



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND



This document is made available by The New Zealand
Archaeological Association under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists 1981- 1997

John Coster

Introduction

Mary O’Keeffe’s timely paper in the March issue of *AINZ*, drawing attention to a range of long-standing issues in the professional practice of archaeology in this country, reminded me that no definitive account of the short-lived Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists (INZA/the Institute) has been published. The Institute, established in the 1980s, had four main, in retrospect ambitious, objectives:

- to accredit and register, through membership, professional archaeologists working in Aotearoa New Zealand,
- to maintain professional standards and ethics,
- to provide information and training for members, and
- to assist and advise members and their employers in regard to professional practice and conditions of work.

A series of notes in the *NZAA Newsletter* and *Archaeology in New Zealand* documents the Institute’s progress (Furey 1981, 1984a, NZAA 1984, Coster 1984, 1991, Brassey 1986, Jones et al. 1997). This paper attempts to supplement that record by setting out a full account of the Institute, its formation, activities and outputs, from its first beginnings in 1981 to its dissolution in 1997.

Background

From 1974, following the appointment of its first staff archaeologist and anticipating the introduction in 1976 of the archaeological provisions of the Historic Places Amendment Act 1975 (the Act), the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT/the Trust) inaugurated an extensive programme of archaeological site recording, employing casual contractors, which continued, as individual grants, into the 1990s (NZHPT 1975, 1976, Geelen 1991; see also, for example, Best 1975, Smith & Wernham 1975, Lawlor & Black 1976, Leahy & Walsh 1982, Crosby & Loughlin 1992). The programme, recognising that much of the country’s archaeology remained unrecorded, represented a significant shift in the operation of the NZAA site recording scheme. From a volunteer project, contributed to largely by amateur enthusiasts, the scheme became dominated by large numbers of records

submitted by paid students and professionals. The Trust's programmes were supplemented in the early 1980s by projects developed under the Government-subsidised Project Employment Programme (O'Connor 1986). These, together with employment opportunities offered by government departments, universities and other agencies as a result of the Act, led to the development of a body of qualified and experienced field archaeologists operating on a variety of short-term and longer contracts but without the security of permanent positions.

Trust contractors were required to complete NZAA site records, submit a report describing methodology and land use, with site summaries, maps, and recommendations on further work, and to "undertake appropriate public relations activity" including press and radio interviews (NZHPT 1977). Writing up time for site records and reports was limited to 50% of fieldwork time (NZHPT 1979, 1981).

Little in the way of training for the field recording programmes was offered at the time, although in August 1978 Garry Law, through the NZAA, organised seminars, held in Auckland and Dunedin, to examine the aims and methodology of site recording (NZAA 1978a), and at least one subsequent training session was held in Auckland, in May 1980, organised by Aileen Fox and tutored by a number of students and contractors active at the time.

Some dissatisfaction with the conduct and conditions of the Trust's site recording programmes was beginning to be expressed in 1978, when, prior to the NZAA's August seminar, an informal group of University students and staff, and NZAA Council members, met in Auckland to discuss conditions of work for archaeological contracting. This resulted in a discussion document (Coster 1978) setting out guidelines for the conduct of contract field recording, including planning, public relations, pay rates and ratios of field time to documentation time. The report was considered by NZAA Council, who endorsed it and referred it to the Trust for comment (NZAA 1978b).

Following the NZAA's approach, the Trust developed policies for the conduct of the contract site recording programme (Challis 1979). At the time, the Trust's approach was that its archaeological staff should be actively involved in fieldwork and archaeological investigations stemming from the administration of the Act, although this moved quickly to a recognition that "there would be a major shift of resources away from the excavation of specific sites by Trust staff" and that contract workers would need to be employed to supplement the Trust's inadequate staffing levels (McKinlay 1979, Anon. n.d.).

Genesis – an Auckland Association of Consulting Archaeologists

Three years after the NZAA's approach to the Trust, the issues which had been identified in regard to the Trust's site recording programme were being raised again by Auckland-based students and contractors. A particular concern was the recommended ratio of field recording time to documentation time of 2:1, which was seen, not surprisingly, as insufficient.

INZA had its beginnings with an initial meeting in the University of Auckland Anthropology Department, at the end of July 1981, which identified pay rates, recognition of qualifications, standards of recording and programme planning as further matters to be addressed. A follow-up meeting a week later proposed the formation of an "Auckland Association of Consulting Archaeologists" to lobby the Trust, in particular to extend the fieldwork to documentation ratio from 2:1 to between 1:2 and 1:5, depending on circumstances, and to address issues of research priorities, allowance for pre-survey preparation time, field expenses and qualifications. One result of the meetings was a detailed letter to the Trust arguing for higher rates of pay than those which had recently been proposed (NZHPT n.d., Cassels et al. 1982, Geelen 1982). The approach resulted in a reconsideration and increase in the pay rates offered by the Trust (McKinlay 1982).

Following these, and a subsequent meeting, a one-day open seminar was held in the Department in April 1982, with a series of working groups addressing the following agenda:

- Advantages of incorporation
- Differences between contracting and consulting
- Terms and conditions of contracts
- Ethical responsibilities
- Registration and accreditation
- Pay scales
- Standards for site survey

In all, 33 students, staff and graduates of the Department, along with state-employed archaeologists, attended the four gatherings. The seminar set up a steering committee, who summarised the proceedings as "A report on the activities of archaeologists who would like to form an association (Inc.) of professional archaeologists" (Coster et al. 1982). The report noted the advantages of incorporation and made some progress toward setting objectives and membership criteria for the proposed association; discussed the difference between consultancies and contract work, making the point

that most work at the time was carried out on contract to the Trust and that true consultancies were rare; set out recommended terms and conditions for contract work, based on Australian practice; outlined the requirements for a code of ethics, detailing specific responsibilities for the parties involved; examined issues around the setting up of a register of archaeologists; discussed pay scales, focussing on experience rather than qualifications as a measure of capability, and on the insecurity of short term work (which ideally, it was argued, entailed higher hourly rates); and made a detailed prescription for the conduct of site surveys, including an allowance of 2 or more days preparation and documentation for every day spent recording in the field.

Development – a New Zealand Association of Professional Archaeologists

The seminar report was distributed prior to the 1982 NZAA conference in New Plymouth, in order to promote discussion among members. The following year, a draft constitution and code of ethics for a “New Zealand Association of Professional Archaeologists” (NZAPA) was compiled by a steering committee and presented to an open meeting at the 1983 NZAA conference in Napier. The meeting agreed in principle to the association being formed and provisionally approved the draft constitution, subject to its approval by a further open meeting (to be held at the 1984 conference in Oamaru). In the meantime, the steering committee called for written submissions on the draft constitution (NZAPA 1983).

Fourteen submissions were received – 5 from academics, 4 from museum archaeologists, 3 from Trust archaeologists and 2 from contract archaeologists, 10 more-or-less supportive, 4 not. Neither the Trust nor the NZAA Council commented on the proposal, despite specific requests. The draft constitution listed 10 objectives, which included reference to the proposed association’s role in accreditation and registration, protecting the professional interests of members and providing “guidelines for employers relating to job prescriptions, contract formats and pay scales”. A significant amount of discussion centred around what was seen as the “union” function implied by these aims.

Concerns raised included:

- the possibility of weakening NZAA by drawing the involvement of professional archaeologists away from NZAA and potentially creating a rift between professionals and amateurs,
- the use of the term ‘professional’ in the association’s title, seen by some to imply that practising archaeologists, particularly those in

secure jobs (principally with the Trust or Universities), who saw no need to join the association, were not professionals.

Alternatives proposed included:

- establishing ‘professional standards’ and ‘contract archaeology’ committees within NZAA, although a proposal to establish a professional issues sub-committee of NZAA with the same functions as the proposed NZAPA (Jones 1984) was not accepted by the NZAA Council.
- restricting the role of the proposed association to that of a trade union advocating on behalf of contractors – an association of contract archaeologists,
- registration and screening of a pool of contract archaeologists to be carried out by the Trust, with no need for a separate body,
- the ‘union’ function of the association to be carried out through the Public Service Association, leaving professional standards and ethics to the NZAA.

One submission, from an established academic, criticised the proposal on the grounds that it confused three separate areas of operation –

1. a primary concern with conditions of work and pay scales affecting contract archaeologists engaged to undertake a particular job of work, as opposed to those employed in universities or museums;
2. the role of consultants (as opposed to contractors), seen as highly-qualified ‘experts’ in their field, engaged “to make specific recommendations or give specific opinions”, who, though they might subscribe to particular standards or ethical codes, acted as individuals; and
3. the establishment of a professional body overseeing “the question of standards in methods and ethics”, as well as (in what could itself be seen as introducing a confusion of function) acting “as a pressure group on professional salaries etc”.

The submitter, while admitting the need for a “professional institute” and code of ethics, argued that the proposed association should be called ‘The NZ Association of Contract Archaeologists’ and concentrate solely on wage rates and conditions of appointment for contractors. While usefully drawing a distinction between contracting and consultancy, the submission tacitly implied, through the tripartite separation, a hierarchy within the profession, with contractors at the lowest level. The association as proposed was rather, seen in retrospect, attempting to avoid the perception of such a hierarchy through an inclusive structure which would address issues of professional standards and ethics applying to all within the profession, as well as specific

employment issues relevant to particular groups. That this was perhaps an unrealistic aim was borne out by the subsequent limited membership and effectiveness of the Institute, which might perhaps be seen as confirming the submitter's opinion that "the whole venture is confused and doomed to a fairly embarrassing failure".

Formation – New Zealand Institute of Archaeologists

Following consideration of the submissions, most of them positive, a revised constitution, including a code of ethics and guidelines for electing "full" and "associate" members, with a change of name to the "New Zealand Institute of Archaeologists", was compiled in early 1984 for discussion at the NZAA conference in Oamaru, in June of that year. At the NZAA's annual general meeting during that conference, a resolution supporting the aims of the Institute, particularly its focus on "ethics, terms of employment, and issues of professionalism", was passed, following "lengthy discussion" (NZAA 1984). Both the NZAA Annual General Meeting and Council offered support for the proposed Institute.

The inaugural meeting of the Institute was held in Oamaru on the 4th June 1984, attended by 46 NZAA members. It resolved (with one dissent) to set up the Institute, appointed a governing council and received nominations for a membership committee. Subsequently, the name was changed once again, in deference to the New Zealand Institute of Architects, and the Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists No. AK279009 was incorporated in August 1985.

Membership

A membership committee of Roger Green, Helen Leach and Neville Ritchie, later to include Ian Smith, was elected to accredit potential members of the Institute according to the following criteria:

"Full members" were required to have:

- an honours or Post Graduate degree in archaeology or prehistory (e.g. BA Hons, Post Graduate Diploma, MA, MA Hons, PhD),
- relevant work experience (other than that required by a first degree course such as BA or BA Honours) totalling two years' full time in Archaeology, and
- general competence to organise and carry through to completion of report a substantial excavation or site survey.

“Associate Members” had to have:

- completed or be undertaking an undergraduate degree or an equivalent tertiary qualification in archaeology or prehistory, and have
- undertaken a minimum of two months' archaeological fieldwork, and
- demonstrated proficiency in work previously undertaken; or have
- other relevant experience or qualifications, to be decided by the Membership Committee.

Twenty archaeologists were accepted to membership of the Institute in 1984, increasing to a maximum of 32 in 1985. At the time, this represented 57% of the archaeologists practising in the country (Coster 2020). The number of members remained stable until 1996.



Figure 1. The attendees at the 1984 NZAA Oamaru conference. It was at this conference that INZA was formally established (Nigel Prickett).

Activities & Outputs

Most of the Institute’s activity took place in the first 3 years of its existence – between 1984 and 1986 (see Table 1). In this period, the Institute issued 2 practice guides (the Code of Ethics and guidelines on advertising of contract vacancies), organised 2 seminars (on photographic and legal aspects of archaeological practice), published one set of seminar proceedings (Lawlor

1987), produced discussion papers on issues related to contracting and rates of pay within the profession, and undertook a survey detailing the number and employment status of professional archaeologists in the country (see Coster 2020).

Seven *News Sheets* were issued over a period of five years, with news of members and activities, and notices of employment opportunities (employers included the Trust, the NZ Forest Service, Department of Lands & Survey, and the occasional local authority and private company). Issues recorded included the developing relationship of archaeologists with Māori, underlined by the publishing in 1985 of the Waitangi Tribunal's report (WAI 8) on the Manukau claim, with its comments on the management and protection of Māori sites.

Early in its existence, the Institute, at the request of Trust staff (Sheppard 1984), developed discussion papers on contract conditions and rates of pay (see Table 1). The contracting paper (Furey 1984b) set out a range of options for organising contract work, including both the original model where archaeologists were contracted to the Trust, which negotiated with the developer, and the present model, where the archaeologist contracts with the developer, under conditions set by the Trust's successor, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).

The Institute, along with NZAA, also made submissions to Government on the 1986 proposal to restructure Government environmental management agencies (a move which eventually led to the creation of the Department of Conservation). The Institute pointed out the need for an increase in the Trust's archaeological staff, and, contrary to the Trust's policy at the time, recommended the appointment of archaeologists within all Government departments with responsibility for resource use and land management. Submissions were also made on the 1992 Historic Places Bill, emphasising the need for adequate funding and staffing of the Trust and the potential accreditation role of the Institute, and a review by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment of historic and cultural heritage management in 1996 (see Table 1). In the latter submission, the Institute emphasised the inadequacies of legislative controls, and lack of funding, for protecting the archaeological heritage, the poor performance of local authorities in their role under the Resource Management Act, and, once more, the need for professional standards, particularly with the "recent move from state controlled public archaeology to the use of independent consultants".

Table 1. INZA tangible outputs 1982-1996.

Date	Authors	Title
Papers & Reports		
1982	Coster, J, L Furey, I Lawlor, C Phillips	A report on the activities of archaeologists who would like to form an Association (Inc.) of Professional Archaeologists. 34 pp.
1982	Coster, J	Proposals for the conduct of site surveys by members of the Auckland Association of Consulting Archaeologists. 7 pp.
1984	Furey, L	Contracting within Historic Places Trust archaeology section □ future directions. NZIA 1984/1. 10 pp.
1985	Coster, J	Rates of pay for non-salaried professional archaeologists. NZIA 1985/1. 10 pp.
1986	Coster, J & C Olsen	Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists Employment Survey 1985. 10 pp.
1986	INZA	Pay claim for non-salaried archaeologists. INZA 1986/1. 3 pp.
1994	Coster, J	Report on meeting with NZ Historic Places Trust to discuss the role of the Institute of NZ Archaeologists under the Historic Places Act 1993. 1 p.
Submissions		
1985	INZA	Submission to the Minister of State Services on the proposed restructuring of environmental management agencies ((Environment 1986.). 2pp.
1989	Slocombe, A	Historic places legislation review □ comments on report of working group (Coad Report). 2 pp.
1992	INZA	Historic Places Bill - submission to the Parliamentary Select Committee from the Institute □ 3 pp.
1996	INZA	Submission to the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment on the Commissioners' investigation into historic and cultural heritage management in New Zealand. 7 pp.
Practice Guides		
1985	INZA	No. 1. Code of Ethics. 4 pp.
1985	INZA	No. 2. Advertising of contract vacancies. 1 p.
Seminars		
1985	Lawlor, I (Ed.)	Seminar Proceedings 1. Photography and care of photographs for the archaeologist. 50 pp.
1986	K Williams, K Green, B McFadgen, D Grove (contributors)	Archaeology and the Law (mss. only).

In 1986, following its employment survey, the Institute approached the Public Service Association (PSA) to lobby for standardised rates of pay for archaeologists employed by state agencies. The move was hampered by the reluctance of many to join the PSA, but also became overshadowed by the establishment in 1987 of the Department of Conservation, at which time virtually all archaeologists previously employed by government agencies became employees of the Department, with standardised terms of employment. This resulted in the Institute, lobbying primarily on behalf of contract and casual employees and without a significant membership from academics and other salaried staff, becoming irrelevant to most in terms of employment issues.

Within a few years, however, shortly before the Institute was wound up and following reviews both of historic places legislation and of the function of the Department of Conservation, the Trust, with a new (1993) Act, became independent of the Department, which retained its archaeological staff, leaving the Trust with only one archaeologist. This decade or so of change, which resulted in an initial decline and then a steep increase in consultancy and contract work from the mid-1990s onward, is discussed in more detail by Challis (1995), Barber (2000) and Walton & O’Keeffe (2004).

Relationship with Historic Places Trust

By 1989, with most former contract archaeologists employed on the staff of the Department of Conservation (and one by the Auckland Regional Authority) the Institute was reassessing its role and viability. The previous year had seen a drop in activity and it was realised that, with the Department of Conservation then the major employer of former contract workers, and little or no input from the two university departments, the potential for the Institute to play a significant role in lobbying on behalf of members or setting professional standards was further reduced.

In one of several approaches for support to the Historic Places Trust (Coster 1994), the suggestion was made that membership of the Institute could be a suitable criterion for approvals under sections 17 and 18 of the 1993 revision of the Act. These were the sections allowing the Trust to withhold approval for any person to carry out work under the conditions of an authority and requiring the Trust to take into account competence and access to professional resources when authorising any person to undertake an investigation. The Institute’s argument that its membership criteria were sufficiently rigorous to meet the requirements of the Act, and that membership could be used by the Trust as a criterion for approval under the

Act, were not accepted by Trust staff, leaving the Institute with no effective role except as a promoter of standards, which would have required more support than it was in fact receiving from the profession.

Ironically, the criteria now adopted by Heritage New Zealand, specifying the academic, work experience and ethical requirements which allow archaeologists to undertake work under s.45 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 bear a close resemblance to the membership criteria originally formulated by the Institute (see HNZPT 2017). (It could further be argued that s.45 approval of an archaeologist amounts to professional certification or accreditation and that this, under the legislation, is a valid role for Heritage New Zealand to assume).

Winding up

The Institute was inactive, apart from holding annual general meetings, for most of the early '90s and by 1995, it was clear that if it had no role through the Historic Places Act then the purposes for which it was originally set up were no longer achievable.

By 1996, recognising that it represented only a minority and was not in a position to effectively set standards or accredit practitioners in archaeology, the Institute revoked its criteria for membership and opened membership to any member of the NZAA, in the hope that more people would join and participate in discussions on the Institute's future role. This move resulted in only 6 new members, the total representing just over half of the profession.

A final suggestion that INZA should adopt a range of roles outside its original intent but still relevant to archaeology, such as surveys of the profession and maintenance of a range of databases (Jones et al. 1997), went unanswered, and the Institute was wound up, following two special general meetings, in 1997. Its considerable remaining funds were donated to NZAA to be used "to promote standards and ethics in New Zealand archaeology" (Coster 1998).

In March 2006, INZA's donation was used to convene a residential workshop for consulting archaeologists to discuss issues relating to professionalism and accreditation. Significantly, there was an almost 50:50 split between those who supported formation of a professional body that could provide accreditation for members and those who did not. In the end, it was agreed to set up a professional training group, the *Professional Development Cell* (PDC) which would provide workshops and regional discussion meetings. Although the suggestion was made,

NZAA did not wish the PDC to be formally affiliated and the group operated independently, organising 23 training workshops between 2006 and 2015. These were well-supported to begin with, but long-term interest waned and training ceased in 2015 (Phillips & Low 2015).

Discussion

In the climate prevailing from 1976, during the first few years of the operation of the archaeological provisions of the Historic Places Act, true consultancies were rare, most public archaeological work being site surveys or excavations undertaken by staff of, or contractors to, the Historic Places Trust, which dealt directly, where necessary, with the developer concerned (Coster et al.1982). This situation has evolved, through three iterations and seven amendments of the Act, to the current status quo, where Heritage New Zealand relies for much of its regulatory role on the professional judgement of consultant archaeologists, who may themselves employ skilled workers on contract or wages. Consultants and contractors now form the majority of archaeologists working in this country (Coster 2020).

Some confusion between the terms “consultant” and “contractor” still exists. Most New Zealand archaeologists, if we are honest, are operating for much of the time at the level of skilled technicians rather than academics or experts. This makes us, for many purposes, as an early critic of the Institute pointed out, analogous to plumbers, called in by landowners or managers to fix a particular problem (with the important difference that we then compile a detailed account of what we found in the hole we dug). This is a different function from that of the consultant, required to deliver an authoritative opinion or analysis, and many archaeological professionals in fact assume both roles. In appearances before bodies such as local authorities and the Environment Court, the opinions of archaeologists carry legal and ethical weight.

With the demise of the Institute, NZAA developed more interest in professional practice, gradually taking on some of the functions INZA had envisaged. In 1999, the NZAA Council, with the support of an AGM resolution, undertook to develop a “framework of codes of ethics and standards for the practice of professional archaeology in New Zealand ... to consist of ... codes of ethics, charters, and best practice guidelines” (NZAA 1999a). This resulted in a “Best Practice Guidelines sub-committee” (NZAA 1999b), which led in turn to the establishment of a directory of professional archaeologists (NZAA 2000). A comprehensive set of principles, ethics and standards proposed by McGovern-Wilson & Walton (1999) was available as

a “professional code of ethics” on the NZAA website until recently (Bickler 2018:257) but has been replaced by an earlier code (NZAA 1993) which appropriately acknowledges the importance of the relationship between Māori and their cultural heritage, but is otherwise limited in scope. The Best Practice Guidelines appear not to have eventuated. An attempt, following a series of workshops on professional issues, to establish a “rebirth” of the Institute via a professional subgroup also appears to have come to nothing (see NZAA 2001a,b).

NZAA does require its members to abide by a general code of ethics (Furey 1992, NZAA 1993), but the 1993 document now on the Association’s website is skeletal, fails to address a number of concerns relevant to professional practice, is problematic to enforce and has none of the comprehensiveness or depth of, for example, the *Code of Ethics & Professional Practice* of the museum profession in Aotearoa New Zealand (Museums Aotearoa 2013) or, indeed, of the original proposals of McGovern-Wilson and Walton.

On the issue of certification or accreditation, NZAA’s online “Member Consultant Directory” comes with a specific disclaimer that “NZAA makes no representation, recommendation or warranty regarding the standard or level of competence or suitability to give archaeological advice of individual members listed in the Directory” (NZAA 2020a), while Heritage New Zealand, as noted above, limits itself to specifying the requirements demanded by its Act. In the field of training, there are limited options, although publications by NZAA (Walton 1999) and Bickler Consultants Ltd. (Bickler 2018) are essential reading. The Universities provide theoretical, and some practical instruction, and issue certificates (degrees) acknowledging specific levels of academic achievement, while Heritage New Zealand publishes a useful, though limited, range of practice guidelines (HNZPT 2020), supplemented recently by a publication from a consultancy firm (Bickler et al. 2017). No organisation yet provides professional accreditation for individual practitioners or ongoing training at a professional level. The NZAA has, however, recently indicated its intention to take on the role of organising training workshops and seminars (Jorgensen 2020, NZAA 2020b).

The issues raised in Auckland 40 years ago, of working conditions, accreditation, ethics and training for archaeology professionals, remain, therefore, largely unresolved. Rates of pay within much of the profession are essentially subject to market forces, neither NZAA nor Heritage New Zealand take responsibility for accreditation, NZAA’s attempts to establish codes of practice seem to have faded away and, outside the limited range

offered by the Universities, there are as yet no regular training opportunities offered.

Bickler (2018) provides a wider perspective on the concerns that prompted the formation of INZA. Both he and O’Keeffe (2020:42-44) highlight the current lack of any professional body setting standards or providing accreditation for the hundred or more archaeological contractors and consultants in Aotearoa New Zealand. Specifically, O’Keeffe proposes the formation of a professional body to address some of the issues for which INZA was set up and which are still current. The fact that she needs to could be seen as a reflection on the profession itself.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Gabrielle Johnston, Caroline Phillips and Ian Lawlor for comments, and in memory of the late Ray Hooker and Ian Smith.

References

The records of the Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists are held in the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. This paper is based primarily on a selection of those records. They and other sources are listed below.

- Anon., n.d. (JR McKinlay? 1982) Symposium New Zealand Historic Places Trust and archaeological policy for the 1980s. Discussion paper, NZHPT Wellington.
- Barber, I. (2000) Archaeological heritage management in New Zealand: what happened? *Archaeology in New Zealand* 43(1):22-36.
- Best, S. (1975) Site recording in the southern half of the South Kaipara peninsula. Report to NZHPT, Wellington.
- Bickler, S. (2018) *Cultural Resource Management Archaeology in New Zealand*. Bickler Consultants Ltd., Auckland.
- Bickler, S.H., A. Brown & R. Shakles (2017) Guidelines for the use of Geophysics in Heritage Management within the Auckland Region. Prepared by Clough & Associates Ltd. for Auckland Council.
- Brassey, R. (1996) Developments with INZA (Notes & News). *Archaeology in New Zealand* 39(2):75.
- Cassels, R., J. Coster, L. Furey & I. Lawlor (1982) Letter 16 March 1982 to Senior Archaeologist NZHPT.
- Challis, A.J. (1979) 1979-80 archaeological site recording programme policy. NZHPT Archaeology Committee paper HP 7/179, File HP 12/7/5.

- Challis, A.J. (1995) Current directions and issues in archaeological site protection. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 38(3):169-90.
- Coster, J. (1978) Archaeological site recording. Report to NZAA Council, 20 August 1978. 3 pp.
- Coster, J. (1984) A New Zealand Association of Professional Archaeologists. *NZAA Newsletter* 27(1):64-68.
- Coster, J. (1991) The Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists (Notes and News). *Archaeology in New Zealand* 34(3):127.
- Coster, J. (1994) Report on meeting with NZ Historic Places Trust to discuss the role of the Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists under the Historic Places Act 1993. INZA paper, July 1994, 1 p.
- Coster J. (1998) Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists. Letter 21 April 1998 Treasurer INZA to Secretary NZAA.
- Coster, J. (2020) Professional profiles in archaeology 1985-2020. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 63(2):43-53.
- Coster, J, L. Furey, I. Lawlor, C. Phillips (1982) A report on the activities of archaeologists who would like to form an association (Inc.) of professional archaeologists. Discussion paper, 34 pp.
- Crosby, A. & S. Loughlin (1992) Site survey report east bank of the lower Piako River. Report to NZHPT.
- Furey, L. (1981) Auckland Association of Consulting Archaeologists. *NZAA Newsletter* 24(3):139-40.
- Furey, L. (1984a) N.Z. Institute of Archaeologists. *NZAA Newsletter* 27(3):136, 139.
- Furey, L. (1984b) Contracting within Historic Places Trust archaeology section. Discussion paper NZIA 1984/1.
- Furey, L. (1992) Draft code of ethics for NZAA (Notes and News). *Archaeology in New Zealand* 35(1):14-15.
- Geelen, A. (1982) Letter 29 March 1982 to Cassels et al. File HP12/20, NZHPT, Wellington.
- Geelen, A. (1991) NZHPT grants (Notes and News). *Archaeology in New Zealand* 34(4):185.
- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (2017) Guidelines for approval of person to carry out activity - section 45 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. *Archaeological Guidelines Series No. 10*, HNZPT Wellington.
- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (2020) Archaeological guidelines and templates, heritage.org.nz/protecting-heritage/archaeology/archaeological-guidelines-and-templates (accessed June 2020).
- Jones, KL (1984) A professional committee of the N.Z.A.A. Council. NZAA internal paper, May 1984, 3pp.

- Jones K.L., A. Walton & A.J. Challis (1997) INZA – use it or lose it (Notes and News). *Archaeology in New Zealand* 40(2):97-98.
- Jorgensen A. (2020) NZAA professional profile survey results. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 63(1):7-16.
- Lawlor, I. (Ed.) (1987) Photography and care of photographs for the archaeologist. INZA Seminar Proceedings 1.
- Lawlor, I. & S. Black (1976) Site recording in the southern half of the Okahukura Peninsula-Kaipara. Report to NZHPT, Wellington.
- Leahy, A.L. & W.D. Walsh (1982) Site surveying in the eastern Bay of Plenty. Report to NZHPT, Wellington.
- McGovern-Wilson, R. & T. Walton (1999) Codes of ethics and standards for the practice of archaeology in New Zealand. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 42(1):3-36.
- McKinlay, J.R. (1979) Archaeology section : future directions & organisation. NZHPT Archaeology Committee paper HP 92/1979, File HP 4/2/2.
- McKinlay, J.R. (1982) Proposed rates of pay for archaeological contract staff. NZHPT circular, 24 May 1982, File HP 12/7/1/4.
- Museums Aotearoa Te Tari o nga Whare Taonga o te Motu (2013). *Code of Ethics & Professional Practice* for Governing Bodies, Managers and Staff of Museums and Art Galleries in Aotearoa New Zealand.
- NZ Archaeological Association (1978a) Site recording how and why – a proposed national debate. Seminar series, Auckland University 5 August 1978, Otago University 14 October 1978. (Notes and programmes held by J Coster.)
- NZ Archaeological Association (1978b) Council minutes 23 September 1978.
- NZ Archaeological Association (1984) Other A.G.M. resolutions NZAA *Newsletter* 27(2):75.
- NZ Archaeological Association (1993) Membership Code of Ethics. nzarchaeology.org/membership/code-of-ethics (accessed June 2020).
- NZ Archaeological Association (1999a) Annual general meeting of the NZAA. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 42(2):100-101.
- NZ Archaeological Association (1999b) NZAA Council meeting minutes. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 42(3):195.
- NZ Archaeological Association (2000) NZAA annual general meeting. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 43(2):99.
- NZ Archaeological Association (2001a) NZAA annual general meeting. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 44(3):173.
- NZ Archaeological Association (2001b) NZAA workshops report. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 44(4):256-259.
- NZ Archaeological Association (2020a) Directory of individual members available for archaeological work. nzarchaeology.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Consultants-Directory_April2020.pdf

- NZ Archaeological Association (2020b) Training & Continuing Professional Development (CPD). nzarchaeology.org/training (accessed June 2020).
- NZ Association of Professional Archaeologists Steering Committee (1983) N.Z. Association of Professional Archaeologists. Supplement to *NZAA Newsletter* 26(1).
- NZ Historic Places Trust (1975) Archaeology. *Report of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for the Year Ended 31 March 1975*, pp. 11,12. Government Printer, Wellington
- NZ Historic Places Trust (1976) Archaeology. *Report of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for the Year Ended 31 March 1976*, pp. 11,12. Government Printer, Wellington
- NZ Historic Places Trust (1977) Conditions affecting site recorders financed or commissioned by the Trust. File HP 12/7/5, 3 November 1977, NZ Historic Places Trust Wellington.
- NZ Historic Places Trust (1979) Archaeological contracts 1979-80. Files HP 2/7/5, HP 12/7/5/8, 5 July 1979, NZ Historic Places Trust Wellington.
- NZ Historic Places Trust (1981) Archaeological site recording programme 1981-82. File HP 12/7/5/10, 21 July 1981, NZ Historic Places Trust Wellington.
- NZ Historic Places Trust (n.d.) Proposed pay scales: contract workers. Undated circular, no file reference.
- O'Connor, M. (1986) The authorising roles of public institutions in job creation and training: legitimating New Zealand employment policy 1980 – 1985. *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations* 11:119-134.
- O'Keeffe, M. (2020) Professional archaeology in New Zealand – further thoughts. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 63(1):39-45.
- Phillips, C. & M. Low (2015) New Zealand archaeology professional development cell. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 58(4):213-220.
- Sheppard, B. (1984) Letter 22 November 1984 to L Furey. File HP12/7/1/4, NZHPT, Wellington.
- Smith, I.W.G. & P. Wernham (1975) Survey of archaeological sites: Te Awapatiki to Hapupu, Hanson Bay, Chatham Island. Report to NZHPT, Wellington.
- Walton A. (Ed.) (1999) Archaeological site recording in New Zealand. *New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph* 23. NZAA, Auckland.
- Walton, A. & M. O'Keeffe (2004) Archaeological heritage management in Furey, L. & S. Holdaway (Eds.) *Change Through Time 50 Years of New Zealand Archaeology*. *New Zealand Archaeological Association Monograph* 26. NZAA, Auckland.