Appendix 20: Responses to the extra questions for sample of respondent participants at the Nene Valley metal detecting rally

Question A: Did you attend the Water Newton metal detecting rally last year?

[All respondents answered ‘yes’ to this a question as a prerequisite to being asked the rest of the survey questions].

Question B: If yes, have you noticed any differences between the two rallies? Please explain your answer.

1) Not as good for finding artefacts as last year
2) Last year was better - more organised
3) Remember the flag and bag method being used
4) Fields might have been searched already
5) Not really - more fun this year
6) Less archaeologists this year
7) TV crew and preferred the flags last year
8) There was a land dispute last year for the farmer, better weather this year
9) None
10) Last year's was better
11) Bag and flag last year
12) TV crews last year
13) Not as many people last year. No Neil Oliver and TV cameras. Not as many archaeologists as last year. New field. Nothing's changed
14) Cameras made a difference
15) Not really, more activity last year because of cameras
16) Not the same hype as last year, less archaeologists, less hassle.
17) Neil Oliver not here, lower profile
18) Less archaeologists this year
19) Not as well organised
20) Not same high profile of archaeologists as last year
21) Land is poorer - harrowed means less finds coming off. Maybe less archaeologists this year, and no TV
22) Fewer finds, rumour is that because items found, there has been a change to what land will be searched - are we meant to workl together or not?
23) Fewer finds
24) Cleaner on site, but distance to fields and signage are issues
25) More low hey - archaeoplogists and a lack of a finds cabinet, where you can see what others have found. Would like an overview of the site
Question C: At the rally last year, did you take part in the ‘bag and flag’ recording of find spots?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pies show counts

Took part in bag and flag
- Yes - 23
- No - 2

n=23
Question D: Did you feel that the ‘bag and flag’ method worked well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pies show counts

- Yes - 16
- No - 9
Question E: Do you have any other comments to make on recording find spots with archaeologists (either through ‘bag and flag’, with the FLO in the marquee, or other)?

1) Less cumbersome this year with no flags
2) Better system than this year, more organised
3) Both good and you get the items back - worthwhile
4) -
5) Not much experience so hard to comment. The fields seem to have been worked before though
6) Flags not necessarily secure - risk can get moved/ Maps are more usual at rallies and are better. The letters this time are good markers on the field
7) Not found enough this time to make much comment
8) Grid works as well, it is easier this year
9) -
10) Like to work with the FLO
11) Bag and flag is much better, and it encourages more people to hand things in
12) It was alright
13) Worked well first day and then second day flags were missed. Good set up this year. Raffle tickets work well and no queue, although exact spots would be better
14) After second day, won't know about this year's method until after
15) The first day messed up a bit
16) Didn't find anything personally, but carrying the flags was tricky
17) Too many flags were missed because they were hard to find. Better to rely on the detectorists to tell the archaeologists where they have found things.
18) -
19) If well organised then yes
20) Worked very well and David Connolly thought that it went well. Although this year it also seems fine as it is
21) OK but this time it is simpler, was hard to carry the flags. Like the letters in the fields to help and the bags.
22) Not easy to use, the map is a better method
23) Hard to use prefer this year's method
24) Not here to be bagging up, it held us up, an intrusion and not a good rapport. archaeologists were taking charge and were arrogant, wouldn't know about the finds at all if not for the detectorists
25) Slower and more boring. Current system with PAS and FLO works well
Question F: Do you have any other comments to make about last year’s Water Newton rally, this year’s rally, or both?

1) -
2) -
3) -
4) Enjoy the social side of the rallies
5) -
6) Spoons saga! It also seems more relaxed this year
7) Enjoyed all of it
8) -
9) -
10) -
11) -
12) It is ok to work with archaeologists
13) Would have been interested to find results from last year in major treasure hunting magazine - mixed view/
14) Both rallies very good
15) Positive, although the bar is slow this year!
16) -
17) Pretty good last year, there were negative points but you don't realise at the time
18) -
19) Enjoyed both
20) Fine
21) Good for the archaeologists to be here, people should show their finds. More marshals and more maps needed from an organisational perspective
22) Lower enthusiasm, the archaeologists have said can't go where finds are, angry about this
23) Annoyed about archaeologists affecting which fields we can search
24) Going over same land in some cases as last year
25) Should have archaeologists working on site for advice and guidance at the time. Feel separate as the archaeologists are in the marquee