1) were asked during this focus group. Questions 4 and 8 on learning and archaeology were not asked. The following are the informative aspects of the focus group. Participants' responses do not necessarily conform to the questions asked and there was some departure from the questions. The Elders did not feel the need or the inclination to discuss the websites, but definitely favoured the Heron Site. In response to question 1 “What do you like about the two websites?” or question 2 “What do you dislike about the two websites?” some Elders did not want to discuss the “sites” because they “don't believe in the digs.” I think this was probably a miscommunication as it was not clear that the question asked was in regard to the websites and not archaeological sites.

One major suggestion the Elders made was to include stories about the dangers of doing archaeology from a spiritual perspective. One Elder told this story about an archaeological site:

... the archaeologist got hit by a spirit. He got knocked out cold. They took him into the hospital; they didn’t know what was wrong with him. They had to get a spiritual person to revive him. This is how dangerous this [archaeology] is ...our ancestors were so powerful that our spiritual healers today may not be able to revive a person. [This] guy [an archaeologist] who [was] bitten [by a spirit], before he got bit he saw one of our ancestors and it was a warrior all dressed in buckskins and regalia and he meant to kill this guy [the archaeologist]. That is why I’m saying it’s dangerous what’s happening and that is something that the Elders [have] seen. The camera, this video camera, to them it is a weapon. So he was protecting himself, his power. Our people were warriors [and] this is
what warriors watching the battleground [do], and they haven’t seen cameras or anything
and they’re lucky they [the spirits] allowed these pictures to be taken.

Although this discussion was initiated by one gentleman, there was a general agreement (over
75%) by all the Elders present. Some Elders tempered this by commenting on their desire to
learn about archaeology.

Relative to the other groups, there was no discussion about technology (such as increased
interactivity for example through music or colour), although all participants agreed that websites are a
good way to get information to the youth. One Elder stated:

When I think of websites, the next generation that’s the only way they are going to know,
because of the technology nowadays. There aren’t many of us who tell a story anymore. So how
are they going to be able to know our ancestors, except from books.

When asked if this was a good way to learn about culture and heritage, one Elder responded “I think it is
the only way.” The Elders suggested there should be “a map that shows other sites in Stó:lō territory, to
go on these websites”. The Elders focused on whether archaeology should be done, by whom and for
whom. They also agreed with the Elder who stated that their people know:

where there are more sites and burials but they don’t want to disclose it because they don’t want
to be interfered with, by anyone else, archaeologists or anybody else, so nothing has been said
about it. I know some of our people are aware of more sites.

This quote reflects a distinct Indigenous perspective in regards to archaeology. Although the responses
fell outside the focus group questions, it would have been disrespectful to direct the Elders to a specific
topic of discussion, when they had their minds set on another. It is important to reemphasize that the
Elders did respond, albeit outside the boundaries of the specific questions. However, the message
delivered by the Elders was in sharp contrast to Groups A and B.

5. Interpretations and Comparative Analysis

The youth answered questions succinctly and discussed the websites from a technology basis. Three
individuals (from Groups B & C) noticed that the text of the websites was the same. Focus Group B
focused on typos and technological problems. Once they determined (on their own) that the text was
identical in both sites, they abandoned the River Site. The Elders (Focus Group C) did not have the
opportunity to move back and forth between the websites, but rather had the River Site read to them.
When they discovered that the text content was the same, they greatly favoured the *Heron Site* with more colour and larger text. These features of the *Heron Site* make it easier to read and more user-friendly. They paid little attention to the actual content of the website, but focused on their perceptions of archaeology. Access to the websites was quite different from the other focus groups; it was done to provide comfort with the Internet and accommodate one gentleman's loss of sight.

### 5.1. Overall Preference

The *Heron site* was preferred by 19 of the 24\(^5\) (79%) participants (see Table 4). Those who preferred the *River Site* (5 of 24, 21%) based their choice on the ability to get the information they wanted without having to go through the whole website. Those who preferred the *Heron Site* stated their preference as related to interactivity and storytelling. Preference rates varied insignificantly between the focus groups. Youths showed the highest preference for the *Heron Site* (82%). This was followed by adults (80%) and then Elders (75%).

Table 4. Website preferences by focus group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Heron Site n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>River Site n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the Stó:lō participants actually view one website as more culturally appropriate, more interesting, more informative, more aesthetically pleasing, and more entertaining than the other? I suggest that they did on all accounts. The *Heron Site* was preferred for a number of reasons. One reason was because it was presented in a storybook format, which they linked to their oral tradition. In this way they saw the *Heron Site* as more culturally appropriate than the *River Site*. More time was spent looking at the *Heron Site*, out of choice, the enhanced graphics made it more interesting, more informative, more aesthetically pleasing and more entertaining – although participants did not always use these words. This suggests that people found the *Heron Site* more engaging.

---

\(^5\) The number of respondents discussed in this section is 24 (it excludes two Elders who did not respond or were unavailable to state their preferences and the one Caucasian male). Tables 4 to 8 reflect this exclusion.
5.2. Gender Differences

The initial result for Focus Group A was that 1 of 5 (20%) of the females preferred the *Heron Site*. However, two of the girls changed their minds and the final result was that the *Heron Site* was preferred by 3 of 5 (60%) of the females in Focus Group A (see Table 5). There are three possibilities for this change: 1) there may have been peer influence, 2) there may have been an initial indecision and/or 3) mistaken identity, caused by mixing up the two website names. I suggest that the most likely scenario is a combination of the three possibilities.

Table 5. Website preferences by gender for Focus Groups A and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heron Site</td>
<td>River Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group A</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These changes in preference may have been eliminated if question 8 "Which website did you prefer and why?" on the survey questionnaire (Appendix - C Version 1) had been clearer. Focus groups create different dynamics. Participants are often influenced by others. The interaction factor is one of many reasons focus groups are valuable, since they demonstrate group dynamics and represent the way Indigenous people often reach decisions, by group consensus.

Group B females were split evenly with one participant preferring each website. Unfortunately, the distribution result for male/female preference was not noted for Group C. As it could not be determined, Group C is excluded from the following discussion. Merging Focus Groups A and B shows 57% of females preferred the *Heron Site* and 43% preferred the *River Site*. This suggests a marginal preference for the *Heron Site* from the perspective of female participants.

If we merge the gender ratios for Focus Groups A & B (see Table 6), we get a clear pattern of gender differences. The results show a 4 to 3 preference for the *Heron Site* amongst females. However, the male preferences clearly display a different pattern with all nine (100%) preferring the Heron Site.

Table 6. Website preferences by gender for Focus Groups A and B combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron Site</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus there is a marked difference in male and female preferences of the websites.

These results compare with research done by Simon (2001) and Saunders (2005), who demonstrate differences between female and male website preferences. As Simon discusses:

Females (52%) suggested that sites making use of pull-down menus are easier to navigate than those with levels that require them to click through to achieve their objectives. Males, on the other hand, indicate that sites making extensive use of graphics and animated objects are clearly their preference (77%) (Simon 2001:30).

Female (43%) preference of the River Site (with a pull-down menu), whereas Simon’s results found that 52% of females prefer sites with menus. Simon’s results show that females (48%) prefer extensive use of graphics and animated objects (2001: 30), whereas this project shows that 57% of females preferred this type of site. This is really a 50-50 split in preference. However, the numbers here appear to be slightly reversed. Simon has a slight minority for preferring graphics, whereas this study shows a slight majority (see Table 7). This suggests that in this study there is a slight difference between the general public and Stó:lō participants in the female participants.

Table 7. Male and female preferences of graphically enhanced/animated sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Low-Graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (2001) results</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Projects results</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unanimous male preference for the Heron Site shows an even stronger preference for graphically enhanced site than the 77% male preference for sites with extensive use of graphics and animated objects reported by Simon (2001). Thus, websites with extensive graphics may have a male bias that does not satisfy the needs or wants of female viewers. These findings correspond to Nielsen (1999), who suggests that female viewers are more conservative web browsers. This indicates a need for alternative website formats for each gender.

5.3. Linear vs. Non-Linear Preferences

Focus Group A felt the Heron Site was too chronological and directed (i.e., the browser could not skip pages as easily). Nielsen (1999) discusses the importance of standardized sites for consistency so Internet users feel more at ease when browsing. The students demonstrate this somewhat through their perspectives that the Heron Site was too chronological; this may relate to the youths’ increased familiarity
with websites in general, and that the River Site can be seen as a standardized site. Their responses suggest those less familiar with the Internet in general, and with the standard webpage, may find the Heron Site more visually pleasing, as they see it without the bias of years of browsing. In contrast, Group B found the River Site to be “too chronological.” There is a complete reversal of which site is classified as chronological between Focus Groups A and B, this could be an age-based difference in perception, where adults are possibly not as Internet savvy as the youth. Although, both groups differed in which website they saw as too chronological they did not differ in website preference. Group A preferred the Heron Site (82%) by a very strong majority. Focus Group B liked the directionality of the Heron Site (67%), as it took them on a journey and had more of a storytelling element.

What does it mean for a website to be “too chronological?” The answer depends on how participants use the term chronological. Both Focus Groups A and B had participants who stated that one of the websites was “too chronological.” All other participants in the two groups agreed with this statement. All websites are created in a linear fashion, allowing for well-organized and non-repetitive websites. This linearity in content presentation is often seen as being “too chronological.” Chronological is defined as “relating to, or arranged in or according to the order of time” (Merriam-Webster 2007). Ideas of the non-linear (non-chronological) tend to be viewed by website browsers as more progressive, global [and even more Indigenous], while linear (chronological) text tends to be seen as being less global and less progressive (Reed et al., 2000). The difference between Focus Group A and B was not only in age but also in perceived linearity/chronology. The youth (Focus Group A), with more Internet experience, may have more Internet savvy, but then why did they think the Heron Site was “chronological”? Possibly “chronological” for them may be a positive label as they preferred the Heron Site. Whereas, Focus Group B, the adults, used “too chronological” as a negative label in regards to the River Site. This has targeting and definition implications for future website design.

5.4. Stó:lō Perspectives

There is definitely a Stó:lō, and possibly Indigenous, perspective that can be identified in this project. Storytelling is a vital part of Stó:lō culture, which was could be one of the reasons focus group participants preferred the Heron Site. In Stó:lō culture, oral traditions have been passed on from generation to generation and have survived over thousands of years. This tradition has remained and has also transcended to other forms of literature and art. It seems reasonable to view the web as another possible extension of this. Further, the fact that youth list Elders as an important place to learn about their
past affirms the strong role of oral history among Stó:lō today and thus further supports the storytelling
telling format of the Heron Site as more culturally appropriate than the River Site

Participants in the youth focus group agreed that "red" is a better colour than "blue" for the
website. It is likely that a question about colour in all three focus groups would have elicited a preference
towards red because of the importance of the colour red to the Stó:lō people. The Stó:lō regard red
highly, because it represents life, and is a powerful and renewing colour (Carlson 2001). Tumulth or "red
ochre", for example, is connected to ceremonies (Carlson 2001). It is worn on archaeological sites for
spiritual protection and is part of the requirements of the Stó:lō Archaeological Research Permit. One
Elder stated that tumulth "won't protect him, it's not for them," which basically means that tumulth is
meant to protect Indigenous people and not non-Indigenous people. Although Elders did not specifically
state to use red on the website, it is an important enough aspect of their culture for the use of red ochre to
have been discussed during the focus group.

This research indicates that colour should be discussed with Indigenous communities when
building a website. Nielsen (1999) suggests that the use of colour in websites is most effective when it
follows a standard. The default website colour tends to be blue text on a white background. Marcus
(1997) and Murch (1985) argue that opposite colour combinations, such as blue and yellow or red and
green, are effective. However, Murch (1985) argues that blue backgrounds are okay, but blue text is not.
Ling and Schaik's (2002) research supports both of these views by demonstrating that the blue/yellow
combination led to the best performance for hits, as did the default blue/white combination. However,
Stó:lō people are clear that the colour red is an important addition to any website, which is contra to the

5.5. Websites as Educational tools

Both the adult and Elder groups agreed websites are a good way to inform youth about heritage. Elders
and adults have probably observed increased Internet and computer use among the youth over the
years. These two groups may perceive that increased usage by the youths is congruent with the youths’
preference for this medium. However, usage and preference are two very different measures. The youth
themselves did not to make the distinction that only young people would prefer the websites, but thought
everyone would like the websites. The youth listed Elders and family as their most important sources of
information, ten of eleven, whereas websites were only give by three of eleven participants. The adult and
Elder groups may be surprised by such a result. It suggests that ones “relations” are still important in
Stó:lo territory. The Internet should be seen as an extension and not a replacement to Elders and family, schools and teachers, museums and cultural centers, TV, books, Magazines and other forms of education. Although, youth may have a greater affinity to the Internet since they have grown up with it; older individuals who have the time and inclination are sure to find a place for themselves within this burgeoning information base. However, without more research on this area, this is largely speculation on my part.

5.6. Aboriginal Connectivity

Current statistics by Aboriginal Canada Portal (2003) indicate Elders are “connected”. Aboriginal Canada Portal data for 2003 show that 70% of Aboriginal communities had basic Internet connectivity; and “almost” 20% of these used high-speed methods to connect (Aboriginal Canada Portal 2003). By 2004, the Aboriginal Canada Portal indicated that 90% of Aboriginal communities had basic Internet connectivity with almost 50% at high speed. Unconnected Aboriginal communities decreased from 30% to 10% in one year. Although community access to the Internet does not imply all individuals have access to the Internet, this research demonstrates that the majority of Stó:lo individuals are connected. All individuals in Focus Group A (youth) use the Internet, while 60% and 40% use the Internet in Focus Groups B (adults) and C (Elders), respectively. This is crucial, as access to the Internet and relevant content have been cited as the main barriers to usage for most minority groups (McDavid 2000). With increased connectivity and access to the Internet, Indigenous people are likely to expand their usage beyond banking, medical advice, and games (Kaye and Johnson 2002). Internet users are highly motivated by their own political interests. Without the barriers to computer access because of Low speed Internet or slow computers, they will indeed move into new areas of hyperspace (Kaye & Johnson 2002).

5.7. Computers & Technology

Computer and/or technological anxiety were noted for some focus group participants in the adult and Elder groups. Their awkwardness and anxiety was often caused by a lack of familiarity with the technology. The youths were comfortable with the technology. Any uneasiness the Elders’ exhibited was most likely correlated to their view of themselves as less knowledgeable about computers in general. Many of the adult women exhibited less interest in discussing or viewing the websites; however, there were only three of them. The interpretation of this data is problematic given the small sample size.
None of the youth seemed to have any fear of the technology, but some were more into using computers and the Internet. Indeed, the youth responded differently than Focus Groups B and C, as they spent most of their time discussing the technology or content rather than skipping to alternative topics. A 2003 study by Forrester Research in Europe found 20% of people over age 55 had Internet access and this represented a 50% increase in two and a half years (NUA 2003). This increase suggests the elderly are rapidly overcoming their fears. Forty percent of Stó:lō Elders in this study used the Internet—double the ratio for Europe. Canadian data indicate only 13.9% of people aged 65 and over in 2000 accessed the Internet from home, but by 2003, this rate increased to 24.9% (Statistics Canada 2006). Among Stó:lō Elders, usage rates are quite impressive (40-50%, see Table 3) and substantially higher than the data for Canadian seniors.

Computers and the Internet are valuable media to reach large populations. It seems this technology is rapidly becoming more commonplace in homes and schools (NUA 2003). The cost of home computers continues to decrease. Forty-eight percent (13) of the participants in this study had home computers and 70% (19) used computers regularly (whether at work, school or home). However, the cost of the Internet, especially in more isolated communities, can still have a great impact on Internet use. Most participants (20, 74%) stated that they had Internet access. Participants' Internet use varied widely from about 2 - 21 hours a week, with most estimating a usage of less than 5 hours a week. With an average of 70% computer access and 74% Internet access, it appears that Stó:lō people consider this technology important for entertainment, school, work and research.

5.8. Other Focus Group Comparability Issues

Each focus group was different in terms of age and experience. However, the results of each focus group were sufficiently similar to suggest that age does not appear to have affected website preference (see Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th></th>
<th>Heron Site</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentages from Table 7 demonstrate the similarities in preference for the Heron Site at: 82% for youths, 80% for adults and 75% for Elders. Youths have access to computers on a regular basis through school (100%). This number decreases slightly with the middle aged, as evident by the adult group who used the Internet at a rate of 83% (this could be biased as it was an adult education group). This percentage decreases again in the Elder group with 40-50% actually using the Internet. Although there is a clear preference for the Heron Site by all three focus groups, not all groups use the Internet equally. This issue requires further examination.

5.9. Summary of Answers to Focus Group Questions

Questions 1, 2 & 3 asked participants to discuss their likes/dislikes and also the similarities/differences regarding the Heron and River Sites. Overall, most participants wanted more interactivity and graphics, larger print, and to avoid sites they labelled as "too chronological." The Heron Site is closer to fitting these preferences, but participants suggested that it could use the colour red, music, a map, narration by Elders and "bubbles" on how to use the dig section. Participants stated that the River Site also lacked these features, and in addition appeared too text heavy, too chronological, and graphically boring. However, the River Site was liked because of its menus, which allowed quick access to information. All participants liked the fact that both dealt with Stó:lō culture.

Questions 4 and 8 dealing with what was or could be learnt, were answered together, but were never fully discussed by participants. "Learning" is the premise behind questions 4 and 8 but "learning" is outside the scope of this thesis project. Question 5, "Which would you prefer to see up?" was answered with ease, the Heron Site was preferred and is the website they would like to see on the Internet. The participants had no qualms about giving advice in reply to question 6. However, advice from the youths targeted improvements with the digital technology, whereas, adults and Elders provided advice on how to work with Indigenous people. The main sentiments expressed concerned the need to be culturally sensitive, to demystify and respect Indigenous culture, and to acknowledge changing traditions within Indigenous culture. These are guidelines to follow with Indigenous people to create mutually beneficial relationships. It is important to include Indigenous viewpoints throughout the research process. In reply to question 7, regarding website relevance in Stó:lō territory, participants stated that they see websites as relevant in Stó:lō territory.
5.10. Challenges of Running Focus Groups

There were advantages and disadvantages to allowing participants to view the websites before the focus group. If participants talk to each other ahead of time then they may not be as talkative during the focus group. A rectification of this possible problem would be to decrease the amount of time between the website viewing and the focus group. It is also advantageous to have visual clues and to revisit the websites even briefly during the focus group. In this research the prior exposure to the website does not appear to have negatively affected the results from Focus Group A. In future research, I would suggest that participants browse each of the websites ahead of time and would ask that they take notes while doing so to discuss these findings in more detail during the focus group. This would make for improved conversation, involvement and feedback by allowing the participants time to brainstorm. Further, it may be advisable to have a female only focus group to elicit more conversation and prevent male influence. The results presented here should be considered in light of this observation.

The planning of participant recruitment appeared simple on paper; however, it was much more complicated in practice. The final focus groups were based on word of mouth through my community contacts. In hindsight, a pilot focus group should have been held prior to undertaking the research in order to test the questions and to gain more experience before venturing out into the community. In addition, this would have led to changes in questions before the first focus group, which would make the three focus groups more comparable.

There are definite focus group issues: such as having to tabulate numbers from nodding heads, tapes and transcripts. Video cameras and an additional data recorder would have been helpful. There were difficulties in measuring shifting opinions in the focus groups. Further, there were time issues with each focus group. For example, in the adult group some participants felt that they needed more time to read the website. Most of these issues were logistical as focus Groups A and B were scheduled during class time. Unfortunately, there was no alternative time to hold the focus group sessions. Finally, it was sometimes difficult to get all participants to participate fully. However, I would suggest the positives outweigh the negatives and focus groups are an appropriate and useful research method when working with Indigenous peoples.

5.11. Hypothesis Evaluation

The Spirit Camp website was replicated in two different formats (the River and Heron sites) to determine whether Stó:lo community members favour one over the other and, if so, why? The null hypothesis is that
there is no difference in participants' preference between the two websites. The alternative hypothesis is that participants prefer one over the other.

Results show the initial hypothesis of no difference in preference is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is supported, as the majority of viewers (79%) preferred the Heron Site. The evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the Heron Site, the website with greater interactivity, storytelling, and enhanced graphics. The results show preference of the Heron Site at 82% for youths, 80% for adults and 75% for Elders. However, age does not appear to be a major factor in regards to preference. In contrast, analysis by gender demonstrates that female viewers view websites differently (only 57% preferred the Heron Site). This suggests that for female viewers, website developers may have to make alternative website formats available to attract a larger viewing audience. Results for male participants, confirm previous research demonstrating an increased interest in graphics and interactivity.

6. Discussion

6.1. Working with Community

Community participation is important and necessary, but not always easy. Working with people at every stage of a project increases both monetary and time costs. However, community members are highly knowledgeable and their contributions are invaluable. The bigger question becomes, "Is it even appropriate to go ahead and create websites about a community's heritage without their involvement?" The answer is no. Most people in the community are more than willing to help in these projects, and many will assist even if they cannot participate fully. This goodwill was evident in those who not only made suggestions, but were also motivated to contact other educational facilities on my behalf. Overall, June tended to be a very busy time of year for many of the educational establishments. Unfortunately, it was too late in the year to attract many participants. In the future, it would have been more prudent to have focus groups set up for the month of September at the beginning of the school year.

Communities must be involved not only in setting the research agendas in their own communities but also in the dissemination of the knowledge gained (Robinson 1996). Self-determination is the only way that people in Indigenous communities are going to be able to prosper. This approach to archaeology is one step in creating common ground. In addition, it is the archaeologists' responsibility, both professionally and academically, to treat the people we work with, with dignity and respect.
Time is always a factor when working with communities. Issues such as government restructuring (e.g., band chiefs and councils are elected every two years) can create challenges. One may have to wait until a new Chief starts to restart the contact process. It is important to be flexible and ready for change and to have respect for the people one is working with (Singleton 2003). However, it is also important to remember that this is your project, so you are the one who has to keep people motivated and on schedule. Your project may be an interesting one, but if one cannot sell it to people consumed with pressing social and economic issues on reserves then nothing you do will get the project done in a timely fashion. Additionally, British Columbia First Nations people are dealing with treaty negotiations. These are of primary importance for the people of this area. Hence, the most important thing is to start as early as possible once you have your plan. It is almost impossible to avoid being thrust into the local political scene in someway. Thus, it is important for researchers to be reflexive, critical and responsible (McDavid 1997, 2000; Leone et al. 1987; Potter 1994).

Collaborative web projects, such as the Levi Jordan site (McDavid 2000), and the Sister Stories site (Joyce et al. 2000), reach out to target audiences for feedback and understanding through blogs, and discussion groups. Although the Levi Jordan and the Sister Stories websites do not deal with Indigenous people, they are great models for working with community. However, it is time to take this a little further. Archaeologists need to use the feedback they attain from communities members and create websites with more cultural sensitivity. Indigenous people are more than just a great “target audience.” Indigenous people are a valuable resource, with a stake in how their history is represented to the outside world. They should be consulted at all stages of a project; this includes obtaining and implementing feedback on the products of research.

6.2. Other Results

People in the communities were pleased to have been consulted and were often surprised that someone even wanted their opinions. The Elders, who described themselves as having little or no knowledge about computers and the Internet, were more helpful on this research topic than they probably imagined. They focused on discussing archaeology, as they knew it, rather than on technology. Despite the numerous archaeological and anthropological projects with public components in the area, it is clear that the archaeological community still has a long way to go to eliminate distrust. As Jameson (2003: 158) notes, we need to arm communities with “the knowledge and understanding of archaeology, which can contribute to people’s sense of identity and ultimately improve their lives”. This is one way archaeologists
can help mend past animosities and open doors of communication and cooperation (Jameson 2003: 158). Focus Group C, the Elders, still do not trust archaeologists and/or they believe that archaeologists are in spiritual danger from their ignorance. The adults appeared less suspicious of archaeologists and stated that they would value the chance to visit an actual archaeological excavation to see what it is all about. Neither the adults nor the youths mentioned sites being spiritually dangerous. Students, on the other hand, seemed to vary in their opinions. Some said archaeology looked boring from the websites; however, others seemed interested in learning about more about their culture through archaeology.

Most (5, 83%) Focus Group B participants would have liked the opportunity to visit the archaeological site. This indicates that archaeologists must continue to open up sites to members of the community with formal invitations. Many archaeologists have open houses and events in which community members and the public are encouraged to come out and look at sites being excavated. Sometimes this can be limited by access, or by other factors such as time or resources. In the 2001 Field School, there was no "open house" day; however, the project was happy to accommodate requests as they arose. This was largely due to logistics (D. Pokotylo pers. com. 2004). The openness of archaeologists to making their work more public will decrease suspicion from community members, who have many stories about the dangers of doing archaeology from a spiritual perspective. This will also decrease the view of archaeology as a secret society with its jargon and nonpublic face (Deloria 1995). This closed shop perspective seemed to be reiterated by some of the Elders. One Elder stated "you don't think they'd like it if we went and dug up their old homesteads and took things away. All those things belong to somebody and they should stay there". Another said "I don't believe in the digs. Cause I know once there were a lot of quality sites, it seems that the whole valley ... tell them about it and the first thing they want to do is dig it up (agreement in background) and we don't want this." These unanticipated responses have contributed to the larger issues of collaborative work and relationships between archaeologists and Indigenous people.

6.3. Recommendations

Focus groups are closely related in style to Indigenous discussion methods as opposed to surveys that are foreign. Further, focus groups are recommended as a culturally respectful method of study in Indigenous communities that rely heavily on an oral tradition. Stó:lo people appeared to enjoy participating in the focus group format. Focus groups allowed participants who felt they had nothing to contribute to open up, and also allowed people to go off topic by enabling them to pose their own
questions. The discussions that ensued from these seemingly "off topic conversations" were sometimes the most interesting and fortunate moments for both the researcher and the participants despite being tangential to the focus of this study. These discussions are directly relevant for larger issues of collaboration between Indigenous people and archaeologists, while not having direct relevance to this study. Focus groups and websites are an important way to give the descendant Stó:lō people the opportunity to be involved in projects within their territory. There is further potential to work with these and other data to determine how to work better with community members and to create websites of interest to all Stó:lō people.

Recommendations for future websites about archaeology in Stó:lō territory are that: 1) the spiritually and culturally significant colour red should be a strong component in the design, 2) information should be presented in a storytelling mode, as this appears to appeal to the largest percentage of people, and 3) graphics should be used along with greater interactivity. The adult and Elder groups indicated that websites are an acceptable form of disseminating Stó:lō cultural heritage, particularly to younger generations. Archaeologists must be engaged with the public both on the local and the global/national scale. The Internet can be a significant venue for this type of interaction. Websites are an excellent way to disseminate information to large groups of people. In conjunction with books, brochures, museums, and archaeological site tours, websites can help archaeologists effectively connect the past to the present. By making the general public more aware of the archaeological record as an important nonrenewable resource, we can all work together to preserve our collective history for future generations. Only with the help of the public can we truly preserve and protect the archaeological record. This project adds to the archaeological body of work by creating another avenue for those interested in archaeology to find information about human history.

With the help of designers knowledgeable about archaeology, archaeologists can develop websites that are effective in disseminating information. The best practice would be for the archaeologist and the designer to interact prior to fieldwork, to ensure that specific information is recorded in the field to be used on the website. The process of creating a website is tedious, even when all the data is readily available. Information needs to be organized and readable from the point of view of the intended audience. It is also important that the archaeologist be aware of the designer's intentions and vice versa. The designer must have knowledge about archaeology, so both parties can clearly outline their needs. For example, the archaeologist must be able to dialogue with the designer, so the intended audience can
clearly understand and interact with the information presented. In addition, the designer needs to articulate what kinds of material (e.g., photos, quotes, etc.) the archaeologist will need to procure while working in the field and after. This collaboration is important if the vision of the website is to be realized. Without this collaboration, the website may not have all the elements necessary for creating a memorable archaeological experience.

To create popular websites, archaeologists need to provide more appropriate material to designers so that they can make the website intriguing enough to capture the browser's attention but not compromise the scholarly content. This is not difficult: the past is a fundamental human curiosity and is thus interesting to most of the public (Pokotylo & Guppy 1999; McDavid 2000; Ramos & Duganne 2000; Pokotylo 2002, 2007). It is up to archaeologists, who have traditionally been the holders of the information, to disseminate it in a user-friendly fashion. The Internet and the Web have already created a forum for people with dissenting views; it is better for archaeology as a whole to increase the sharing of information, rather than have incorrect information looted out of our research or have correct information misinterpreted (McDavid 2000).

6.4. Future Research

This research project bridges three areas of study: digital archaeology, Indigenous archaeology and public archaeology. As one of the first projects to attempt to bridge these areas, the research design of this project had to be developed from scratch. Benchmark data from complementary research efforts such as case studies, focus groups and surveys are needed to provide an empirical basis for research conclusions on the use of the Internet in archaeology. This study has added to this database.

The research presented is based on a relatively small sample of individuals within an Indigenous community. This is too small a sample to fully understand the views of all Stó:lō people, let alone Indigenous people in general. While small sample size may restrict the scope, the study and its methods provide a model for future research. Thus, more case studies, focus groups and surveys are needed to analyze the relationship of the Internet and archaeology, not only, in Stó:lō territory, but across all Indigenous communities. These studies would provide the data necessary for us to create culturally appropriate and meaningful archaeological websites. One area of future research could entail replicating this study with other groups by creating two new but identical websites of relevance in their own area to see if the results from this research that can be generalized to other Indigenous peoples and/or the general public.
The Stó:lō also offer further research opportunities of the type done in this study. There are 24 bands within Stó:lō territory. What are the similarities and differences in attitudes, preferences and perceptions towards archaeological websites across these bands? If differences exist, what motivates these? Future research projects using focus groups need not be focused on age but could be structured on gender, income, or ethnicity. More surveys and focus group along the lines of the ones in this project would provide a more representative sampling of Stó:lō people. Some questions to build on this study are: What is your preferred theme colour(s) for the website? What types of accommodations should be used for people who are older or who have disabilities? For example, is it to the archaeologists’ benefit to use large text or even include an audio component in websites to make them more accessible to Elders? Would you have looked at this website on your own? Will you look at this website again? Do you think this website helps demystify Indigenous people and create understanding with the general public? Do these websites make archaeology more inviting? The latter questions are really an extension on the learning questions I asked in my research that were never succinctly or adequately answered. The genesis for these areas of future research came out of the focus groups and the responses provided by the participants. These questions, both broad and specific, can move research towards effectively understanding archaeological website preferences of Indigenous people. This research may also help to provide the broader Internet community with the information they need to build websites that are more attractive to Indigenous peoples and thus would receive greater usage.

A question arising from this research that cannot be answered with the data collected is, “Why did Focus Group A (youths) and Focus Group B (adults) not agree on which of the two websites were “chronological”? Adults and Elders suggested that the Internet is a good way to teach the youths, but not necessarily themselves, about archaeology. This suggests that age may be a variable affecting responses, although age did not affect the overall results for website preference. This finding suggests that preference and usage are not necessarily one and the same. How does one test for the differences between preference and usage? Individuals may prefer a website but does that truly indicate that they will actually use the website? Further focus groups and surveys would help in creating a larger database which allows researchers to make more generalizations and comparisons by being more representative of the community.

The importance of oral history in Indigenous culture was evident from responses by youths, adults, and Elders, who listed Elders/family as the most important means for learning about their history.
Thus, it would be prudent to ask questions probe the continuing relevance of these cultural methods of knowledge transmission. Focus group questions could include: “How is storytelling relevant in Stó:lō territory today?” Elders suggest using the Internet as a storytelling/teaching tool. How do individuals perceive website effectiveness in achieving these teaching and storytelling goals? Is storytelling via the Internet an appropriate method for disseminating knowledge about cultural heritage to outsiders?

A further next step is a cross-cultural study of website preference which could determine similarities and differences among Indigenous people beyond Stó:lō territory. This could then be extended to Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Although the initial data presented in this research project, and that of Simon (2001), suggest little difference in website preference cross-culturally, larger samples are required to formally test this, as are studies to determine how culture and world view affect preferences in archaeological websites. The survey questionnaire used in this study obtained some socio-economic information; nevertheless, the one area missing in this survey is income level of participants. Research suggests that economic background is a factor in understanding Internet usage. For example, Statistics Canada’s 2003 survey results conclude that “82% of households in the highest income group had a member who used the Internet from home,” while those from the $24,000 to $43,999 income bracket, only had a 45% usage (Statistics Canada 2006).” However, this survey also suggests that the lower income group had the strongest growth a 13% increase in usage from 2002 to 2003 (ibid).

Household type (one person, two person, single, married, etc.) is another area often collected in surveys (Statistics Canada 2006). Background information was gathered in this study for age, gender, education, language and cultural background. However, only age and gender were analyzed fully. Of the remainder, education level appears quite interesting as previous studies by Statistics Canada in 2003 demonstrate that “nearly 77% of households with someone with a university degree were connected from home,” whereas “only about 12% of households in which the highest level of attainment was less then high school were connected from home” (2006). However, Internet connection and Internet usage are two different measures and need to be researched further as they have implications for archaeological websites as a means to communicate with Indigenous communities and the public. More surveys, to gather background information and computer experience, accompanying focus groups would be necessary to draw out further patterns particularly in a cross-cultural study.
7. Conclusions

This project has demonstrated that graphics and interactivity are important for disseminating information via websites to Indigenous people. It has discussed the importance and responsibility of archaeologists to be ethically accountable. It also has established the need for Indigenous representation at all stages of the research process as stewards of their own past, present and future histories.

The null hypothesis suggested that there would be no preference for either website. However, Stó:lō community members had a clear preference (76%) for the more graphic and interactive Heron Site. This project discusses that participants saw the Heron Site as more culturally appropriate, more informative, more aesthetically pleasing, and more entertaining than the River Site. These preferences were often based on intangible feelings that one website was “just better”, but everyone expressed that the Heron Site told the story of Spirit Camp in a more pleasing manner. Further, the River Site (preferred by 24% of participants) appeared too “text heavy” in format/presentation despite the fact that both sites had identical texts. Participants preferred the story format website that used more imagination and graphic design. Although the Internet elite (Bosley 2000) may prefer the standardization of websites (Nielsen 1999), this studies’ findings suggest that the industry needs to explore alternatives.

Does the format of a website affect the perceptions of the Indigenous viewing audience, in this case, Stó:lō people? The study approached this question by discussing the River and Heron websites with three focus groups of youth, adults and Elders. The results show that format affects perception and that successful websites must satisfy the needs of the viewer, whether those needs be information, entertainment or both. The preference for the story-telling format demonstrates that the design of the data delivery affects viewers. This project affirms that Elders are an important resource for Indigenous community members in today’s society. Stó:lō participants prefer the more structured website, Heron Site, even with identical content. The analysis demonstrates gender is the most important factor for this particular study. There are definite differences between gender preferences. Very little difference in preference occurs across age.

The Heron and River Sites discussion attempts to facilitate a balance between the burgeoning of websites created by non-archaeologists, and the need for archaeology websites written and created by archaeologists and their Indigenous partners. This project informs the debate on the use of the Internet for public archaeology, Indigenous archaeology and even digital archaeology. The best way for archaeologists to counter misinformation is to create information written in readily accessible formats.
This information has the potential to increase the general public's overall knowledge and ethical responsibility. This may ultimately aid in the protection of the archaeological record.

The results of this research indicate the *Heron Site* is the preferred of the two formats considered for disseminating information about Stó:lō heritage. Implementation of some of the changes suggested by the community is advisable. The most significant modifications are the implementation of more red throughout the website, the addition of some music, an Elder's welcoming message, a map, and information on how to use the dig section. More changes may keep the audience on the website longer. Some of these changes could include sections that alter to suit the needs of specific viewers or that allow viewers to interact with archaeologists through blogs or discussion groups.

Finally, I hope I have given a fair and just presentation of the opinions and perceptions the participants shared in the focus groups. A strong majority of the participants prefer the *Heron Site*. I recommend that UBC seek permission from Stó:lō to make this website publicly accessible, with some of the changes recommended by the participants. More importantly, I hope that both my thesis and the *Heron Site* continues to be an important contributing part to the Stó:lō Nation's body of knowledge.
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Within traditional Stó:lō territory, there are many places of legend, former villages, camps, trails, burial grounds, spiritual training grounds, rock paintings and carvings, quarry sites, spiritual places, transformer sites and ceremonial grounds.

The Harrison River is a key feature of the Upper Fraser Valley; it was a major transportation route into the interior, and also an exceptionally rich salmon river. Harrison is a short (12 km) but wide river, draining Harrison Lake into the Fraser River. Harrison Lake is a 84 km-long arm reaching northwest into the Cascade Mountains, ultimately connecting with the Lil’wat River in the territory of the Stó:lō people.

The Harrison River and its tributaries make up one of a few watersheds in Canada which supports all six species of salmon: Sockeye, Pink, Chum, Chinook, Coho and Steelhead. Even today, the number of returning salmon is exceptional, particularly spring salmon runs.
Within traditional Stó:lo Territory, there are many places of legend, former villages, camps, trails, burial grounds, spiritual training grounds, rock paintings and carvings, quarry sites, caches, spiritual places, transformer sites and ceremonial grounds.

Spirit Camp, a 5000 to 7000 year old archaeological site at the confluence of the Fraser and Harrison River near Aggasiz, B.C. is one such place. In 2001, an archaeological field school organized by the University of British Columbia and guided by members of the Stó:lo First Nation excavated at the site.

Welcome to an exploration of their journey through time ...

- Traditional Territory of Stó:lo Nation
- Discovery of Spirit Camp
- Research Design
- Spirit Camp 2001 Field School
- The Dig
Figure 4. Heron Site: Introduction to "The Dig" Section.

Figure 5. Heron Site: "The Dig" – Level.
### The Dig

The Dig Section is based on the data gathered during the 2001 Spirit Camp Field School. Imagine, if you will, the discovery of amazing objects each with their own stories to tell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Territory</th>
<th>Discovery of Spirit Camp</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Field School 2001</th>
<th>The Dig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where The Rivers Meet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scowlitz Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamity Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discovery of Spirit Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging a Pit House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Clues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating Dig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Directions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moving Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St6:16 Heritage Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St6:16 Nation Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Permit - Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Fieldwork Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying the Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready, Set...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field School 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Camp Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The Dig |

---

Layer A is the surface humic layer, extending 10-20cm deep, composed of densely matted grass roots. There are abundant cultural materials present, but roots, small animals and current human activity have caused significant natural disturbance, making it unreliable for recognizing significant cultural information.

---

Figure 6. River Site: The Dig Section Page.
Spirit Camp - Archaeology in Action

Spirit Camp, a 5000 to 7000 year old archaeological site at the confluence of the Fraser and Harrison Rivers near Agassiz, B.C. is one such place.

In 2001 an archaeological field school organized by the University of British Columbia and guided by members of the Stó:lo First Nation excavated at the site.

Figure 7. Heron Introduction: Page 2.

Figure 8. Heron Introduction: Page 3.
Welcome to an exploration of their journey through time...

Figure 9. Heron Introduction: Page 4.

The Old People then told us to "go out there" and "take care of the archaeological sites.

Figure 10. Heron Site: Home Page.
In 1994, members of the Sto:lo Nation selected Calamity Point as the site for "Spirit Camp," a summer cultural program for children to learn traditional cultural knowledge and values from Sto:lo elders.

The activities at Spirit Camp included learning how to harvest and process salmon.

http://www.ataoc.ca/dev/SpiritCamp/Spirit.htm

Figure 11. Heron Site: Discovery of Spirit Camp Sample.

The 1994 investigation suggested a considerable age to the deposits at Spirit Camp, or as the site is officially known, DHR 245. (See Burden Grid System in the glossary for an explanation of the official designation.) It appeared to span the entire Early Period in southwestern B.C. Further investigation of the site naturally fell to Dr. David Pozorski of the Department of Anthropology at UBC.

During the 1994s, Dr. Pozorski's work included collaboration with the Sto:lo Nation and other archaeologists studying the Early Period archaeology of the lower Fraser River catchment and valley. He worked closely with the Sthl'eh at Xalet, the Fraser River site.

Investigation of DHR 245 would provide an excellent opportunity to continue his long-term study of the Early Period.

http://www.ataoc.ca/dev/SpiritCamp/Spirit.htm

Figure 12. Heron Site: Creating a Research Design Sample.
The Spirit Camp Story - 2001 Spirit Camp Field School

Spirit Camp Begins

By the end of May, 2001, everything was in place to begin investigations at Spirit Camp.

Two sites were required. Since Calamity Point could only be reached by water, it was decided to set up living and lab quarters at an old schoolyard across the river. All supplies, camping gear and food could be easily transported by road.

Learn more about Archaeological Field School from a student's perspective.
- Is Archaeological Field School Right For You?
- Gear!

Figure 13. Heron Site: 2001 Spirit Camp Field School Sample.

Figure 14. Heron Site: "The Dig".
Spirit Camp: Archaeology in Action

Traditional Territory of Stó:los Nation

Traditional Territory
- Harrison River
- Where The Rivers Meet
- Calamity Point

Discovery of Spirit Camp
- Cultural Camp
- Digging a Pit House
- Urgent Archaeology
- Test Cut
- Reaching Bottom
- Cultural CLues
- Dating Dig
- Future Directions

Research Design
- Moving Forward
- Stó:los Heritage Policy
- Stó:los Nation Permit
- B.C. Permit - Heritage 2001 Fieldwork Goals
- Modifying the Design
- Ready, Set...

Field School 2001
- Spirit Camp Begins
- Camp Life
- Preparing the Site
- Excavation

The Dig

Harrison River
The Harrison River is a key feature of the Upper Fraser Valley. It was a major transportation route into the interior, and an exceptionally rich salmon river.

The Harrison River is a short (12km) but wide river, draining into the Fraser River. The Harrison Lake is a 64 km-long arm reaching northwest into the Cascade Mountains, ultimately connecting with the Lillooet River in the territory of the Stó:los people.

The Harrison River and its tributaries make up one of a few watersheds in Canada which supports all six species of sockeye: Pink, Chum, Chinook, Coho and Steelhead. Even today, the number of returning salmon is exceptional, particularly the spring salmon run.

Where Two Rivers Meet
Where the Harrison flows into the Fraser River, the water is turbulent and dangerous. It is not surprising that the land at this confluence is historically called Calamity Point.

Its importance as a salmon harvesting and processing site has been passed down through the ages. Oral tradition says that the traditional fishing technique of dip-netting originated where the Harrison and Fraser Rivers meet. This is said to be the only area along the lower Fraser where one can effectively wind dry salmon.

The Scowitz Site (DNRE)
Just upstream from the Harrison and Fraser confluence, the Scowitz site was occupied for the last 3000 years. This important archaeological site contains over 40 burial facilities, including burial mounds and cists, that date to the last 1000 years.

Archaeological investigations of this site began in the early 1990s when excavation confirmed a long history of cultural use. For more than 2000 years people harvested and processed salmon at this location, establishing settlements and developing deep spiritual relations with the landscape. An important question (yet unanswered) is the relationship between the Spirit Camp and Scowitz sites.

For more information about the Scowitz Site visit:
- http://www.sfu.ca/archaeologymuseum/scowitz/
- http://www.sfu.ca/archaeologymuseum/pebriscom.html

Calamity Point
The site of Spirit Camp, named Calamity Point on modern maps, is on the north shore of the Fraser River, overlooking the confluence of the Fraser and Harrison River. It is located on a grassy terrace, cleared of forest when the area was farmed back in the 1950's and 1960's.
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Cultural Camp

In 1994, members of the Sto:lo Nation selected Calamity Point as the site for Spirit Camp, a summer cultural program for children to learn traditional cultural knowledge and values from Sto:lo elders. The activities at Spirit Camp included learning how to harvest and process salmon.

Digging a Pit House

One program project was the construction of a traditional pit house. This structure, 10 metres in diameter and 2 metres deep, was excavated by the students. The students dug a 10m diameter and 2m deep pit for the house, and uncovered a large number of stone artifacts, such as cobble tools, choppers, and numerous utilized flakes.

This was a very substantial archaeological deposit, but how old was it, and how was it related to other nearby sites?

Emerging Archaeology

Immediately upon the discovery of the archaeological materials, the pit house project was stopped. Gordon Mills was the first to Heritage consultant at the time, on behalf of the Sto:lo Nation, requested that an assessment of the exposed archaeological deposits be undertaken. UBC archaeology students Sandra Morrison, Heather Myhre and Christ Thorn were invited to carry out the investigation.

During the excavation, several distinct cultural layers were exposed in the pit house wall, and hundreds of stone artifacts were found in the back fill.

Test Cut

In order to learn as much as possible in the limited time available (one day), the archaeologists used the pit house excavation to their advantage.

A 1 m x 30 cm test cut was excavated to avoid as little further disturbance as possible.

Reaching Bottoms

To determine if there were deeper archaeological deposits, a small test pit was dug into the pit house floor, reaching glacial deposits at 285 cm below the surface.

Following the excavation, the entire pit was refilled.

Cultural Change

The test excavations revealed four cultural layers in the test cut and two more in the shovel-test pit. Cultural occupation appeared to be continuous throughout the layers.

Key features of the deposits were large amounts of fire-altered rock and a substantial number of chipped stone debits from making stone tools.

Dating the Dig

One of the most intriguing findings was the nature of the tools discovered at Spirit Camp. These were relatively fine-ground stone tools, but an abundance of chipped stone tools. Carbon dating of samples from the middle and lower levels yielded dates of 3260±80 and 7150±100 BP. This suggested that the site is very old, potentially extending through the Charles and OCC (Old Cordilleran Culture) period (5000-3500 BP).

So although this excavation was severely limited in time, it revealed that this was potentially a very significant archaeological site.

Future Directions

The results of the initial investigation of Spirit Camp raised more questions than answers:

How old is the site? How did people utilize it? What is the relationship with the Sowaliu site? Were they part of one large settlement?

It was clear that further investigations would be necessary to get a better understanding of the site.

The 1994 investigation suggested a considerable age to the deposits at Spirit Camp, or as the site is officially known, DHRI25. (See Borden Grid System in the glossary for an explanation of the official designation.) It appears to span the entire Early period in southwestern B.C. Further investigation of the site naturally fell to Dr. David Pokotylo of the Department of Anthropology at UBC.

During the 1990s, Dr. Pokotylo's work included collaborations with the Stó:lō Nation and other archaeologists studying the Early Period archaeology of the lower Fraser River canyon and valley. He worked closely with the Stó:lō at Xa:ytem, the Hatzic Rock site. Investigation of DHRI25 would provide an excellent opportunity to continue his long term study of the Early Period in the lower Fraser Valley and build on the body of knowledge that would enable comparisons between coastal and inland sites.

Working with the Stó:lō Nation and specifically the Scowlitz First Nation, Dr. Pokotylo planned an archaeological dig at Spirit Camp for the summer of 2001 that would build on the preliminary work done in 1994.

Stó:lō Heritage Policy

Any archaeological work in Stó:lō Téméxw, Stó:lō Traditional Territory, must be planned and carried out in consultation with the Stó:lō Nation's Department of Aboriginal Rights and Titles.

The Stó:lō Heritage Policy, in place since the 1980s, guides cultural research, including archaeological excavations. While the policy has been revised over the years, its philosophy of "respect and protection for the people, land, resources and environment" remains paramount.

An important requirement of the Stó:lō Nation is that the protocols and beliefs of their culture be respected. To this end, the Stó:lō actively participate in archaeological...
By the middle of May 2001, everything was in place to start archaeological investigations at the Spirit Camp site. Two sites were required. Since Calamity Point could only be reached by water, it was decided to set up the living and lab quarters at an old schoolyard across the river. Lab supplies, camping gear and food could be easily transported by road.
Appendix C - Survey Questions

Appendix Version 1 - Survey for Group

Background information
1. Gender (please circle): male female
2. Age: ________________
3. Cultural background: ________________
4. What Language do you normally speak at home? English Other ______
   If other, indicate which language do you speak at home ________________
5. Please indicate the highest grade of education you have completed: __________
6. How have you learned about your history (circle all that apply):
   Elders/Family
   Museum
   School/Teacher
   Cultural center
   Archaeological excavation
   TV
   Books
   Magazines
   Websites
   Other: ________________

Computer Experience
1. Do you own a computer? Yes No
2. Do you use your own computer or any computer regularly? Yes No
   If yes, what do you use your computer for?
3. Do you use the Internet? Yes No
4. About how much time do you spend on the Internet each week? _________
5. What tasks do you use the Internet for?
6. Do you use a Low speed or Hi speed Internet service? Yes No
7. Which website did you prefer and why?
# Background information

1. Gender (please circle): male  female
2. Age: __________
3. Cultural background: __________
4. What Language do you normally speak at home? English  Other ______
   If other, indicate which language do you speak at home __________
5. Please indicate the highest grade of education you have completed: ________
6. How have you learned about your history (circle all that apply):
   - Elders/Family
   - Museum
   - School/Teacher
   - Cultural center
   - Archaeological excavation
   - TV
   - Books
   - Magazines
   - Websites
   - Other: __________
7. Do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the subject of archaeology/history? Yes  No

## Computer Experience

1. Do you own a computer? Yes  No
2. Do you use your own computer or any computer regularly? Yes  No
   If yes, what do you use your computer for?
3. Do you use the Internet? Yes  No
4. About how much time do you spend on the Internet each week? __________
5. What tasks do you use the Internet for?
6. Do you use a Low speed or Hi speed Internet service? Low  Hi
7. Do you feel that you have a higher than average interest in the Internet and web surfing? Yes  No
8. Which of the two websites that you just viewed did you prefer and why?
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