Diversity, Identity, and Oppression
in the Production of Archaeological Knowledge

Laura Ellen Heath-Stout

Dissertation Proposal submitted to the
Department of Archaeology, Boston University

2016

First Reader: _____
Dr. David M. Carballo

Second Reader: _____
Dr. Mary C. Beaudry

Third Reader: _____
Dr. Catherine Connell

Introduction

"Maybe you just haven't met the right man yet," says a fellow student on an archaeological dig when I tell him I am queer. When I tell him that maybe *he* has not met the right man yet, he is deeply offended.

"I went to the SAAs [Society for American Archaeology annual meeting] this year. Wow, that was the whitest conference I have ever attended!" says a Black woman archaeologist in a panel discussion of the archaeology of Black and indigenous communities.

A group of women graduate students sit around a hotel room in a Latin American country. We drink wine and bemoan the difficulty of supervising male workers. Not one of us has escaped sexual harassment in the field: we resentfully accept this as the price of doing the research we love.

It is clear that American archaeology has a problem. Look at the sea of white male faces at any major conference, or any faculty meeting, for that matter. Look at the news stories about sexual harassment at the Museum of Natural History (Balter 2016; Feltman 2016). Ask a young woman archaeologist if and how she plans to have children even though she lives on a graduate school stipend and spends every summer in a foreign country: she has thought it through. Ask an archaeologist of color about her imposter syndrome. Go to the Queer Archaeology Interest Group events at next year's SAA conference and hear the stories about being the only queer archaeologist on a project and the wincing laughs of recognition.

American archaeologists work around the world. We study people of every race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, ability, age, nationality, religion, class, and occupation. We are interested in all people, not just the straight white men of history. Yet disproportionately large numbers of archaeologists, especially those in positions of influence and power, are straight

white men. How does this lack of diversity shape the questions we ask and the stories we tell about the human past? How do racism, sexism, and heterosexism affect the production of archaeological knowledge?

Archaeology does not exist in a vacuum: it is part of the larger apparatus of American academic research. In this dissertation, I use the discipline as a case study to understand how race, gender, and sexuality affect knowledge production in the social sciences more broadly. Although each social science is unique, archaeology is inherently interdisciplinary, using methods and theories borrowed from anthropology, history, art history, classics, geology, biology, chemistry, and other disciplines. This means that the discipline affects and is affected by a wide variety of other fields, making it a good case study for understanding how social science knowledge production works in a broader sense.

Furthermore, as feminist archaeologists have argued since the 1980s, archaeology is deeply implicated in the construction of gender and sexuality, as advocates of patriarchal gender roles often appeal to how human society has supposedly always worked (Conkey and Spector 1984). Archaeology has, historically, been used to justify racism (Challis 2013), colonialism (Díaz-Andreu García 2007), and even genocide (Arnold 2006). Therefore, by investigating how gender, race, and sexuality shape archaeology, I will also contribute to our understanding of how these identities and oppressions are, themselves, constructed.

In this dissertation, I will examine the state of American archaeology both quantitatively and qualitatively. First, I will examine the demographic composition of the field, both in terms of who is present in archaeology programs and who publishes research on which topics. This will allow me to identify broad trends in representation and knowledge production in the field of archaeology. I will then interview a diverse sample of archaeologists about their experiences

within the discipline and how they have shaped their research: this will allow me to explain those broader trends.

<u>Intersecting Systems of Oppression</u>

This dissertation is informed by an intersectional feminist theoretical framework. In this way of thinking, racism, sexism, and heterosexism are seen as systems of oppression. This means that these words do not only refer to bigotry and hate speech but rather to ideologies that shape large parts of society, culture, and government, as well as interpersonal interactions. Systemic racism refers to the structures that privilege white people over people of color, from the mass incarceration of young Black men to resistance to affirmative action programs. Systemic sexism, also known as patriarchy, refers to the structures that privilege men over women and people of other genders, from the pay gap to rape culture. Heterosexism and heteronormativity privilege straight people and ways of being over queer[1] people and ways of being, from employment discrimination to the disproportionately large numbers of queer youth who experience homelessness. Thus sexism, racism, and heterosexism include the hateful thoughts and actions of individuals, but extend far beyond these to implicate the government, economy, and culture. This way of thinking about oppression is common in feminist, anti-racist, and queer activist and academic circles (e.g. Alexander 2012; hooks 2000; Sullivan 2003).

---

[1] In this proposal, I use "queer" as an umbrella term for a wide variety of people who are not heterosexual, including gay, lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, queer-identified, and other people. Queer also includes transgender, genderqueer, and other gender non-conforming people, but since there are so few transgender archaeologists, this dissertation will primarily focus on cisgender (non-transgender) archaeologists.

One important element of systems of oppression is that they intersect with each other. The term "intersectionality" was coined by Black feminist legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), although the concept was already under discussion by women of color writers before Crenshaw's term (e.g. Lorde 1984). The idea is that racism, sexism, and heterosexism do not exist separately from each other. A Black woman experiences sexism differently from a white woman because of her race. She also experiences racism differently than a Black man does because of her gender. Queer people experience race and gender differently than straight people do because of their queerness. The mixture of multiple forms of oppression and privilege in one person's life creates a unique experience. Discourses about intersectionality have expanded over the past 30 years to include academic applications of the theory to a variety of topics, complete with arguments about the possibilities and limits of intersectionality, but has also deeply affected many activist movements (Cho et al. 2013). I use an intersectional perspective because I believe that it is important to look beyond the experiences of "women," "queer people," and "people of color" to see the specific experiences of women of color, queer women, queer people of color, and queer women of color in archaeology. It is insufficient to study each of these forms of oppression separately, since they exist together.

Choo and Ferree (2010) identify three different ways that scholars have commonly applied intersectionality theory to their work: by centering the identities of multiply-marginalized groups, by investigating how the processes of oppression interact with each other in specific contexts, and by examining how oppressive systems are always interacting in all contexts. I seek to use this third notion of intersectionality, as Choo and Ferree (2010) and Cho et al. (2013) advocate. I refuse to center gender, race, or sexuality over the others: they are all always co-existing and influencing each other. All archaeologists' experiences are shaped by the

interactions of sexuality, race, and gender. Furthermore, all of these systems of oppression are not just inert identity categories, but rather are active dynamics of power and inequality.

Oppression and Knowledge Production in Academia

The university system is not exempt from systemic oppression. Academics travel through a "leaky pipeline," where more women "leak" out of the university system at each career stage due to both outright sexism and sexual harassment and subtler structural problems like lack of support for new parents (Hoopes 2008; Resmini 2016; Smaglik 2004). The American Association of University Women researches these problems and advocates for better conditions (Hill et al. 2010). Black academics write guidebooks to guide each other through a hostile and lonely environment (Rockquemore and Laszloffy 2008). Women of color face racism and sexism intersecting with other forms of oppression (Gutiérrez y Muhs et al. 2012). Academics have created blogs like *Tenure, She Wrote* and *Conditionally Accepted* as safe online spaces for academics to discuss these problems and their coping strategies. It is clear that systemic racism, heterosexism, and patriarchy are alive and well in the ivory tower.

A wide variety of scholars have examined how these problems affect the production of knowledge. Sociologists have studied knowledge production as a social process since the 1920s, and the sociology of knowledge is a large and well-recognized subfield (Curtis and Petras 1970; Stehr and Meja 1984). The interplay between knowledge and power has long been an essential topic of study, including studies of conceptualizations of identity and oppression (e.g. Berger 1970; Lieberman 1970). Some of these theories have been explicitly applied to contemporary academia. For example, Rhode's *In Pursuit of Knowledge: Scholars, Status, and Academic Culture* examined the "gap between principles and practice and the distortion of the pursuit of

knowledge by the pursuit of status" (Rhode 2006:2). This dissertation will build on this long tradition of study of power dynamics and the processes of knowledge production.

Oppression and Knowledge Production in Archaeology

This dissertation builds on a thirty-year-old tradition of feminist, anti-racist, and queer critiques of archaeology. These discourses within the discipline have primarily focused on how gender, race, and sexuality have worked in the human past. Other scholars have looked at equity issues within the field, and formed advocacy groups within professional organizations to address these problems. I will expand on this literature by providing an updated and intersectional look at the demographics and equity issues of archaeology, and analyzing how these patterns affect the knowledge produced about the human past.

Identity in the Human Past

Feminist archaeologists have studied women and gender in a wide variety of past societies since the 1980s (Conkey 2003; Conkey and Gero 1997; Conkey and Spector 1984; Nelson 2004). Wylie (1991) has argued that the development of feminist archaeology followed the same patterns as the development of political feminist movements. The first publications, analogous to the women's suffrage movement, pointed out that women exist and should have equal treatment to men, as in Conkey and Spector's (1984) argument that archaeology was typically androcentric and should be examined with a feminist lens. The next wave, corresponding to Women's Liberation movements in the 1960s and 1970s, consisted of archaeologists looking for evidence of women's activities and identities in the past (e.g. Claassen 1994; Gilchrist 1991; Hamilton et al. 2007; Sørenson 2000). Once more women had been "found" in the archaeological record, third wave feminist ideas about gender as a system that

6

affects men as well as women and ideas about intersectionality were picked up by archaeologists (e.g. Delle et al. 2000; Battle-Baptiste 2011). Alongside these developments, queer theory has made inroads with the work of Barbara Voss and others over the past two decades (Dowson 2000; Schmidt and Voss 2000; Voss 2008; Voss and Casella 2012).

Many scholars, especially historical archaeologists, have studied race and colonialism as well. European colonialism during the fifteenth through nineteenth centuries has become a popular topic of study for archaeologists working in a wide variety of cultures and locations (Croucher and Weiss 2011; Cusick 1998; Given 2004; Gosden 2004; Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002; Murray 2004; Stein 2005). Colonialism has been studied in domestic contexts (e.g. Deagan 1973; Rodríguez-Alegría 2012; Wernke 2012), in religious contexts (e.g. Card 2013; Cummins 2002), and on the body (e.g. Loren 2008; Voss and Casella 2012). Historical archaeologists studying non-Native communities of color in the Americas have also created a vibrant literature on race (e.g. Gosden 2006; Orser 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007; Voss 2008). Much of this literature focuses on African-American communities, both enslaved and free (e.g. Agbe-Davies 1998, 2003; Battle-Baptiste 2011; Franklin 1997; Franklin and McKee 2004; Galle and Young 2004; Garman 1998; Hudgins 1996; Kicza 1997; Wilkie 2003).

Oppression in the Field of Archaeology

Women Archaeologists Feminist archaeology began with an exploration of the experiences of women archaeologists, with Gero's (1985) "Socio-Politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology." Gero argued that women archaeologists have been marginalized, restricted to the parts of archaeological work that are less valued, such as laboratory and museum work, rather than running their own field projects. Gero's article used figures on the authorship of

American Antiquity articles on Mesoamerica, archaeology dissertations described in *Dissertation Abstracts International*, and successful National Science Foundation grants to show these trends. Follow-ups to Gero's original article focused on intellectual herstory of archaeology (e.g. Claassen 1994; Cohen and Joukowsky 2004; Diaz-Andreu and Stig Sørenson 1998; Reyman 1992; White et al. 1999), or expanded on her quantitative study of equity issues (Claassen 1994; Nelson et al. 1994). Other scholars theorized about what has kept women out of archaeology, most notably Claassen's (2000) analysis of homophobia and sexism and their implications for archaeology.

Feminist analysis of gender equity issues has led to strong advocacy groups in many professional organizations. The Society for American Archaeology's (SAA) Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology (COSWA) "seeks to understand the current status of women in the profession through the gathering of data and to improve the position of women in archaeology" (Society for American Archaeology) and its Women in Archaeology Interest Group (WAIG) creates a space for women to network, discuss equity issues, and advocate for women's equality within the discipline. The Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) has its own WAIG, but no committees that primarily address gender issues. The Society for Historical Archaeology's (SHA) Gender and Minority Affairs Committee does similar work through a wide variety of projects in conjunction with SHA leadership, by giving awards to exceptional field schools, and by setting up mentoring relationships between marginalized scholars (Society for Historical Archaeology).

Archaeologists of Color There is a growing literature on the roles of people of color in archaeology. Publications on the history of the discipline increasingly examine race and racism (e.g. Reyman 1992; Challis 2013). Black archaeologists like Maria Franklin, Anna Agbe-Davies,

and Whitney Battle-Baptiste have intentionally mixed reflection on their own roles and experiences in the field of archaeology with their interpretations of Black communities in the past (Agbe-Davies 1998, 2003; Battle-Baptiste 2011; Franklin 1997, 2001). Other scholars have delved into the colonialist history of archaeology and the tensions between archaeologists and Native communities (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009; McNiven and Russell 2005). There is also a growing body of literature on collaborations between indigenous communities and archaeologists that seek to rectify these rifts (Atalay 2006, 2012; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Silliman 2008; Smith and Wobst 2005).

The SAA and SHA have launched various initiatives to support archaeologists of color and to make archaeology more diverse and welcoming. The SAA's Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarships (HUGS) and Native American Scholarships programs provide resources to help archaeology students of color do fieldwork (Society for American Archaeology). The aforementioned SHA Gender and Minority Affairs committee honors especially diverse and anti-racist field schools and provides conference travel scholarships for underrepresented students, and hopes to create a program similar to HUGS in the future (Society for Historical Archaeology). The Archaeological Institute of America's website does not list analogous efforts: perhaps Classical archaeologists have done less to attempt to diversify their ranks than Americanists and historical archaeologists.

Queer Archaeologists Conversations about the positions and experiences of queer people in archaeology have only just begun. These conversations are essential, but have not yet made it into the scholarly literature: to my knowledge, there are no peer-reviewed or scholarly publications on the experiences of queer archaeologists. There is, however, at least one relevant book written by queer cultural anthropologists about their experiences, *Out in the Field* (Lewin

9

and Leap 1996). The introduction suggests that the stories shared in the book are key to both reducing stigma in the field of cultural anthropology and to the practice of reflexive anthropology (Lewin and Leap 1996:22). Twenty years after the publication of *Out in the Field*, it is high time for archaeologists to do similar work.

The Society for American Archaeology conferences of the past three years have been the site of some of these conversations within archaeology. The SAA's Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG) was founded in 2014. QAIG supports scholarship on sexuality and queer studies, as well as meeting "the need to recognize, support, and mentor Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transsexual, Queer, and Intersex (LGBTQI) archaeologists, students, and communities" (Rutecki and Blackmore 2016:9). At the 2015 SAA Annual Meeting in San Francisco, QAIG hosted a symposium on queer theory and a forum on the experiences of queer archaeologists in the field. As reported in a special issue of *The SAA Archaeological Record* in January 2016, queer archaeologists discussed the ways that archaeology's fieldwork culture marginalizes them and subjects them to heterosexist oppression (Blackmore et al. 2016). At the 2016 SAA conference, QAIG successfully advocated for the designation of a gender-neutral restroom at the conference and hosted another forum on inclusion in archaeology.

Personal Narratives about Identity and Oppression in Archaeology Although this dissertation is the first large-scale study of how the identity of archaeologists affects archaeological knowledge production, some feminist archaeologists have addressed these issues through reflections on their own career paths. Battle-Baptiste's (2011) *Black Feminist Archaeology* is an excellent example: she places her research on historical sites associated with Black communities and the creation of a Black feminist methodology within the context of her

own development as a researcher. Tellingly, she writes about her start as an archaeologist, when

she worked at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, where

> I was surrounded by people of color, progressive allies, and specialists that wanted to listen to our traditions and memories of the details of life and apply them to how they analyzed ceramics, faunal (animal) and plant remains… I was spoiled and had no idea of the harsh world that awaited me once I left the confines of historic Williamsburg. (Battle-Baptiste 2011:27–28)

Throughout the book, Battle-Baptiste reflects on her own life experience as a woman of color in

a white- and male-dominated field and how that affected her research and writing.

Even more recently, Nelson's (2015) *Shamans, Queens, and Figurines: The Development*

of Gender Archaeology traced both the author's career and the development of feminist

archaeology through a mixture of memoir and selected essays from Nelson's career. Nelson

reflects frankly on how her gender, family status, and feminist politics shaped her research

career.

> I thought I wasn't discriminated against as much as neglected, but even I could see the lack of advantages for any faculty member to invest effort in my future career. Why bother with a mother of three who will never have time to amount to anything, even if she has the skills and the will?...
> I almost had an archaeological project in [a remote area of] Taiwan instead of South Korea … but an unexpected snag rerouted my plans. Whoever was in charge of granting visas to Taiwan appeared to be horrified that a mother would take her children to a place where there were no schools and no health care. No attempted pulling of strings budged the decision. (Nelson 2015:22–23)

Although these accounts focus on the experience of particular individuals, they offer a window

into how race and gender affect the research career trajectories of archaeologists.

Thanks to this body of scholarship and advocacy work, it is clear that the discipline of

archaeology has, historically, had problems with equity and diversity, and that these problems

have affected the kinds of research that has been conducted. Yet, our our understanding of these

issues is limited in two ways. First, the most recent article on gender equity issues in the United States is from 2002, almost fifteen years ago, and none of the quantitative equity studies are intersectional in their analysis. It is time for an update that shows the state of archaeology as a field in terms of gendered, racial, and sexual diversity. Second, our understanding of how identity and inequity shapes knowledge production is limited to personal accounts by individual archaeologists, necessitating a larger-scale study. This dissertation will address these limitations.

Research Design

Research Questions

In this dissertation, I will answer two major sets of questions.

What is the demographic composition of academic archaeology in the United States? In order to understand race, gender, and sexual orientation dynamics in American archaeology, we must first understand the demographic composition of the discipline. Who participates in archaeology? What is the gender balance of the discipline? How many archaeologists are people of color or openly queer? How do these identities cross-cut academic hierarchies? How does the discipline compare to related disciplines like Classics and Sociocultural Anthropology, American academia more broadly, and American society in general? The answers to these questions will create a context for understanding the significance of the answers to the main set of questions.

How do the race, gender, and sexual orientation of researchers affect the knowledge about the human past that they produce? Is the identity of the archaeologist a significant factor in what subfield, culture area, and/or methods they choose to pursue? Do lived experiences of racism, sexism, and/or heterosexism deeply affect the career trajectories and research specialties of marginalized archaeologists? What causes privileged archaeologists to study marginalized

people and systems of oppression in the past? How do archaeologists motivated by feminist, queer, and/or anti-racist politics rectify anti-oppression values with academia's discourses of objectivity, truth-seeking, and scholarly rigor?

Part 1: The Demographics of American Archaeology

The first step in understanding the positions of women, people of color, and queer people in archaeology is to gather data about who participates in archaeology in the American academy and how they do so. I will thus begin my study with a census of who is present in university departments and programs, as well as of the membership of professional organizations. This census will address my first research question: What is the demographic composition of academic archaeology in the United States?

First, I will examine the simple presence of women, people of color, and queer people in academic programs, as students and faculty members. One way to access these data is by using guidebooks like the *Peterson's Guide to Graduate Programs in the Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences 2016*, which gathers data from many departments (see "Pilot Data" section below). I will also reach out to representatives from professional organizations such as the Society for American Archaeology, the Society for Historical Archaeology, and the Archaeological Institute of America, in order to solicit data about race, gender, and/or sexual orientation that they collect about their membership.

Ascertaining the demographics of archaeology programs is not enough, however. Who survives and thrives in archaeology? Who produces significant archaeological knowledge? Who produces what kinds of knowledge? In order to get at the composition of archaeological researchers, I will study trends in dissertations completed, grants received, and journal

publications. All dissertations and theses are reported in the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database: I will survey dissertation authors from the last fifteen years about their demographic data. One of the most prominent granting agencies for archaeologists is the National Science Foundation: following Gero (1985), I will study data published by the NSF about their grantees. As with the professional organizations, I will contact Archaeology Division Director John Yellen about the availability of demographic data, and if the data are not available, I will survey grant recipients.

I will also conduct a study of authorship in several major journals: *American Antiquity, Latin American Antiquity, Advances in Archaeological Practice, Historical Archaeology,* the *American Journal of Archaeology*, and the *Journal of Field Archaeology*[2] over the past fifteen years. I will collaborate with the editorial staff of journals to gain these data if they are already collected by the journals, and to send a survey to authors if they are not.[3] This data will build on data from previous studies of gendered publication patterns (Beaudry and White 1994; Ford 1994; Ford and Hundt 1994; Hutson 2002; Nelson et al. 1994) both by updating them and by taking an intersectional approach that includes race and sexual orientation. I will also use several journals, allowing me to compare Americanist, Latin Americanist, Historical, and Classical archaeology as fields.

---

[2] I currently work as an editorial assistant at the *Journal of Field Archaeology*, so I may have special access to these data, but will also need to consult with my supervisors to see whether they see a conflict of interest in my study of the journal.

[3] The publications on gender dynamics do not specify how it was determined which authors were men and which were women: I assume that these identifications were based on names when the feminist researchers did not know article authors personally. Unfortunately, it is not so easy to guess at racial and sexual identification.

All of these data will be analyzed first in terms of who is producing archaeological knowledge. My hypothesis, based on my own informal observations, is that straight white men are disproportionately represented in archaeology, especially as faculty members, grant recipients, and authors of journal articles. I hypothesize that most undergraduate archaeology students are women, but that women leave the field at every stage (in other words, that we have a leaky pipeline in archaeology), leading to male-dominated faculties. I also hypothesize that people of color, queer people, and especially people who hold more than one oppressed identity, are dramatically underrepresented. I will test these hypotheses statistically, comparing the data on archaeologists to data on the U.S. population in general and the demographics of the American university system.

Next, I will examine who produces which kinds of data. By tagging dissertations, grants, and journal articles with the part(s) of the world studied, methods used, theoretical frameworks used, and other categories, I will identify trends in which demographic groups study which topics. I hypothesize that the trends that Gero (1985) identified three decades ago still hold true: women are more likely to conduct lab work while men are more likely to conduct field work. I also hypothesize that people of color are concentrated in historical archaeology and the archaeology of the racial groups to which they belong and that queer archaeologists tend to conduct fieldwork in the United States and other nations where they have civil rights. I also postulate that the archaeology of gender is disproportionately conducted by women, that the archaeology of racial minorities is disproportionately conducted by archaeologists of color, and that the archaeology of sexuality is disproportionately conducted by queer people. More basically, this part of the study will allow me to quantitatively test the hypotheses that gender, race, and sexual orientation affect what archaeologists study.

Part 2: Identity and the Production of Archaeological Knowledge

Following my census of archaeology, I will conduct a more open-ended survey and series of interviews, in order to address my second research question: how do the race, gender, and sexual orientation of researchers affect the knowledge about the human past that they produce? Since this is a more qualitative question, I will solicit more qualitative information from a diverse sample of archaeologists.

I will conduct a series of interviews with various archaeologists, including people of different races, genders, sexual orientations, and career stages, whom I will contact through my own professional network and through snowball sampling techniques with quotas for each category in which I want diversity. I will ask three main sets of questions. First, I will ask each interviewee to tell the story of how they came to choose the research topics they have focused on. How did they identify their topics for theses, dissertations, field projects, and other large pieces of work? Next, I will ask them questions about their experiences of race, gender, and sexual orientation in archaeological field and lab settings, during their undergraduate and graduate education, and in the workplace. I will solicit stories both about negative experiences with oppression, discrimination, microaggressions,[4] and harassment and about positive experiences of welcoming communities and strong mentorship. Finally, I will ask informants about their perceptions of the connections between these two lines of questioning. Do they believe that their career paths and research have been deeply affected by their gender, race, and/or sexual orientation? If so, how? If not, why not? The interviews will be recorded and then

---

[4] Microaggressions are small, everyday interactions that may not be intended to harm but make oppressed people feel unwelcome. They accumulate over time to create a hostile environment.

transcribed and coded in NVivo, and I will discuss them anonymously in the dissertation, per IRB guidelines.

In my analysis of the interviews, I will identify trends in how archaeologists discuss their decision-making processes around research topics, how they talk about their experiences of privilege and oppression, and how they understand the relationships between the two. I hypothesize that, much like the gay and lesbian public school teachers studied by Connell (2014), marginalized archaeologists use a variety of strategies to navigate tensions between political pressures to be loud and proud about identity and academic pressures to conduct rigorous or even objective research. Connell's gay teachers fell into three categories—"splitters" who were completely closeted at work, "knitters" who were out and proud at school, and "quitters" who were pushed out of teaching professions by these tensions—and archaeologists from marginalized groups may use similar strategies.

I will also observe the proceedings of diversity and equity initiatives at the SAA, SHA, and AIA conferences. I will attend all three conferences and all relevant meetings, including COSWA, WAIG, QAIG, HUGS committee, and Native American Scholarship committee meetings at the SAA; the Gender and Minority Affairs Committee meeting at the SHA; and the Women in Archaeology Interest Group meeting at the AIA. I will analyze how they discuss the demographics of archaeology; the production of knowledge about gender, race, and sexuality in the past; and the relationship between these two things. Do these groups conceptualize equity for modern archaeologists as integrally related to the production of critical scholarship about oppression in the past? Which of these two goals do they privilege? How do they articulate the connections? Do the groups' narratives mirror those of the individuals I interview? By

examining how organized equity initiatives conceptualize these issues as well as how individual

archaeologists do, I will gain a more nuanced understanding of the issues.

Pilot Data: Gender and Race in Archaeology Graduate Programs

In order to create a preliminary picture of archaeology's disciplinary problem with

diversity, I turned to data that have already been collected on the demographics of graduate

programs in archaeology. Peterson's (2016) guide to *Graduate Programs in the Humanities, Arts*

& Social Sciences, published each year, collects data on a wide variety of graduate programs. Its

chapter on archaeology programs includes 54 programs in the United States. Of these, 15

provided data on the gender ratios of their faculty, 21 provided data on gender ratios of graduate

students, and 20 provided data on the racial demographics of graduate students[5] (see Table 3).

These numbers show some disturbing (although predictable) trends, especially when

compared to U.S. Census data from 2015 (U.S. Census Bureau 2015), the same year the

Peterson's data were collected. In terms of gender (see Table 1), women are underrepresented

among faculty (44%), but overrepresented among graduate students (63%). This appears

hopeful: theoretically, graduate students will become the next generation of faculty and the

disparity will disappear. After all, Kramer and Stark (1988) reported almost thirty years ago that

women made up only 33.4% of Ph.D. recipients and only 20% of faculty. Although their data are

not from Peterson's guide, and are therefore not directly comparable to what is reported in Table

1, it is clear that women's representation has improved over the past three decades. Research on

---

[5] Data from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Material Sciences Department were
eliminated because the department includes so many people whose work does not relate to
archaeology and there were no data specific to the Center for Materials Research in Archaeology
and Ethnology.

the leaky pipeline effect, however, suggests that the process is slower than it would ideally be (Hoopes 2008; Resmini 2016; Smaglik 2004). The current numbers suggest that archaeology still has work to do in terms of faculty gender parity.

The Peterson's data show a more distressing trend in terms of race (see Table 2). As compared to the U.S. population (61.6% white), white people are far overrepresented in archaeology graduate programs (81.6% of American students). Black and Latinx[6] students, on the other hand, are vastly underrepresented: Latinxs make up 17.6% of the population but only 7.1% of archaeology graduate students and Black people make up 13.3% of the population but only 1.5% of archaeology graduate students. Native American/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Asian populations are more comparable, and people of two or more races are, in fact, slightly overrepresented in archaeology graduate programs. The shameful underrepresentation of Black and Latinx students in our programs suggests that archaeology as a discipline needs to work to be more accessible and welcoming to people from these minority groups.

Lest members of the Boston University Department of Archaeology think we are exempt from these problems, we must compare our own demographics to those of the field in general. In terms of gender balance, our graduate student population is typical of archaeology programs (62.5% women) and our faculty is only 33.3% women as compared to 44.4% in the overall Peterson's data set (see Table 1). Our statistics about race and ethnicity are similar to those of the

---

[6] "Latinx" is a gender-inclusive version of Latino/a. In Spanish, the –o ending is masculine and the –a ending is feminine. The –x ending is a new usage that uses x as a variable, making it clear that "Latinx" includes people who are neither men nor women.

larger sample of archaeology programs, although we have a larger percentage of international students than the overall sample (see Table 2).

The Peterson's guide data are far from perfect. Less than half of the 54 American graduate programs surveyed provided any demographic data, and it is possible that some programs were not surveyed. Some universities provided data about faculty but none about graduate students or vice versa, so the data may be skewed by sample bias. Furthermore, there are no data about the race/ethnicity of faculty and international students, and no data about the sexual orientation of any members of the departments. Most important, the data do not allow for an intersectional analysis, since the race and gender data are presented separately. It is impossible to know how many white men, white women, men of color, or women of color are present in any department. The data do, however, provide a preliminary look into archaeology's demographic diversity problems, showing the necessity of the dissertation research laid out in this proposal.

Conclusions

It is time for archaeologists to face up to our lack of diversity and its consequences. We need to understand just how male-, white-, and straight-dominated our field is. We need to understand the particular ways that racism, sexism, and heteronormativity affect the knowledge we produce about the human past. I will build on the literature on the status of women in archaeology in the 1990s, updating it. I will take a broad look at the status of archaeologists of color. I will be one of the first scholars to write about the experiences of queer archaeologists. More important, I will take an intersectional perspective, which none of the previous literature on equity issues in the field has done. Most important of all, I will elucidate how our problems with

diversity affect how we understand of the human past, the central goal of archaeology. These will point out the next steps in making archaeologists and our research questions as diverse as the people we study. As I synthesize my data, I will make suggestions for how individuals, academic programs, research projects, professional organizations, and advocacy groups can build a more diverse, inclusive, reflexive, and rigorous discipline of archaeology.

More broadly, this dissertation will build on literature about social scientific knowledge production and the ways it is shaped by intersecting systemic oppressions. Although I will focus on the case of archaeology, my findings will be relevant to scholars in other disciplines. Furthermore, because archaeology has been used to construct race, gender, and sexuality, my research will contribute to the understanding of these systems of oppression.

Proposed Chapter Outline

Introduction

Oppression, Intersectionality, and Archaeology (literature review)

Part 1: The Demographics of American Archaeology
- A Census of American Archaeology
- Who Produces Archaeological Knowledge?
- Trends in Demographics, Research Topics, and Methods

Part 2: Identity and Oppression in Archaeological Knowledge Production
- Factors in Choosing Research Topics among Archaeologists
- Manifestations of Racism, Sexism, and Heterosexism in Archaeology
- Common Strategies in Navigating Identity and Oppression in Archaeology

Discussion and Conclusions
- Race, Gender, and Sexuality in Archaeology
- Building a More Equitable and Inclusive Archaeology
- Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Social Sciences
- Implications for Understanding the Construction of Race, Gender, and Sexuality

Proposed Schedule

Fall 2016
- Completed NVivo webinar 9/7/2016
- Defend new dissertation proposal to Archaeology Department
- Solicit IRB Approval after proposal defense
- Conducting literature review
- Auditing GRS SO 702: Proseminar: Sociological Methods

Winter 2017
- Attend SHA Annual Meeting, January 4-8 in Fort Worth, conduct interviews and observations for Part 2

Spring 2017
- Draft "Oppression, Intersectionality, and Archaeology"
- Collect data for Part 1
- Begin analyzing data from *American Antiquity, Latin American Antiquity, Advances in Archaeological Practice*
- Attend SAA Annual Meeting, March 29-April 2 in Vancouver
  - Present paper: "An Intersectional Study of Authorship and Citation in *American Antiquity*, *Latin American Antiquity*, and *Advances in Archaeological Practice*" in session "Gender, Race, and other Consequential Categories: Experiments in

Intersectional Archaeology" organized by Dr. Christina Hodge and Dr. Jessica
MacLean
- Conduct interviews and observations for Part 2
- Audit GRS WS 801: Theories and Methods in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Summer 2017
- Complete Data Analysis for Part 1

Fall 2017
- Draft Part 1
- Conduct interviews for Part 2
- Participate in the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies' Workshop for Dissertation Writers in Women's and Gender Studies

Winter 2018
- Attend AIA Annual Meeting, January 4-7 in Boston, conduct interviews and observations for Part 2

Spring 2018
- Finish conducting interviews for Part 2
- Code and analyze interviews and observations for Part 2
- Participate in the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies' Workshop for Dissertation Writers in Women's and Gender Studies

Summer 2018
- Draft Part 2

Fall 2018
- Draft introduction
- Draft conclusion
- Finish writing and revisions
- Defend dissertation

Tables

Table 1: Gender Figures from *Peterson's* (2016)

	Peterson's[7]			B.U.		
	Total	Women	%	Total	Women	%
Faculty	311	138	44.4%	12	4	33%
Full Time	276	123	44.6%			
Part Time	35	15	42.9%			
Graduate Students	1287	811	63.0%	48	30	62.5%

---

[7] See Table 3 for list of universities represented in this sample

Table 2: Race/Ethnicity Figures for Domestic[8] Archaeology Graduate Students from

***Peterson's* (2016) as compared to U.S. Census (2015)**

	Peterson's Sample[9]		BU[10]		U.S.
	Total	**%**	**Total**	**%**	
White	979	83.6%	34	85.0%	61.6%
Minority	192	16.4%	6	15.0%	38.4%
Black/African American	18	1.5%	1	2.5%	13.3%
Native American/Alaska Native	12	1.0%	0	0.0%	1.2%
Asian	42	3.6%	1	2.5%	5.6%
Hispanic/Latino	83	7.1%	2	5.0%	17.6%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0.2%
Two or more races	36	3.1%	2	5.0%	2.6%
Total Domestic Graduate Students	1171		40		

---

[8] Because no data was provided on the race or ethnicity of International students, this table uses only data on American students at American universities. International students made up 9.0% of the Peterson's sample (n = 116) and 16.7% of Boston University students (n = 8).
[9] See table 3 for list of universities represented in this sample
[10] As reported in Peterson's

Table 3: University departments contributing demographic data to the *Peterson's* (2016) sample

University	Department(s) or Program(s)	Faculty Data:	Grad Student Data:	
		Gender	Gender	Ethnicity
Boston University	Archaeology	Not Provided	Yes	Yes
Bryn Mawr College	Classical & Near Eastern Archaeology	Yes	Yes	Yes
California State University Northridge	Anthropology	Not Provided	Yes	Yes
Florida State University	Classics	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Anthropology	Yes	Yes	Yes
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Material Sciences	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
Michigan Technological University	Industrial Archaeology	Yes	Yes	Yes
New York University	Archaeology	Not Provided	Yes	Yes
Tufts University	Classics	Not Provided	Yes	Not Provided
University of Chicago	Anthropology	Not Provided	Yes	Yes
University of Colorado Denver	Anthropology	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Denver	Anthropology	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Memphis	Communication & Fine Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Michigan	Anthropology, Classical Art & Archaeology	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Missouri	Art History & Archaeology	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of New Mexico	Anthropology	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Oklahoma	Archaeology	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Pennsylvania	Art & Archaeology of the Mediterranean World	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of South Florida	Anthropology	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington State University	Anthropology	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wheaton College	Biblical Archaeology	Not Provided	Yes	Yes
Totals		14	20	19

Works Cited

Agbe-Davies, Anna
   1998 Dealing with "Race" in African American Archaeology. *Anthropology News* 39(5): 14–14.

   2003 Archaeology and the Black Experience. *Archaeology*. 56(1):22.

Alexander, Michelle
   2012 *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. The New Press, New York.

Arnold, Bettina
   2006 "Arierdämmerung": Race and Archaeology in Nazi Germany. *World Archaeology* 38(1): 8–31.

Atalay, Sonya
   2006 Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3-4): 280–310.

   2012 *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Balter, Michael
   2016 The sexual misconduct case that has rocked anthropology. *Science*, February 9.

Battle-Baptiste, Whitney
   2011 *Black Feminist Archaeology*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Beaudry, Mary C., and Jacquelyn White
   1994 Cowgirls with the Blues? A Study of Women's Publication and the Citation of Women's Work in Historical Archaeology. In *Women in Archaeology*, edited by Cheryl Claassen, pp. 138–158. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Berger, Peter L.
   1970 Identity as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge. In *The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader*, edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras, pp. 373–386. Praeger Publishers, New York.

Blackmore, Chelsea, Leslie Drane, Richard Baldwin, and David Ellis
   2016 Towards an Inclusive Queer Archaeology: An Overview and Introduction. *The SAA Archaeological Record*. 16(1): 18-23.

Card, Jeb J. (editor).

    2013 *The Archaeology of Hybrid Material Culture*. Occasional Papers in Archaeology 39. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL.

Challis, Debbie

    2013 *The Archaeology of Race: The Eugenic Ideas of Francis Galton and Flinders Petrie*. Bloomsbury Academic, London.

Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall

    2013 Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis. *Signs* 38(4): 785–810.

Choo, Hae Yeon, and Myra Max Ferree

    2010 Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28(2): 129–149.

Claassen, Cheryl

    1994 *Women in Archaeology*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

    2000 Homophobia and Women Archaeologists. *World Archaeology* 32(2): 173–179.

Cohen, Getzel M., and Martha Sharp Joukowsky (editors).

    2004 *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip

    2009 *Inheriting the Past: The Making of Arthur C. Parker and Indigenous Archaeology*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T.J. Ferguson

    2008 *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. AltaMira Press, Lanham.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T.J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, Randall H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman

    2010 The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2): 228–238.

Conkey, Margaret W.

    2003 Has Feminism Changed Archaeology? *Signs* 28(3): 867–880.

Conkey, Margaret W., and Joan M. Gero

    1997 Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 411–437.

Conkey, Margaret W., and Janet D. Spector
      1984 Archaeology and the Study of Gender. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 7(1): 1–38.

Connell, Catherine
      2014 *School's Out: Gay and Lesbian Teachers in the Classroom*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé
      1989 Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989(1).

Croucher, Sarah K., and Lindsay Weiss (editors).
      2011 *The Archaeology of Capitalism in Colonial Contexts: Postcolonial Historical Archaeologies*. Contributions to Global Historical Archaeology. Springer, New York.

Cummins, Tom
      2002 Forms of Andean Colonial Towns, Free Will, and Marriage. In *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, edited by Claire L. Lyons and John K. Papadopoulos, pp. 199–240. Issues and Debates. Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.

Curtis, James E., and John W. Petras (editors).
      1970 *The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader*. Praeger Publishers, New York.

Cusick, James G. (editor).
      1998 *Studies in Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change, and Archaeology*. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University Carbondale Occasional Papers 25. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL.

Deagan, Kathleen
      1973 Mestizaje in Colonial St. Augustine. *Ethnohistory* 20(1): 55–65.

Delle, James A., Stephen A. Mrozowski, and Robert Paynter
      2000 *Lines that Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Díaz-Andreu García, Margarita
      2007 *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Díaz-Andreu García, Margarita, and Marie Louise Stig Sørenson (editors).
      1998 *Excavating Women: A History of Women in European Archaeology*. Routledge, London.

Dowson, Thomas A.

2000 Why queer archaeology? an Introduction. *World Archaeology* 32(2): 161–165.

Feltman, Rachel
    2016 American Museum of Natural History researcher faces sexual assault and harassment accusations. *Washington Post*, February 9. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/speaking-of-science/wp/2016/02/09/the-american-museum-of-natural-history-faces-sexual-assault-and-harassment-accusations/>

Ford, Anabel
    1994 Women in Mesoamerican Archaeology: Why Are the Best Men Winning? In *Women in Archaeology*, edited by Cheryl Claassen, pp. 159–172. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Ford, Anabel, and Anna Hundt
    1994 Equity in Academia -- Why the Best Men Still Win: An Examination of Women and Men in Mesoamerican Archeology. In *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*, edited by Margaret C. Nelson, Sarah Milledge Nelson, and Alison Wylie, pp. 147–156. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 5. American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

Franklin, Maria
    1997 "Power to the People": Sociopolitics and the Archaeology of Black Americans. *Historical Archaeology* 31(3): 36–50.

    2001 A Black feminist-inspired archaeology? *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1): 108–125.

Franklin, Maria, and Larry McKee
    2004 Introduction: African Diaspora Archaeologies: Present Insights and Expanding Discourses. *Historical Archaeology* 38(1): 1–9.

Galle, Jillian E., and Amy L. Young (editors).
    2004 *Engendering African American Archaeology: A Southern Perspective*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Garman, James C.
    1998 Rethinking "Resistant Accommodation': Toward an Archaeology of African-American Lives in Southern New England, 1638-1800. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 2(2): 133–160.

Gero, Joan M.
    1985 Socio-Politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology. *American Antiquity* 50(2): 342–350.

Gilchrist, Roberta

   1991 Women's Archaeology? Political Feminism, Gender Theory and Historical Revision. *Antiquity* 65: 495–501.

Given, Michael
   2004 *The Archaeology of the Colonized*. Routledge, London.

Gosden, Chris
   2004 *Archaeology and Colonialism: Cultural Contact from 5000 B.C. to the Present*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

   2006 Race and Racism in Archaeology: Introduction. *World Archaeology* 38(1): 1–7.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P. Harris (editors).
   2012 *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. University Press of Colorado, Boulder, CO.

Hamilton, Sue, Ruth D. Whitehouse, and Katherine I. Wright (editors).
   2007 *Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues*. Publications of the Institute of Archaeology, University College, London. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Hill, Catherine, Christianne Corbett, and Andresse St. Rose
   2010 *Why So Few? Women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C.

hooks, bell
   2000 *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Pluto Press, London.

Hoopes, Laura Mays
   2008 Fixing the Leaky Pipeline. *Scientist* 22(1): 67–70.

Hudgins, Carter L.
   1996 The Archaeology of Plantation Life in 18th-Century Virginia. In *The Archaeology of 18th-Century Virginia*, edited by T.R. Reinhart, pp. 47–56. Special Publications of the Archeological Society of Virginia 35. The Council of Virginia Archaeologists, Richmond.

Hutson, Scott R.
   2002 Gendered Citation Practices in American Antiquity and Other Archaeology Journals. *American Antiquity* 67(2): 331–342.

Kicza, John E.
   1997 Native American, African, and Hispanic Communities during the Middle Period in the Colonial Americas. *Historical Archaeology* 31(1): 9–17.

Kramer, Carol, and Miriam T. Stark

31

1988 The Status of Women in Archeology. *Anthropology Newsletter* 29(9): 1, 11–12.

Lewin, Ellen, and William L. Leap
1996 *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Lieberman, Leonard
1970 The Debate over Race. In *The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader*, edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras, pp. 569–484. Praeger Publishers, New York.

Lorde, Audre
1984 *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press, Freedom, CA.

Loren, Diana DiPaolo
2008 *In Contact: Bodies and Spaces in the Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Eastern Woodlands*. Issues in Eastern Woodlands Archaeology. AltaMira Press, Lanham.

Lyons, Claire L., and John K. Papadopoulos (editors).
2002 *The Archaeology of Colonialism*. Issues and Debates. Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.

McNiven, Ian J., and Lynette Russell
2005 *Appropriated Pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*. AltaMira Press, Lanham.

Murray, Tim (editor).
2004 *The Archaeology of Contact in Settler Societies*. New Directions in Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nelson, Margaret C., Sarah Milledge Nelson, and Alison Wylie (editors).
1994 *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 5. American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

Nelson, Sarah Milledge
2004 *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige*. 2nd ed. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

2015 *Shamans, Queens, and Figurines: The Development of Gender Archaeology*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

Orser, Charles E.
1998 The Challenge of Race to American Historical Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 100(3): 661–668.

2001 *Race and the Archaeology of Identity*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

2004 *Race and Practice in Archaeological Interpretation*. Archaeology, Culture, and Society. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

2007 *The Archaeology of Race and Racialization in Historic America*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Peterson's
2016 *Graduate Programs in the Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences 2016*. Peterson's, Albany.

Resmini, Marina
2016 The "Leaky Pipeline." *Chemistry: A European Journal* 22(11): 3533–3534.

Reyman, Jonathan E. (editor).
1992 *Rediscovering Our Past: Essays on the History of American Archaeology*. Worldwide Archaeology Series 2. Avebury, Aldershot.

Rhode, Deborah L.
2006 *In Pursuit of Knowledge: Scholars, Status, and Academic Culture*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Rockquemore, Kerry Ann, and Tracey Laszloffy
2008 *The Black Academic's Guide to Winning Tenure without Losing Your Soul*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, CO.

Rodríguez-Alegría, Enrique
2012 The Discovery and Decolonization of Xaltocan, Mexico. In *Decolonizing Indigenous History: Exploring Prehistoric/Colonial Transitions in Archaeology*, edited by Maxine Oland, Sioban M. Hart, and Liam Frink, pp. 45–65. Archaeology of Colonialism in Native North America. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.

Rutecki, Dawn M., and Chelsea Blackmore
2016 Towards an Inclusive Queer Archaeology: An Overview and Introduction. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, January.

Schmidt, Robert A, and Barbara L Voss
2000 *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Routledge, Florence, KY.

Silliman, Stephen W.
2008 Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 1–21. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.

Smaglik, Paul

        2004 Patching a Leaky Pipeline. *Nature* 427: 657.

Smith, Claire, and Hans Martin Wobst
        2005 *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London.

Society for American Archaeology
        SAA's Committee / Taskforce Section: Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology.
        <https://ecommerce.saa.org/saa/staticcontent/staticpages/adminDir/committeeDisplay.cfm?Committee=COMMITTEE%2FSTAS>

        Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS). *Society for American Archaeology*.
        <http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Awards/HistoricallyUnderrepresentedGroupsScholarship/tabid/1516/Default.aspx>

Society for Historical Archaeology
        Gender and Minority Affairs Committee. *Society for Historical Archaeology*.
        <https://sha.org/committees/gender-minority-affairs-committee/>

Sørenson, Marie Louise Stig
        2000 *Gender Archaeology*. Blackwell Publishers, Inc., Malden, MA.

Stehr, Nico, and Volker Meja (editors).
        1984 *Sociology and Knowledge: Contemporary Perspectives in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.

Stein, Gil J. (editor).
        2005 *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters: Comparative Perspectives*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, NM.

Sullivan, Nikki
        2003 *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*. New York University Press, New York.

U.S. Census Bureau
        2015 Population estimates, July 1, 2015, (V2015). < www.census.gov/quickfacts/>

Voss, Barbara L.
        2008 *The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis: Race and Sexuality in Colonial San Francisco*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Voss, Barbara L., and Eleanor Conlin Casella (editors).
        2012 *The Archaeology of Colonialism: Intimate Encounters and Sexual Effects*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Wernke, Steven A.
    2012 Andean Households in Transition: The Politics of Domestic Space at an Early Colonial Doctrina in the Peruvian Highlands. In *Decolonizing Indigenous Histories: Exploring Prehistoric/Colonial Transitions in Archaeology*, edited by Maxine Oland, Sioban M. Hart, and Liam Frink, pp. 201–229. The Archaeology of Colonialism in Native North America. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.

White, Nancy Marie, Lynn P. Sullivan, and Rochelle A. Marrinan (editors).
    1999 *Grit-Tempered: Early Women Archaeologists in the Southeastern United States*. The Ripley P. Bullen Series. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Wilkie, Laurie A.
    2003 *The Archaeology of Mothering: An African-American Midwife's Tale*. Routledge, New York.

Wylie, Alison
    1991 Gender Theory and the Archaeological Record: Why Is There No Archaeology of Gender? In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by Joan M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey, pp. 31–54. Social Archaeology. Basil Blackwell Ltd., Cambridge, MA.