General Info

Title of Project (15 words or less) **Career Arcs: Identity, Oppression, and Diversity in Archaeology**
Three keywords or phrases that best categorize your research. **Diversity, Knowledge Production, Archaeology**
The choice of a discipline and region/topic that is selected from a predetermined list.
Archaeology
Beginning date and duration of writing time for which support is requested: Enter the expected beginning date, end date, and expected duration of the fellowship period. The beginning date of the fellowship must be after January 1 of the following year. The total fellowship period cannot exceed twelve consecutive months. The amount of the award is pro-rated according to the duration of the writing period. The maximum award is $40,000 for a twelve-month project.
January 2–December 31, 2021
Location where your writing will take place. **University of Massachusetts, Boston**
Does your project include any additional research? If yes, please indicate the amount of time to be devoted to research activities and whether any funding is requested for research purposes. **I will conduct additional research in Summer and Fall 2020, to be completed before the beginning of the Hunt Postdoctoral Fellowship tenure.**
Other sources of aid received or requested for the period of writing covered in this application: Include any support received or other funding being applied for that relates to this fellowship application. Such support might include grants from other agencies and/or compensation from sabbatical or other academic leave.

Abstract

Your abstract is a very important component of your application. In language that an interested layperson could understand, you need to convey what's at the heart of your project. Your abstract should begin broad and go narrow, communicating the major theme or debate in anthropology your research addressed, then explaining the particular question you investigated. It should convey the "why," "what," "where," and "how" of your research, while giving the reader a strong sense of the publication(s) you plan to finish to communicate your results. Your abstract will be the shortest part of your proposal, but it will also the hardest to write. You will need to have a very clear idea of your plans to do a good job. You probably should write it last.

In *Career Arcs: Identity, Oppression, and Diversity in Archaeology*, I present an intersectional, qualitative study of how racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and ableism shape the demographics of archaeology, and the knowledge that archaeologists produce. I examine the personal narratives of over seventy diverse archaeologists, with whom I conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews. I demonstrate that intersecting systemic oppressions deeply shape who enters archaeological careers, the conditions of those careers, and the research archaeologists pursue. On the disciplinary level, our homogenous demographics limit the knowledge of past human societies that archaeologists produce. I offer strategies for marginalized archaeologists to build successful careers and for established scholars to support the creation of a discipline as diverse as the past peoples we study.

Question 1:
　　Describe the research that forms the basis of this application and the conclusions that you have drawn.(Note: If you are including a short period of additional research in your fellowship application, explain why additional research is needed and the relevance of this research to your publication plans.) [Maximum: 1500 words] When answering this question, applicants should clearly describe their specific research questions and preliminary conclusions. They must make clear how their findings further anthropological debates and add to the existing literature. Applicants are advised to make sure that their theoretical claims are supported by appropriate evidence from their research. The Foundation looks carefully for proposals that acknowledge and discuss an applicant's research in the context of the large body of work done by international scholars. If a period for additional research is included in the proposal, the objective and significance of this component should be included in the answer to Question 1. Applicants should be explicit about how this research relates to the completed research and its importance. Applicants should remember that the underlying objective of the award is to support writing for publication.

　　Anthropologists study past peoples of all genders, races, sexual orientations, nationalities, ages, socioeconomic statuses, and abilities. Yet we ourselves tend to be straight, white, cisgender, non-disabled, from middle- or upper-class backgrounds, and, when in positions of authority, men. How can universities that remain populated and led by the privileged few address the questions and problems that face the world today? My research program addresses this question by focusing on diversity and equity issues in academia, and how they affect the knowledge we produce.
　　Since the 1980s, feminist archaeologists have critiqued the male domination of the discipline and this demographic imbalance's effects on knowledge production (Conkey and Spector 1984; Gero 1985). Gero's (1985) germinal publication on the gender composition of archaeology dissertators, grant recipients, and journal authors inspired waves of what Wylie (1997) terms "equity critiques" in the discipline in the early 1990s (Victor and Beaudry 1992; du Cros and Smith 1993; Beaudry and White 1994; Claassen 1994; Ford 1994; Ford and Hundt 1994; Nelson, Nelson, and Wylie 1994; Handly 1995) and the late 2010s (Bardolph 2014; Bardolph 2018; Bardolph and Vanderwarker 2016; Tushingham, Fulkerson, and Hill 2017; Goldstein et al. 2018; Meyers et al. 2018; Radde 2018; Fulkerson and Tushingham 2019; Jalbert 2019; Colannino et al. 2020; Heath-Stout in press). Many of these publications follow Gero in counting numbers of men and women who publish in a particular journal or receive a particular grant over a set period of time; others use surveys to gather data about experiences of sexual harassment or other issues. They tend to focus nearly exclusively on sexism, to the exclusion of other forms of oppression such as racism, classism, ableism, and heterosexism.
　　Equity critiques focused on these other systemic oppressions do exist in archaeology, but they tend to be both less numerous and less likely to be supported by data. Anti-racist and anti-colonial critique is especially well-developed (e.g., Franklin 1997; Franklin 2001; Agbe-Davies 2002; Atalay 2006; Smith and Wobst 2005; Atalay 2012; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Bruchac, Hart, and Wobst 2010; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Battle-Baptiste 2011; Gonzalez-Tennant 2018), and there are many excellent publications on decolonizing archaeological practice, but to my knowledge, there have been no systematic studies of the experiences of archaeologists of color until my own. Queer theory has been applied to past

societies (e.g., Dowson 2000; Voss 2007; Voss 2008; Blackmore 2011; Voss and Casella 2012), but published conversations about heterosexism among archaeologists have been limited (Blackmore et al. 2016; Rutecki and Blackmore 2016). Published critiques of ableism (O'Mahony 2015) and classism (Shott 2006; Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020) in the discipline are even fewer and farther between. In sum, critiques of sexism in archaeology have included extensive quantitative data, but excluded intersectional perspectives, while antiracist critiques have focused more on the practices of the discipline than on systematic data-gathering about the presence and experiences of archaeologists of color. Discussions of heterosexism, ableism, and classism in the discipline are just beginning.

In order to expand all of these equity critiques, I conducted a study, grounded in intersectional feminism. Coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989; 1991) and theorized by a rich lineage of women of color thinkers (e.g., Combahee River Collective 2017 [1967]; Collins 1991; Collins and Bilge 2016; Cooper 2016), "intersectionality" refers to the idea that societies are "shaped not by a single axis of social division, be it race or gender or class, but by many axes that work together and influence each other. Intersectionality as an analytic tool gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves" (Collins and Bilge 2016:2). I originally focused on the operations of sexism, racism, and heterosexism in archaeology, and am currently expanding my research to more directly address classism and ableism in the discipline. Following McCall (2005), I subscribe to what she terms an "intercategorical" approach to intersectional research, in which I investigate how social ideas about the categories of identity produce inequalities in people's experiences. Furthermore, as advocated by Choo and Ferrée (2010), I work from the perspective that all of these systems of oppression are at work and intersecting with each other in any social situation.

I began with the research question, "how do identities and experiences of gender, race, and sexual orientation shape the knowledge that archaeologists produce?" I envision this question as being applicable at two different scales, the individual and the disciplinary. I am curious about how each individual archaeologist's research trajectory is shaped by intersecting systemic oppressions, and how their identities affect the knowledge of the past that they produce through their research. On the larger scale, I set out to investigate how the relatively homogeneous demographics of the discipline shape what archaeologists, collectively, do and do not learn about past societies.

In order to address these questions, I conducted a series of qualitative in-depth interviews, in which I interviewed a diverse sample of 72 archaeologists about their experiences, research programs, identities, and perceptions of diversity issues in the discipline. The interviews demonstrate that marginalized archaeologists are pushed into or pulled out of particular subfields and specializations based not only on their interests and the quality of their work, but on the ways they are treated and mistreated on the basis of their identities. This mistreatment falls along a spectrum of severity from microaggressions (Sue 2010) to outright violence. Prejudice and abuse (or the threat of possible abuse) create an extra cognitive burden for marginalized archaeologists, who must spend time and energy strategizing how to navigate a hostile discipline, rather than on producing archaeological knowledge. The most important factors for the success of marginalized archaeologists were strong support from mentors and communities. These mentors and communities ideally include a mixture of those who share marginalized identities and thus deeply understand each other's experiences, and those who hold social privilege but mobilize that privilege in order to support marginalized community members and mentees.

The 72 interviews that I conducted in 2017–2018 and presented in my dissertation (Heath-Stout 2019:pt. 3) were focused on sexism, heterosexism, and racism among archaeologists. In the processes of interviewing and presenting preliminary data, I found that classism and ableism were so entangled with racism, sexism, and heterosexism that a study of the latter without exploration of the former was insufficient. I thus plan to conduct follow-up interviews with some of my interlocutors and interviews with some new interlocutors who are disabled and/or from poor or working-class backgrounds in order to gain a more fully intersectional perspective. These interviews will be conducted by videoconference in Summer 2020, and analyzed during Fall 2020.

I seek support from the Wenner-Gren Hunt Postdoctoral Fellowship for writing about this research in the form of a monograph, *Career Arcs: Identity, Oppression, and Diversity in Archaeology*, which will use both the 2017–2018 interviews and the new set of interviews to present an intersectional study of how ableism, classism, heterosexism, racism, and sexism shape the demographics, career paths, practices, and knowledge production of archaeologists. The book will be of interest to researchers on the politics of knowledge production, anthropologists engaged in diversity-related service and teaching work, and students considering careers in archaeology. Furthermore, it will provide suggestions for how archaeologists can build more diverse and inclusive departments, research projects, and professional organizations, based in the evidence of what has worked to welcome and support marginalized students and scholars.

This research builds on a long legacy of equity critique publications in archaeology, and is the first systematic intersectional study of diversity issues in archaeology. It elucidates the connections between archaeology's demographics and knowledge production, and provides specific actions that archaeologists can take to build a more diverse and inclusive field. By understanding and diversifying the demographic composition of researchers, we can create an academy that lives up to its meritocratic ideals and produces knowledge that will help society respond to the problems it faces today and in the future.

Question 2:
Describe your research process (the research design you used to gather your evidence). How have you used this evidence to support the conclusions that you have drawn? [Maximum: 500 words] Applicants should provide a brief review of the actual research conducted, focusing on the kind of evidence collected, the analysis used, and the reasons underlying the choice of the specific methodology, or methodologies, employed.

The research for this project consisted of a qualitative in-depth interview study. Although the homogenous demographics have often been assessed quantitatively (e.g., Gero 1985; Zeder 1997; Bardolph 2014; Association Research, Inc. 2016; Fulkerson and Tushingham 2019), the mechanisms by which these trends reproduce themselves have rarely been systematically studied. In order to understand how intersecting systemic oppressions shape the recruitment, career paths, research trajectories, and retention of marginalized archaeologists, I conducted interviews with a diverse sample of academic archaeologists.

Interviewees were recruited through a mixture of announcements at conferences and on social media and snowball sampling, for in-person or videoconference interviews. I began by asking my interlocutor how they had decided to be an archaeologist. Since most had been asked this question many times, it put them at ease, while also providing important data about the

recruitment of archaeologists. If the interlocutor did not naturally launch into the story of how they came to focus on the subfield they currently study, I asked about their current research and how they came to it. Then, I gently guided the conversation to the topics of gender, race, and sexual orientation in archaeology, often following up on hints from their first answers to gain a deeper understanding of their experiences and insights. This fluid and conversational interview style was especially appropriate because as an archaeologist interviewing archaeologists and presenting my analysis to archaeologists, I wanted to build trusting and collegial relationships with my interlocutors. All interviews were recorded; transcribed; and anonymized by replacing names of people, sites, universities, and projects with short anonymous descriptors in brackets. They were then coded and analyzed using NVivo software, according to the principles outlined by Charmaz (2014).

This study was conducted using a constructivist grounded theory methodology, in which "data form the foundation of our theory and our analysis of these data generates the concepts we construct" (Charmaz 2014:3). One principle of grounded theory is that the researcher moves back and forth between interviewing and analysis, letting later interviews and follow-up interviews be influenced by early analysis. Although the 72 interviews conducted in 2017–2018 (Heath-Stout 2019) focused on race, gender, and sexual orientation issues, several interviewees told me about their experiences of classism and ableism. Furthermore, much of the feedback I received when distributing a survey for my quantitative journal authorship study (Heath-Stout in press) criticized how the study overlooked class issues (Heath-Stout 2019:chap. 7). In order to incorporate analysis of disability and class in archaeology, I will conduct a second series of interviews during the summer of 2020, including a mixture of follow-up conversations with previous interlocutors and interviews with newly recruited archaeologists, with a focus on these two issues. I anticipate conducting up to thirty more interviews, likely by videoconference in order to maintain social distancing measures. These new interviews as well as those from 2017–2018 will form the basis for the monograph I will write during the tenure of my fellowship.

Question 3:
Outline the publication/s that will result from the fellowship. [Maximum: 500 words] Applicants should state their publication plans. Provide an annotated outline of the book's chapters or a description of the articles and the subjects that these articles will address. Please be specific about the content of your book/articles and the journals or publishers you will approach. Indicate if a book contract is already in hand or if publishers or journal editors have already shown interest in your work. In addition, applicants should describe what needs to be done during the fellowship period to bring the project to a successful completion (e.g. editing/augmenting current drafts of chapter/s or articles, initiating all or part of the project from scratch, etc.).

The fellowship would support the production of an academic book in a readable style, for three primary audiences: anthropologists interested in diversifying the discipline, researchers on identity and knowledge production, and students considering archaeology careers. Editors from Routledge's Archaeology of Gender and Sexuality Series, University Press of Florida, and University of Alabama Press have expressed interest, and I am currently corresponding with editors at University of California Press and Oxford University Press, as I prepare a proposal to submit in Summer 2020. The book loosely follows the path of an archaeology career, from chapter 2 on origin stories to chapter 7 on untimely career ends. It concludes with two synthetic

chapters: one discussing the implications of these systemic oppressions on knowledge production and the other providing suggestions for concrete steps archaeologists can take in a variety of contexts to build a more diverse and inclusive archaeology.

1. Introduction (drafted): The introduction establishes the argument, intersectional feminist theoretical framework, the current literature on disciplinary demographics, study methods, and structure of the book.

2. Discovering Archaeology (drafted): The chapter lays out the different ways students encounter archaeology, how identities shape these experiences, and how imbalances in disciplinary demographics begin with recruitment.

3. Barriers to Entry (in progress): This section explores problems students face in beginning careers, with special reference to the cost of field school (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020) and familial obligations and pressures.

4. Microaggressions and Macroaggressions (not begun): This chapter introduces the concept of the spectrum of abuse (ranging from microaggressions to violence) using examples of sexism and sexual violence, then applies the concept to other forms of oppression.

5. The Cognitive Burden of Marginalization (not begun): The theory of the cognitive burden of marginalization is explored with examples of queer and/or disabled archaeologists navigating the politics of disclosure, analyzed using disability studies literature (e.g., Samuels 2003; Kafer 2013) to theorize the differences between apparent and non-apparent marginalized identities.

6. Mentors and Communities (not begun): Here, I argue that for marginalized archaeologists to succeed in their careers, they need support from mentors and communities, using stories from Black interlocutors about mentors and communities of a variety of races.

7. Pushed Out (not begun): This chapter shares stories of archaeologists who leave the discipline due to mistreatment, lack of job security, and other factors, in order to advocate for measures to retain talented marginalized scholars.

8. Interests, Opportunities, and Reflexivity (not begun): This synthetic chapter examines how these problems shape knowledge production, the limitations of our knowledge about the past, and a call for reflexivity for all archaeologists.

9. Conclusion: Systemic Changes (not begun): The book ends on a positive note with suggestions for archaeologists to implement in a variety of professional contexts in order to contribute to systemic changes leading to a more diverse and inclusive discipline.

Appendix: Methods (drafted): The appendix comprises a detailed description of the methods used, IRB approval, recruitment and consent scripts, and the full list of questions that guided interviews

Question 4:
Question 4: The goal of the Wenner-Gren Foundation is to support original and innovative research in anthropology. What contribution does your project make to anthropological theory and to the discipline? [Maximum: 250 words] The Hunt Postdoctoral Fellowship is very competitive. While many applications are examples of excellent research and interesting case studies, applicants must also be clear as to the uniqueness of the work and/or why it is an important contribution to the discipline of anthropology. The Wenner-Gren Foundation defines anthropology in its broadest terms as a discipline that advances significant and innovative research about humanity's cultural

and biological origins, development, and variation. A successful application is one that emphasizes the contribution of the proposed research not only to the specific area of research being addressed but also to the broader field of anthropology. Applicants should be explicit about the potential contribution of their research to anthropological theory and debate in the broadest possible sense. What relevance and/or impact would your publication/s have for the field? Applicants should note that the answer to this question must build on the arguments presented earlier in the proposal and clearly demonstrate how the writing project will contribute to the relevancies claimed in the answer to this question.

Since the beginnings of postprocessualism in the 1980s, anthropological archaeologists, especially those engaged in feminist archaeology, have argued that the knowledge we create about the human past is shaped by our own experiences, identities, and social contexts (Hodder 1982; Hodder 1985; Conkey and Spector 1984; Shanks and Tilley 1988). Reflexivity about one's own biases and the process of research has become a central tenet of feminist practice within and beyond anthropology (Woolgar 1988; Spector 1993; Gero 2007; Battle-Baptiste 2011; Gero 2015; Harding 2015; Nelson 2015; Whitson 2017). Critical analyses of sexist disciplinary practices and structures, which Wylie (1997) terms "equity critiques," have also been a key strand of feminist archaeology (e.g., Gero 1985; Nelson, Nelson, and Wylie 1994; Claassen 2000; Bardolph 2014; Goldstein et al. 2018; Fulkerson and Tushingham 2019). *Career Arcs* brings together and develops these two traditions of reflexivity and equity critique by analyzing the processes and phenomena by which systemic oppression shapes both the experiences of marginalized archaeologists and the knowledge that archaeological research as a whole produces about the human past. The project further serves the discipline by evaluating a variety of practices for diversification, providing evidence-based suggestions for how to recruit and retain archaeologists who hold a wider range of identities. This research and its dissemination thus serve the goal of building a more heterogeneous and inclusive discipline that can more effectively understand diverse cultures and societies.

Bibliography

A bibliography should be prepared specifically for this proposal and should focus on the central research question and its related debates. The bibliography should be prepared in a format compatible with Microsoft Word, and attached to the application following the directions provided during the online submission process. All sources appearing in the bibliography must be cited in the resubmission statement or the project description questions. In-text citations should take the form of the authors' name/s followed by the date: (Sahlins 1961) or (Aiello and Wheeler 2003) or (Aiello et al. 2002). The bibliography should not exceed ten pages in length, using single-line spacing and 10-point font or larger, with 1-inch (2.5 cm) left, right, top and bottom margins. Bibliographic references should be complete, be listed in alphabetical order and be presented in one of any of the bibliographic formats found in major anthropological journals (e.g., Current Anthropology or American Anthropologist or American Journal of Physical Anthropology, among others). Whichever format is used, the bibliography should be consistent throughout.

Agbe-Davies, Anna
 2002   Black Scholars, Black Pasts. SAA Archaeological Record 2(4): 24–28.

Association Research, Inc.
 2016   Report on the 2015 Member Needs Assessment Conducted for the Society for American Archaeology. Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archaeology. http://ecommerce.saa.org/saa/Member/SAAMember/Members_Only/2015_Needs_Assessment.aspx, accessed February 17, 2019.

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. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bardolph, Dana N.
 2014   A Critical Evaluation of Recent Gendered Publishing Trends in American Archaeology. American Antiquity 79(3): 522–540.
 2018   Controlling the Narrative: A Comparative Examination of Gendered Publishing Trends in the SCA and Beyond. California Archaeology 10(2): 159–186.

Bardolph, Dana N., and Amber M. Vanderwarker
 2016   Sociopolitics in Southeastern Archaeology: The Role of Gender in Scholarly Authorship. Southeastern Archaeology 35(3): 175–193.

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

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. Cheryl Claassen, ed. Pp. 138–158. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Blackmore, Chelsea
 2011   How to Queer the Past Without Sex: Queer Theory, Feminisms and the Archaeology of Identity. Archaeologies 7(1): 75–96.

Blackmore, Chelsea, Leslie Drane, Richard Baldwin, and David Ellis
 2016   Queering Fieldwork: Difference and Identity in Archaeological Practice. The SAA Archaeological Record, January: 18–23.

Bruchac, Margaret M, Sioban M Hart, and Hans Martin Wobst
 2010   Indigenous Archaeologies a Reader on Decolonization. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press.

Charmaz, Kathy
 2014   Constructing Grounded Theory. 2nd edition. London: Sage Publications.

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, ed.
 1994   Women in Archaeology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
 2000   Homophobia and Women Archaeologists. World Archaeology 32(2): 173–179.

Colannino, Carol E., Shawn P. Lambert, Emily L. Beahm, and Carl G. Drexler
 2020   Creating and Supporting a Harassment and Assault Free Field School. Advances in Archaeological Practice.

Collins, Patricia Hill
 1991   Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. New York: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia Hill, and Sirma Bilge
 2016   Intersectionality. Key Concepts. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T.J. Ferguson
 2008   Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T.J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, et al.
 2010   The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. American Antiquity 75(2): 228–238.

Combahee River Collective
 2017 (1967) The Combahee River Collective Statement. *In* How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective. Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, ed. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

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

Cooper, Brittney
 2016   Intersectionality. *In* The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory. Lisa Disch and Mary Hawkesworth, eds. Pp. 385–406. New York: Oxford University Press.

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).
 1991   Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. Stanford Law Review 43(6): 1241–1299.

du Cros, Hilary, and Laurajane Smith, eds.
 1993   Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique. Occasional Papers in Archaeology, 23. Canberra: Canberra Department of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australia National University.

Dowson, Thomas A.
 2000   Why Queer Archaeology? An Introduction. World Archaeology 32(2): 161–165.

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

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. Margaret C. Nelson, Sarah Milledge Nelson, and Alison Wylie, eds. Pp. 147–156. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association, 5. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

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.

Fulkerson, Tiffany J., and Shannon Tushingham

   2019   Who Dominates the Discourses of the Past? Gender, Occupational Affiliation, and Multivocality in North American Archaeology Publishing. American Antiquity 84(3): 379–399.

Gero, Joan M.
 1985   Socio-Politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology. American Antiquity 50(2): 342–350.
 2007   Honoring Ambiguity/Problematizing Certitude. Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 14: 311–327.
 2015   Yutopian: Archaeology, Ambiguity, and the Production of Knowledge in Northwest Argentina. The William and Bettye Nowlin Series in Art, History, and Culture of the Western Hemisphere. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Goldstein, Lynne, Barbara J. Mills, Sarah Herr, et al.
 2018   Why Do Fewer Women Than Men Apply for Grants After Their PhDs? American Antiquity 83(3): 367–386.

Gonzalez-Tennant, Edward
 2018   Anarchism, Decolonization, and Collaborative Archaeology. Journal of Contemporary Archaeology 5(2): 238–244.

Handly, Martin James
 1995   A Gendered Review of the "Canadian Archaeological Associatioin Bulletin" (1969-1976) and the "Canadian Journal of Archaeology" (1977-1993): The First Twenty-Five Years. Canadian Journal of Archaeology / Journal Canadien d'Archéologie 19. JSTOR: 61–78.

Harding, Sandra
 2015   Objectivity and Diversity: Another Logic of Scientific Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heath-Stout, Laura E.
 in press   Who Writes About Archaeology? An Intersectional Study of Authorship in Archaeological Journals. American Antiquity.
 2019   Diversity, Identity, and Oppression in the Production of Archaeological Knowledge. Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University.

Heath-Stout, Laura E., and Elizabeth M. Hannigan
 2020   Affording Archaeology: How Field School Costs Promote Exclusivity. Advances in Archaeological Practice.

Hodder, Ian, ed.
 1982   Symbolic and Structural Archaeology. New Directions in Archaeology. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
 1985   Postprocessual Archaeology. Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory 8: 1–26.

Jalbert, Catherine L.
 2019   Archaeology in Canada: An Analysis of Demographics and Working Conditions in the Discipline. Ph.D. dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Kafer, Alison
 2013   Feminist Queer Crip. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

McCall, Leslie
 2005   The Complexity of Intersectionality. Signs 30(2): 1771–1800.

Meyers, Maureen S., Elizabeth T. Horton, Edmond A. Boudreaux, et al.
 2018   The Context and Consequences of Sexual Harassment in Southeastern Archaeology.
Advances in Archaeological Practice 6(4): 275–287.

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

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

O'Mahony, Theresa
 2015   Enabled Archaeology. BAJR Guides, 41. Dunbar, UK: British Archaeological Jobs and
Resources.
http://www.bajr.org/BAJRGuides/41_Enabled_Archaeology/41EnabledArchaeology.pdf.

Radde, Hugh D.
 2018   Sexual Harassment Among California Archaeologists: Results of the Gender Equity and
Sexual Harassment Survey. California Archaeology 10(2): 231–255.

Rutecki, Dawn M., and Chelsea Blackmore
 2016   Towards an Inclusive Queer Archaeology: An Overview and Introduction. The SAA
Archaeological Record, January: 9–11.

Samuels, Ellen
 2003   My Body, My Closet: Invisible Disability and the Limits of Coming-Out Discourse.
GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies 9(1–2): 233–255.

Shanks, Michael, and Christopher Y Tilley
 1988   Social Theory and Archaeology. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Shott, Michael J.
 2006   An Unwashed's Knowledge of Archaeology: Class and Merit in Academic Placement. *In*
Reflections from the Wrong Side of the Tracks: Class, Identity, and the Working Class
Experience in Academe. Stephen L. Muzzatti and C. Vincent Samarco, eds. Pp. 221–241.
Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

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

Spector, Janet D.
 1993   What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Sue, Derald Wing
 2010   Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.

Tushingham, Shannon, Tiffany Fulkerson, and Katheryn Hill
 2017   The Peer Review Gap: A Longitudinal Case Study of Gendered Publishing and Occupational Patterns in a Female-Rich Discipline, Western North America (1974-2016). PLoS ONE 12(11): e0188403.

Victor, Katharine L., and Mary C. Beaudry
 1992   Women's Participation in American Prehistoric and Historical Archaeology: A Comparative Look at the Journals American Antiquity and Historical Archaeology. *In* Exploring Gender Through Archaeology: Selected Papers from the 1991 Boone Conference. Cheryl Claassen, ed. Pp. 11–21. Monographs in World Archaeology, 11. Madison: Prehistory Press.

Voss, Barbara
 2007   Feminisms, Queer Theories, and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities. *In* The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader. Timothy Insoll, ed. Pp. 124–136. Taylor & Francis.

Voss, Barbara L.
 2008   The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis: Race and Sexuality in Colonial San Francisco. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.bu.edu/lib/bostonuniv/docDetail.action?docID=10229951.

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

Whitson, Risa
 2017   Painting Pictures of Ourselves: Researcher Subjectivity in the Practice of Feminist Reflexivity. The Professional Geographer 69(2): 299–306.

Woolgar, Steve
 1988   Knowledge and Reflexivity: New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Sage.

Wylie, Alison
 1997   The Engendering of Archaeology: Refiguring Feminist Science Studies. Osiris 12: 80–99.

Zeder, Melinda A.
 1997   The American Archaeologist: A Profile. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.