



The Invisibly Disabled Archaeologist

Laura E. Heath-Stout¹ 

Accepted: 7 January 2022

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2022

Abstract

In this article, I use three theories from disability studies—compulsory able-bodiedness, coming out and masquerading, and crip time—to examine stories of non-apparent disability from my interview study of diversity issues among archaeologists. I consider how our discipline privileges some bodies and minds over others and offer suggestions for building a truly inclusive and accessible archaeology.

Keywords disabled archaeologists · non-apparent disability · equity issues · crip theory

In early 2009, I was hired for a summer field archaeology internship. I had lots of camping and fieldwork experience, so I did not mind that interns slept in cabins without electricity. But then, that spring, I was diagnosed with sleep apnea, a chronic condition that causes me to stop breathing while asleep, disrupting my sleep cycles. I received a Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP) machine to help me breathe while I slept, and it needed electricity. I ordered an expensive battery pack for my machine, which was essentially a car battery in a bag. It did not work: the fuse blew a few minutes after I fell asleep every night. So, I spent the summer powering through days of fieldwork and exhaustion. There were lots of beds at the organization where I worked with electrical outlets next to them, but interns traditionally slept in the cabins and it did not occur to me to ask to sleep somewhere else. It did not occur to the organization's staff to inquire if I needed accommodations. After all, I do not appear to be disabled, and talking about disability is not part of the disciplinary culture of archaeology, or the culture of academia more broadly.

Here I present the experiences of archaeologists like me, who have invisible or non-apparent disabilities. At archaeology conferences and on field projects, I notice few people with wheelchairs, service animals, canes, prosthetics, or other visible

✉ Laura E. Heath-Stout
laura.heathstout@umb.edu

¹ Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts Boston, 100 William T. Morrissey Blvd, Boston, MA 02125, USA

signs of disability, but there are more disabled people in archaeology than you might perceive. We may have chronic conditions, mental illnesses, learning disabilities, or a variety of other impairments, which affect our lives and work in a wide variety of ways. The stories presented here come from my in-depth interview study of archaeological career trajectories and diversity issues in the discipline (Heath-Stout 2019). None of my interlocutors were apparently disabled, but several of my interviewees told me stories of non-apparent disability. I explore their stories using three inter-related bodies of theory drawn from disability studies and crip theory: compulsory able-bodiedness; passing, coming out, and masquerading; and crip time. The experiences of my interlocutors, viewed through these theoretical lenses, demonstrate that archaeology is systemically shaped by ableism, which creates the illusion that all archaeologists are nondisabled and makes it difficult for those of us who have disabilities to succeed. I conclude with suggestions for building a more accessible and inclusive discipline of archaeology.

Methods

In my research on sexism, racism, and heterosexism in the discipline, I conducted in-depth interviews with a diverse sample of 72 archaeologists about their experiences, identities, and research trajectories (Heath-Stout 2019). I interviewed archaeologists affiliated with US universities and engaged in research within three subfields: historical archaeology of the Americas, Latin American archaeology, and Mediterranean archaeology. I chose to focus on three subfields in order to gain an understanding of subdisciplinary cultures without neglecting the diversity of archaeological practices. I chose Latin American and historical archaeologies because of my background in and familiarity with these subfields. Because they are both primarily aligned with the discipline of anthropology in the United States, I chose Mediterranean archaeology (often considered part of the discipline of Classics, rather than anthropology) as a contrasting subfield to study.

Interviewees were identified through snowball sampling. I began with acquaintances, and asked each interviewee for recommendations of other people I should talk to, until I was several degrees of separation from my own circle. I did not interview anyone affiliated with my own university, nor anyone who works very closely with members of my dissertation committee, in order to protect the privacy of my interlocutors. Snowball sampling is commonly used in sociological interview studies because it allows the researcher to get to know a wide network of members of the community being studied, and builds trust with interviewees since each has been put in touch with the researcher by a friend or colleague. I found some interviewees through a small amount of advertising. I posted a recruitment call in a Facebook group called “Archaeologists for a Just Future” that was formed shortly after the 2016 US Presidential election and that includes over 5,000 archaeologists concerned with social justice issues. I also made announcements at the meetings of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group at the 2017 and 2018 Society for American Archaeology annual meetings, at the Society of Black Archaeologists meeting at the 2017

Society for Historical Archaeology annual meeting, and at the Women in Archaeology Interest Group meeting at the 2018 Archaeological Institute of America annual meeting.

I did not want to build a representative sample of archaeologists: that would entail interviewing many straight white cisgender archaeologists and few who are queer, transgender, non-white, or disabled. This would make it impossible to generalize about the experiences of people in these minority groups. Instead, I sought a diverse sample, including as many members of various marginalized communities as possible. When I asked interviewees to suggest contacts or made announcements, I made sure to note that I was especially looking for archaeologists who were non-straight and/or non-white. Because the original intended focus of the study did not include ableism, I was not explicitly seeking disabled subjects.

I interviewed 72 archaeologists in total, all of whom are engaged in Mediterranean (21), Historical (26), or Latin American (17) archaeology, or in multiple of these subfields (8). They ranged from one undergraduate student through full professors nearing retirement, although many were graduate students, postdocs, or early career professors. One was no longer working as an archaeologist, having left graduate school partway through a degree program in order to pursue a career in community organizing. I present the gender, race, and sexual orientation self-identifications of my interview sample in Table 1.

In each interview, I asked interviewees how they decided to become archaeologists; how they came to develop their current research project or projects; and about their experiences and perceptions of gender, sexual orientation, and race issues in the field. Although I had a list of prepared questions, I often added follow-up questions or otherwise tailored each conversation to the interests of the interviewee, leading to interviews conducted in a semi-structured, conversational style. The questions focused on race, gender, and sexuality issues, but four of the 72 interviewees mentioned experiences of disability as well: these are the interviewees whose experiences form the basis for this article. I recorded and transcribed the interviews, and analyzed them using NVivo qualitative analysis software in order to understand trends in archaeological career trajectories, and how interviewees' identities shape their work. A more complete discussion of methods and results can be found in my dissertation (Heath-Stout 2019). This study was approved by the Boston University Institutional Review Board (#4381X), and I present all data pseudonymously, with identifying details removed.

Disabled Interviewees

Although my interview study was designed to understand systems of oppression that are based on gender, sexual orientation, and race, these are not the only types of identity that inform social privilege and marginalization. Ableism is “a set of beliefs or practices that devalue and discriminate against people with physical, intellectual, or psychiatric disabilities” (Smith *n.d.*). Although ableism was not a primary focus of my interview, stories about ableism arose in my conversations with several interlocutors. Because I intended to understand how systems of oppression are

Table 1 Intersecting Identities of Interviewees (Percentages of Complete Sample)

Gender	Sexual Orientation	Race					Total
		White	Black	Latinx	Asian	White-Identified, with Multiracial Heritage	
Cisgender Men		12 (17%)	1 (1%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	19 (26%)
	<i>Straight</i>	9 (13%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	15 (21%)
	<i>Gay</i>	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
	<i>Queer</i>	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
Transgender men		1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
	<i>Straight</i>	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Cisgender women		38 (53%)	7 (10%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	51 (71%)
	<i>Straight</i>	28 (39%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	37 (51%)
	<i>Complicated</i>	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (6%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)
	<i>Queer</i>	4 (6%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (10%)
Genderfluid people		1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
	<i>Queer</i>	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total		52 (72%)	8 (11%)	8 (11%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	72

interlocking using an intersectional feminist theoretical framing (e.g., Cho et al. 2013; Choo and Ferree 2010; Collins and Bilge 2016; McCall 2005), I allowed these conversational interviews to digress from my original list of questions in order to understand how ableism in archaeology intersects with racism, sexism, and heterosexism. I use the stories of four particular interlocutors, all of whom have disabilities that are not visible or apparent to colleagues, but that nonetheless affect their careers: Emily, Amy, Lindsay, and Taylor. Emily and Amy are both queer-identified white cisgender women. Taylor is genderfluid, queer-identified, and white, and uses the gender-neutral singular pronoun “they.” Lindsay is a straight white cisgender woman. At the time of the interviews, Taylor was in the first half of a graduate program, Lindsay was nearing the end of her graduate program, Emily was a faculty member, and Amy worked for a government agency. Among them, they studied

Mesoamerican and historical archaeology and they had diagnosed mental illnesses, learning disabilities, and chronic health problems. Alongside their stories, I reflect on my own experiences as a non-apparently disabled white cisgender queer woman in archaeology.

This sample of disabled archaeologists is small and limited by the lack of people of color, men, and people with visible or apparent disabilities. Furthermore, Lindsay, Taylor, Amy, and Emily may not be the only scholars with disabilities whom I interviewed: because none of my questions focused on disability or ableism, other disabled interlocutors may not have disclosed their diagnoses or identities. However, their stories allowed me to make the preliminary interpretations of ableism in archaeology that I present here, with a focus on the experiences of non-apparently disabled white women archaeologists. I intend to conduct further interviews with a broader sample of archaeologists with disabilities for a future project.

Lindsay, Emily, Taylor, and Amy experienced both outright discrimination on the basis of their disabilities and more subtle difficulties related to having disabilities and working within a discipline and a university system created by and for non-disabled scholars. In order to understand their experiences, I use several theoretical lenses drawn from disability studies: compulsory able-bodiedness/mindedness; closeting, coming out, and masquerading; and crip time.

Compulsory Able-Bodiedness

In “Compulsory Able-bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence,” McRuer (2006:1) writes that “Able-bodiedness... still largely masquerades as a non-identity, as the natural order of things.” McRuer’s title and theory of compulsory normativity is explicitly drawing and playing on Rich’s (1980) “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence,” in which she argued that in a heteronormative society, lesbianism is rendered invisible, deviant, or abhorrent, and lesbians break the foundational rule of compulsory heterosexuality. Similarly, in McRuer’s theory, able-bodiedness/mindedness is seen as the “natural order of things” and those who are not able-bodied/minded are exceptions to the rule, who must be ignored or ostracized in order to reinforce that rule. This is true not only in society, but within the discipline of archaeology, where being non-disabled is so normalized that we rarely even discuss the issue.

One of the common themes of my interviews was the silence around disability in archaeology. Archaeologists have been discussing gender equity issues for the past 35 years (e.g., Bardolph 2014; Fulkerson and Tushingam 2019; Gero 1985; Heath-Stout 2020; Hutson 2002; Nelson et al. 1994) and there are vibrant literatures on queering (e.g., Blackmore 2011; Blackmore et al. 2016; Dowson 2000; Voss 2000) and decolonizing archaeology (e.g., Atalay 2006; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Gonzalez-Tennant 2018; Smith and Wobst 2005; Watkins 2005). Yet we rarely acknowledge the presence of disabled scholars among us (with the exceptions of Fraser 2007; O’Mahony 2015; and Wooten, this volume). “We don’t talk about” disability, as Emily and Lindsay both told me. Archaeologists with disabilities

are silenced and overlooked by this culture of compulsory able-bodiedness and able-mindedness.

I see the workings of compulsory able-bodiedness in my own opening story: it did not occur to my supervisors that an archaeological field intern would be disabled, and nothing about my appearance or behavior gave them a different impression. They were not being bigoted against me, or trying to make my work difficult, but were rather actively participating, as we all do, in a society and discipline where being non-disabled is assumed. If I had asked for accommodations, I would have been shedding light on my own failure to comply with this social norm, and although I suspect that I would have gotten the accommodation I needed, this would have been a difficult and stressful thing to do. When discussing disability is taboo due to compulsory able-bodiedness and able-mindedness, it can be easier to comply with that social rule than it is to break it by “coming out” as disabled.

Although ableism is systemically embedded in academia, shaping the experiences of people in all disciplines (Hamraie 2016; Kerschbaum et al. 2017; Nishida 2016; Price 2011), it manifests in particular ways in archaeology due to the discipline’s emphasis on fieldwork. The gendered elements of the glorification of fieldwork have long been discussed by feminist archaeologists (Gero 1985; Leighton 2020; Moser 2007). Indeed, many of my women interviewees who did not address disability explicitly did discuss the masculine-coding of fieldwork in ways that suggested that the sexism of this ideology is intertwined with ableism. Many women interviewees expressed pride in their physical abilities related to digging and moving heavy objects. Indeed, the example of carrying buckets came up over and over: many women experienced chivalrous male colleagues taking heavy buckets out of their hands as a sexist microaggression. When colleagues did not allow them to carry their own buckets, many women felt undermined in terms of their belonging in the field. While I agree with them that the assumption that women cannot carry buckets is sexist (and, indeed, have shared similar stories myself), the ability to carry a heavy bucket should not be a criterion for belonging on a field project. In the ubiquitous example of bucket-carrying, it is clear that ableism and sexism are mutually constitutive. Women prove that they belong in the masculine field on the basis of physical strength, but this rhetoric undermines people of all genders who may not be able to carry the buckets but can contribute in other ways. By using the rhetoric of compulsory able-bodiedness to support women’s inclusion in the discipline, we reinforce the idea that upper-body strength is what makes a good archaeologist, which is harmful to women and to disabled people of all genders.

Closeting, Coming Out, and Masquerading

Compulsory able-bodiedness creates a silence around disability, which contributes to an environment where non-apparently disabled people must make constant, fraught choices about disclosure. Telling our colleagues about our disabilities breaks the rules of compulsory able-bodiedness/mindedness and exposes us to discrimination, yet sometimes we must “come out” as disabled in order to receive the accommodations we need to succeed and even to feel comfortable and honest with our

colleagues. Lingsom (2008) laid out a variety of motives that one might have to either attempt to pass or acknowledge one's impairment. Passing allows for not only a relief from stigmatization by others, but also privacy and a rest from constantly thinking about disability. Besides, many of us simply pass by default, due to compulsory able-bodiedness/mindedness, and would have to be constantly announcing our diagnoses and identities in order to not pass. On the other hand, disclosure allows for accommodation, whether through reduced demands, altered standards of evaluation, or support from medical and service professionals. As Samuels (2003:239) writes, "Like racial, gender, and queer passing, the option of passing as nondisabled provides both a certain level of privilege and a profound sense of misrecognition and internal dissonance." At the time of my story about the internship and the CPAP, I did not yet hold a politicized disabled identity, and the summer internship was short enough for me to power through without my CPAP machine, so I simply never disclosed and successfully passed.

Disability studies literature shows that disclosure and passing in higher education are intricate processes: as Kerschbaum et al. (2017:2) put it in the introduction to their edited volume on the subject, "disability disclosure [is] a complex calculus in which degrees of perceptibility are dependent on contexts, types of interactions that are unfolding, interlocutors' long- and short-term goals, disabilities and disability experiences, and many other contingencies." Similarly, Price et al. (2017) emphasize the complexity of decision-making around disclosure for faculty with mental health disabilities, although they find that accommodation-seeking is less common among faculty members than among students. Faculty members are often either unaware of the accommodations that universities are legally required to offer or are unwilling to open themselves to stigma due to the disclosures necessary to access accommodations.

Lingsom (2008) explores a variety of complexities to both passing and disclosing. In order to pass, one must carefully plan the support one needs for a variety of situations, and self-surveil in order to avoid outing oneself. It is impossible to pass in all parts of one's life, and the effort of passing at work might negatively affect other parts of one's life. For example, Lingsom (2008:7) argues that passing in professional settings requires overexertion, which takes away time and energy from family life. Finally, a person passing for non-disabled must perform busyness and tell stories about their life that indicate a lack of disability in order to avoid raising suspicions. All of this entails a lot of effort. Yet disclosure is also fraught: there are risks of losing employment, being disbelieved, or being interrogated. In interpersonal relationships, telling someone too soon can be awkwardly personal while waiting too long to disclose implies distrust. Talking about disability too often can come off as whining, whereas never mentioning it allows non-disabled people to forget disability, leading to discomfort when the disclosure happens again.

Many of these complexities were evident in my interviewees' stories. As Taylor explained, their experiences of mental illness led to a complicated relationship with their graduate school adviser:

There's an issue when your employer, your adviser, your confidante, your mentor is all rolled into one person and you have to make a very public admission

of incapability and/or failure to that person and expect them to be that kind of figure that can help you and will also not just say that you're not worth it. ... It's difficult to be honest and then you end up putting yourself in a position where you have to explain everything. You have to lay that out. And to come to a panel of people who have your future literally in their hands and say 'These are all the ways that I'm incapable' is a very humbling experience and it is one that's hard to recover from in terms of professional ability.

Taylor was very aware of the risks that came with disclosing, yet they were left without a choice when their mental illness affected their work, and they felt that they needed to explain what was happening. Furthermore, the timing and tone of disclosure were difficult to calibrate:

'I'm sorry that I missed that deadline, cause I had to take the meds that make me calm and level for survival reasons.' Sometimes that happens. And that's a very difficult conversation to explain to somebody without sounding dramatic and showboat-y. It's like, 'Sorry, you know, I didn't actually harm myself last night, and that's why I missed that deadline.' And people are like, 'wow, WOW, okay, alright, alright!' No, I don't mean it like THAT. I'm not trying to make you feel bad, I'm just giving you the very real open reason, because we're working on this honesty thing now.

Taylor felt that their experience of mental illness would not be relatable or understandable to their peers, so coming out as having a mental illness could easily tip over into being seen as melodramatic or whiny. It was hard to tell the story in a way that would not receive any of the wide variety of possible negative responses.

Some of my interviewees receive responses of disbelief when they disclose their disabilities. Emily, who has anxiety, often successfully performs able-mindedness, so that when she discloses her diagnosis, colleagues react with surprise and disbelief. She told me, "People also say, 'Well, you don't seem like you're anxious.' I'm like, 'You do not see the shit going down on the inside.'" Similarly, Lindsay explained that "Especially when you have a disability that is not visible, there are definitely... people who are very willing to be like 'oh that's not real. That doesn't affect you.' ...I've fought with deans throughout my life." Both of these archaeologists find themselves passing successfully enough that when they choose to or need to disclose their disabilities in order to receive accommodations, they are doubted. As Hamilton (1997) writes about her experience with learning disabilities, "We are in a sense forced to pass, and at the same time assumed to be liars—this is the double bind of hidden disabilities like [learning disabilities]."

Some disabled scholars respond to these quandaries by playing up their disabilities. When the disabilities are non-apparent, this can take the form of repeatedly verbally coming out. Amy explained that, "I was diagnosed with both social anxiety but also general anxiety. I actually am pretty open with people about that because this should not be a dirty f***ing secret and I can't tell you the number of people that I've talked to who are like, 'Oh my God, I'm also dealing with that.'" Siebers (2004:4) used the word "masquerade" to describe and theorize the ways that disabled people emphasize their impairments, writing that, "They disguise one kind of

disability with another or display their disability by exaggerating it... I refer to these altered forms of disability passing as the ‘masquerade.’” By engaging in masquerade, Amy disrupts compulsory able-bodiedness and able-mindedness in archaeology, and makes herself visible to non-apparently disabled colleagues, allowing for community-building. When she was open about her diagnoses, colleagues felt comfortable coming out to her about their own, allowing her to build mutually supportive relationships with other archaeologists with mental illnesses.

One important element of managing disclosure and non-disclosure is the amount of effort it entails. Lindsay’s lifelong fights with deans required energy, time, and effort. Learning disabilities might give an archaeologist a slower-than-average processing speed, making their work take longer; they could ask for accommodations like extra time to complete a task, but advocating for that accommodation takes time away from the task itself. Asking for accommodations also opens the risk of being met with ableism, or being discriminated against by mentors or colleagues, but not asking for accommodations makes it difficult to do their best work. These double-binds are difficult to navigate, and strategizing when and how to disclose in order to both protect oneself and succeed requires time and energy that non-disabled archaeologists can use to actually conduct archaeological research.

On top of simply managing one’s own life and work as a disabled academic, many of us feel a desire to simultaneously serve as advocates. Coming out also can contribute to a sense of personal integrity, and allows us to live out anti-ableist political values. Miller et al.’s (2017: 124) study of queer and disabled college and graduate school students showed that “contextual disclosures of identities could become strategic disclosures that participants used to accomplish certain goals,” such as educating classmates, advocating for changes to campus policies, and receiving accommodations. The students in their study carefully monitored the contexts they inhabited and deliberately chose when and how to disclose their queer and/or disabled identities in order to build a more diverse and inclusive university. I see the same phenomenon with Amy disclosing her mental health diagnosis to colleagues in order to build community and fight stigma, and with Lindsay advocating for her and her students’ accommodations. I also see it in my own “coming out” in this article: I am disclosing my disabled identity in print for the first time because it helps me make my points about the ableism of archaeology.

The effort of managing disclosure of disabilities is shaped by the intersections between the archaeologist’s disability and other identities that may be non-apparent and require disclosure. As McRuer’s (2006) use of Rich (1980) makes clear, compulsory able-bodiedness/mindedness is both analogous to and mutually constitutive with compulsory heterosexuality. Amy, Emily, and Taylor are all queer, and Taylor is genderfluid, so they must all manage the complexities of disclosure around multiple different identities at the same time. Miller et al. (2017) show that queer disabled students and academics make many of their decisions around disclosure based on a wide variety of factors, including the relative apparent- or non-apparentness of the identities, the relative importance of the identities to their self-image, the strategic potential of coming out, and the perceived attitudes of others in the space. Sometimes this calculation requires choosing only one identity to disclose at a time: as a queer disabled field intern, I did choose to undertake the difficulty of coming out as

queer but did not come out as disabled. In Taylor's case, their appearance marked them as queer from their first arrival in graduate school, but they passed as nondisabled at the beginning. As they progressed through graduate school, more and more of the other students entering the program were queer, and they felt increasingly comfortable as a queer person in the space. This sense of safety meant that when they had to disclose their mental health disability to their adviser, their queer identity was already taken for granted and accepted: they were able to disclose these two elements of their experience one by one. Similarly, Amy's butch gender presentation means that she was out as queer in professional spaces long before coming out as disabled. By spreading out our disclosures over time, Taylor, Amy, and I were all able to accustom our colleagues to one marginalized identity before disclosing another, which helped us to strategically establish ourselves in the discipline.

Overall, concerns about disclosure were central to my disabled interlocutors' experiences as disabled archaeologists. Like our colleagues across the academy, we must consistently strategize when, how, and to whom to disclose our disabilities in order to avoid stigma and access the accommodations and community support we need to succeed.

Crip Time

My interviewees' stories of strategic disclosure tended to have an element of negotiation of time, which brings me to my third piece of theory: crip time. "Running on crip time" is a common joke about disability-related activist events beginning late, and a variety of disability theorists have taken up queer theories about time and futurity to theorize crip time (e.g., Kafer 2013; Samuels 2017). Depending on the specifics of impairments, disabled people may need more time to sleep, rest, perform activities of daily living, transport ourselves, or simply to think and process than our nondisabled colleagues. Kafer (2013) explains that "Rather than bend disabled bodies and minds to meet the clock, crip time bends the clock to meet disabled bodies and minds."

At first glance, academic work seems like it should be compatible with crip time: our hours of work are not counted or even reported to our superiors. We must be physically present for meetings and classes (unless these take place online) but have significant freedom to arrange our own schedules. Non-academics tend to believe that professors barely work, and take three months off during the summer. This perception of academia as time-flexible and low-stress is exemplified by the job posting website CareerCast (2019) listing "University Professor" as one of the ten least stressful jobs! (CareerCast's listed median salary of \$76,000 clearly indicates that they are ignoring the three-quarters of academics who are non-tenure-track [Flaherty 2018]).

Recent literature on the experiences of faculty show that we are not the lackadaisical, absent-minded professors that the public expects. As higher education becomes increasingly managerialist (Barry et al. 2001) and incorporated into a wired global economy (Menziez and Newson 2007), faculty become more and more overwhelmed by the demands on our time. Berg and Seeber (2016:16-31) summarize a

wide swath of academic self-help literature and find that time management is one of the most common themes, as scholars struggle to make time for the meaningful thinking and teaching that should be at the center of academic life: they and others (e.g., Slow Science Academy 2010) advocate a “slow” approach to academic work, inspired by the slow food movement. Although neither Berg and Seeber’s (2016) book nor the Slow Science Manifesto (Slow Science Academy 2010) explicitly discuss disability, their work shows that changes in the structure of higher education in recent decades has created a culture of rapidity and cutthroat competition that is directly at odds with balanced and healthy life for any faculty, especially those running on *crip time*. The ableism of neoliberal academia’s culture of hyperproductivity is more effectively and directly addressed by Nishida (2016: 152), who writes that,

The neoliberal academy amplifies the difficulties disabled people face in relation to academia; both entering and participating in it successfully. The academies have a set of fundamental prerequisites in order to enter it: being a productive, rational, logical, and autonomous individual (Price 2011). Such prerequisites exclude many disabled people due to the exclusiveness of such prerequisites in general, and due to the inaccessibility of university spaces and other inaccessible social conditions.

With the physical inaccessibility of archaeological fieldwork as well as these other forms of inaccessibility, archaeology is especially hostile to the disabled academic. Nishida advocates for disabled activists to resist neoliberalism by embracing an ethos of *crip time*.

My interviewees experienced this conflict between the timing of their lives and the timing of academia on several different scales. Lindsay, who has learning disabilities, told me that, for her,

Everything just takes longer and I’ve learned to adapt to it. But I also know, you learn what you have to do to get by and what you can get away with not doing. There are, like, just crazy expectations, I think, of people. Like the assumption that if somebody is a high achiever that everybody is going to be able to do the crazy s*** that they do. But not everyone is the same.

Lindsay must strategically choose where to focus her efforts since each task takes longer than it might for a non-disabled colleague. Other disabilities make it hard to work for long periods of time. Taylor described having monthly progress meetings with their supervisor: “It is an ever-evolving situation where it’s like, ‘I see you have had a bad month again.’ And how do you process that and explain that again? Well, it’s the same reason.” Unlike Lindsay, Taylor had periods when they could work on the timeline that their prolific adviser expected, and then periods when they could not, and had trouble explaining this to their adviser. On an even longer timescale, Emily’s physical and mental health caused trouble for her on the tenure track: “I lost 18 months. At the end I was trying to see if I could stop the tenure clock more to give myself a little bit more time to catch up on the book. There was like, ‘well you should have asked for more *then*.’” She was not able to take care of her physical health, her job, and negotiating accommodations at the same time, so once she was

healthier, she tried to change her tenure clock, but found her institution unforgiving of the ways her health shaped her career trajectory and timeline.

Lindsay, Taylor, and Emily all found that their disabilities made the extreme pace of academia even more unreasonable and inhumane than it is for non-disabled colleagues. They had various experiences advocating for their institutions' acceptance of their working on crip time, but for all of them, these negotiations were difficult because compulsory able-bodiedness in the culture of higher education means that institutional policies and individual attitudes alike are based on the presumption that the normal academic is non-disabled. The disabled scholar is working in a system that is not built to work on crip time.

Conclusions

Here, I have explored how compulsory able-bodiedness shapes the discipline of archaeology, and how non-apparently disabled archaeologists pass, disclose, masquerade, and negotiate time, using my own experiences and those of my interviewees. Although my interviews did not focus on disability, Lindsay, Emily, Amy, and Taylor taught me that ableism is pervasive in archaeology and that it is inextricable from the other systems of oppression that affect who participates in archaeological research and how. I have presented their stories, but my analysis has been limited by both small sample size and the lack of diversity represented by these four archaeologists. Three of the four are women, three of the four are queer, three of the four are historical archaeologists, and all four are white and have non-apparent disabilities. They do not adequately represent the diversity of archaeologists with disabilities. I plan to follow this study with a more comprehensive set of interviews with a larger and more diverse sample of disabled archaeologists, to be presented along with my dissertation work in a monograph on diversity and knowledge production in archaeology.

Scholarly exploration of disability has grown over the past several decades as disability studies developed as an interdisciplinary field. Disability-focused sessions at the 2019 Society for Historical Archaeology and Society for American Archaeology Annual Meetings have led to the publication of this special issue. It is important that these theoretical and methodological innovations be accompanied by work to change the material conditions of the discipline. As Hamraie (2016: 261) writes to her fellow philosophers, "Simply developing feminist philosophy with reference to disability is not meaningful or accountable unless feminist philosophers transform the material and cultural arrangements, real-time interactions, and physical spaces in which feminist philosophy takes place." The same is true for archaeology. We must not only examine disabled lives in the past but also transform the material realities of our discipline in the present; therefore, I would like to make some recommendations for how we can all participate in building a more inclusive, less ableist discipline.

First, archaeologists should try to keep in mind that any group of archaeologists is likely to include some colleagues with disabilities, even though compulsory able-bodiedness makes it difficult to remember this. If you are a teacher, supervisor, or

mentor, I invite you to proactively open conversations about accommodations with each of your students or protegees. If you begin the conversation, you may find new ways to support people and help them do their best work. Be open-minded and flexible about accommodations and timelines as much as you can. Part of how I do this is by including this statement on syllabi for the classes I teach and sharing it verbally on the first day of class:

We all learn in different ways. Please feel free to manage your classroom experience in the way that is best for you. You may make audio recordings of lectures or discussions, take pictures of the board, sit or stand wherever you like in the classroom, bring in food or beverages, leave the classroom when necessary, etc. Students who want transcripts for audio/visual material should let me know as soon as possible so that I can make them. If there is something I can do to create a more comfortable learning environment for you, please never hesitate to ask, even if you're not registered with Disability Services.

If you have a disability, you are encouraged to register with the Office of Disability Services ([contact information]) to receive official accommodations for all your courses.

Several students have told me that they felt comfortable disclosing their disabilities to me and asking for accommodations because of this statement. One such student only had hearing in one ear: as the classroom filled up, I would place my coat or bag on a seat at the front corner of the classroom, and remove it when she arrived so she could sit there, and have her hearing ear both close to me and pointed into the classroom and her deaf ear toward the corner. This was an easy accommodation, but as a result of the Americans with Disabilities Act, colleges and universities generally have resources to support disabled students and their professors and colleagues: the staff of these offices may be able to suggest or provide accommodations that would allow a budding archaeologist to succeed.

This proactive approach can allow disabled students and volunteers to flourish even in archaeological field settings. Lindsay told me that her experience as a disabled archaeologist led her to have a conversation with each student she brought to her field school or worked with in the lab about their needs, and was able to meet many of them. O'Mahony (2015: 2) recommends beginning this conversation by putting a question about access needs on any form that students or volunteers must fill out before participating in research, thus building accommodation planning into the general planning process for fieldwork. She recommends a variety of specific possible accommodations for physically disabled excavators, including building earthen steps or ramps down into trenches, having blind participants pass their hands over sediment between passes with a sharpened trowel, and attaching tools to limbs with tape for researchers with loss of limbs or disabilities affecting their motor control or grip. She also points out that having a designated quiet space for people to rest during fieldwork and encouraging people to use that space when they need to is helpful for all participants, but especially those with fatigue or chronic pain. By being proactive, thoughtful, creative, and generous, archaeologists can build research projects where a wide variety of people are welcome, comfortable, and able to succeed.

If you are disabled, remember that it is not inherently problematic to pass and it is not inherently liberatory to come out. The processes of passing, disclosure, and negotiation of accommodations are extremely complex. Please do what you need to do to succeed in this ableist field. You are not alone.

Acknowledgments Thank you to Amy, Emily, Lindsay, Taylor, and 68 other interviewees for sharing your stories with me. Thanks also to the organizers Stacey Camp and Sarah Surface-Evans and discussant Laurie Wilkie of the 2019 Society for American Archaeology symposium; to my fellow panelists; and to Stacey, Sarah, and Jodi Barnes for organizing this special issue; and to Stacey, Kimberly Wooten, Maria Smith, and an anonymous reviewer for providing insightful feedback on my paper. Finally, thank you to my partner, Allegra Heath-Stout, who has educated me about disability studies and disability justice, and supported me in my personal and scholarly disability journeys.

Declarations

A small research grant from the Chad DiGregorio Memorial Fund of the Boston University Archaeology Program supported transcription of interviews, and the interview study was approved by the Boston University Institutional Review Board (#4381X). The work was also partially supported by a Hunt Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Wenner-Gren Foundation. The author has no financial or proprietary interests in any material discussed in this article.

References

- Atalay, S. (2006). Indigenous archaeology as decolonizing practice. *American Indian Quarterly* **30**(3–4): 280–310.
- Bardolph, D. N. (2014). A critical evaluation of recent gendered publishing trends in American archaeology. *American Antiquity* **79**(3): 522–540.
- Barry, J., Chandler, J., and Clark, H. (2001). Between the ivory tower and the academic assembly line. *Journal of Management Studies* **38**(1):87–101.
- Berg, M. and Seeber, B. K. (2016). *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Blackmore, C. (2011). How to queer the past without sex: queer theory, feminisms and the archaeology of identity. *Archaeologies* **7**(1): 75–96.
- Blackmore, C., Drane, L., Baldwin, R., and Ellis, D. (2016). Queering fieldwork: difference and identity in archaeological practice. *SAA Archaeological Record* **16**(1): 18–23.
- CareerCast. (2019). Least stressful jobs. *CareerCast.com*. <<https://www.careercast.com/jobs-rated/least-stressful-2019>>, accessed November 2019.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., and McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs* **38**(4): 785–810.
- Choo, H. Y. and Ferree, M. M. (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.
- Collins, P. H. and Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Polity, Cambridge.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C., Ferguson, T. J., Lippert, D., McGuire, R. H., Nicholas, G. P., Watkins, J., and Zimmerman, L. J. (2010). The premise and promise of Indigenous archaeology. *American Antiquity* **75**(2): 228–238.
- Dowson, T. A. (2000). Why queer archaeology? an introduction. *World Archaeology* **32**(2): 161–165.
- Flaherty, C. (2018). About three-quarters of all faculty positions are off the tenure track, according to a new AAUP analysis. *Inside Higher Ed*. October 12. <<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/10/12/about-three-quarters-all-faculty-positions-are-tenure-track-according-new-aaup>>, accessed March 2021.
- Fraser, M. (2007). *Dis/Abling Exclusion, En/Abling Access: Identifying and Removing Barriers in Archaeological Practice for Persons with (Dis/)Abilities*. Doctoral dissertation, American University, Washington, DC.

- Fulkerson, T. J. and Tushingam, 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.
- Gero, J. M. (1985). Socio-politics and the woman-at-home ideology. *American Antiquity* **50**(2): 342–350.
- Gonzalez-Tennant, E. (2018). Anarchism, decolonization, and collaborative archaeology. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* **5**(2): 238–244.
- Hamilton, A. (1997). Oh, the joys of invisibility! *Electric Edge*. <<http://www.raggededgemagazine.com/archive/look.htm>>, accessed April 2019.
- Hamraie, A. (2016). Beyond accommodation: disability, feminist philosophy, and the design of everyday academic life. *philoSOPHIA* **6**(2): 259–271.
- Heath-Stout, L. E. (2019). *Diversity, Identity, and Oppression in the Production of Archaeological Knowledge*. Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, Boston, MA.
- Heath-Stout, L. E. (2020). Who writes about archaeology? an intersectional study of authorship in archaeological journals. *American Antiquity* **85**(3): 407–426.
- Hutson, S. R. (2002). Gendered citation practices in *American Antiquity* and other archaeology journals. *American Antiquity* **67**(2): 331–342.
- Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist Queer Crip*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Kerschbaum, S. L., Eisenman, L. T., and Jones, J. M. (eds.) (2017). *Negotiating Disability: Disclosure and Higher Education*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Leighton, M. (2020). Myths of meritocracy, friendship, and fun work: class and gender in North American academic communities. *American Anthropologist* **122**(3): 444–458.
- Lingsom, S. (2008). Invisible impairments: dilemmas of concealment and disclosure. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* **10**(1): 2–16.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* **30**(2): 1771–1800.
- McRuer, R. (2006). Introduction: compulsory able-bodiedness and queer/disabled existence. In McRuer, R. (ed.), *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability*. New York University Press, New York, pp. 1–32.
- Menzies, H. and Newson, J. (2007). No time to think: academics' life in the globally wired university. *Time & Society* **16**(1):83–98.
- Miller, R. A., Wynn, R. D., and Webb, K. W. (2017). Complicating “coming Out”: disclosing disability, gender, and sexuality in higher education. In Kerschbaum, S. L., Eisenman, L. T., and Jones, J. M. (eds.), *Negotiating Disability: Disclosure and Higher Education*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 115–134.
- Moser, S. (2007). On disciplinary culture: archaeology as fieldwork and its gendered associations. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* **14**(3): 235–263.
- Nelson, M. C., Nelson, S. M., and Wylie, A. (eds.) (1994). *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*. American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.
- Nishida, A. (2016). Neoliberal academia and a critique from disability studies. In Block, P., Kasnitz, D., Nishida, A., and Pollard, N. (eds.), *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*. Springer, New York, pp. 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3>.
- O'Mahony, T. (2015). *Enabled Archaeology*. British Archaeological Jobs and Resources, Dunbar, UK.
- Price, M. (2011). *Mad at School: Rhetorics of Mental Disability and Academic Life*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Price, M., Salzer, M. S., O'Shea, A., and Kerschbaum, S. L. (2017). Disclosure of mental disability by college and university faculty: the negotiation of accommodations, supports, and barriers. *Disability Studies Quarterly* **37**(2). <<https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/5487>>, accessed March 2021.
- Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs* **5**(4): 631–660.
- Samuels, E. (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.
- Samuels, E. (2017). Six ways of looking at crip time. *Disability Studies Quarterly* **37**(3). <<https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/5824/4684>>, accessed March 2021.
- Siebers, T. (2004). Disability as masquerade. *Literature and Medicine* **23**(1): 1–22.
- Smith, C. and Wobst, H. M. (2005). *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London.
- Smith, L. (n.d.). Ableism. *Center for Disability Rights*. <<http://cdmrys.org/blog/uncategorized/ableism/>>, accessed November 2019.

- The Slow Science Academy. (2010). The slow science manifesto. *Slow Science*. <<http://slow-science.org/>>, accessed November 2019.
- Voss, B. L. (2000). Feminisms, queer theories, and the archaeological study of past sexualities. *World Archaeology* **32**(2): 180–192.
- Watkins, J. (2005). Through wary eyes: Indigenous perspectives on archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* **34**: 429–449.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.