

Bias in Archaeology
Anthropology 1058 / 2058
Spring 2022
WEDNESDAYS 9 AM
Peabody Museum 561

Instructors:

Rowan FLAD

Office: 567 Peabody Museum

Phone: 495-1966

e-mail: rflad@fas.harvard.edu

Office Hours: Thursdays 1:30-4:00 pm or By Appointment

(see [My Calendly Scheduler](https://calendly.com/rflad/15min): <https://calendly.com/rflad/15min>)

Jess BECK

Office: 569 Peabody Museum

e-mail: jbeck1@fas.harvard.edu

Office Hours: By appointment

Course Description:

This seminar will focus broadly on bias in archaeology, covering issues of bias in authorship, citations, accessibility, popular media coverage, fieldwork, training and education, hiring and promotion, and other related topics. We will also address recent research that focuses on disrupting patterns of bias in some of these areas. Class meetings will involve discussion of published papers in the various course themes in order to both understand and interrogate the implications of previous studies and examine the methods used to empirically investigate topics of bias in the field. For their final project, students will engage in original research or synthesize research topics in one or more of these areas for their final project.

Requirements and Policies:

Students are expected to attend all seminar sessions and participate in discussion. All class discussions will be led by students in the class together with the course instructors. Discussion leaders for particular topics will be assigned, but in order to make for a successful seminar, all students must be prepared to participate each week. Each week has designated “Core” readings and some “Optional,” additional readings. The course discussion will focus on the Core readings, and the optional ones are listed for those who have particular interest in the topic of that week. You should feel free to bring up issues, examples, methodological considerations and other things from the Optional readings that you do, but you should not assume all seminar participants have read that material. Accordingly, be prepared to briefly summarize such readings. Additional readings related to the course topic have been compiled by the course instructors are included in a bibliography at the end of the syllabus. This list is a non-exhaustive resource of other readings that might be consulted for course final projects.

In Week 6, students will present an idea for their research topics as a “pitch” and presentations of preliminary results and planned arguments will be made by all students during the last course session. The research paper and presentation are described in greater detail below.

Undergraduate / Graduate Course Difference

The primary difference between the expectation for those enrolled in 1058 and 2058 concerns the paper topic. Those doing the Graduate Level course (**Anthro 2058**) should expect to conduct original data collection and research related to a topic on bias in archaeology. Those enrolled in the Undergraduate Level course (**Anthro 1058**) are expected to write a synthetic research paper. Otherwise, course participation, leadership, and presentation expectations are the same.

Course Evaluation:

Weekly class participation: 35%

Discussion Leadership: 15%

Research Paper: 40%

Research Presentation: 10%

The course grade will be based on **participation** (contributing to class discussions) and **leadership** (thoughtful leading of discussions on the assigned articles and books) in addition to a **research paper** – due at the end of the term, and a **presentation** about the research paper topic split into two parts: a “pitch” and a presentation.

Participation and Leadership: Students are expected to do all of the required readings for the week in advance of class. Discussion will revolve around these readings; most discussions will be structured by one of the class participants, and we will assign discussion organizers during the first class meeting. Organizers / Discussion leaders are expected to lead the discussion during the week(s) they are assigned. These discussion leaders should start class with a brief overview of the main themes for the course and come to class with a plan for how the discussion will proceed. Depending on the number of enrollees, we may have joint leadership. There will be some guests invited to join the class. On weeks when there are guests, the discussion leaders will coordinate with the course heads to structure the course.

Research Paper:

As mentioned, the distinction between the expectations of the students in 1058 and 2058 concerns the research paper subject matter. For those enrolled in **Anthro 1058**, the course paper should be a synthetic examination of existing published papers focused on some topic of bias in archaeology. These can include the topics explicitly considered in the course readings, related topics or other relevant topics identified in consultation with the course instructors. For students registered in **Anthro 2058**, the expectation is that the students will engage in original research and data collection that aims to address empirically a question related to bias in archaeology. These students will aim to design a study and collect data. Their research paper should lay out the background for the question(s) being examined, the methodological approach, and preliminary results obtained by the end of the term. In both cases, the submitted paper should have a clear argument, be well structured, and clearly engage with both the methodological and

theoretical / interpretive aspects of the subject matter. Papers should range between approximately 12-20 pages in length. Students should consider the topic of their research paper early in the term so that there is sufficient time to write it.

Research Pitch and Presentation: Students will give brief project pitches on week 6 and presentations of their research or project topics during the last meeting of the term. The projects should connect to themes that are discussed in the course. For those enrolled in Anthro 2058, the pitches should identify the intended or initiated process of data collection.

Academic dishonesty of any sort will be referred to the Administrative Board. Please consult the Student Handbook (<https://registrar.fas.harvard.edu/general-information/handbooks>) for information regarding academic dishonesty. Additional details concerning academic dishonesty in writing can be found in the “[Writing with Sources](#)” pamphlet on-line and the additional information provided in tips provided in the [Anthro Writes](#) resources. Students must acknowledge any collaboration and its extent in all submitted work. Here is the official collaboration policy:

Discussion and the exchange of ideas are essential to doing academic work. This is especially true in the context of a research seminar, where weekly readings and discussion is a collaborative effort. Submitted work, in the form of a research paper or proposal due at the end of the term, must be your own, original work. You must also adhere to standard citation practices in this discipline and properly cite any books and articles that you have used as sources for your work. Web sources are generally not considered peer-reviewed sources of high academic standard and should be used cautiously if at all.

Schedule of Classes

Week	Date	Topic
1	26 January	Introduction to bias [Discussion of project options]
2	02 February	Authorship
3	09 February	Citations and peer review [Laura Heath-Stout visit]
4	16 February	Format and accessibility of research
5	23 February	Popular media [IRB overview by Jonathan Girard]
6	02 March	Bias in education, training, and mentorship [Pitch day]
7	09 March	Fieldwork and funding
8	<i>16 March</i>	<i>No class, spring break</i>
9	23 March	Harassment
10	<i>30 March</i>	<i>RESEARCH WEEK FOR FINAL PROJECT (SAAs)</i>
11	06 April	Hiring and promotion
12	13 April	Open science and open data
13	20 April	Disrupting bias [Jade d'Alpoim Guedes visit]
14	27 April	Student presentations

WEEK 1: (Jan. 26) – Introduction: Bias as a topic [Discussion of project options]

What is bias, and why is it important? This class explores how particular kinds of biases—ideological, colonial, preservational, implicit, confirmation, cultural, self-serving, status-characteristics based, etc.—affect our understanding of human history and prehistory and particularly the way that the past is presented and investigated. This week we will also discuss some of the strategies researchers are using to rigorously evaluate bias in the academy.

Approximate Total Pages: ~52+

Core readings

Trigger, B.G (1984). Alternative archaeologies: Nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man*, 19(3), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2802176>

Wobst, H. M., & Keene, A.S. (1984). Archaeological explanation as political economy. In J. Gero, D. Lacy, & M. Blakey (Eds.), *The socio-politics of archaeology* (pp.79–90). Research reports, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Department of Anthropology, no. 23.

Benson, B. (2016, September 1). Cognitive bias cheat sheet. *Better humans*.
<https://betterhumans.pub/cognitive-bias-cheat-sheet-55a472476b18>

Borck, L. (2018). Constructing the future history: Prefiguration as historical epistemology and the chronopolitics of archaeology. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 5(2), 229–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1558/jca.33560>

Smith, R. W. A. & Bolnick, D.A. (2019). Situating science: Doing biological anthropology as a view from somewhere. *American Anthropologist*, 121(2), 465–466.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13213>

Watkins, R. (2020). An alter(ed)native perspective on historical bioarchaeology. *Historical Archaeology*, 54, 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41636-019-00224-5>

Optional readings

Trigger, B.G. (1980). Archaeology and the image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity*, 45(4), 662–676. <https://doi.org/10.2307/280140>

Wylie, A. (1984). Comments on the “socio-politics of archaeology”: The de-mystification of the profession. In J. Gero, D. Lacy, & M. Blakey (Eds.), *The Socio-Politics of Archaeology*, (pp.119–130). Research reports University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Department of Anthropology, no. 23.

Athreya, S., & Ackerman, R. (2020). Colonialism and narratives of human origins in Africa and Asia. In M. Porr & J. Matthews (Eds.), *Interrogating human origins: Decolonization and the deep human past* (pp. 72–95). New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

WEEK 2: (Feb. 2) – Authorship

In this week we consider the authorship of archaeological research. Who are authors of archaeological scholarship? Are there patterns in gender, institution, ethnicity or other aspects of author identity? Are there trends over time?

Approximate Total Pages: ~89+

Discussion Leader _____

**Before coming to class this week take one of the Implicit Bias Tests available here:

<https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/>

Core readings

Bardolph, D. N. (2014). A critical evaluation of recent gendered publishing trends in American Archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 79(3), 522–540. <https://doi:10.7183/0002-7316.79.3.522>

Dring, K. S., Silliman, S. W., Gambrell, N., Sebastian, S. & Sidberry, R. S. (2019). Authoring and authority in Eastern Pequot community heritage and archaeology. *Archaeologies*, 15, 352–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-019-09377-4>

Fulkerson, T. J. & Tushingham, S. (2019). Who dominates the discourses of the past? Gender, occupational affiliation, and multivocality in North American archaeology publishing. *American Antiquity*, 84(3), 379–399. <https://doi:10.1017/aaq.2019.35>

Hilário, C. M., Martínez-Ávila, D., Cabrini Grácio, M. C., & Wolfram D. (2018). Authorship in science: A critical analysis from a Foucauldian perspective. *Research Evaluation*, 27(2), 63–72.

McKnut, M. K., Bradford, M., Drazen, J. M., Hanson, B., Howard, B., Hall Jamieson, K., Kiermer, V., Marcus, E., Kline Pope, B., Schekman, R., Swaminathan, S., Stang, P. J. & Verma, I. M. (2018). Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication. *PNAS*, 115(11), 2557–2560. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvx041>

Heath-Stout, L.E. (2020). Who writes about archaeology? An intersectional study of authorship in archaeological journals. *American Antiquity*, 85(3), 407–426. <https://doi:10.1017/aaq.2020.28>

Optional readings

- Lutz, C. (1990). The erasure of women's writing in sociocultural anthropology. *American Ethnologist* 17(4), 611–627. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1990.17.4.02a00010>
- Rautman, A. E. (2012). Who gets published in *American Antiquity*? *SAA Archaeological Record*, 12(2), 25–30.
- Gupta, A. (2014). Authorship, research assistants and the ethnographic field. *Ethnography*, 15(3), 394–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138114533460>
- Bardolph, D. N. & Vanderwarker, A. M. (2016). Sociopolitics in southeastern archaeology: The role of gender in scholarly authorship. *Southeastern Archaeology*, 35(3), 175–193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0734578X.2015.1113101>
- Bardolph, D. N. (2018). Controlling the narrative: A comparative examination of gendered publishing trends in the SCA and beyond. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 159–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535813>
- Holcolmbe, A. O. (2019). Contributorship, not authorship: Use CRediT to indicate who did what. *Publications*, 7(48), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7030048>
- CLEAR. (2021). CLEAR Lab Book: A living manual of our values, guidelines, and protocols, V.03. St. John's, NL: Civic Laboratory for Environmental Action Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador.

WEEK 3: (Feb. 9) – Citations and peer review [Visit by Laura Heath-Stout]

Continuing the theme from the previous week, we discuss aspects of citation practices and peer review in archaeological scholarship. Who is being cited? By whom? Are there evident biases in citation practices?

Approximate Total Pages: ~90+ twitter feed, blog and poster

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Hutson, S. R. (2006). Self-citation in archaeology: Age, gender, prestige, and the self. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 13(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-006-9001-5>

Conkey, M. W. (2007). Questioning theory: Is there a gender of theory in archaeology? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 14, 285–310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-007-9039-z>

Tushingam, S., Fulkerson, T. & Hill, K. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188403>

Ralph, L.(2019). Ever wonder how whiteness is privileged in the social sciences? *Twitter*. https://twitter.com/laurence_ralph/status/1161826024281260033?lang=en

Souleles, D. (2020, September). What to do with the predator in your bibliography. *Allegra lab: Anthropology for Radical Optimism*. <https://allegralaboratory.net/what-to-do-with-the-predator-in-your-bibliography/>

Heath-Stout, L. E. (2020). Guest editorial introduction: Gender, equity, and the peer review process at the *Journal of Field Archaeology*. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 45(3), 135–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2020.1719295>

Mohr, S. (2021). Citation network analysis of the *Bulletin of ASOR (BASOR)*, 1970–2020. Poster presented at the American Society of Overseas Research (ASOR) Meetings, Chicago, 17–20 November 2021.

Smith, C. A., & Garrett-Scott, D. (2021). “We are not named”: Black women and the politics of citation in anthropology. *Feminist Anthropology*, 2(1), 18–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fea2.12038>

Optional readings

Beaudry, M. C. & White, J. (1994). Cowgirls with the blues? A Study of women's publication and the citation of women's work in historical archaeology. In C. Classen, (Ed.), *Women in archaeology* (pp.138–158). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Webb, J. M. & Frankel, D. (1995). This fair paper, this most goodly book. Gender and international scholarship in Cypriot archaeology 1920–1991. In J. Balme & W. Beck, *Gendered Archaeology: The Second Australian Women in Archaeology Conference* (pp. 34–42). ANH Publications, RSPAS.

Hutson, S. R. (2002). Gendered citation practices in *American Antiquity* and other archaeology journals. *American Antiquity*, 67(2), 331–342. <https://doi:10.2307/2694570>

WEEK 4: (Feb. 16) – Format and accessibility of research

More focus on publishing turns our attention to the venues in which archaeological research is made available. What options do authors have in terms of publishing? What is available to other scholars (which journals can they access, how does that relate to type of institution and country of institution?).

Approximate Total Pages: ~60+ two blogs

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Larivière, V., Haustein, S. & Mongeon, P. (2015). The oligopoly of academic publishers in the digital era. *PLoS ONE*, 10(6), e0127502. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>

Costopoulos, Andre (2017, September 13) The post-journal academic publishing landscape. *ArcheoThoughts*. <https://archeothoughts.wordpress.com/2017/09/13/the-post-journal-academic-publishing-landscape>

Wenzler, J. (2017). Scholarly communication and the dilemma of collective action: Why academic journals cost too much. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(2), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.78.2.183>

Fogelin, L. (2020). What I learned writing an irreverent archaeological theory book and giving it away for free. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 20(1), 35–37.

Beck, J., E. Gjesfjeld & Chrisomalis, S. (2021). Prestige or perish: Publishing decisions in academic archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 86(4), 669–695. <https://doi:10.1017/aaq.2021.64>

Tommy, K. & Hawks, J. (2021). Strategizing public-facing work within an academic career. *American Journal of Human Biology*, e23699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23699>

Optional readings

Zarmati, L. (1998). ‘Archeo-speak’: The politics of language in archaeology. In D. Donlon, M. Casey, J. Hope & S. Wellfare (Eds.), *Redefining Archaeology: Feminist Perspectives* (pp.3–8). ANH Publications, RSPAS.

Buranyi, S. (2017, June 27) Is the staggeringly profitable business of academic publishing bad for science? *The Guardian*
<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/jun/27/profitable-business-scientific-publishing-bad-for-science>

Hassett, B., Pilaar Birch, S., Herridge, V., & Wragg Sykes, R. (2017). TrowelBlazers: Accidentally crowdsourcing an archive of women in archaeology. In V. Apaydin (Ed.), *Shared knowledge, shared power: Engaging local and indigenous heritage* (pp.129–141). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68652-3_9

WEEK 5: (Feb. 23) – Popular media

****[IRB Overview by Jonathan Girard at 11:00 am]**

During this week we consider biases in the way that archaeological research is presented in popular media, including public education, museum contexts, news media and elsewhere.

Approximate Total Pages: ~70+ op ed.

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Blakey, M. L. (1984). Socio-political bias and ideological production in historical archaeology. In J. Gero, D. Lacy, & M. Blakey (Eds.), *The socio-politics of archaeology* (pp.5–16). Research reports, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Department of Anthropology, no. 23.

Zarmati, L. (1995). Popular archaeology and the archaeologist as hero. In J. Balme & W. Beck (Eds.), *Gendered archaeology: The second Australian women in archaeology conference* (pp. 43–47). ANH Publications, RSPAS.

Solometo, J. & Moss, J. (2013). Picturing the past: Gender in *National Geographic* reconstructions of prehistoric life. *American Antiquity*, 78(1), 123–146. <https://doi:10.7183/0002-7316.78.1.123>

Stojanowski, C. M., & Duncan, W. N. (2015). Engaging bodies in the public imagination: Bioarchaeology as social Science, science, and humanities. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 27, 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.22522>

Asr, F. T., Mazraeh, M., Lopes, A., Gautam, V. Gonzales, J., Rao, P., & Taboada, M. (2021). The gender gap tracker: Using natural language processing to measure gender bias in media. *PLoS ONE*, 16(1), e0245533. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245533>

Flad, R. K. (2021, May 23) It's a Golden Age for Chinese Archaeology – And the West is Ignoring it *Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/05/11/chinese-archaeology-egyptian-bias-sanxingdui/>

Optional readings

Burt, F. (1987). "Man the Hunter": Gender bias in children's archaeology books. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 6(2), 157–174.

Gero, J. M. & Root, D. (1990). Public presentations and private concerns: Archaeology in the pages of *National Geographic*. In P. W. Gathercole & D. Lovwenthal, *The Politics of the Past* (pp. 19–37). Unwin Hyman.

Gifford-Gonzales, D. (1993). You can hide, but you can't run: Representations of women's work in illustrations of Paleolithic life. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 9(1), 21–41.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/var.1993.9.1.22>

Moser, S. (1993). Gender stereotyping in pictorial reconstructions of human origins. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in archaeology: A feminist critique*, (pp. 75–92). Canberra Department of Prehistory.

WEEK 6: (Mar. 2) – Bias in education, training, and mentorship [Pitch Day]

What are people encouraged to do in terms of specialization, and how does this relate to identity? Which foci of archaeological training are emphasized? How has this changed over time? What are the rhetorical biases that align with one's educational bonafides (e.g., who is considered an authority)? This week we will also touch upon CRM vs. academia as a bifurcation of the field in North American archaeology.

Approximate Total Pages: ~78+ blog

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Gero, J. M. (1985). Socio-politics and the woman-at-home ideology. *American Antiquity*, 50, 342–350. <https://doi.org/10.2307/280492>

Bauder, H. (2006). Learning to become a geographer: Reproduction and transformation in academia. *Antipode*, 38(4), 671–679.

Brown, K. M. (2018). Gender, race, and mentorship: A perspective from California archaeology. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 187–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535814>

VanDerwarker, A. M., Brown, K. M., Gonzalez, T., & Radde, H. (2018). The UCSB Gender Equity Project: Taking stock of mentorship, equity, and harassment in California archaeology through qualitative survey data. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 131–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535791>

Rutherford, J. (2019). Academic descent with intentional modifications: A reflection on mentoring as developmental environment. *American Anthropologist*, 121(2): 482–483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13220>

White, W. & Draycott, C. (2020, July 7). Why the whiteness of archaeology is a problem. *Sapiens*. <https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/archaeology-diversity/>

Heath-Stout, L. E. (Under Review). Socio-politics, researcher identities, and methodological and regional specializations in the discipline of archaeology. (*Manuscript will be circulated in advance of class*).

Optional readings

- Damm, C. (1986). An appeal for women in archaeology. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 5, 215–218.
- Spector, J. D. & Whelan, M. K. (1989). Incorporating gender into archaeology courses. In S. Morgen (Ed.), *Gender and anthropology: Critical reviews for research and teaching* (pp.65-94). American Anthropological Association.
- Clarke, A. (1993). Cultural Resource Management (CRM) as archaeological housework: Confining women to the ghetto of management. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith, *Women in archaeology: A feminist critique* (pp. 191–194). Canberra Department of Prehistory.
- Hill, W. & Kelley, J. (1994). Relationships between graduate training and placement in Canadian archaeology. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity issues for women in archaeology* (pp.47–52). American Anthropological Association.
- Truscott, M. C. & Smith, L. (1993). Women's roles in the archaeological workforce. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith, *Women in archaeology: A feminist critique* (pp.217–222). Canberra Department of Prehistory.
- Gero, J. M. (1996). Archaeological practice and gendered encounters with field data. In R. P. Wright (Ed.), *Gender and archaeology* (251–280), University of Pennsylvania.
- Classen, C. (2000). Homophobia and women archaeologists. *World Archaeology*, 32(2), 173–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240050131162>
- Various authors. (2014). Special Forum on Mentoring. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 14(4), 15–37.

WEEK 7: (Mar. 9) – Fieldwork and funding

Many would argue that fieldwork is inextricable from the culture and practice of archaeology, yet fieldwork is not equally accessible to all archaeologists. How has the history of archaeology as a fieldwork-focused endeavor shaped disciplinary norms and expectations? What are the costs and risks of fieldwork for marginalized groups? How has the COVID-19 pandemic shifted expectations of what it means to do research?

Approximate Total Pages: ~87 + Blog

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Moser, S. (2007). On disciplinary culture: Archaeology as fieldwork and its gendered associations. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 14, 235–263.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-007-9033-5>

Blackmore, C., Drane, L., Baldwin, R., & Ellis, D. (2016). Queering fieldwork: Difference and identity in archaeological practice. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 16(1), 18–23.

Schmitt, Christopher (2016, 17 January). On being a queer primatologist. *Evopropinquitous*.

<https://evopropinquitous.tumblr.com/post/137452863477/on-being-a-queer-primatologist/amp>

Goldstein, L., Mills, B. J., Herr, S., Burkholder, J. E., Aiello, L., & Thornton, C. (2018). Why do fewer women than men apply for grants after their PhDs? *American Antiquity*, 83(3), 367–386. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2017.73>

Heath-Stout, L. E. & Hannigan, E. M. (2020). Affording archaeology: How field school costs promote exclusivity. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 8(2), 123–133.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.7>

Scerri, E. M. L., Kühnert, D., Blinkhorn, J., Groucutt, H. S., Roberts, P., Nicoll, K., ... Vella, N. C. (2020). Field-based sciences must transform in response to COVID-19. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, 4(12), 1571–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01317-8>

Schneider, M., Lord, E., & Wilczak, J. (2020). We, too: Contending with the sexual politics of fieldwork in China. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 28(4), 519–540.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2020.1781793>

Optional readings

Yellen, J. E. (1984). Women, archaeology, and the National Science Foundation. In J. Gero, D. Lacey, & M. Blakey (Eds.), *The socio-politics of archaeology* (pp. 59–65). Research reports University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Department of Anthropology, no. 23.

Yellen, J. E. (1994). Women, archaeology, and the National Science Foundation: An analysis of fiscal year 1989 data. *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association*, 5.1, 53–57.

Bol, T., de Vaan, M. & van de Rijt, A. (2018). The Matthew effect in science funding. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(19): 4887–4890.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1719557115>

Schmitt, C. (2020). On being a queer field biologist: Challenges and prospects in field-based STEM research. *American Fisheries Society, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Day 2020 Video*.
<https://vimeo.com/showcase/7537077/video/456671555>

WEEK 8: (Mar. 16) – NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK

WEEK 9: (Mar. 23) – Harassment

How does harassment, or the threat of harassment, affect early careers in archaeology? How is harassment directional? In what contexts (field, lab, departmental) are such abuses of power most likely to occur? How have various research teams quantified the risk and extent of harassment to argue for changes in disciplinary practice?

In class, we will watch the following video:

Hinde, K. (2021, April 15). Land of milk and “honey”: Confronting gendered experiences in field research. *Society for the Advancement of Biology Education Research (SABER), Diversity and Inclusion Speaker Series*.

Links to individual components of the presentation, generously shared by Katie Hinde, can be found here:

- (1) [video recording](#)
- (2) [presentation slides](#)
- (3) [post-talk Q&A](#)
- (4) [additional resources](#)

Approximate Total Pages: ~89

Discussion Leader _____

Clancy, K. B. H., Nelson, R. G., Rutherford, J. N. & Hinde, K. (2014). Survey of Academic Field Experiences (SAFE): Trainees report harassment and assault. *PLoS ONE*, 9(7), e102172. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102172>

Meyers, M. S., Horton, E. T., Boudreaux, E. A., Carmody, S. B., Wright, A. P., & Dekle, V. G. (2018). The context and consequences of sexual harassment in southeastern archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 6(4), 275–287. <https://doi:10.1017/aap.2018.23>

Radde, H. D. (2018). Sexual harassment among California archaeologists: Results of the gender equity and sexual harassment survey. *California Archaeology*, 10, 231–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535816>

Hodgetts, L., Supernant, K., Lyons, N., & Welch, J. R. (2020). Broadening #MeToo: Tracking dynamics in Canadian archaeology through a survey on experiences within the discipline. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 44(1), 20–47.

Voss, B. L. (2021). Documenting cultures of harassment in archaeology: A review and analysis of quantitative and qualitative research studies. *American Antiquity*, 86(2):244–260. <https://doi:10.1017/aaq.2020.118>

WEEK 10: (Mar. 30) – NO CLASS – RESEARCH WEEK
--

WEEK 11: (Apr. 6) – Hiring and promotion

Who is most likely to become tenure-track archaeology faculty? How are academic trajectories linked to aspects of identity—race, class, gender, and socio-economic status—and networks of institutional prestige? How has the academic job market in archaeology and anthropology changed over the past forty years, and what do these changes mean for the next generation of archaeologists?

Approximate Total Pages: ~77

Discussion Leader _____

Wylie, A. (1993). Workplace issues for women in archaeology: The chilly climate. In H. D. Cross & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in archaeology: A feminist critique*, (pp. 245–260). Canberra Department of Prehistory.

Franklin, M. (1997). Why are there so few black American archaeologists? *Antiquity*, 71(274), 799–801. <https://doi:10.1017/S0003598X00085732>

Speakman, R. J., Hadden, C. S., Colvin, M. H., Cramb, J., Jones, K. C., Jones, T. W., ... Thompson, V. D. (2018). Choosing a path to the ancient world in a modern market: The reality of faculty jobs in archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 83(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2017.36>

Speakman, R. J., Hadden, C. S., Colvin, M. H., Cramb, J., Jones, K. C., Jones, T. W., ... Thompson, V. D. (2018). Market share and recent hiring trends in anthropology faculty positions. *PLoS ONE*, 13(9), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202528>

Kawa, N. C., Clavijo Michelangeli, J. A., Clark, J. L., Ginsberg, D., & McCarty, C. (2019). The social network of US academic anthropology and its inequalities. *American Anthropologist*, 121(1), 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13158>

Morgan, A. C., LaBerge, N., Larremore, D., Galesic, M., & Clauset, A. (Preprint). Socioeconomic roots of academic faculty. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/6wjxc>

Optional Readings

Nelson, Margaret C. & Crooks, D L. (1991). Dual anthropology career couples: Different strategies and different success rates. In D. Walde & N. D. Willows (Eds.), *The archaeology of gender: proceedings of the twenty- second annual conference of the archaeological association of the University of Calgary* (pp. 220–225). The University of Calgary.

Ford, A. & Hundt, A. (1994). Equity in academia—why the best men still win: An examination of women and men in Mesoamerican archaeology. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity issues for women in archaeology* (pp. 147–156). American Anthropological Association.

- Hutson, S. R. (1998). Institutional and gender effects on academic hiring practices. *SAA Archaeological Bulletin*, 16(4), 19–21.
- Oprisko, R. (2012). Superpowers: The American academic elite. *Georgetown Public Policy Review*. <http://gppreview.com/2012/12/03/superpowers-the-american-academic-elite/>
- Clauset, A., Arbesman, S., & Larremore, D. B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances*, 1(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400005>
- Clauset, A., & Warner, J. (2015, February 23). The academy's dirty secret. *Slate* <https://slate.com/human-interest/2015/02/university-hiring-if-you-didn-t-get-your-ph-d-at-an-elite-university-good-luck-finding-an-academic-job.html>
- MacNeill, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovations in Higher Education*, 40: 291–303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4>
- Rivera, L. A. (2017). When two bodies are (not) a problem: Gender and relationship status discrimination in academic hiring. *American Sociological Review*, 86(2), 1111–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122417739294>
- Gonzalez, T. (2018). Perceptions versus reality: A comparative analysis of gender equity trends within academia and CRM in California. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 211–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535815>
- Overholtzer, L., & Jalbert, C. L. (2021). A “leaky” pipeline and chilly climate in archaeology in Canada. *American Antiquity*, 86(2), 261–282. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2020.107>
- Leighton, M. (2020). Myths of meritocracy, friendship, and fun work: Class and gender in North American academic communities. *American Anthropologist*, 122(3), 444–458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13455>
- Chilazi, S. (2021). Culture & inclusion literature review. *Harvard Kennedy School: Women and Public Policy Program Report*. <https://wapp.hks.harvard.edu/publications/culture-inclusion-literature-review>

WEEK 12: (Apr. 13) – Open science and open data

What responsibilities do archaeologists have to make their data and results broadly available? What strategies can archaeologists employ to facilitate data sharing in ways that are equitable, accessible, and feasible to implement? What are the ethical considerations and moral obligations surrounding the dissemination and access of particular kinds of data from the human past, such as ancient DNA or other biological data?

Approximate Total Pages: ~70 + blog post and two short responses

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Beck, A., & Neylon, C. (2012). A vision for Open Archaeology. *World Archaeology*, 44(4), 479–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.737581>

Kansa, E. (2012). Openness and archaeology's information ecosystem. *World Archaeology*, 44(4), 498–520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.737575>

Lake, M. (2012). Open archaeology. *World Archaeology*, 44(4), 471–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.748521>

Costopoulos, A. (2017, May 17) The traditional prestige economy of archaeology is preventing its emergence as an open science. *ArcheoThoughts*. <https://archeothoughts.wordpress.com/2017/05/17/the-traditional-prestige-economy-of-archaeology-is-preventing-its-emergence-as-an-open-science/>

Reardon, J., & TallBear, K. (2012). “Your DNA is *our* history”: Genomics, anthropology, and the construction of whiteness as property. *Current Anthropology*, 53(5), S233–S245. <https://doi.org/10.1086/662629>

Marwick, B., d’Alpoim Guedes, J., Barton, C. M., Bates, L. A., Baxter, M., Bevan, A., ... Wren, C. D. (2017). Open science in archaeology. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 17(4), 8–14.

Alpaslan-Roodenberg et al. (2021). Ethics of DNA research on human remains: five globally applicable guidelines. *Nature*, 599, 41–46. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04008-x>

Somel, M., Ezgi Altınışık, N., Özer, F. & Ávila-Arcos, M. C. (2021). Collaborate equitably in ancient DNA research and beyond. *Nature*, 600, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-03541-z>

Tsosie, K.S., Bader, A. C., Fox, K., Bolnick, D. A., Garrison, N. A. & Smith, R. W.A. (2021). Ancient-DNA researchers write their own rules. *Nature*, 600, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-03542-y>

Optional readings

Marks, J. (2010). Science, samples, and people. *Anthropology Today*, 26(3), 3–4.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2010.00733.x>

Huggett, J. (2015). Digital haystacks: Open data and the transformation of archaeological knowledge. In A. T. Wilson & B. Edwards (Eds.), *Open source archaeology: Ethics and practice* (pp. 6–290). DeGruyter Open. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110440171-003>

Imbler, S. (2021, October 20). Ancient-DNA researchers set ethics guidelines for their work. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/20/science/ancient-dna-archaeology-ethics.html>

Fox, K. (2020). The illusion of inclusion—the “all of us” research program and indigenous peoples’ DNA. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(5), 411–413.
<https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1915987>

WEEK 13: (Apr. 20) – Disrupting bias [Visit by Jade d’Aploim Guedes]

This class has focused on charting the systemic biases that structure knowledge production in archaeology. How do we confront and ameliorate these issues? Readings this week focus on actionable strategies for fostering change in the discipline, outlining the creation of standards for disrupting harassment, ensuring fieldwork safety, facilitating data sharing, and developing an anti-racist and inclusive practice of an archaeology for the future.

Approximate Total Pages: ~95

Discussion Leader _____

Core readings

Nelson, R. G., Rutherford, J. N., Hinde, K., & Clancy, K. B. H. (2017). Signaling safety: Characterizing fieldwork experiences and their implications for career trajectories. *American Anthropologist*, 119(4), 710–722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.12929>

Marwick, B., & Birch, S. E. P. (2018). A standard for the scholarly citation of archaeological data as an incentive to data sharing. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 6(2), 125–143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2018.3>

Colaninno, C. E., Lambert, S. P., Beahm, E. L., & Drexler, C. G. (2020). Creating and supporting a harassment- and assault-free field school. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 8(2), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.8>

d’Alpoim Guedes, J., Gonzalez, S., & Rivera-Collazo, I. (2021). Resistance and care in the time of COVID-19: Archaeology in 2020. *American Anthropologist*, 123(4), 898–915. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13669>

Flewellen, A. O., Dunnivant, J. P., Odewale, A., Jones, A., Wolde-Michael, T., Crossland, Z., & Franklin, M. (2021). “The future of archaeology is antiracist”: Archaeology in the Time of Black Lives Matter. *American Antiquity*, 86(2), 224–243. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2021.18>

Voss, B. L. (2021). Disrupting cultures of harassment in archaeology: Social-environmental and trauma-informed approaches to disciplinary transformation. *American Antiquity*, 86(3), 447–464. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2021.19>

Optional Readings

Ammerman, C., & Groysberg, B. (Eds.). (2021). *Glass half broken: Shattering the barriers that still hold women back at work*. Harvard Business Review Press.

WEEK 14: (April 27) – Student presentations

[Thursday, April 28TH is the start of reading period]

FINAL PAPERS DUE ON MONDAY MAY 9, AT MIDNIGHT

Bibliography

- Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (1996). Doing Good and Feeling Bad: The Work of Women University Teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26, 401-422.
- Ammerman, C., & Gorysberg, B. (Eds.). (2021). *Glass Half Broken: Shattering the Barriers that Still Hold Women Back at Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Arnold, K., Gilchrist, R., Graves, P., & Taylor, S. (1988). Women and Archaeology. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 7(1), 2-8.
- Asr, F. T., Mazraeh, M., Lopes, A., Gautam, V., Gonzales, J., Rao, P., & Taboada, M. (2021). The Gender Gap Tracker: Using Natural Language Processing to measure gender bias in media. *PLoS ONE*, 16(1), e0245533. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245533>
- Athreya, S., & Ackerman, R. (2020). Colonialism and Narratives of Human Origins in Africa and Asia. In M. Porr & J. Matthews (Eds.), *Interrogating Human Origins: Decolonization and the Deep Human Past* (pp. 72-95). New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2013). *Blindspot: Hidden Biases of Good People*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Bardolph, D. N. (2014). A Critical Evaluation of Recent Gendered Publishing Trends in American Archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 79(3), 522-540.
- Bardolph, D. N. (2018). Controlling the Narrative: A Comparative Examination of Gendered Publishing Trends in the SCA and Beyond. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 159-186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535813>
- Bardolph, D. N., & Vanderwarker, A. M. (2016). Sociopolitics in Southeastern Archaeology: The Role of Gender in Scholarly Authorship. *Southeastern Archaeology*, 35(3), 175-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0734578X.2015.1113101>
- Bauder, H. (2006). Learning to Become a Geographer: Reproduction and Transformation in Academia. *Antipode*, 38(4), 671-679.
- Baxter, J. E. (2005). Gendered Perceptions of Archaeology: A Perspective from the SAA Member Needs Assessment Survey. *SAA Archaeological Record*, 5(4), 7-9.
- Beaudry, M. C. (1994). Women Historical Archeologists: Who's Counting? In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 225-228). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Beaudry, M. C., & White, J. (1994). Cowgirls with the Blues? A Study of Women's Publication and the Citation of Women's Work in Historical Archaeology. In C. Classen (Ed.), *Women in Archaeology* (pp. 138-158). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Beck, A., & Neylon, C. (2012). A vision for Open Archaeology. *World Archaeology*, 44(4), 479-497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.737581>
- Beck, J., Gjesfjeld, E., & Chrisomalis, S. (2021). Prestige or Perish: Publishing Decisions in Academic Archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 86(4), 669-695. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2021.64>
- Bellas, M. L. (1999). Emotional Labor in Academia: The Case of Professors. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561, 96-110.
- Benson, B. (2016). Cognitive Bias Cheat Sheet: An organized list of cognitive biases because thinking is hard. Retrieved from <https://betterhumans.pub/cognitive-bias-cheat-sheet-55a472476b18>
- Bernick, K., & Zacharias, S. K. (1995). The Status of Women in British Columbia Archaeology. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 19, 79-86.
- Bezanson, M., & McNamara, A. (2019). The what and where of primate field research may be failing primate conservation. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 28(4), 166-178. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21790>
- Blackmore, C., Drane, L., Baldwin, R., & Ellis, D. (2016). Queering Fieldwork: Difference and Identity in Archaeological Practice. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, 16(1), 18-23.
- Blakey, M. L. (1983). Socio-political Bias and Ideological Production in Historical Archaeology. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 5-16).
- Borck, L. (2019). Constructing the Future History: Prefiguration as Historical Epistemology and the Chronopolitics of Archaeology. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 5(2), 229-238. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jca.33560>
- Brown, K. M. (2018). Gender, Race, and Mentorship: A Perspective from California Archaeology. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 187-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535814>

- Burt, F. (1987). "Man the Hunter": Gender Bias in Children's Archaeology Books. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 6(2), 157-174.
- Chapman, C. A., Bicca-Marques, J. C., Calvignac-Spencer, S., Fan, P., Fashing, P. J., Gogarten, J., . . . Chr. Stenseth, N. (2019). Games academics play and their consequences: how authorship, h-index and journal impact factors are shaping the future of academia. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 286(1916), 20192047. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2047>
- Chester, H., Rothschild, N. A., & Wall, D. d. (1994). Women in Historical Archaeology: The SHA Survey. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 213-218). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Beaudry, M. C., & White, J. (1994). Cowgirls with the Blues? A Study of Women's Publication and the Citation of Women's Work in Historical Archaeology. In C. Classen (Ed.), *Women in Archaeology* (pp. 138-158). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Chilazi, S. (2021). *Culture & Inclusion Literature Review*. Retrieved from
- Clancy, K. B. H., Nelson, R. G., Rutherford, J. N., & Hinde, K. (2014). Survey of Academic Field Experiences (SAFE): Trainees Report Harassment and Assault. *PLoS ONE*, 9(7), e102172. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102172>
- Clarke, A. (1993). Cultural Resource Management (CRM) as Archaeological Housework: Confining Women to the Ghetto of Management. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 191-194): Canberra, Australia.
- Classen, C. (Ed.) (1994). *Women in Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Classen, C. (2000). Homophobia and Women Archaeologists. *World Archaeology*, 32(2), 173-179.
- Clauset, A., Arbesman, S., & Larremore, D. B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Clauset, A., & Warner, J. (2015). The Academy's Dirty Secret. *Slate*.
- Colaninno, C. E., Lambert, S. P., Beahm, E. L., & Drexler, C. G. (2020). Creating and Supporting a Harassment- and Assault-Free Field School. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 8(2), 111-122. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.8>
- Conkey, M. W. (2007). Questioning Theory: Is there a gender of theory in archaeology? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 14, 285-310.
- Conkey, M. W., & Tringham, R. E. (1996). Cultivating Thinking/ Challenging Authority: Some Experiments in Feminist Pedagogy in Archaeology. In R. Wright (Ed.), *Gender and Archaeology* (pp. 224-250). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Costopoulos, A. (2017). The Post-Journal Academic Publishing Landscape. Retrieved from <https://archothoughts.wordpress.com/2017/09/13/the-post-journal-academic-publishing-landscape>
- Costopoulos, A. (2017). The Traditional Prestige Economy of Archaeology Is Preventing Its Emergence as an Open Science. Retrieved from <https://archothoughts.wordpress.com/2017/05/17/the-traditional-prestige-economy-of-archaeology-is-preventing-its-emergence-as-an-open-science/>
- d'Alpoim Guedes, J., Gonzalez, S., & Rivera-Collazo, I. (2021). Resistance and Care in the Time of COVID-19: Archaeology in 2020. *American Anthropologist*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13669>
- Damm, C. (1986). An Appeal for Women in Archaeology. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 5, 215-218.
- Eberhardt, J. L. (2019). *Biased: Uncovering the Hidden Prejudice that Shapes what we See, Think, and Do*. New York: Viking.
- Evasdottir, E. E. S. (2005). *Obedient autonomy: Chinese intellectuals and the achievement of orderly life*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Flewellen, A. O., Dunnivant, J. P., Odewale, A., Jones, A., Wolde-Michael, T., Crossland, Z., & Franklin, M. (2021). "The Future of Archaeology Is Antiracist": Archaeology in the Time of Black Lives Matter. *American Antiquity*, 86(2), 224-243.
- Ford, A. (1994). Women in Mesoamerican Archaeology: Why Are the Best Men Winning? In C. Classen (Ed.), *Women in Archaeology* (pp. 159-172). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Ford, A., & Hundt, A. (1994). Equity in Academia -- Why the Best Men Still Win: An Examination of Women and Men in Mesoamerican Archaeology. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 147-156). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Fox, K. (2020). The Illusion of Inclusion—The "All of Us" Research Program and Indigenous Peoples' DNA. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(5), 411-413.
- Franklin, M. (1997). Why are there so few black American archaeologists? *Antiquity*, 71(274), 799-801.

- Fulkerson, T. J., & Tushingham, S. (2019). Who Dominates the Discourses of the Past? Gender, Occupational Affiliation, and Multivocality in North American Archaeology Publishing. *American Antiquity*, 84(3), 379-399. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2019.35>
- Gero, J. M. (1983). Gender Bias in Archaeology: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology*, (pp. 51-58).
- Gero, J. M. (1985). Socio-politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology. *American Antiquity*, 50, 342-350.
- Gero, J. M. (1988). Gender Bias in Archaeology: Here, Then and Now. In S. Rosser (Ed.), *Feminism Within the Science and Health-Care Professions: Overcoming Resistance* (pp. 33-43). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Gero, J. M. (1991). Gender Divisions of Labor in the Construction of Archaeological Knowledge. In D. Walde & N. D. Willows (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary* (pp. 96-102). Calgary: The University of Calgary.
- Gero, J. M. (1993). The Social World of Prehistoric Facts: Gender and Power in Paleoindian Research. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 31-40): Canberra, Australia.
- Gero, J. M. (1996). Archaeological Practice and Gendered Encounters with Field Data. In R. P. Wright (Ed.), *Gender and Archaeology* (pp. 251-280). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Gero, J. M., & Root, D. (1990). Public Presentations and Private Concerns: Archaeology in the Pages of National Geographic. In P. W. Gathercole & D. Lovwenthal (Eds.), *The Politics of the Past* (pp. 19-37). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Gifford-Gonzales, D. (1993). You Can Hide, But You Can't Run: Representations of Women's Work in Illustrations of Paleolithic Life. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 9(1), 21-41.
- Goldstein, L., Mills, B. J., Herr, S., Burkholder, J. E., Aiello, L., & Thornton, C. (2018). Why do Fewer Women than Men Apply for Grants After their PhDs? *American Antiquity*, 83(3), 367-386. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2017.73>
- Gonzalez, T. (2018). Perceptions Versus Reality: A Comparative Analysis of Gender Equity Trends Within Academia and CRM in California. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 211-229. <https://10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535815>
- Goulding, M., Buckley, K., & Brennan, G. (1993). The Role of Gender in Archaeological Career Structures: A Victorian Case Study. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 222-231): Canberra, Australia.
- Hanan, M. P., & Kelley, J. H. (1983). Social and Philosophical Frameworks for Archaeology. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 107-118).
- Hassett, B., Birch, S. P., Herridge, V., & Wragg Sykes, R. (2018). TrowelBlazers: Accidentally Crowdsourcing an Archive of Women in Archaeology. In V. Apaydin (Ed.), *Shared Knowledge, Shared Power: Engaging Local and Indigenous Heritage* (pp. 129-141). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Heath-Stout, L. E. (2020). Guest Editorial Introduction: Gender, Equity, and the Peer Review Process at the Journal of Field Archaeology. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 45(3), 135-139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2020.1719295>
- Heath-Stout, L. E. (2020). Who Writes about Archaeology? An Intersectional Study of Authorship in Archaeological Journals. *American Antiquity*, 85(3), 407-426. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2020.28>
- Heath-Stout, L. E., & Hannigan, E. M. (2020). Affording Archaeology: How Field School Costs Promote Exclusivity. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 8(2), 123-133. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.7>
- Hendon, J. A. (1994). The Society for American Archaeology's Committee on the Status of Women: A Progress Report for 1991-1993. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 195-198). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Hilário, C. M., Martínez-Ávila, D., Grácio, M. C. C., & Wolfram, D. (2018). Authorship in science: A critical analysis from a Foucauldian perspective. *Research Evaluation*, Volume 27, Issue 2, April 2018, 27(2), 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvx041>
- Hill, W., & Kelley, J. (1994). Relationships Between Graduate Training and Placement in Canadian Archaeology. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 47-52). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Hodgetts, L., Supernant, K., Lyons, N., & Welch, J. R. (2020). Broadening #MeToo: Tracking Dynamics in Canadian Archaeology through a Survey on Experiences within the Discipline. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 44(20-47).
- Hope, J. (1998). Making Up Stories: Bias in Interpretation of Aboriginal Burial Practices in Southern Australia. In D. Donlon, M. Casey, J. Hope, & S. Wellfare (Eds.), *Redefining Archaeology: Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 239-245). Canberra: ANH Publications, RSPAS.

- Huggett, J. (2015). Digital Haystacks: Open Data and the Transformation of Archaeological Knowledge. In A. T. Wilson & B. Edwards (Eds.), *Open Source Archaeology: Ethics and Practice* (pp. 6-29). Warsaw/Berlin: DeGruyter Open.
- Hutson, S. R. (1998). Institutional and Gender Effects on Academic Hiring Practices. *SAA Archaeological Bulletin*, 16(4), 19-21, 26.
- Hutson, S. R. (1998). Strategies for the Reproduction of Prestige in Archaeological Discourse. *Assemblage*, 4, <http://www.assemblage.group.shef.ac.uk/4/>.
- Hutson, S. R. (2002). Gendered Citation Practices in American Antiquity and Other Archaeology Journals. *American Antiquity*, 67(2), 331-342.
- Hutson, S. R. (2006). Self-Citation in Archaeology: Age, Gender, Prestige, and the Self. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 13(1), 1-18.
- Kansa, E. (2012). Openness and archaeology's information ecosystem. *World Archaeology*, 44(4), 498-520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.737575>
- Kawa, N. C., Clavijo, J. A., Michelangeli, J. L., Clark, D. G., & McCarty, C. (2019). The Social Network of US Academic Anthropology and Its Inequalities. *American Anthropologist*, 121, 14-29.
- Kelley, J. H., & Hill, W. (1991). Relationships Between Graduate Training and Placement in Canadian Archaeology. In D. Walde & N. D. Willows (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary* (pp. 195-200). Calgary: The University of Calgary.
- Knapp, A. B. (1998). Boys Will be Boys: Masculinist Approaches to a Gendered Archaeology. In D. Donlon, M. Casey, J. Hope, & S. Wellfare (Eds.), *Redefining Archaeology: Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 32-36). Canberra: ANH Publications, RSPAS.
- Kramer, C., & Stark, M. (1988). The Status of Women in Archaeology. *Anthropology Newsletter*, 29(9), 11-12.
- Kramer, C., & Stark, M. (1994). The Status of Women in Archaeology. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 17-22). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Lake, M. (2012). Open archaeology. *World Archaeology*, 44(4), 471-478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.748521>
- Larivière, V., Haustein, S., & Mongeon, P. (2015). The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era. *PLoS ONE*, 10(6), e0127502. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>
- Leighton, M. (2020). Myths of Meritocracy, Friendship, and Fun Work: Class and Gender in North American Academic Communities. *American Anthropologist*, 122(3), 444-458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13455>
- Lyman, R. L., O'Brien, M. J., & Schiffer, M. B. (2005). Publishing Archaeology in Science and Scientific American, 1940–2003. *American Antiquity*, 70(1), 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40035274>
- MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching. *Innovations in Higher Education*, 40, 291-303.
- Mandt, G., & Naess, J.-R. (1999). Who Created and Recreates Our Distant Past? Structures and Content of Norwegian Archaeology in the Perspective: How Male is Science? *Kvinner I Arkeologi I Norge - in English* (101-118).
- Marks, J. (2010). Science, Samples, and People. *Anthropology Today*, 26(3), 3-4.
- Marwick, B., d'Alpoim Guedes, J., Barton, C. M., Bates, L. A., Baxter, M., Bevan, A., Bollwerk, E. A., Bocinsky, R. K., Brughmans, T., Carter, A. K., Conrad, C., Contreras, D. A., Costa, S., Crema, E. R., Daggett, A., Davies, B., Drake, B. L., Dye, T. S., France, P., Fullagar, R., Giusti, D., Graham, S., Harris, M. D., Hawks, J., Health, S., Huffer, D., Kansa, E. C., Kansa, S. W., Madsen, M. E., Melcher, J., Negre, J., Neiman, F. D., Opitz, R., Orton, D. C., Przystupa, P., Raviele, M., Riel-Salvatore, J., Riris, P., Romanowska, I., Smith, J., Strupler, N., Ullah, I. I., Van Vlack, H. G., Van Valkenburgh, N., Watrall, E. C., Webster, C., Wells, J., Winters, J., and Wren, C. D. (2017). Open Science in Archaeology. *SAA Archaeological Record*, 17(4), 8-14.
- Marwick, B., & Birch, S. E. P. (2018). A Standard for the Scholarly Citation of Archaeological Data as an Incentive to Data Sharing. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 6(2), 125-143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2018.3>
- Meltzer, D. J. (1983). Prehistory, Power and Politics in the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1879-1906. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 67-78).
- Meskell, L. (2002). The Intersections of Identity and Politics in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31(1), 279-301. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085457>
- Meyers, M. S., Horton, E. T., Boudreaux, E. A., Carmody, S. B., Wright, A. P., & Dekle, V. G. (2018). The Context and Consequences of Sexual Harassment in Southeastern Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 6(4), 275-287. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2018.23>

- Mitchell, K. M. W., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender Bias in Student Evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 648-652. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800001X>
- Moser, S. (1993). Gender Stereotyping in Pictorial Reconstructions of Human Origins. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 75-92): Canberra, Australia.
- Moser, S. (2007). On Disciplinary Culture: Archaeology as Fieldwork and Its Gendered Associations. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 14, 235-263.
- Nelson, M. C., & Crooks, D. L. (1991). Dual Anthropology Career Couples: Different Strategies and Different Success Rates. In D. Walde & N. D. Willows (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary* (pp. 220-225). Calgary: The University of Calgary.
- Nelson, R. G., Rutherford, J. N., Hinde, K., & Clancy, K. B. H. (2017). Signaling Safety: Characterizing Fieldwork Experiences and Their Implications for Career Trajectories. *American Anthropologist*, 119, 710-722.
- Nelson, S. M., Nelson, M. C., & Wylie, A. (Eds.). (1994). *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Nixon, L. (1994). Gender Bias in Archaeology. In S. Fischler, L. Archer, & M. Wyke (Eds.), *Women in Ancient Societies* (pp. 1-23).
- Oprisko, R. (2012). Superpowers: The American Academic Elite. *Georgetown Public Policy Review*.
- Overholtzer, L., & Jalbert, C. L. (2021). A “Leaky” Pipeline and Chilly Climate in Archaeology in Canada. *American Antiquity*, 86(2).
- Park, S. M. (1996). Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn’t Women’s Work Count? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 46-84.
- Paynter, R. (1983). Field or Factory? Concerning the Degradation of Archaeological Labor. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 17-30).
- Radde, H. D. (2018). Sexual Harassment among California Archaeologists: Results of the Gender Equity and Sexual Harassment Survey. *California Archaeology*, 10, 231-255.
- Rautman, A. E. (2012). Who gets published in *American Antiquity*? *SAA Archaeological Record*, 12(2), 25-30.
- Reardon, J., & TallBear, K. (2012). “Your DNA is Our History”: Genomics, Anthropology, and the Construction of Whiteness as Property. *Current Anthropology*, 53(5), S2333-S2245.
- Rivera, L. A. (2017). When Two Bodies Are (Not) a Problem: Gender and Relationship Status Discrimination in Academic Hiring. *American Sociological Review*, 86(2), 1111-1138.
- Rutherford, J. N. (2019). Academic Descent with Intentional Modifications: A Reflection on Mentoring as Developmental Environment. *American Anthropologist*, 121(2), 482-483.
- Sampson, R. (1988). Superwoman, Wonderwomen, Great Women, and Real Women. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 7(1), 60-66.
- Schiebinger, L. (1993). Why Mammals are Called Mammals: Gender Politics in Eighteenth-Century Natural History. *The American Historical Review*, 98(2), 382-411.
- Schneider, M., Lord, E., & Wilczak, J. (2020). We, too: contending with the sexual politics of fieldwork in China. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2020.1781793>
- Sebastian Dring, K., Silliman, S. W., Gambrell, N., Sebastian, S., & Sebastian Sidberry, R. (2019). Authoring and Authority in Eastern Pequot Community Heritage and Archaeology. *Archaeologies*, 15(3), 352-370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-019-09377-4>
- She. (2000). Sex and a Career. *World Archaeology*, 32(2), 166-172.
- Slocum, S. (1975). Woman the Gatherer: Male Bias in Anthropology. In R. R. Reiter (Ed.), *Toward an Anthropology of Women* (pp. 36-50). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Smith, C. A., & Garrett-Scott, D. (2021). “We are not named”: Black women and the politics of citation in anthropology. *Feminist Anthropology*, 2(1), 18-37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fea2.12038>
- Smith, L. (1993). Feminist Issues in Cultural Resource Management. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 210-216). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University.
- Smith, R. W. A., & Bolnick, D. A. (2019). Situating Science: Doing Biological Anthropology as a View from Somewhere. *American Anthropologist*, 121(2), 465-466.
- Soffer, O. (1983). Politics of the Paleolithic in the USSR: A Case of Paradigms Lost. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 91-106).
- Solometo, J., & Moss, J. (2013). Picturing the Past: Gender in National Geographic Reconstructions of Prehistoric Life. *American Antiquity*, 78(1), 123-146.
- Sorensen, M. L. S. (1988). Is There a Feminist Contribution to Archaeology? *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 7(1), 9-20.

- Sorensen, M. L. S. (1996). Identifying or Including: Approaches to the Gendering of Archaeology. *Kvinner I Arkeologi I Norge - in English*, 21, 51-60.
- Souleles, D. (2020). What to do with the predator in your bibliography. Retrieved from <https://allegralaboratory.net/what-to-do-with-the-predator-in-your-bibliography/>
- Speakman, R. J., Hadden, C. S., Colvin, M. H., Cramb, J., Jones, K. C., Jones, T. W., . . . Thompson, V. D. (2018). Choosing a Path to the Ancient World in a Modern Market: The Reality of Faculty Jobs in Archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 83(1), 1-12.
- Speakman, R. J., Hadden, C. S., Colvin, M. H., Cramb, J., Jones, K. C., Jones, T. W., . . . Thompson, V. D. (2018). Market share and recent hiring trends in anthropology faculty positions. *PLoS ONE*, 13(9), e0202528. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202528>
- Spector, J. D., & Whelan, M. K. (1989). Incorporating Gender into Archaeology Courses. In S. Morgen (Ed.), *Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching* (pp. 65-94). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Stark, M. (1991). A Perspective on Women's Status in American Archaeology. In D. Walde & N. D. Willows (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the Twenty- Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary* (pp. 187-194). Calgary: Archaeological Association, The University of Calgary.
- Stojanowski, C. M., & Duncan, W. N. (2015). Engaging bodies in the public imagination: Bioarchaeology as social science, science, and humanities. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 27(1), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.22522>
- Tommy, K., & Hawks, J. (2021). Strategizing public-facing work within an academic career. *American Journal of Human Biology* (Early View), e23699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23699>
- Trigger, B. G. (1984). Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man, N.S.*, 19(3), 355-370.
- Triunfol, M., & Gouveia, F. C. (2021). What's not in the news headlines or titles of Alzheimer disease articles? #InMice. *PLOS Biology*, 19(6), e3001260. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001260>
- Truscott, M. C., & Smith, L. (1993). Women's Roles in the Archaeological Workforce. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 217-222): Canberra, Australia.
- Tushingham, S., Fulkerson, T., & Hill, K. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188403>
- VanDerwarker, A. M., Brown, K. M., Gonzalez, T., & Radde, H. (2018). The UCSB Gender Equity Project: Taking Stock of Mentorship, Equity, and Harassment in California Archaeology Through Qualitative Survey Data. *California Archaeology*, 10(2), 131-158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535791>
- Victor, K. L., & Beaudry, M. C. (1992). Women's Participation in American Prehistoric and Historic archaeology. In C. Claassen (Ed.), *Exploring Gender Through Archaeology: Selected Papers from the 1991 Boone Conference* (pp. 11-22). Madison: Prehistory Press.
- Voss, B. L. (2021). Disrupting Cultures of Harassment in Archaeology: Social-Environmental and Trauma-Informed Approaches to Disciplinary Transformation. *American Antiquity*, 86(3), 447–464. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2021.19>
- Voss, B. L. (2021). Documenting Cultures of Harassment in Archaeology: A Review and Analysis of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Studies. *American Antiquity*, 86(2):244–260. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2020.118>
- Webb, J. M., & Frankel, D. (1995). This Fair Paper, This Most Goodly Book. Gender and International Scholarship in Cypriot Archaeology 1920-1991. In J. Balme & W. Beck (Eds.), *Gendered Archaeology: The Second Australian Women in Archaeology Conference* (pp. 34-42). Canberra: ANH Publications, RSPAS.
- Wenzler, J. (2017). Scholarly Communication and the Dilemma of Collective Action: Why Academic Journals Cost Too Much. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(2), 183-200.
- West, M. S., & Curtis, J. W. (2006). *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*. Retrieved from Washington, D.C.:
- White, W., & Draycott, C. (2020). Why the Whiteness of Archaeology is a Problem. *Sapiens*. Retrieved from
- Whittlesey, S. M. (1991). Beyond Anatomy: The Sociology of Gender in Arizona Archaeology. In D. Walde & N. D. Willows (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the Twenty- Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary* (pp. 226-232). Calgary: The University of Calgary.
- Whittlesey, S. M. (1994). The Sociology of Gender in Arizona Archaeology. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 173-182). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

- Wildesen, L. E. (1994). The Status of Women in Archaeology: Results of a Preliminary Survey. In S. M. Nelson, M. C. Nelson, & A. Wylie (Eds.), *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology* (pp. 7-16). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Wobst, H. M., & Keene, A. S. (1983). Archaeological Explanation as Political Economy. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 79-90).
- Wylie, A. (1983). Gender Bias in Archaeology: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology*, (pp. 119-130).
- Wylie, A. (1993). Introduction: The Complexity of Gender Bias. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 53-60). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University.
- Wylie, A. (1993). Workplace Issues for Women in Archaeology: The Chilly Climate. In H. D. Cros & L. Smith (Eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique* (pp. 245-260). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University.
- Wylie, A., & Conkey, M. W. (1991). Gender Theory and the Archaeological Record: Why is there no Archaeology of Gender? In Joan M. Gero (Ed.), *Engendering Archaeology: Women in Prehistory* (pp. 31-54). Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, Inc.
- Yellen, J. E. (1983). Women, Archaeology and the National Science Foundation. In D. Lacy, J. M. Gero, & M. L. Blakey (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of Archaeology* (pp. 59-66).
- Yellen, J. E. (1991). Women, Archaeology, and the National Science Foundation. *SAA Archaeological Bulletin*, 9(1).
- Zarmati, L. (1995). Popular Archaeology and the Archaeologist as Hero. In J. Balme & W. Beck (Eds.), *Gendered Archaeology: The Second Australian Women in Archaeology Conference* (pp. 43-47). Canberra, Australia: ANH Publications, RSPAS.
- Zarmati, L. (1998). 'Archaeo-speak': The Politics of Language in Archaeology. In D. Donlon, M. Casey, J. Hope, & S. Wellfare (Eds.), *Redefining Archaeology: Feminist Perspectives*. Canberra, Australia: ANH Publications, RSPAS.