QUEERING CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: DEFYING NORMS IN CRM ARCHAEOLOGY

MADISON BADGER
Bachelor of Arts, MacEwan University, 2022

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

ANTHROPOLOGY

Department of Anthropology
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

QUEERING CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: DEFYING NORMS IN CRM ARCHAEOLOGY

MADISON BADGER

Date of Defence: March 07, 2025

Dr. P. Wilson	Associate Professor	Ph.D.
Thesis Supervisor		
Dr. S. Lenon	Professor	Ph.D.
Thesis Examination Committee Member		
Dr. K. Biittner	Associate Professor	Ph.D.
Thesis Examination Committee Member		
Dr. J. Asselin	Associate Professor	Ph.D.
Chair, Thesis Examination Committee		

DEDICATION

For the weird little girl with the expansive rock collection who was never afraid to ask ‘why.’ She still lives inside me, and I hope she would be proud.

ABSTRACT

Through ethnographic inquiry within the context of an Alberta-based Cultural Resource Management (CRM) firm, this thesis applies a queer perspective to CRM archaeology in the process of knowledge production and translation. Though archaeology is often thought of as being rather objective, results and analysis from this project suggest otherwise. Qualitative methods (participant observation, semi-structured interviews, thematic analysis, and discourse analysis) were used to explore and analyze how CRM employees' ideologies regarding their role in the research process influence the production and translation of knowledge. Further, the ultimate goal of this research is to provide an example of and an argument for queering archaeology. Specifically, the analysis includes a discussion on the impact of queer as a verb on current archaeological methods, theories, and ideologies in CRM. I conclude that to queer (v.) is necessary to avoid narrowing perspectives of the past, and to move towards a more widely representative and inclusive future of CRM.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Work described in this thesis received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name “QUEERING CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: DEFYING NORMS IN CRM ARCHAEOLOGY”, No. Pro00133980, August 23, 2023.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To everyone I worked with and got to know over the course of this project, especially the participants who became coworkers, teachers, and friends. You have all taught me so much about what it means to be responsible for representing the past. I will always look back on our time together in the field fondly, including every torn pair of gloves, breaks in the work trucks to avoid heat exhaustion, and rainy days that left us chilled to the bone. Those were some of the most physically taxing months of my life, and I would not change any of it for the world.

To all of the trailblazers who have come before me to make it even possible for me to do the work I do. Those who go against the norms have been and unfortunately continue to be systematically silenced. It is from an immense place of privilege that I was able to even do this project. I want to express my gratitude to Indigenous, Black, queer, and trans folks whose hard work have made it possible for me to conduct research in a system that has tried to keep us out for so long. Thank you also to the multitude of women, whether they were grad students, wives, or otherwise, whose work in anthropology and archaeology has been used as kindling to feed the flames of a man's career. Though you may be forgotten and underappreciated by some, you will always matter to me.

To Dr. Suzanne Lenon, whose outlook on academia, research, and queerness grabbed me by the shoulders and flipped my world upside down. I am a better researcher, student, and person because of you. Thank you for your guidance and for being the best example of what it looks like to open up our worldviews to the widest possibilities.

To Dr. Katie Biittner, who was the first one to show me what it means to be an anthropologist. Sitting in your lectures during my undergraduate degree was the first time

I felt represented and seen in academia, and you constantly inspire me to push forward against adversity. I am forever moved by your ability to show up in every space with the goal of being "aggressively human," which is something I will take with me in the future.

To Dr. Patrick Wilson, who took a chance on me and said "yes" to my ideas, neither of us knowing how things would go. You have always shown up with grace, understanding, and curiosity. Each time we were thrown a curve ball, you helped me get back on track, which is no easy feat. Thank you for always taking the time to read my ideas, even when they were barely formed, for pointing me in new directions when I was feeling stuck, and for listening to and encouraging me even when I felt unsure.

To my step mother, Michelle, who suggested that I take my first anthropology course when I was 18. I feel very lucky that you have always been a vocal supporter of the fact that I am getting not one, but *two* arts degrees. Thank you for the guidance you have always given me, but especially in the post secondary world. Thank you also for setting an example of what balance can look like between being career-driven and making time for family and adventure (and for making sure I know I am always welcome on these adventures).

To my dad, Jack, who is the reason that I can even joke about the fact that I am getting a second arts degree. Your support in every possible way means the world to me, and I would not be able to pursue my passion if it was not for you. Beyond supporting my formal education, thank you for all of the late-night spelling bees to help me fall asleep as a child; I am positive those nights are the reason why I have a vast vocabulary and the love of a big, fancy word. Thank you for being exactly who you are, because it makes me braver in the act of being exactly who I am.

To my step father, Jason, for instilling in me the desire to want to know more. I can confidently say that my need to beat you at Jeopardy from the time I was about 10 years old has significantly contributed to my interest in learning about all aspects of human existence. Thank you for making sure my car got me to and from school safely (even through harsh Alberta winters) all throughout my high school and post secondary careers. Without a way to get there, I surely would not have been able to learn enough to become smarter than you (although you still have me beat in some of the history categories… I will NOT take Historical Hodgepodge for 800, Alex).

To my mom, Robyn, who is my best friend and confidant. You have always made me believe that anything is possible, and that I am capable of anything. You have given me my confidence, my outspoken nature, and my caffeine dependency. I can always count on a FaceTime from you to make me feel better, even when you have no idea what I am talking about. You have always encouraged me to take up space as if I belong there, because I do, and for that I am a better scholar and person. I am who I am because of you.

To Carley, who has been my absolute rock through this entire journey. Thank you for your guidance, even when I did not realize that I needed it. Especially then. I am constantly inspired by your hard work and dedication, and the way you rise up to every challenge set in front of you. Beyond this, you consistently push me to be the very best version of myself, because you always see that version of me no matter what. I mean it with all of my heart when I say that I would not have gotten here without you.

Lastly, to myself. If you would have told fifteen-year-old Madi that she would be where she is, she would be awestruck. If you would have told five-year-old Madi, however, she would not bat an eye, because she always knew what she was capable of.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CRM	Cultural Resource Management
DBH	Diameter Breast Height
EU	Excavation Unit
LGBTQ+	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, etc.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

> The point at hand, however, is that although archaeologists have not participated in the discourse about gender, they have not remained silent on the subject of gender.
>
> —Margaret W. Conkey & Janet D. Spector, *Archaeology and the Study of Gender*

5:00am is not an hour of the day that I typically would spend with my eyes open. Yet here I am, sitting down for a quick breakfast before my coworkers, who are also my roommates at the moment, get into the work truck to head to our 6:00am tailgate meeting. It's my third shift with the same people, and with the intimate nature of working in remote locations with the same cohort, I have come to know these folks quite well. I know what they pack for lunch every day, I know which tools they had set aside for themselves while packing up the site the day before, and I know for certain that we are all here because we want to do a job well done.

After a morning drive that takes between ten minutes to almost an hour, we arrive at the tailgate meeting where we begin signing safety paperwork and chatting amongst ourselves, coffee cups in hand. Even those who did not have a taste for coffee before this job have now developed a dependency on it; partially for the boost to get through the ten-hour work day, and partially for the warmth it brings because the sun has not peeked over the mountains yet. Conversations start flowing, covering anything from what artifacts we had found the previous day, to predicted weather conditions for the rest of the shift. Once everyone has signed all of the paperwork, we stand in a circle facing each other to hear our morning speech about how to keep ourselves and others safe during the day. As I look around, I see many different faces, some familiar, the rest belonging to employees of other subcontracted companies on the project. What strikes me is how similar we all look:

same dusty work boots, same dirt covered cargo pants, same hard hat covered in stickers from various work sites or trips to the dollar store. What does this say about us? How have so many individuals become homogenous in this way?

Once we have been given our instructions, we head off to do our assigned tasks, which for most of us is to rake through piles of dirt delivered to us by skid steers, looking for artifacts. Most of what we find in these piles are flakes or other forms of debitage, which are essentially byproducts of creating an object like a tool. You are lucky if you find anything interesting, but you are celebrated across the whole yard if you find a projectile point. This milestone was something I got to celebrate during my time in the field. Sometimes this work is easy on the body, as you can rake through sediment that feels like sand, and other days are physically taxing, caused by having to drag your rake through dense, heavy mud. If these physical conditions do not seem strenuous enough, then I urge you to consider the heatstroke archaeologists are faced with during the humid days with no shade. Or, on the other end of the spectrum, even your fleece-lined gloves are not enough to keep your fingers from going numb in the cold. I heard many people question why they chose this profession on days like that. Luckily, while you rake through these dirt piles looking for artifacts, you are surrounded by other archaeologists to bounce ideas off of. As someone who had no experience doing archaeological fieldwork at this point, I felt very fortunate that people around me were so eager to help. I learned a lot from my coworkers, and not just about the artifacts.

Some days, you would get called up to the big leagues: getting to dig for artifacts in an excavation unit (EU). On my third shift I was lucky enough to experience this, and off we went to the site. Upon arrival, I could tell that this location was very important, as only the most experienced individuals were working on these EUs. Here I got my first

taste of excavation experience, which also became the first time I excavated human remains. This experience was unlike any other, both in positive and negative ways. I continued to learn a lot from my coworkers in this context, as everything was once again new to me as it had been on my very first shift. People were kind enough to slow down and explain, covering methods of excavation, to the symbolic significance, to certain materials local to the area. Although we moved on from these EUs after only a few days, this experience impacted me immensely, especially through the knowledge I gained from the people around me.

Once we have packed up for the day, we gather around in our circle once again as a group. We are thanked for our hard work, told the time to meet for the morning tailgate the next day, and sent on our way. As we take off our dirt-caked work boots, our conversations turn away from the artifacts and more towards if anyone has the energy to make dinner. Most often, the answer is no. Someone offers to drive home, and we set out for our accommodation, ready to shower away the grime of the day and be in bed by 8:30pm. Wash, rinse, repeat, for fourteen days. Seems pretty standard, right? Well, I would argue it is just the opposite, once you begin to pull back the curtain—the Wizard of Oz turned out to be just a regular man, after all.

After completing my last fieldwork shift in October, which had left me exhausted but appreciative of the experience, I had to adjust back to the realities of my life as a graduate student. This meant more time sitting at a computer screen, and less time asking a group of people, “do you think this could be an artifact?” Since I was on shift more than not, I thought it would be enlightening to work in the company’s laboratory space to see how the other side of this job worked. From my days in the laboratory, I came to understand

that it can be a very solitary position, unlike the field experience where you are with the same people 24/7.

What I just described was my life during the summer of 2023; two weeks on, one week off, from the blistering heat and humidity in June, all the way to the rain that leaves you permanently cold in October. Though I only experienced this reality for a few months, my coworkers (who have become friends, teachers, and participants) had been working for this company for much longer; some for many years. Each individual I had the pleasure of working alongside for the duration of this research brings something special to the table, because they have all gone through unique experiences that led them to work in Cultural Resource Management (CRM). These employees come from different backgrounds, including race, education, age, abilities, and, most relevant to the topic of my research, gender. I recognize the sample included in this project is only a small representation of the diverse identities represented in CRM. However, I believe it is important to represent their voices in this arena and hope to inspire larger conversations of gender in Canadian CRM archaeology, which I explore here.

1.1 OVERVIEW

Archaeological fieldwork can be an exclusionary space for professionals who are not white, cisgender, heterosexual men (Blackmore et al., 2016), and archaeologists who frame their work using critical theoretical perspectives (e.g., feminist and queer theories) have long argued for the need to diversify the profession. This argument emerged from demands of equity and inclusion, as well as recognition of links between gendered perspectives and research outcomes (Conkey & Spector, 1984; Heath-Stout, 2020; Moser, 2007). CRM, one of the largest professional arenas for archaeologists working outside of academia, has been largely undervalued regarding its role in the production of

archaeological knowledge. However, CRM firms contribute consistently and reliably to data collection and knowledge dissemination in this discipline (Heath-Stout, 2020). Further, CRM firms employ a large percentage of professionally trained archaeologists (Altschul & Patterson, 2010), making it a suitable context to explore the various influences on knowledge production in the archaeological profession.

For this research, I ethnographically examined a Canadian CRM firm in Southern Alberta, which I will refer to using the pseudonym 'Alberta Archaeology Inc.' to maintain confidentiality (each employee/participant mentioned throughout will also be referred to by a pseudonym). The original goal of this research was to understand and examine the intersection of CRM employees' gendered ideologies and the production of archaeological knowledge, especially through knowledge translation by gendered individuals throughout the process of archaeological inquiry. However, after data collection at various stages, I eventually pivoted my goal(s) to understanding and applying a queer perspective to CRM archaeology to examine and acknowledge its institutional biases. Specifically, both qualitative methods including participant observation, interviews, thematic analysis, and discourse analysis were used to analyze how CRM employees' ideologies regarding subjective influence on the production and translation of archaeological knowledge. This was operationalized through two inter-related research objectives explored below.

1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

A) <u>CRM daily practices in relation to false objectivity</u>: Anthropology and archaeology have been critiqued by various scholars for reinforcing Western norms and ideologies, particularly overemphasizing the need to be classed as strictly objective (Cobb & Croucher, 2016; Latour & Woolgar, 1986; Todd, 2016).

The privileging of certain ideologies over others may contribute to institutionalizing said ideologies in the workplace, thereby potentially normalizing being uncritical of certain practices as long as they give the Western appearance of objectivity (Blackmore et al., 2016; Todd, 2016). I examined this topic within an Alberta-based CRM firm through an exploration of daily workplace rituals and practices, including formal and informal settings (e.g., laboratory, field sites; break times, relevant social times). Particular attention was paid to the collaborative aspects of fieldwork, specifically in relation to the role of garnering multiple (subjective) perspectives when analyzing artifacts at the field level.

B) Queering production of knowledge in CRM: Queer and feminist theorists argue that dominant norms (heteronormativity, androcentrism, Eurocentrism, etc.) continue to be detrimental to the production of anthropological and archaeological knowledge (explained more below). Both frameworks posit that current disciplinary environments reproduce narrow theoretical perspectives for interpreting the archaeological record (Harding, 1998; Voss, 2000). This research examines how we can queer (v.) archaeology in spaces that continue to actively narrow our understanding of the past through heteronormative, masculinist, Eurocentric research, and the influence this has had and continues to have on the archaeological production and translation of knowledge (particularly in literature).

1.3 ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

CRM is industry- and development-driven archaeological research, often sanctioned by (settler colonial) governmental laws (Black & Jolly, 2003). A majority of this type of archaeology is done relating to bureaucratic issues, such as construction on previously "undeveloped" land. Although some view CRM work as less valuable than academic

archaeology (Black & Jolly, 2003), this group of archaeologists produces a profound amount of indispensable knowledge (Heath-Stout, 2020). As this sector employs such a large portion of archaeologists and has a unique cultural dynamic that has previously gone under-studied (Altschul & Patterson, 2010), this research contributes to an ongoing area of inquiry regarding gender and knowledge production/translation in archaeology. Notably, the company owner (Daphne) identifies as a woman, and during her interview we discussed what this identity means to her personally. As archaeology tends to be a male-dominated field (Blackmore et al., 2016), partnering with a company who does not fit this expectation offered a unique perspective. Additionally, more employees at Alberta Archaeology Inc. identify as women than men, further defying statistical probabilities.

I worked with and alongside Alberta Archaeology Inc. conducting participant observation over the course of the 2023 field season, specifically from June – October, with all aspects of data collection (including participant interviews) finished by January of 2024. Further, I conducted discourse analysis on historical impact assessments produced by the firm, as well as discourse analysis on subsequent documents cited in the primary sources, which I completed in October of 2024. Though Alberta Archaeology Inc. is a Southern Alberta-based company, the participant observation portion of data collection took place in Central British Columbia. The interviews were mostly online (via Zoom); each participant was in Alberta at the time of the interviews, including one in-person interview that took place on the University of Lethbridge campus (in my office at the time). Further, much of the literature I conducted discourse analysis on centres Alberta and plains-focused work. I want to acknowledge that both of these Western Canadian provinces have some similarities, yet these environments each provided me with unique context for conducting this research. Archaeology can differ greatly from place to place;

for example, one participant (Roberta) mentioned to me both in our interview and in the field that although she feels rather comfortable with her knowledge of materials and tools local to Alberta, she had to learn quite a lot before becoming comfortable with her knowledge of the materials commonly found in the area(s) that we worked in (e.g., central British Columbia). I am thankful to have gained the experience and knowledge from conducting research in both of these provincial contexts, as it has given me a wider breadth of understanding.

1.4 QUEER AS A VERB

I have had the exceptional pleasure to immerse myself in a world where queer is something to celebrate and be proud of. Yes, queer can mean sexual orientation and identity, but it can and does mean so much more than that. Queer (v.), as I understand it, means the act of defiance against what has been prescribed to us. It means swimming against a river current that is pushing you in the opposite direction, because you want to explore and understand what is upstream. This is how I view my research: swimming back upstream to the mouth of the river to see where all of the water is coming from, and how it transforms and is transformed as it moves along its pathway(s).

As I situate myself within the realms of research and queer theory, many scholars informed my work; they discuss methods and methodology (e.g., Fields, 2016), marginalization and intersectionality (e.g., Byrd, 2021; Pratt, 1984), and the action of queering in academia (e.g., Amin, 2016; Love, 2011). In scholarly inquiry specifically, Amin (2016) and Fields (2016) both argue that ‘queer’ can also be associated with the feelings we have towards our research. Further, Amin (2016) explains it as a concept “capable of intervening in a social and political field,” (p. 175), and argues that the process of queering is continual because nothing ever seems queer enough. Following this

thread, it seems to me that queer and queering are consistently applicable to the pursuit of progressive academia and research practices, especially as our work continues to influence and be influenced by socio-political contexts (Latour & Woolgar, 1986).

As queering archaeology informed all aspects of my work, including the methods I used for data collection, I want to highlight the influence Fields (2016) had on me. This scholar took a reflexive approach while utilizing queer methodologies, where she acknowledges the position of power she holds in the Participatory Action Research (PAR) she conducted with incarcerated women in the United States. Fields (2016) used PAR as a framework centered on agency and participation of all those involved in the research process (i.e., researchers as participants, participants as researchers). One key idea I took with me into my research is Field's (2016) drive to make research (and subsequently, academia) more accessible through her work. This notion especially informed my decision to make the interview stage of data collection semi-structured as opposed to fully structured, as this seems to give participants more agency to discuss what they want to talk about in research that is for and about them. To queer can and does mean choosing methods and methodologies that at minimum do not build up the already present barriers in research.

Though the literature I have cited here is not conclusive or even all-encompassing, each informed my work, provided a guiding light for my research, and exemplified how the process of queering is essential to more ethical and accessible research. To queer is to decentre whiteness, heteronormativity, androcentrism, and other (potentially harmful) dominant ideological systems. What I find rather beautiful is that the term 'queer' is not any single thing. To queer means to look at things in entirely new ways, whatever that may mean in any given context. Of course, I cannot take credit for this concept, or even

my own definition and understanding of it. I am constantly informed by those who came before me, those who I work alongside, and I look forward to finding myself in awe of those who will inevitably come after me. Queer is joy, and queer is pain. To queer is important, and I will take this concept with me every day moving forward; not as something I keep in my pocket for when it suits me, but rather as the glasses I see through every day that alter my vision for the better. Science, anthropology, and archaeology would greatly benefit from more people using queer as a verb.

1.5 SUBJECTIVITY IN SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE

Although some may argue that science is objective and irrefutable, including participants in this study, many scholars have explored how subjectivity exists within science and emphasize the importance of acknowledging it. Rolin (2011) explains that objectivity has a certain amount of assumption involved that can only be accounted for when situated within the social realm. In other terms, what is considered true or factual did not appear from thin air, rather a conclusion is decided upon from a laborious process of decision making based on the cultural context in which this truth was created. Specifically relating to science, Latour and Woolgar (1986) explain that to understand science, we need to understand how it is produced within culture(s). This struck me as profound, specifically the exploration of science as being produced; this concept posits that there is no strict fact that can be explored by science that exists in a reality untouched by culture, but that culture informs science. Though they may not have intended it, Latour, Woolgar, and many others who associate themselves within this realm of thinking are queering our conceptualization of science. When we begin to see science as less of an untouchable, irrefutable truth, and more of a produced understanding, we are actively challenging dominant norms and ideologies that put objectivity on a pedestal.

Other voices support the idea that culture and science are intertwined, such as Martin's (1998) description of science as a citadel, making scientific inquiry a concept that is hidden behind a wall and kept separate but is still a part of society. This metaphor shows how science may be accessible to some, even mystified, yet it still exists within a greater context—it cannot be considered as a separate and completely objective entity. An example of the effect culture has on science that this author highlights is the narrative regarding the egg and the sperm in the process of human reproduction; specifically, that sperm were often discussed using masculine and active vocabulary, while the egg was often referred to with feminine and passive terminology (Martin, 1991). The gendered language used to describe the egg and the sperm informed a large number of individuals within and outside of the scientific community, yet upon further investigation, these gendered ideas were not evidence-based (Martin, 1991). Thus, we can see how culture-specific gender ideologies informed science, which subsequently influenced scientists to believe these ideas to be true without the backing of empirical evidence. When Martin (1998) asks, "how can I think about science outside of itself," (p. 25) she pushes us to recognize that there is no way to examine scientific inquiry without acknowledging the cultural context it is situated in. From this stance, she is looking at the ways cultural biases affect scientific research and the production of knowledge. Moreover, Martin (1998) wonders how knowledge and science might be conceptualized differently if our values of these ideas were not so rooted in Eurocentric ideas. As Todd (2016) argues, science is a very Western sphere of knowledge creators that do not always accept or uplift views outside of those already accepted by the community. Therefore, I argue it is ignorant to claim that science is objective or free from cultural bias, and instead we should be interrogating the role of bias in production of knowledge. In other words, this

can be defined as queering our understanding of the relationship between science and culture, a concept long argued and uplifted by feminists as well.

Further, Eurocentricity is evident throughout the scientific community beyond historical events, rather it is science's racist history that continues to inform our work. Notably, Latour and Woolgar (1986) explain that facts are networked, meaning that institutions give merit; this relates to CRM and the lessened value their knowledge attains, as the institution (i.e., CRM) holds less merit than an academic institution. This differential value placed on the knowledge being produced based on the institution it comes from is subjective, thereby shaping the bodies of knowledge production deemed legitimate and illegitimate. Further, Latour and Woolgar (1986) argue that in constructing and producing knowledge, once knowledge is deemed as fact, the social factors seem to disappear. More simply, once the knowledge is constructed, the process of getting to that point is disregarded. Harding (2011) supports this idea, stating that "culture is conventionally conceptualized as an obstacle over which scientific method, its standards and production of facts must triumph," (p. 88). This is another way that scientists falsely push the narrative of objectivity in science—as Latour and Woolgar (1986) explain, there is a lot of purposeful forgetfulness in the scientific process. Even though it may not be as obvious, omission of the process and context(s) of arriving at scientific conclusions is a means of subjectivity in science, which I explore more in-depth in Chapter 3.

Another perspective from critical scholars such as Todd (2016) is that if we are to accept the arguments of privileged scholars like Latour, we must analyze why we do not allow Indigenous and other underappreciated scholars to produce knowledge with their own self-determination. In this sense, science cannot be objective; when we allow colonialism and racism to influence knowledge production, it is false to claim objectivity

in the scientific tradition. However, Todd (2016) also supports Latour and Woolgar's (1986) point that the different arenas where scientific knowledge is produced allocates different values to said knowledge. In other terms, Indigenous knowledge is not as valued as other knowledge produced within the Western scientific tradition. Though Todd (2016) was specifically talking about Indigeneity, postcolonial efforts have begun to address a variety of issues in the scientific community that lead to uneven privileging and inequality. Indigenizing and queering, though unique in the contributions scholars of each area have made, can and should work in tandem (Byrd, 2021), and I feel work best when doing so. Therefore, informing my own work with scholars such as Byrd (2021) and Todd (2016) helps me in my objective to queer archaeology, as we share a common goal to disrupt and resist norms in archaeology.

One of the issues those who concern themselves with queering hope to address is the role of gender and gendered ideologies in science, specifically how gender affects the ways in which science is constructed. Harding (1998) explains that science and societies are in a constant process of co-construction; like Latour and Woolgar's argument highlighted above, Harding (1998) believes that science is not its own separate entity untouched by culture. Notably, in her argument, culture does not exist separate from science, either. She explains that "systematic knowledge-seeking is always just one element in any culture, society, or social formation in its local environment, shifting and transforming other elements," including aspects such as gender relations (Harding, 1998, p. 4). I interpret this to mean that science does not exist in a vacuum; it is affected by and affects culture, which some scientists may forget in their false reliance on objectivity. An idea I found myself turning to frequently throughout this project is Conkey and Spector's (1984) notion that being silent on the conversation of gender does not equate to a lack of

participation in that discourse. In other terms, refusing to discuss gender reveals more about one's ideologies and values than they might realize. When scientists do not discuss social influences such as gender, it may expose a myriad of things about that individual; in particular, I would assume it reveals a lack of negative influence on their work/career coming from their gender (or other aspects of identity and social factors). Further, Rolin (2011) argues that the underrepresentation of certain genders not only poses threats to equality and inclusion, but this underrepresentation "is an epistemic problem insofar as it impedes criticism from diverse perspectives," (p. 27). This lack of diverse perspectives leads to a sense of homogeneity in what knowledge comes to be commonly accepted, leaving out certain ideas in the narrative of what is considered true or factual. To queer archaeology and to fight against the narrowing of our understanding of the past, we must privilege and uplift these diverse voices that are often silenced. Though this may not be sufficient, I argue it is an important place to start.

Additionally, Harding (1998) eloquently explains that it would be a tragedy if science was pared down to a universal tradition, which has been brought to light by postcolonial studies. The idea of one single scientific tradition is based heavily in Eurocentrism, which is often associated with an unfulfilling grasp on various subjects of study that the scientific community may not recognize. Harding (1998) argues that the privileging of Eurocentric science is not due to any inherent benefit to science at large, rather it is valued due to how it often silences cultural factors in the process of knowledge production (i.e., creating a false narrative of science as being untouched by culture). Although published almost 20 years prior to Todd's (2016) work highlighted previously, themes of Eurocentricity seemingly continue in science as Harding (1998) and Todd (2016) discuss some of the same issues regarding privilege in scientific inquiry. This

shows me that there is still much work to be done in the future regarding these issues, which I believe begins with addressing matters within the objectivity/subjectivity discourse within scientific production of knowledge. I will note that throughout this thesis, I refer to objectivity and subjectivity in connection to each other, but I conceptualize these concepts as being on somewhat of a spectrum as opposed to a strict binary. Perhaps that is just another way I am acting to queer this research. I believe this can be a meaningful starting point because if we address the subjectivity masquerading as objectivity in widely accepted Western science, then perhaps this will lead the scientific community to become more accepting of diverse perspectives, including those from gendered lenses.

1.6 ARCHAEOLOGIES OF GENDER

Conkey and Spector (1984) are often credited with leading the call for archaeologies of gender through their critique of how the discipline had historically ignored conversations of gender. Although there have been several critiques of gender in the discipline since then (e.g., Rutecki & Blackmore, 2016; Voss, 2000), theirs was the first to bring gender into mainstream archaeological discourse. Their work was one of the first to condemn the strict gender roles and ideologies present in archaeology at the time, stating that archaeology "has been neither objective nor inclusive on the subject of gender," (Conkey & Spector, 1984, p. 1). This emphasis on lack of reflexivity shows that it was common at the time to make assumptions about gender according to the archaeologist's ideas of how gender functions in society, which directly defies the anthropological concept of reflexivity. Following this conversation, the crisis of representation became a widely debated concept in anthropology, which was centrally an epistemological challenge to the pursuit of objective knowledge within archaeology and anthropology

more broadly (e.g., Behar, 1996; Clifford, 1986). Specifically discussing the exclusion of women within this crisis, Behar (1996) explains that "[a]ll eyes are indeed on us. But we are not afraid to look back – and to offer a vision of a different anthropology that places women's writing center stage," (p. 2). This idea points to how including voices in writing other than that of the privileged perspectives of men is essential, yet only one of many actions that can help broaden the scope of anthropological production of knowledge. As mentioned previously, a truly objective science and/or archaeological record is not entirely possible, and the crisis of representation notably addresses this idea by arguing to include more perspectives that are not falsely claiming to be completely objective. Not only does this tend to include more voices of women (Behar, 1996), but more voices advocating for feminist and queer theory within the discipline as well. Though the primary focus of this sector of archaeology is gendered discussions, these scholars and their contributions to the archaeological record are an excellent example of what it can look like to queer archaeology.

In their original critique, Conkey and Spector (1984) argued that archaeologists were applying their own Western assumptions of gender to the past and left no room for variability in gender ideologies. The authors also attribute the normativity of these assumptions to the absence of any empirical framework when studying gender in this discipline, which is the underlying issue of their three main critiques. First, they argue that gender-specific models which were not inclusive of all genders appeared too frequently in archaeological literature. Next, they emphasized the dominant assumption that division of labour must be based on sex, which results in archaeologists sex-linking activities and artifacts. Lastly, the authors criticize the different values placed on male- and female-linked activities and artifacts, stating that there is too much focus on male-

linked evidence (Conkey & Spector, 1984). Although viewing gender as a social relationship is not inherently problematic, which I will explore further on, the authors' purpose was to highlight the gender bias in archaeological research which had led to rigidity in archaeological interpretations favouring dominant, heteronormative, Western gender ideologies. Further, Conkey and Spector (1984) state that "although archaeologists have not participated in the discourse about gender, they have not remained silent on the subject of gender," (p. 5). In other terms, the absence of a gendered acknowledgement in archaeological work does not mean that gender is not relevant or present, but instead speaks to how that specific archaeologist views gender. Although conversations on gender have slightly shifted from 1984 given the everchanging sociopolitical context outside of archaeology, Conkey and Spector's ideas have inspired the discourse that continues today. Over the past four decades, discussions of archaeologies of gender have expanded beyond the male-female binary and has been informed by advances in queer and feminist theory in cognate disciplines; the following will explore important debates and trends with implications for archaeologies of gender and its role in queering archaeology more broadly.

1.7 FEMINIST ANTHROPOLOGY & ARCHAEOLOGY

Feminist ideologies are not unique to archaeology but are used in anthropological literature more broadly, and in my attempt to queer archaeology I was greatly informed by scholars working in this area of research. Stockett and Geller (2006) explain that feminism in anthropology covers a wide variety of topics and has now come to a place where these scholars ultimately look at identity, power, and differences. Feminist anthropology is often characterized by a political agenda, although not necessarily one that only focuses on gender. This is not to say that "mainstream" anthropology and

archaeology are *not* political, what I mean instead is feminist anthropologists and archaeologists bring their political agenda to the forefront of their work instead of ignoring it. In anthropology and archaeology, feminist frameworks can be applied critically to a wide variety of subjects in anthropology (Stockett & Geller, 2006), including but not limited to aspects of identity (like gender) and their role in the context of research. One aspect that feminist anthropology specifically addresses is the notion that gender is socially constructed, especially "categorizing society as the combined creation of male and female actors," (Stockett & Geller, 2006, p. 5). Similarly, Rosaldo (1980) explains that gender differences between men and women "are themselves created by gender relations," (p. 401); according to the author, we must view gender as a relational concept as opposed to something inherent, or biological. This view of women as active participants in a gendered society is an important step in the analytical process within feminist anthropology, as prior to this pivotal moment there was a heavy focus on biological differences between men and women (Lamphere, 2006; Rosaldo, 1980; Stockett & Geller, 2006). Within this shift from a biological focus to one of gender as being socially constructed, anthropologists "have retained an interest in critically evaluating the relationships between men and women, understanding the nature of power, and connecting political economy and culture," (Lamphere, 2006, p. x).

Further, feminist anthropologists tend to use Judith Butler's work of embodiment and performativity in their discussions of gender, which reinforces the notion of gender as a process of materialization (Butler, 1990; Lamphere, 2006). Gender performativity, a concept popularized by Butler (1990), means gender is not something inherent in each individual but is something repeatedly enacted by that individual through their thoughts, actions, and available discourses. The idea of gender performance is particularly

important in addressing my first research objective, looking at how quotidian workplace practices may be connected to gender. After exploring how culture and reality are constructed in the above sections, it struck me when Butler (1990) stated that it is "impossible to separate out 'gender' from the political and cultural intersections within which it is invariably produced and maintained," (pp. 4 – 5). I understand this concept to mean that gender cannot be examined in a vacuum, rather we must examine gender and its performance within the cultural confines and available discourses the individual(s) exist in. Gender norms precede us, both our own and those of others, and we cannot stop ourselves from being interpellated into them.

Another way feminist anthropology has impacted the lens through which anthropologists view gender differences is by the push to ask more of the right questions (Rosaldo, 1980), and by providing scholars with critical frameworks to include in our analyses. Instead of asking how women are inherently different than men, we must ask about gender relations and gender as a social construction; men and women do not exist independently from each other, but rather, gendered identities and relations are a product of interaction in social fields. The "right questions" in the eyes of Rosaldo (1980) produce discourse in feminist anthropology that allows us to branch away from some of the rigid, heteronormative, masculinist discussions that have been critiqued (see Conkey & Spector, 1984). Once again, though not always explicitly stated by the scholars conducting this research, their actions and stated intentions align greatly with the goals of queering.

Ideas from feminist theory have not only impacted conversations in anthropology in notable ways, but have also found their way into anthropological archaeology. This discipline has been somewhat slower to adopt feminist theoretical frameworks compared to the other subfields in anthropology, save for biological anthropology (Stockett &

Geller, 2006, p. 2). However, feminist archaeology has gained momentum in the discipline, notably in discussions such as Wiley's (1992) work, who credits the rise of feminist archaeology to Conkey and Spector (1984) as I have stated previously. As defined by Wiley (1992), feminism in archaeology "questions the entrenched assumptions about women and gender and directs attention to them as subjects of inquiry," (p. 16). This sounds rather queer to me, as Wiley (1992) encourages us to challenge what is normal and normalize the abnormal.

Similar to feminist anthropology, feminist scholars in archaeology have concluded that viewing gender as a biological factor is not necessarily correct. Wiley (1992) posits that "gender is not a 'natural,' immutable given," (p. 17) but rather a concept that is constructed and relational. Further, the past more broadly is something that is "actively constructed," as opposed to "reconstructed, recaptured, or represented," (Wiley, 1992, p. 19). This idea of the past as something that is constructed helps us realize the full effect that archaeologists have on our depictions of the past, which can have implications for discussions of gender in archaeology. If the past is constructed, then gender relations in the past are constructed as well; thus, the inherent gender ideologies of the archaeologists participating in discussions of gender likely play a role in implanting certain gendered ideologies into their research. This idea aligns with those of Conkey and Gero (1997) who explain that gender as a social construction may be confusing to archaeologists, as we often tie our work with materiality. Notably, they argue that we must "probe the best means of analyzing the dialectic between human life as socially constructed and the very materiality of human life," (Conkey & Gero, 1997, p. 418). To look at this connection meaningfully, Wiley (1992) argues that feminism should be used by archaeologists to balance some of the objectivist versus extreme relativist issues. Specifically, feminist

ideas can help us recognize that all archaeologists can (and do) enter conversations about evidence from different perspectives, but that we can still center our work on empirical modes of interpretation and analysis. These differing perspectives offer more insight into how history is actively constructed, as each archaeologist is making both conscious and unconscious decisions within their research that are associated with their own perceptions.

Another widely discussed idea is that the rise of feminism in archaeology can be conceptualized as a reaction to various sociopolitical issues within and outside of the discipline. Notably, Moser (2007) states that to understand the current sociopolitical state in archaeology, we must first grasp how the history of the discipline constructed our current culture and professional identity. On the topic at hand, Conkey and Spector (1984) must be credited with spurring this reaction by first critiquing the lack of empirical discussion of gender in the discipline. Following this critique, Wiley (1992) explains that Conkey and Gero (1997) saw how impactful it was to question gendered assumptions in other contexts and subsequently concluded that feminist theory would likely pose a similar benefit to archaeology. These authors posit that feminism in archaeology is "[m]otivated by a rejection of the equation of human behaviour with the behaviour of men," and it aims to "identify or assert the presence and activities of women on prehistoric sites," (Conkey & Gero, 1997, pp. 414-415). Shown here is further evidence of feminist archaeology as being a reaction to the previous, arguably even current, state of archaeology, an archaeology much too focused on the masculine and patriarchal aspects of the constructed history.

Although some might argue that politics do not belong in empirical inquiry, Wiley (1992) states that "politically engaged science is often much more rigorous, self-critical,

and responsive to the facts than allegedly neutral science," (p. 30) which shows how essential this reaction to the sociopolitical state is to feminist archaeologists. Moser (2007) further explains that archaeology as a discipline places masculinity at its apex, where men are seen as being more than capable of doing fieldwork and masculine-associated research is labeled with the utmost importance. Emphasis on masculine attributes is problematic to archaeological discussions because it ignores women's participation and value in cultures both past and present (Conkey & Spector, 1984). Many scholars attribute issues with the value placed on masculinity to an acceptance of Western gender ideologies regarding expression, what a family should look like, and who is granted differing levels of power (Renoe, 2003; Moser, 2007). Feminist theory, as a reaction to this widespread acceptance, pushes archaeologists to challenge their own assumptions and biases (Blackmore, 2011; Voss, 2000). This idea is not unique to feminist theory, but is shared with queer theoretical frameworks, as explored below.

1.8 QUEER ANTHROPOLOGY & ARCHAEOLOGY

Like feminist theory, queer theory has roots in anthropology beyond its place in archaeology. In describing the connection to feminist anthropology, Boellstorff (2007) states that "[w]ork on the anthropology of sexuality is now often enrolled into forms of queer politics in a manner reminiscent of how the anthropology of women began to be used in forms of feminist politics a generation ago," (p. 18). This author also credits anthropology of gender with laying the groundwork to create an environment where queer studies and queer anthropologists have a place in the discipline (Boellstorff, 2007). Further, this author explains that queer anthropology is often interdisciplinary, and posits that regional studies offer valuable insight to queer studies in anthropology as they provide location-specific information that is often found through ethnography

(Boellstorff, 2007). After exploring different aspects of the history of queer theory in anthropology, Boellstorff (2007) argues that queer anthropology is most effectively used to promote intersectionality, where multiple aspects of identity are examined in relation to each other as opposed to any one aspect of identity in isolation.

More recently, Manalansan IV (2016) describes queer anthropology "as an aspirational field of inquiry," as well as being "in continuous motion," meaning that a queer anthropologist's work is never truly done (p. 596). Similar to Boellstorff (2007), Manalansan IV (2016) explains that there is always progress to be made in challenging the methodologies and ideologies that have dominated anthropology since its inception. Boellstorff (2007) explains that "[t]heorizing and ethnographically investigating the coconstitutive imbrication of sexuality and gender remains a foundational challenge for anthropological inquiry," (p. 27); to move towards a newer queer studies that is more inclusive of diverse analytical frameworks and interpretive perspectives, the intersectional approach the author describes is necessary. Other queer anthropologists have also pushed for the inclusion of differing perspectives in anthropology, where Weiss (2016) posits that queer theory in anthropology "provided an opening, a possibility, a way to think differently – exactly what had drawn me to anthropology," (p. 628). If anthropology invites us to think differently about the material in front of us in terms of analysis and interpretation, which is what Weiss (2016) says attracted her to the discipline, then queer theory rightfully belongs in anthropology. Queer theory functions to disrupt the perpetuated cycles of homogenous knowledge production left from the discipline's earlier thinkers, or in other terms, pushes anthropologists to think differently.

Contrary to what the name might lead one to assume, queer theory does not merely focus on studying sexuality. Weiss (2016) explains that this framework is "meant to point

beyond or beside identity […] and instead signify transgression of, resistance to, or exclusion from normativity, especially but not exclusively heteronormativity," (p. 628). So, although heteronormativity is one of the common norms queer anthropology actively tries to deconstruct, it is not the only one; rather this framework criticizes and attempts to move past norms more broadly. Similarly, others describe queer theory in anthropology and archaeology as challenging the discipline's ideas of what is deemed normative versus deviant, and how to interact with any feelings towards these norms (Blackmore, 2011; Dowson, 2000). If we use Wylie's (1992) idea of the past as being actively constructed from various perspectives, then it should be fair to assume that the past is constructed by largely normative (i.e., heteronormative) perspectives. Queer anthropology, however, functions to construct a past that is more inclusive of a variety of perspectives, and promotes analytical frameworks that are more intersectional, as Boellstorff (2007) argues. However, as with feminist anthropology, queer theory is not limited to cultural anthropology but has begun to take hold in anthropological archaeology as well.

Applying queer theory in anthropology focuses mainly on disrupting the status quo and questioning norms, while also trying to promote the use of a variety of interpretive and analytical frameworks. The same holds true for archaeology, which has been criticized for being a discipline that continues to uphold antiquated ideologies and silencing voices that appear to diverge from the mainstream (Blackmore et al., 2016). Specifically challenging heteronormativity in archaeology is important to queer theoretical frameworks, as not only do these norms affect archaeologists within the LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning, etc.) community, but they influence research as well. Archaeological explanations and interpretations under the blanket assumption of heterosexuality as the norm are often accepted without challenge,

even when they might benefit from critique (Dowson, 2000). Dowson's work and the work of other archaeologists who utilize queer theory in archaeology (e.g., Voss, 2000) show how queering the past through challenging norms, including but not limited to heteronormativity, allow for a more holistic interpretation of the past as opposed to the narrow ideas currently being reproduced.

One issue specifically addressed by queer archaeologists is how exclusive the discipline is towards individuals who exist outside of heteronormative realities, from prospective students to established professionals. Dowson (2000) explains that the "careers of homosexual [sic] and heterosexual students alike are affected by fear of and prejudices about difference or deviance," (p. 162). This has implications for individuals who are deemed deviant to any extent, even outside of debates about sexuality, as those individuals who may offer unique perspectives are not often given the same merit as those who appear to uphold the discipline's explicit and implied standards. This author further explains that as a gay man, he faced the ramifications of being associated with queerness, which then influenced his students and queer colleagues (Dowson, 2000). This notion is further supported by other archaeologists and anthropologists, stating that a sexual identity other than heterosexuality has deeply impacted their experiences in pursuit of a career in this discipline (She, 2000). Love (2011) explains that the term queer can have many definitions, two of the more well-known being the association with identity and the association with the abstract concept (i.e., closely aligned with the concept of queer as a verb). The author argues that many queer scholars "maintain ties to the minority identities that led us to the field in the first place," but that "we are also tied to universalization, which is the enabling condition of the field and our own place in the profession today," (Love, 2011, p. 182). What I understand this argument to mean is that some scholars

(myself included) cannot separate these aspects of 'queer,' and feel that we should not have to, as this aspect of queer identity can be a first step leading us towards queer theory in the abstract sense.

In contrast, She (2000) explains that being openly queer and participating in queer relationships affected her career in that she ultimately felt removed from the discipline, which does not seem to be a unique experience among LGBTQ+ archaeologists (e.g., Blackmore et al., 2016). Heteronormativity, and more severely, homophobia, are also connected to a loss of connections in the form of grants, mentorship, and friendship, which consequently can affect one's career (Claassen, 2000; Dowson, 2000). Queer theory, although often used as a theoretical framework applied to our research, also aims to combat these negative experiences within the archaeological community. This issue can have implications for production of knowledge as well, as these individuals who may promote more diverse ways of thinking are being systematically put at a disadvantage. Thus, our analytical and interpretive frameworks are not benefiting from diverse voices, because we are unlikely to hear them in the first place. Without the critical perspective of queer theory, we may only be constructing a past that fits our own norms and perspectives without acknowledging alternative explanations.

One arena that specifically has been credited with reinforcing heteronormativity and its corresponding values in archaeology is that of fieldwork (Blackmore et al., 2016), which means that it also stands to benefit from the use of queer theory and methodologies. Participation in archaeological fieldwork is often romanticized as being the deciding factor for whether someone can call themselves a true archaeologist (Holtorf, 2006), and because it is such an exclusionary environment, young professionals of diverse backgrounds may not feel as though they are able to take the final step from novice to

professional (Blackmore et al., 2016; Cobb & Croucher, 2016). With this limit on who feels welcomed into the discipline, those who currently control the narratives will continue to do so, and privileged individuals will continue to stay at the forefront of the field (Cobb & Croucher, 2016). This could mean that the knowledge being produced will not benefit from the critical eye of queer theory, as there is a barrier facing those who may enter the field with this framework in mind. Therefore, the same problematic and homogenous ideologies will continue to be produced within constructions of the past, because there is likely no voice being heard other than those which are already dominating the discipline. Queer theorists argue that inclusion of unique and diverse ideologies could have influence at a structural level, where our issues lie, and thus we may be able to create a field environment more accepting of diverse individuals and perspectives (Cobb & Croucher, 2016).

Although queer theory can be used to create a more inclusive working environment for archaeologists, the main implication I am concerned with is the effect it has on production of knowledge within the discipline. Creating space for more diverse individuals within archaeology not only impacts who is hired, published, and generally included in the discipline (Heath-Stout, 2020), queer theory also highlights more diverse perspectives that lead to broader and sometimes more holistic interpretations and constructions of the past. For example, including women and other diverse bodies in the workplace does not simply check the box for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) metrics as a band-aid fix, similar to the 'add women and stir' critique from the 1990s. Instead, inclusion of a diverse set of individuals can create space for more perspectives that may challenge current normative ones and what had previously been accepted as canon. Behar (1996) explains that "women's labor in anthropology is quietly erased by

the maintenance of a prestige hierarchy within the discipline that has fixed a (male) canon of what counts as important knowledge," (p. 9). To a queer theorist, they would see the commonly accepted canon as one that excludes a myriad of voices; therefore, what is deemed as "important knowledge" needs to change to include more of these diverse voices, specifically through queer theoretical methods of analysis and interpretation. Unsurprisingly, queer anthropology and archaeology heavily align with my research objectives and my intent to queer archaeology.

1.9 METHODS

This study was conducted ethnographically, through a combination of participant observation and qualitative interviewing. This methodology helped me examine the production and translation of archaeological knowledge through viewing one CRM firm as a group that can be studied as a culture. Most literature regarding gender in the archaeological workplace is anecdotal (Moser, 2007); to queer archaeology and explore and the influence of subjectivity on production and translation of knowledge in this context, I felt an ethnographic approach was warranted to grant a more in depth and holistic understanding beyond individual recollection. Specifically, participant observation allowed me to witness translation and production of knowledge in real time during the workday that employees may not consider impactful or significant, though nonetheless essential to the knowledge translation and production processes. Ethnographic inquiry is considered essential to anthropological work and has been since the discipline's beginning (Schultz et al., 2023) and is a method of research involving spending extended time in a culture, studying members through observation, interviewing, and participation in cultural proceedings (Creswell & Poth, 2018). As this method requires studying the participating group/individuals at the cultural level (i.e., a

group of people that share values, beliefs, practices, etc.), I inserted myself into the workplace culture of Alberta Archaeology Inc. and gained both emic and etic perspectives.

I studied the way participants grappled with the influence of subjectivity on translation and production of archaeological knowledge in this context over a period of six months overall, not including the two months I spent working with the company and building rapport prior to data collection. Specifically, I conducted participant observation in the archaeological field during the months of August – October of 2023, and again in the laboratory space during December of 2023. This process consisted of taking field notes of daily occurrences, which I then composed into longer reflections at the end of the workday. Following data collection, I then analyzed these field notes to identify recurring themes. The relatively long period I spent living with and working among the participants allowed me to form relationships with them that I feel go beyond the simple researcher/participant dichotomy. Instead, I feel as though these people are friends and teachers who have allowed me access to the nuances of their jobs and experiences in this CRM firm. I believe these relationships allowed them to speak openly with me about their gendered experience regarding translation and production of archaeological knowledge in their chosen career. Through my time in the field, I was also able to observe patterns in these processes that I would not have been able to grasp in a shorter time. I feel that an ethnographic approach to this project helped me to gain a meaningful understanding of the research topic in the chosen context.

After the participant observation portion of my study ended, I conducted four online interviews (via Zoom) between November of 2023 – January of 2024, where each of these participants volunteered from the existing pool of participants (i.e., those who

consented to participant observation). This portion of my study allowed me to explore ideas of subjectivity (especially regarding gender ideologies) and knowledge translation/production within CRM archaeology with four employees of different positions and experiences. These interviews were semi-structured (see Appendices 1 and 2 for the original and revised interview guides) to help myself and participants feel more comfortable than the rigidity of a fully structured interview situation would have allowed. As we had already built rapport in a more casual way, I felt the formality of a structured interview would take away from the already friendly relationships I had with the participants. Further, the semi-structured style allowed participants to offer up information that they felt was important, instead of the conversations being based entirely on my own assumptions and topics. Through this portion of the study, I was able to supplement the knowledge I had already gained during participant observation. I was also able to clarify certain nuances in knowledge translation and production that I had previously made note of in the field. The interviews also served a purpose for participants, as Lauren specifically noted that she was excited and happy to talk to me about gender in CRM archaeology, as she had not previously had an outlet to do so. These interviews not only allowed me to explore certain topics more intimately with participants, but they also helped ensure that participant voices were heard, specifically in their own words instead of only through the lens of my interpretation and analysis. The interview portion of the data collection stage truly allowed me to hear the participants concerns, for which I am grateful, but sadly I cannot voice all of their concerns in this study. The following explores this omission in more detail.

This project was approved by the University of Alberta's ethics review board (no. Pro00133980). Ethical considerations are of utmost importance when conducting

research, especially when the project includes human participants (Ashley, 2020). However, obtaining ethics approval for this project came with its own set of challenges. First, as the University of Lethbridge's ethics board was dissolved shortly before my time at this institution, I had to go through the University of Alberta's ethics review process. Not only was I communicating with an institution far removed from where the research was being conducted, but I was also competing for a timely response against a bigger pool of applicants. I believe this larger pool of applicants (compared to having in-house access to an ethics review board at the University of Lethbridge) contributed to not receiving feedback on my initial application for several weeks, meaning that I had to push back my data collection start time from April of 2023 until August of 2023. As the archaeological field season in Canada is limited to environmental factors such as weather, this means that the field season typically ends during the winter months. Due to the delay in receiving ethics approval, I was forced to refrain from collecting data for four months of the already limited time period that I could have collected data. I originally planned to collect observational data from April of 2023 – September of 2023 to limit the amount of time I would be away from campus during the Fall term; however, to collect as much observational data as possible with my shifted timeline, I decided to extend my field experience to October of 2023. Although I was able to adjust my schedule to compensate for being in the field a month later into the year than expected, this was only possible due to the cooperation of multiple parties, including the company I studied and worked with. Further, although I was able to push this portion of data collection into October, I still had approximately six weeks less time to collect observational data than originally planned. As I was expecting the response time from the University of Alberta's ethics board to be much shorter than it was for their initial feedback, myself and the owner of the company I

worked with and studied were very disappointed with the timeline to get ethics approval for this project.

Another issue I faced during the ethics process was their insistence that I pivot my project away from studying workplace culture from a gendered perspective. They believed that participants would have wanted more privacy than my initial proposal would have given them, as I initially wanted to examine gender performance within and outside of the workplace. However, I was instructed not to include this aspect of my project in the final proposal, as the ethics review board thought it would cause too much discomfort in participants. Essentially, I was told that I could remove this aspect of my project and reframe it so that I was not studying workplace culture from a gendered perspective, or a full review from the entire ethics review board would take place at the end of August, where I was still not guaranteed approval for the project. As I wanted this project to move forward, especially in a timely matter to make up for time lost during the initial delay, I decided to change focus on the project to be more suitable to their requests (i.e., studying the role of gender in the production and translation of archaeological knowledge). Once reframed, the University of Alberta's ethics review board approved this project with minor revisions, and I set to work collecting data in August of 2023. The changes I made included editing my interview guide and informed consent document to include the new focus of the project being gender in the production and translation of knowledge.

However, even though the informed consent form I gave to all participants clearly states the focus of this project, participants often described issues they had in the workplace that are explicitly linked to gendered ideologies in workplace culture. Specifically, in each of the four interviews I conducted, the last point on my interview

guide was to ask the participants if they had anything else they wished to discuss (see Appendices 1 and 2). Every participant wanted to discuss situations that can only be described as relating to workplace culture and had nothing to do with translation or production of knowledge. From this repeated outcome, combined with discussions I had with participants in the field, I infer that participants do want to talk about gendered workplace culture as much as I initially planned to. Unfortunately, due to the limitations I am placed under by the University of Alberta's ethics review board, I am unable to include any of this data in my thesis beyond what is described here. I believe the direction I was pushed to take reduced the meaningfulness of my research to the community that I studied. This is not to say that this project is meaningless. I would argue quite the opposite; however, I do feel as though the participants' voices are not able to be fully heard, even though they are the most important to this research and its outcomes (Ashley, 2020). One hope to come from this struggle that I faced regarding ethics is that this research can function as a springboard for others to continue this research regarding gendered workplace culture in CRM archaeology. In other words, let this thesis serve as evidence that this community wants to participate in a project like this and discuss topics that may seem too difficult or unnerving by certain governing bodies, such as Research Ethics Boards.

After thematically analysing field notes from participant observation and the transcripts from participant interviews, I moved on to discourse analysis of historical impact assessments produced by Alberta Archaeology Inc. In simplified terms, a historical impact assessment documents the work done (primarily archaeological in nature) on a site that is proposed for development. These documents also contain rationale behind a decision of whether it is historically responsible to move forward with

development on that land, or if there is more work that needs to be done (e.g., more archaeological excavation, preservation efforts, etc.). I was given access to 16 of these reports, sent to me by the company's owner/manager, Daphne. I conducted discourse analysis on each of these reports, initially with the intent of studying the potential discussions (or lack thereof) regarding gender. However, this point of focus did not provide much meaningful data to analyze, so I switched focus to how there is a form of 'purposeful forgetting' (Latour & Woolgar, 1986) in the process of archaeological knowledge production. Essentially, I conducted what I call bibliography archaeology, where I explored what and who was being cited in these primary sources (i.e., the historical impact assessment), and how the authors of these primary sources did (or did not) engage in critical reflection regarding their citation practices.

From there, I conducted discourse analysis of the sources cited in the primary sources, following the chain of knowledge production back to what seemed like the origins of the knowledge produced in the contemporary documents. As this was a rather vast body of literature to analyze if I included every citation, I focused mainly on citations dealing with cultural material. I did not follow many citation chains to do with arguably non-cultural topics (e.g., geology), though there is always an exception to any rule. During this section of discourse analysis I analyzed 182 sources, with varying degrees of separation from the primary sources. This portion of analysis took place from August to October of 2024; I theoretically could have kept following these trails of knowledge production for much longer, but under the time constraints of a masters thesis, the research team and I decided to cap this process in mid-October of 2024. I want to note that I am purposefully excluding a detailed list of a) the primary sources, and b) the secondary/tertiary sources I analyzed as a precautionary measure to protect

confidentiality, as a portion of them can be directly connected to the company I partnered with during this research. I also want to note that a further contextualization of my position on conducting discourse analysis is explicitly defined in the following chapter.

1.10 SIGNIFICANCE

I took a rather pragmatic approach to this research, because I believe that research should benefit the group being studied and/or society at large. Therefore, I wanted to conduct this work to benefit archaeologists more than anything else. As I have explored above, the CRM work environment is not fair, equitable, or accessible (Blackmore et al., 2016). My hope is that this research spurs conversations of how to queer archaeology. Further, I hope that these conversations will lead to practical change, especially in CRM, as it tends to be uniquely narrow-minded (as I have shown here and will continue to explore in the following chapters). We cannot ignore diverse perspectives in archaeological settings, as one dominant, narrow representation of the past cannot encompass all of what it means and has meant to be human throughout all of our history. Thus, my exploration of what it means to queer archaeology and how I actively worked to queer my research can serve as a guidepost for future scholars who want to disrupt the norms of academia.

This research also made meaningful contributions to our understanding of EDI questions in CRM archaeology by highlighting the ways that the profession may reinforce dominant, homogenizing Western gender ideologies. Further, this project contributes to our understanding of both feminist and queer theory perspectives that have challenged the heteronormative, sexist, and racist underpinnings of archaeology as a discipline. Lastly, it advances debates about the relationship between researcher subjectivity and the production of knowledge, both within archaeology and in a broader scientific context.

1.11 CONCLUSION

After summarizing the theoretical and practical preparation that went into this research, I move into a discussion of two main themes that I found in the process of data collection and analysis. First, I will discuss the veneer of objectivity currently dominating archaeology, with the goal of cracking through that facade to show how subjectivity can and does influence archaeological knowledge production. Then I will move on to discuss issues regarding the lack of critical reflection on the process of archaeological knowledge production from start to finish, specifically how this ignorance contributes to a narrowing perspective of human history. I cover these two topics in their own respective chapter, which I then summarize and connect in a separate final chapter. As you read the following chapters, I encourage you to keep in mind that none of this is a critique of the individuals I worked alongside; they have all taught me so much about what it means to be a steward of the archaeological record. Instead, I urge you to read this work through a lens of holding each other accountable, as we are all responsible for being as respectful as we can to those who came before us.

CHAPTER 2: SUBJECTIVITY IN SUPPOSEDLY STANDARD SCIENCE

2.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

Archaeology is uniquely situated at the crossroads of natural and social sciences, the humanities, and even sometimes popular culture—yes, I often wish I had a big hat like Indiana Jones, and yes, we actually do wear that much khaki. With the discipline's roots in these areas of scholarly inquiry, it also has roots in empirical thought, which is often associated with a commitment to objectivity. However, any archaeologist who has ever been in the field (or laboratory) knows that subjectivity has been and will always be a part of archaeology, as so much of this job is what participants refer to as "judgement calls." Though I originally started this project with a focus on the impact of gendered ideologies on the production of knowledge, my time in the field (both in the archaeological field and the laboratory setting) made me realize that this is just one aspect of the widely ignored role that subjectivity plays in archaeology. In this chapter, I explore how CRM produces a veneer of objectivity surrounding archaeological work, and how this veneer slowly falls away when examining their fieldwork critically. After introducing and contextualizing CRM archaeology through the lens of an objectivity/subjectivity debate, I will walk through what a typical day looked like for me while I was in the field. Then I will explore arenas where objectivity is valued but ultimately starts to fail, followed by participants' perspectives on subjectivity in their career. Finally, I discuss how a discipline so committed to objectivity can conduct their work problematically if they ignore their subjective influence on their work, and why it is important to practice reflexivity in this context.

First, I want to discuss a quote from my interview in January of 2024 with Lauren, a laboratory assistant I conducted participant observation with during December of 2023.

After quickly exchanging greetings, we dove into our discussion of gender and subjectivity in the process of archaeological knowledge production and translation (see Appendix 2 for the interview guide I used during this interview). Near the end of our discussion, Lauren explained to me just how unique the context of CRM is, stating that gender in analysis "percolates into CRM," but that it is "much more prominent in academia." Following this train of thought, she explained to me that CRM firms often have other priorities, stating that "these CRM companies are businesses, and they need to remain profitable and […] stay in business. And so, more often than not, they're not spending the time thinking about these things." This idea stood out to me because CRM research is not limited to being strictly for the sake of knowledge production but is driven by industry and revenue. Though academic archaeology is subject to budgetary restrictions, such as access to research grants or other forms of funding, CRM archaeology is more closely tied to profit (Black & Jolly, 2003). From what many participants told me, the company that can make a proposal outlining their ability to get the job done as quickly and as cheaply as possible is almost guaranteed to find more work. So, with external motivators like tight deadlines and budgets, which Lauren also touched on during this interview, how is it possible for CRM archaeologists to act completely objectively when these factors influence how they do their work? Lauren summarized this point of why gendered analysis and discussion often falls to the wayside by saying that academic archaeologists may look at CRM and think,

> "you don't fully understand what you're digging out of the ground, and the implications that it has. You don't […] potentially fully understand the scope of what it is that you're digging out of the ground because you're not taking the time to think about these things."

When an archaeologist (or more broadly, an entire CRM firm) is hired to get a job done fast and effectively, they are not necessarily getting paid to engage critically with the material they are excavating beyond what is in their contract. From what Lauren mentions, this might mean that they are not "potentially fully understand[ing] the scope" of these artifacts. So, in the context of CRM, these archaeologists exist within the context of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities (and those respective disciplinary expectations), but these archaeologists also have to contend with a capital-driven industry as well. This excerpt is one of many instances from data collection that prove CRM archaeology is not and cannot be completely objective, even if the archaeologist's goal is to be as objective as possible.

Another (perhaps more positive) reason CRM archaeologists grapple with their loyalty to objectivity is the idea that who we learn from influences how we do the job. At the beginning of this project, I was what many archaeologists call a "greenhorn," which means that I had limited experience doing archaeological work. I had a lot to learn, and every single person I met throughout this experience taught me something about the job and what it means to them. One participant named Maude (whom I discuss later in this chapter) even walked me through how to use a trowel properly – a skill that most CRM archaeologists have already learned in field school. One of the most practical and applicable kinds of knowledge translated amongst archaeologists is *how* to do the job; you cannot interpret an artifact until you have properly learned how to excavate it without causing irreparable damage to the site and the archaeological record. Who archaeologists learn these skills from matters because it shapes how they act in and move through the field. However, not only does the matter of who we learn from influence the way we conduct archaeological work, but we also bring our own unique perspectives to this

process. While those partial to valuing the supposed objective nature of scientific inquiry may disagree, scholars such as Latour, Harding, and others argue that science does not exist freely from the subjectivity of those conducting the work.

Archaeology and subjectivity have always and will continue to go hand in hand. The project I worked on over the course of my fieldwork was comprised of a large number of archaeologists, each contributing their own helpful and valuable perspectives that influence the archaeological record. Every time I picked up a rock to determine if it was an artifact, I would look at the people around me and gather their opinions as well. More often than not, my own interpretation of an artifact was built off of the various interpretations of those around me as much as it was my own. However, as we cannot travel back in time to confirm our interpretations of the archaeological record, that is what they must remain as: *interpretations*. This is not to say that archaeological work is unscientific or unvaluable, however we must acknowledge that the information archaeologists present to various stakeholders are presented through the lens of those doing the work. Though archaeology is seen by some as a science, or at the very least, uses the scientific method (Arponen et al., 2019), the lines between "hard science" and "soft science" seem to be a bit blurred for these archaeologists. Lauren, the laboratory specialist I quoted in the beginning of the chapter, posits that "archaeology is not science, but instead uses science." Scientific knowledge, especially from a Western lens, is seen as truly objective and we often privilege it over other ways of knowing (Todd, 2016). Further, the idea that science needs to be objective and untouched by culture (and therefore gender) is rooted in colonialism and Eurocentrism (Harding, 1998; Todd, 2016). However, this knowledge is not as strictly objective as some may think. Instead, this false notion of objectivity happens because once knowledge that has been constructed and

produced is deemed as fact, the social factors connected to it seem to disappear through purposeful forgetfulness; this "forgetting" or omission is itself a form of subjectivity (Latour & Woolgar, 1986). Archaeologists like to talk about facts, yet they seem to forget that these "facts" and other widely accepted bodies of knowledge (e.g., methods, theories, etc.) come from the ideas of individuals and/or groups of people, sometimes even from themselves. Do they ignore the influence individuals have over the knowledge they produce and translate? Or do they recognize these things?

Knowledge translation is defined differently in various disciplines and communities, so to clarify what working definition I used during this project, knowledge translation can be viewed as "connecting what we know with what we do," (KT Pathways, 2024). Other common definitions link the term to research (e.g., Canadian Institutes of Health Research, 2016). I understand knowledge translation in relation to how ideas are passed from one individual or group to another, from both learning and teaching perspectives. Something the participants taught me is that archaeologists are often both, and that you never truly stop learning. Senior archaeologists who have been in the field for over ten years still mention aspects of the job they continue to learn about, while translating other knowledge to less experienced colleagues. Participants consistently offered to teach me about the most effective methods of excavation, how to confidently make the distinction between an artifact and an "AFR" (another f**king rock, a colloquial term many newcomers like me were told jokingly during initial shifts), and much more. This knowledge translation came from all sides; it came from crew leads, members of other crews, and eventually I even began to pass on certain knowledge I had acquired to other archaeologists. In their interviews, participants also discussed the value of experiencing both a teacher and student role at various times throughout their careers.

As cultural beings, what we learn is influenced by who we are learning from (Schultz et al., 2023). So, what I find myself asking is, is it possible to tease out the ties to gendered ideologies from the knowledge translation process, when gender is such a prevalent aspect of social classification both past and present? And if so, how?

In the field, whether this means the mountains in British Columbia, the prairies in Alberta, or anything beyond, CRM archaeologists interact with excavated materials for the first time; to them, this also means they are looking at what is sometimes called "raw data." However, we know that subjectivity influences science in such a way that as soon as we interact with these materials, we are looking at them through the lens of our own history and identity (Harding, 1998; Latour & Woolgar, 1986). In many situations, participants can recognize the inherent subjectivity in their job, often commenting on the collaborative nature of archaeology and the importance of getting multiple perspectives before coming to a conclusion. They recognize that each person uniquely contributes to this step in the research process due to variances in work experience, learning environments, and other aspects. However, they are hesitant to acknowledge the role that gender plays in this process or even admit to the sense of objectivity being a veneer overall. So how can a CRM archaeologist admit that their work does include some subjectivity, yet believe their work is truly objective? The following explores this question, maybe not entirely answering it, but hopefully showing how CRM got to this impasse between theory and practice.

I also want to note here that in this exploration of subjectivity in CRM, this project is both an argument for and the practice of queer(ing) as a verb. Queer (v.) in the context of research is affective and animate, meaning that the process of queering our research is associated with the feelings we have towards our research (Amin, 2016; Fields, 2016).

We can also conceptualize queer(ing) as a disruptive process that makes us challenge our biases, assumptions, and the norms we find ourselves working within (Amin, 2016). Not only do I argue that participants in this research would benefit from challenging their assumptions (especially regarding gender and subjectivity), but my own role as researcher functions to queer archaeology as well, as I am actively challenging many assumptions through my analysis and discussion here. I also want to point out that the process of queering archaeology is never finished, but rather continual, as nothing can ever be queer enough; when we challenge our assumptions enough to break through barriers and create new norms, we must always remain conscious and continue to question the processes that lead to new norms being accepted (Amin, 2016). To queer is also relevant to sociopolitical contexts we find ourselves in (Amin, 2016; Fields, 2016; Love, 2011) which I explore in this chapter and more in-depth in the following chapter. I argue throughout this project that participants and archaeology more broadly must queer their work by critically examining each step in the archaeological knowledge production process. I was also reminded to continually work to queer the world of research, both in the context of this project and beyond.

With the goal to queer CRM archaeology through this research, I will guide readers through an exploration of subjectivity and objectivity in CRM archaeology, not as a binary, but rather two interconnected concepts that participants interact with in their work. First, I begin by deconstructing the supposedly "standard" methods and quotidian practices that make up a CRM archaeologist's workday. Then I will walk readers through various contexts that I witnessed participants struggle with their desire to remain objective, even when this veneer begins to crack. In the latter sections of this chapter, I explore how subjectivity (especially from a gendered lens) can and does play a role in

CRM work. Finally, I will end this chapter with a discussion of how participants' goals to remain objective can have the opposite of their desired effect when we fail to think reflexively, and why this is a problem.

2.2 "STANDARD" METHODS & DAILY RITUALS

Though each project has its own schedules, rules, regulations, and expectations, what each day as a CRM archaeologist has in common are the existence of daily rituals and implementation of prescribed methods of conducting archaeological work. Each day CRM archaeologists expect to go through some of the same routines, which are a part of their culture and therefore integral to the work they do (Latour & Woolgar, 1986). They often stick to these routines in the name of the scientific method and can even rely on these supposedly standard practices as proof of the validity of their work; multiple participants go as far as arguing that CRM archaeologists sometimes "hide behind methods" this way. However, when we begin to look beyond the curtain, sometimes these "standard" methods are not what they seem. To begin pulling back this metaphorical curtain, I want to explore what some of these daily routines, rituals, and "standard" methods are, and what an average day can look like where each of these aspects are enacted. To do this, I began each interview by asking participants to describe what a day in the field looks like. Each of these descriptions, as well as my own experience during my time in the field, are quite similar when looked at from a bird's eye view, which I will summarize.

Each morning, we get up long before the sun rises. From our shared accommodation(s) with other team members, we drive to whatever site we are scheduled to be on that day, which can take anywhere from 15-45 minutes, sometimes longer. Once we arrive at the work site for the morning, we all sign the daily paperwork, which

normally includes the work plan for the day and any relevant safety information. Once everyone has arrived and checked in, we have what is called a tailgate meeting, which is exactly what it sounds like; each archaeologist and others working on site (e.g., equipment operators) stands around in a circle, morning coffee in hand, to listen to whoever is in charge discuss in more detail what was on the paperwork. Once everyone has been briefed for the day, we head to work. Sometimes this includes driving to another (relatively close by) location, but often times this means grabbing our tools, donning our protective gear, and getting our hands in the dirt. Most of my time on this project involved processing (i.e., sorting through) already excavated dirt to ensure artifacts are not missed before the dirt is returned to the context it originally came from. Other times this involved going to active excavation units, which is what is more typically portrayed in media and popular culture: someone in cargo pants leaning over a square of dirt with a trowel. For our safety, however, we switch out the big "Indiana Jones" hat for a protective hard hat. We work at whatever site we are at for around 10 hours a day, not including the time it takes to drive to and from the sites. We normally take three breaks a day, including two short ones and a longer one for lunch, often eaten in work trucks or sitting in whatever spot of shade is available. Once the day is over, typically around 4:30pm on the project I worked on, we pack up the equipment we had used that day and head back to the accommodations to shower and scrub the dirt off and fall into bed. Wash, rinse, repeat, two weeks on and one week off.

The way participants described a typical day in the field, and the picture I have painted for you here, makes it seem like most days are fairly similar, with little deviation from the standard. However, during my time in the field, I noted smaller scale differences that have a large impact when looked at in the context of cracking the veneer of

objectivity and “standard” methods. For example, the tailgate meetings that everyone mentions as an important start to the day definitely happen every single day. However, I do not think I ever experienced a tailgate meeting that was the same from one day to the next. At certain sites, instead of an archaeologist giving the rundown of the rules and regulations, one of the non-archaeology crew members (e.g., machine operators) would take point. Though we all worked on the same project, those coming from different industries had experience and priorities that differed from someone like Maude (a participant who had sometimes taken lead at these meetings). When these individuals outside of the archaeology team(s) are the ones breaking down the day’s tasks, they would emphasize different aspects than an archaeologist. Further, certain individuals (whether they were an archaeologist or not) would go into more detail than others on the plan for the day, especially depending on how far along in the shift we were. If we had the same crew working on the same site for ten days in a row without any changes to our daily tasks, the morning tailgate on the eleventh day of that shift looked a lot different than it did on the first day of shift with a fresh crew. So, something that is so integral to the daily practices of a CRM archaeologist on this project that seems rather standard becomes rather variable when looked at under a microscope.

Further, differences in how the days proceed based on who is acting within leadership roles influences more than just the morning tailgate meetings. For example, sometimes our team was split up between multiple sites during the day; with only one designated team lead for the shift, obviously only one group would be directly supervised by that individual on that specific day. When I was in the group of employees who were on a site whose supervision team did *not* include our team lead from Alberta Archaeology Inc. (i.e., we were reporting to other contractors and subcontractors that day), the way we

went about our days would be different. As our crew was known to be rather efficient compared to other subcontractors, we were held to somewhat higher standards, and we felt the pressure even more when we were not under direct supervision from our own team lead. Speaking for myself, I wanted to prove that I could confidently complete the job on my own, which seemed to be the consensus of the other employees on site. I noted that participants acted more independently while not under direct supervision from an Alberta Archaeology Inc. team lead. They seemed more confident in their actions, as they were more certain in identifying artifacts for collection and quickly moved on to the next task once they had completed the previous one.

Contrastingly, in situations where we did have our Alberta Archaeology Inc. supervisor on site, I noticed that many participants used this opportunity to double-check their interpretations with our team lead (myself included). This could potentially be because participants felt more comfortable going to our in-house supervisor more than the supervisors belonging to other crews, as we all worked closely with each other over extended periods of time, thus building rapport and trust. I will also note that this does not mean that participants were wrong in either situation (i.e., they were no more or less correct in asking more questions versus less). What I will say, however, is that differences in leadership did influence the number of perspectives included in determining whether something was an artifact. So again, we see that something supposedly "standard," such as any one individual assessing a piece of material culture, does vary once we look at the decision-making process in different contexts.

Another aspect of our workday that influenced our interpretive processes was how slow the day was. In other words, if we were having a day where we were processing several units of excavated materials while finding very few artifacts, the time and care we

put into analyzing something was far greater. If I had been raking through dirt for two hours and finally found a rock that looked even slightly modified, I may pick it up to inspect. On busy days, however, where we were finding many artifacts and needed to process material quicker, I may not have given that same rock a second glance. I do not want to fault myself or any other archaeologists, participants or not, for any potential oversight. We were all told, both by Alberta Archaeology Inc. team leads and external team leads, that a certain amount of error is to be expected when we are working efficiently to meet deadlines. Yet there were certain days where we knew we only had a set amount of material to process, and if we wanted to stretch it out to last the whole day, we were almost painfully precise at inspecting every single rock. Further, on these slow days, if we were unsure of whether something was an artifact, even after several people had laid eyes on the item, we were more likely to toss it into the artifact bucket to be sent to the lab. I had truly lost count of how many times those of us working in the field could not decide what to do with an object, so someone would toss it in the bucket and say, "well, it's the lab's problem now."

Clearly, after looking at these aspects of a typical workday on this project, there is a lot of grey area in what can actually be described as "typical" or "standard." Yes, when looked at from a macroscopic perspective, we can see a rather consistent routine throughout each workday. Yet, when looked at critically, each aspect of every workday that I experienced was much less standard than even I had originally expected. Coming into this project as an archaeological outsider, I did not know the extent to which even the more obviously subjective parts of this job are subject to change. Though participants were all fairly consistent in describing what a typical workday in the field looks like for them, what I experienced and observed during my time in the field showed me that there

is not really a "typical" workday filled with standard methods and practices. Yet even though participants and I both experienced the same daily rituals and routines, they are steadfast in their belief that archaeology can be objective and "standard." To queer this perspective of an "objective archaeology," I felt it necessary to examine how participants had come to inherit these beliefs, practices, and norms, which I explore below.

2.3 ARENAS OF PRESCRIBED OBJECTIVITY

To open this section, we will start at the beginning of most CRM archaeologists' careers: field school. Participants believe that field school is a large asset to any CRM archaeologist entering the job field for the first time and is arguably one of the most important factors in being successfully integrated into this career. Archaeological field school is often a school-sanctioned field experience during time as a university student, where groups of students are brought into the field and taught about the excavation process while gaining hands-on experience excavating materials (Boytner, 2012; Connell, 2012; Morrison, 2012; Perry, 2004). Holtorf (2006) explains that those who have not gained field experience are often subject to mockery, further stating that "students become 'real' archaeologists" (p. 83) only once they have entered the field. From the general consensus of those I spoke to, I would argue this sentiment still holds true.

Each participant except for one had gone to at least one field school during their time as a university student, and the general participant perspective of field school is that it holds incomparable value. While Daphne, the company owner, says there are other factors that influence her decision to hire someone, stating that "attitude counts a huge stride in the right direction," as does a "willingness to learn and to take feedback and critique," other participants say that it would be very difficult to find a job without having gone to a field school. They argue that a field school has given them applicable skills and

knowledge for the field, which leads to higher likelihood of success in their careers and careers overall in CRM. Morrison (2012) explains that part of the reason field school is so pivotal is because it not only teaches young archaeologists the skills needed in this discipline, it also teaches them *how to be outside*. I can see the merit in this argument; during my time as an undergraduate student, I was taught how to take proper notes and what measurements to take, but it was not until my time in the field that I learned how to do all of this while out in the sun for ten hours a day with dirt in my eyes. Notably, most of the situations participants described regarding their field school experience were anything but objective, even though this is supposedly an arena of knowledge translation that is supposed to breed commitment to objectivity. Even at this beginning stage of a CRM archaeologist's career, the veneer begins to crack.

Archaeological work is often very tactile, meaning a large portion of this work involves physical labour of various skills and abilities. Participants argue that the essentialness of field school comes from the inability to teach these skills in a typical classroom setting. I witnessed this belief coming from participants both in the field during participant observation as well as during subsequent interviews. Though interview discussions were more explicit, in the field I noted the importance and sometimes prestige of having gone to particular field schools. Especially during down time, participants would discuss their time in field school amongst themselves and with archaeologists from other companies on the site. Those who had gone to field school under the supervision of a specific set of professors were often seen as more competent and trustworthy when it came to artifact analysis at the field level. Therefore, the ideas of this group of individuals who had all been taught by the same people were often taken at face value, thus reinforcing the knowledge translated to them in field school. As time goes on, these

voices continued to get privileged over others (who had either gone to a different field school or had not attended one at all). This leads to a certain set of ideologies, whether helpful or harmful, to dictate the direction and form the archaeological record may take. I want to note that this is not a critique of these archaeologists' abilities to do their jobs, but merely an observation of how easy it was for those around them to fall into habit of blindly accepting their advice and input.

One participant who had gone to this specific field school and studied under these professors is Roberta, a laboratory specialist and field archaeologist whom I worked alongside during my time in the field. In our interview, Roberta explicitly told me that field school is greatly important to finding and keeping a position in CRM. We were sitting across from one another in my office at the University of Lethbridge campus, face-to-face for the first time since I had concluded the participant observation portion of data collection. Though we had spent multiple two-week periods seeing each other for upwards of twelve hours a day, this scholarly setting was a new situation for both of us. Instead of grime covering us from head to toe, including underneath our steel-toed boots and hard hats, we were both dressed in clothes much less geared towards digging in the dirt. Similar to the distinction between how we adorned ourselves in the field versus in an academic institution, there is a noticeable difference in learning about archaeology in field school versus in the classroom (Perry, 2004). Perry (2004) explains that field school is often the first time a prospective archaeologist can "become engaged in authentic research activities of an archaeological community," (p. 256). Field schools as "authentic learning" is something that scholars and participants alike agree on, valuing the intense and extensive experience your first prolonged period in the field offers you (Holtorf, 2006; Perry, 2004). Roberta explained that:

> "…in school, like, they teach you, like, about the artifacts. They teach you about, like, lithics, and about the stratigraphy, and about the sediments and everything about archaeology. But they don't teach you, "okay, here's a one-by-one. Here is how you map an artifact. Here is how you make quadrants. Here's how you go down in levels. Here's how you do a shovel test. Here's how you screen." Like, they don't teach you that stuff. […] you might know everything about the artifacts, but they say, "okay, here's an excavation unit." You wouldn't know what the first thing to do is, but like, because I went to a field school, I know, "okay, we need to go down in either five- or ten-centimeter increments, and we need to map special artifacts. But not all artifacts, because that's just too much work. And then everything needs to be screened." But then yeah, like, you're going down in layers, levels. Every single level has a different level plan. When you're done, you have a stratigraphy drawing of the walls, like, you wouldn't know that you had to do that if you didn't have a field school."

Having this knowledge translated to archaeologists in the field school setting is only one step in a complex process of learning about and how to conduct archaeological research. However, each participant argued that this experience was pivotal to their careers and the careers of many in CRM work.

Additionally, participants also explained to me that a field school's value often depends on who is translating the knowledge to the students (i.e., the field school is better depending on who is teaching at that time). As I discussed previously, participants who had gone to field school under specific supervision were often seen as more competent due to *who* was running that field school. Daphne mentions that she has campaigned students to take a field school under a certain supervisor at a certain post-secondary institution, as she believes that particular mentor will set the student up for the best chance of success in comparison to other field schools. Similarly, Lauren explained a situation where she was told that the individual leading the field school she was attending was so influential in the community that just having the ability to claim that she studied under him would give her credibility as an archaeologist. She described her experience with the professor running the field school, stating:

> "he's like, 'if you want a job in… in archaeology, I will either, like, vouch for you or […] stop your career in its path,' depending on how you perform in the field school. […] he laid it out pretty… pretty bare for us, because archaeology is, and you know this, a very small field. So, your reputation goes, like, a long way. Like it or not, unfortunately."

After hearing Lauren explain the prestige that comes with a recommendation from this professor, it seems that objectivity is faltering yet again in the field school context, as the students studying under this individual are not necessarily being valued based on merit. Additionally, Lauren was not the only one who commented on her experience in field school as being influenced by the individual translating knowledge to younger/newer archaeologists. Roberta also described her experience in field school being taught by two differently gendered individuals, one woman and one man. She explained to me that the woman was often the one doing a majority of the teaching, while the man was more hands off. We followed this thought by wondering if the woman professor felt more obligated than the man to act this way because of her gender. This performance of gender by Roberta's female mentor/teacher aligns with literature regarding women in knowledge translation roles, specifically in that she is (either consciously or subconsciously) putting in more emotional labour to translate this archaeological knowledge (Kendall & Tannen, 2001). If we look at this style of teaching through the lens of gender performance, then Roberta's experience being taught by a woman was influenced by that individual performing her gender through teaching, as everything one does is an act of gender performance (Butler, 1990). Overall, the situations these participants described to me align with Schultz and colleagues (2023) argument that who we learn from impacts what and how we learn, as each of the participants gained knowledge that was dependent on the individual teaching them at that time. I want to acknowledge that having different teachers impacting one's career in different ways is not a bad thing, I would even argue it

can benefit the student. Instead, I gave these examples to highlight how the arena of field school cannot be entirely objective based on how the system is set up and has been functioning for decades.

Further, there are also ways that knowledge translation from field school can negatively impact overall attitudes towards diverse and critical perspectives, including topics such as gender. Specifically, although archaeologists see field school and fieldwork experience as having undeniable value, the field setting is often a concentrated site of reinforcing normative assumptions (Blackmore et al., 2016). Having field experience is a stepping stone to becoming considered a true archaeologist by one's colleagues, and yet it is rather exclusionary (Conkey, 2003). Multiple participants mentioned that field school is exceptionally important because an archaeologist learns so much in this setting that cannot be taught in a classroom. Therefore, with fieldwork being such an important arena of learning, if exclusive ideologies are taught in the field, then the individuals being taught there are likely to reinforce these ideologies (in this case, gendered ideologies) (Blackmore et al., 2016; Cobb & Croucher, 2016). Further, the people with privilege, power, and prestige will continue to stay on top because, as Maude pointed out in her interview, an archaeologist's first experience doing fieldwork can either make or break their career. Maude, even though she has been working as an archaeologist for the past ten years, explained that:

> "I f**king hated field work when I was in field school. Both times I didn't like it. I was out of shape; I didn't drink any water the whole time. I was miserable like a teenager. I didn't think I'd be a field archaeologist, but here we are."

In Lauren's interview she also stated that she went into the field and did not like her experience, and because of it, she happened to enter a different aspect of archaeology in the laboratory. Although Lauren did not leave the field altogether, her case is an example,

not necessarily the norm, as many individuals have left archaeology due to the strain and exclusivity of the field (Cobb & Croucher, 2016). If the system is set up to systematically exclude certain groups of people because of the way it functions (e.g., physically demanding, built for certain body types/abilities, dominated by whiteness and masculinity, etc.) then the perspectives of certain groups are excluded from the archaeological record (Blackmore et al., 2016). Therefore, if we do not figure out a way to include these voices, how can we be objective when we are missing entire groups of people from our scientific endeavours?

Notably, one participant mentioned to me that although she loves archaeology and has enjoyed her time in the field, she was thinking of switching career paths to something that was less taxing on her body, as her specific physical needs are not always suitable with the expectations of field archaeology. Though this example may seem strictly physical and/or practical in nature, the physicality involved in CRM archaeology is closely linked to culture; it is the norm for archaeologists to be challenged and push themselves to the physical limit in the name of conducting fieldwork (Peixotto et al., 2021). Before I had even begun graduate school, I had a colleague tell me they were actually glad I did not pursue field school during my undergraduate degree. They knew the toll it takes on an archaeologist's body, especially if that person faces any preexisting challenges. Even for those who are relatively able-bodied, the field can still offer danger; it is common for archaeologists to have tales of close calls and near-misses (Peixotto et al., 2021). During my time in the field, we faced the risk of heat exhaustion almost every day during the summer months. Yet even though we were given breaks every so often to cool down, we all still showed up every day with the knowledge that we were pushing our bodies to their limits.

Further, if we revisit the idea that field school teaches archaeologists things they would otherwise not have been able to learn in a classroom, this same notion applies to the ways we are able to address wellness issues in the field. Peixotto and colleagues (2021) argue that "methodology for field wellness planning is rarely included in course offerings. More commonly, it is a tacit curriculum, learned through experience," (p. 2). In my own experience, I believe this is true. In a classroom, no one has ever taught me how to lift cobble stones properly without hurting my back. Part of my "tacit curriculum" was learning that I *needed* to stay hydrated to avoid feeling faint or nauseous in very humid climates, and that it was not just a suggestion. While some of this may be explained in a classroom setting, I argue it takes an archaeologist actually experiencing these situations for them to wholly understand the magnitude of safety and field wellness.

However, with the cultural norm in CRM archaeology of expecting to put your body on the line to do a job, this limits the group of individuals who actually make their way in to the field to produce and translate knowledge. As a scholar focused on gender discourse in anthropology and archaeology, until this research project I had not gone into the field in any capacity due to various roadblocks. If I had been in the field, perhaps I could have contributed more diverse, gendered approaches to archaeological knowledge production. However, because of the exclusive nature of fieldwork, I was not in that setting to fill a potential gap, hypothetically allowing for dominant gender norms to go unchallenged. In other terms, with field school and fieldwork being such an exclusionary setting, the number of individuals entering the field becomes limited, and in turn limits opportunities for diverse perspectives (Blackmore et al., 2016; Cobb & Croucher, 2016). Therefore, homogenous ideologies (especially regarding gender) can continue to

reproduce if only a certain subset of individuals end up making it past their first experience in the field (i.e., field school).

One area where subjectivity is disguised as objectivity is the constant ignoring of gender and gendered ideologies, which happens as early as field school. What I mean by subjectivity disguised as objectivity is that CRM archaeologists are taught that they are being more objective if they ignore the subject of gender, when really this silence indicates a subjective ideology that gender is not valuable enough to include in analysis and discussion. This then allows dominant ideologies to continue to reproduce because they go unquestioned, which happens regarding subjects including gender and beyond. While participants did not explicitly mention gender in discussions regarding field school, this step in the translation of archaeological knowledge still influences their ideologies toward gender in archaeological knowledge production. The knowledge translated amongst archaeologists both at the beginning and throughout their career inform how they do their job, thus informing how the knowledge they gain through excavation is translated to those further along in the research process. As participants believe in the essential step of participating in field school, this time spent being mentored by more senior archaeologists impacts the way archaeologists situate themselves in the context of archaeology as they continue their careers. Therefore, what they learn and is ingrained in their thought processes at this stage informs the lens they use to interpret, analyze, and translate knowledge to other archaeologists. From a gendered perspective, if they are learning specific gendered ideologies at this point in their careers, they may carry these ideologies with them as they continue to translate and produce knowledge. More specifically, if they are learning to ignore conversations of gender in analysis and interpretation, this can become normalized and influence how they interact with gendered

discussions moving forward. When looked at through the discussion of objectivity as a veneer, if these participants want to act more objectively, then actually including gender in their interpretations and analysis can be a step in the right direction. However, the field school context is not the only arena where we see this veneer of objectivity falter; in this next section I discuss how I saw and experienced these supposed flaws firsthand.

2.4 CRACKS IN THE VENEER (KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION ON SITE)

Another context of knowledge translation is the field/job site, where the knowledge of best practice and site-specific information that cannot be learned in field school is passed between archaeologists. On these job sites, archaeologists are given a specific set of guidelines that lay out how we are supposed to act in the field, both for our safety and for maximum efficiency/productivity. Each company also has their own set of rules and expectations their employees are expected to follow; for example, during my time with Alberta Archaeology Inc., I was told multiple times by fellow employees, team leaders, and the owner that this company holds itself to rather high standards. Notably, because of these expectations, participants and all other employees of Alberta Archaeology Inc. were valued workers on this project because they were able to get the job done well in a timely fashion. Our company, as a subcontractor for the larger project we were working on, was sometimes asked to go to certain sites within the project that needed us to come in and get the job done faster than the pace of the current workers. Though I recognize I was only working with the company for a short time, this prestige associated with the name I wore on our company-issued attire was something I felt proud of. Was I objectively better at my job than those around me? I would argue not—but those who did not know I was new to the job saw who I was working for and assumed the best.

Though this made my experience in the field more pleasant, I argue that how I was treated by others was just one of many cracks in the veneer of objectivity surrounding CRM.

Luckily for me, I was taught so much by those around because I was completely new to CRM, but other knowledge sharing/translation happened around me as well. Archaeologists who had been in the field for years were going up to younger professionals to ask questions, simply because there is no single archaeologist who knows everything there is to know about how to do this job. Each participant both taught and learned from those around them because each unique experiences offer different ways to interpret the same artifact (Latour & Woolgar, 1986). By working with participants in the field, both observationally and through practice, I experienced firsthand how knowledge (especially regarding necessary and helpful skills) was translated differed depending on who was involved in the transaction. Though valuable, each archaeologist's unique perspective is rife with subjectivity, even when they are teaching another archaeologist how to do their job in a supposedly objective way.

For example, the first person to teach me any practical skills on this job was Maude. She was our crew lead for most of my time with the company, meaning she was in charge of ensuring we were all doing our jobs to the satisfaction of our various bosses (i.e., the company owner and the contractors the company was hired by). As she knew I was inexperienced, each time we moved to a new task, she took me aside to ensure I would be able to complete it successfully. Notably, each time Maude took the time to explain something to me, she would start by asking me if I knew what I was doing or had any experience with that particular task. She later explained to me that this was because she wanted to make sure that I had the necessary knowledge to do my job and would willingly explain the process to me. However, she did not want to infantilize, talk down

to, or otherwise make me feel as though I was intellectually inferior by unnecessarily explaining something to me. In other words, she wanted to ensure she was not telling me something I already knew.

Looking at this situation through the lens of gender performativity (Butler, 1990), Maude's act of knowledge translation when teaching me (and others) how to do this job is itself a performance of gender, regardless of whether these actions align with societal expectations. Every act we execute is a performance of gender (Butler, 1990); therefore, an archaeologist's work can never be completely separated from gender (Latour & Woolgar, 1986; Harding, 1998). As information is translated to us (e.g., from Maude to me), that knowledge is informed by our teacher's subjectivity and gender, and as we begin to teach others, our learning experiences inform the subjective influence we now bring to the table. Though I do not want to lean toward extreme constructivism, I argue that aspects of identity such as gender/gender performance render archaeologists incapable of explicit objectivity. Our gendered experiences make us experience every aspect of social interaction differently, including such situations as our jobs, specifically as CRM archaeologists in this example. Further, though Maude and I share the same gender identity (i.e., we both identify as women, though what that means to each of us may differ), the way we experience our gender—especially in the workplace—is so unique that we neither experience nor interpret a given situation in the same way. The same can be said for how we interpret and analyze artifacts, a topic to which I will return.

An instance where gender roles, expectations, and ideologies became a noticeable crack in the veneer of objectivity was while processing previously excavated dirt. This job was physically demanding, as it involves moving in a repetitive motion (i.e., raking through sediment) for most of our shifts, upwards of eight hours a day. Though we were

all doing the same motion, the advice we were given on how to be more effective at our jobs differed. Mainly, the men I worked with were told to slow down so they would not miss any artifacts in the sediment, whereas the women were told to speed up our raking because we were not processing the material fast enough (I want to note that I am only using the dichotomous terms 'men' and 'women' as no one told me they identified outside of the gender binary, so these are assumptions I am making based on Western norms of gender expression). The men were told they needed to act one way because they were potentially missing essential artifacts, whereas the women were told to act in another, as it was acceptable to miss a small percentage of artifacts for the sake of efficiency. Notably, the men I worked with were finding as many artifacts, if not more, than the women processing the same context. Therefore, in my opinion, the advice given to different gendered individuals was not based on evidence in their work, but rather their gender. I feel comfortable assuming that gender was the primary factor, as the individuals that made up these different groups crossed race and age-based lines, making gender the only visible similarity within groups. The instructions given were subject to the individuals the knowledge was being translated to, seemingly based on gendered expectations and gender performance, even though we were all trained on (supposedly) the same methodologies and practices. Therefore, not only is the gender of who translates the knowledge relevant, but also the gender of who the knowledge is being translated to, which exemplifies my argument that this veneer of objectivity falters when examined critically. Yes, we were all given the same task: to rake through the dirt looking for artifacts. However, what is supposed to be part of the scientific method based on empirical evidence is then influenced by expectations placed upon individuals based on sociopolitical factors.

However, CRM archaeology is not the only area that falls victim to this issue. As I explore in the next chapter, archaeology (in this case, archaeology conducted by Alberta Archaeology Inc.) sometimes crosses over into the world of ecology when examining the context of the area under study. Ecological studies are also rooted in empiricism and therefore have some of the same goals when it comes to scientists using methodologies aimed towards objectivity. Kimmerer (2013) eloquently explains this in her book *Braiding Sweetgrass*, where she explores how Indigeneity and colonialism influence her work. She states that her perspective as an Indigenous woman varies quite drastically from what she was taught to value by Western science; specifically, Kimmerer writes:

> "my natural inclination was to see relationships, to seek the threads that connect the natural world, to join instead of divide. But science is rigorous in separating the observer from the observed, and the observed from the observer. Why two flowers are beautiful together would violate the division necessary for objectivity," (p. 42).

Western science, whether a "hard science" like ecology in the case of Kimmerer (2013) or archaeology in the case of my study, does not leave much room for epistemologies that function outside of the colonial desire for strict objectivity. She also writes that:

> "science can be a language of distance which reduces a being into its working parts; it is a language of objects. The language scientists speak, however precise, is based on a profound error in grammar, an omission, a grave loss in translation from the native languages of these shores," (Kimmerer, 2013, p. 49).

I wonder, how can we argue that science is completely objective, when the act of translation that Kimmerer talks about effectively alters our understanding of the world around us? To try and reconcile these opposing understandings, Kimmerer (2013) believes it important to fuse (Western) science with traditional ways of knowing so we can see the world more completely, balancing these objective desires with the acknowledgement that valuable interpretations exist outside of strict objectivity.

Additionally, I want to emphasize again that certain processes we label as objective can look rather different when we begin to examine them more closely. For example, in Raffles' (2002) work with Mahogany trees in the Amazon, he explains that certain measurements of these trees are taken from diameter breast height (DBH). DBH refers to the diameter of the tree at the breast height of whoever had taken the measurement, and this measurement was accepted as standard in this industry and on this project (Raffles, 2002). Given how much the human population varies in physiological makeup, this measurement could not be very standard at all. If we were to use employees/participants of Alberta Archaeology Inc., the height I would be measuring at compared to those around me could vary by several inches—so how does DBH become standard when it depends on something as varied as the height of the individual collecting that data? Similar situations happen in CRM archaeology though; what is supposed to be standardized quickly falls apart when you begin to look at application in the field. When measuring the depth of an excavation unit, a participant and I produced different numbers using the same tools while measuring from the same reference point. I even produced two different numbers myself when measuring the same depth twice in a row using the same tools from the same reference point. Does this mean that the data we collected should be written off as useless? I would hope not, because if we excluded any data affected by human influence, the archaeological record would be empty, and science would essentially cave in on itself. Instead, what I mean, is that it is important that we acknowledge subjective human influence on theoretically objective methodologies and practices. From the DBH example, we can see that scientific endeavours outside of archaeology can (and do) fall victim to some of the same traps when it comes to putting up a veneer of objectivity that does not always hold up under a critical examination.

Perhaps if we start to acknowledge the cracks in this veneer in archaeology, some of the adjacent disciplines will begin to follow suit (though that may be wishful thinking).

2.5 SUBJECTIVITY THROUGH NON-GENDERED ASPECTS

The overarching idea that scientific inquiry (including archaeology) is subjective is upheld by scholars (e.g., Latour & Woolgar, 1986; Martin, 1998; Rolin, 2011) and participants alike, though the two parties are not entirely in agreement on the degree of subjectivity involved. Participants believe that certain aspects of subjectivity trickle into their work, which they often refer to as "judgement calls," or their own judgement more broadly. However, they believe that archaeology is meant to be rather objective, leaving little room for certain critical and/or alternative explanations, including those involving gender. Latour and Woolgar (1986) argue that science is constructed within culture, and to meaningfully understand science we must understand it through a lens of being constructed by cultural beings (i.e., the scientists conducting the work). While these scholars agree that gender (of the researcher *and* their subjects of study) is one of many influences on the production of knowledge and scientific inquiry, participants are not so accepting of this assumption. Participants agree with some parts of the literature, specifically that archaeological work is subjective, yet they only recognize certain ways that individuals may influence the knowledge being produced. When asked if their own gender influences their subjective interpretations of the past, most participants argued that the gender of an archaeologist *should not* and *does not* influence their work. Further, when asked if there is ever an appropriate time to include gender in analysis and interpretation, the consensus from interviewed participants is that gender is irrelevant to much of the archaeological research process.

Participants are quick to acknowledge how they influence their work in other supposedly non-gendered ways, including Lauren, the laboratory specialist I mentioned earlier. During her interview, I asked Lauren if her gender has influenced her work, to which she responded, "I think I can probably get defensive, but I think that's more like a personal thing more than anything else." While sidestepping the idea of gender, she acknowledged another way she may personally influence archaeological knowledge production and translation. Like Lauren, other participants acknowledge that archaeology has a certain amount of subjectivity; in our interview, Maude told me she believes things like cognitive abilities, spatial reasoning, and confidence could impact an archaeologist's subjectivity. I have seen that this is possible, as I witnessed various situations where participants took the same measurement and record different results, so spatial reasoning and/or cognitive abilities would influence the number they recorded. Though there may have been one true "black and white" answer, Maude was correct in saying the archaeologist's subjectivity (in this case, their spatial reasoning) ultimately affected what was recorded. Still, she vehemently argued against gender as an influence on subjective reasoning, saying it does not and should not play a role. Maude and Lauren are not the only participants to argue this notion, either.

Participants strongly believe that experience and time spent working in CRM is a large influence on an archaeologist's subjective influence on knowledge production and translation. In our interview, Daphne explicitly told me as such, saying,

> "I think there's a lot of aspects of it that can be very cut and dry, […] and we reduce a lot of it to the mechanics of like, 'this measures this. It is made of this material type.' These are things that are kind of immutable. […] You know, there's lots that… that nicely removes our judgement call, but I think one hundred percent in the field, when you're interpreting the landscape or you're interpreting features, I think there's a lot of judgement that comes into it. And a lot of that judgement, hopefully, is based on experience, […] and you're hopefully then creating

> interpretations that are… are grounded in experience, but also in the judgement of others around you."

Here, Daphne indicates her belief that some parts of the job are completely free from "judgement" or subjectivity. Though scholars may disagree, stating that science cannot be understood separately from culture and subjectivity (Latour & Woolgar, 1986; Martin 1998), what interested me more was her acknowledgement of the subjective or "judgement-based" aspects of the job. While explaining that one archaeologist can interpret something differently than another, she is still of the belief that gender has no place in her work. As the owner and boss of Alberta Archaeology Inc., Daphne has put her value of work experience into practice by hiring and maintaining a staff with a diverse background. Notably, some of her employees have garnered significant experience outside of archaeology, not just within it.

One participant with unique experience that contributes to her subjective influence on archaeological knowledge production and translation is Roberta. In our interview, she told me that she comes to the table with a different knowledge background because she completed an undergraduate degree in biochemistry. She further explained that her experience in a different discipline makes her feel more confident in the knowledge she produces during certain laboratory work versus field identification. Roberta believes she is uniquely qualified among many archaeologists because of this experience, specifically stating, "I am more comfortable in the lab, because I have more experience in the lab, because my whole degree was about the lab." Though she told me she feels more confident in the laboratory due to her educational background, I saw this skillset transfer into the field context as well. Roberta was able to answer different types of questions with information that no one else had, specifically in relation to biochemical composition of

artifacts. So yes, her subjective influence is impacted by supposedly non-gendered aspects like education and experience, which participants and scholars alike agree upon.

Throughout participant observation and during later interviews, participants specifically acknowledged the subjective nature of their work by emphasizing the necessity of collaboration. When I got the opportunity to work on an excavation unit, all of the employees from Alberta Archaeology Inc. present on that site were working on the same unit at once; we were collaborating on both the physical exertion (i.e., digging through compact layers of dirt and clay), as well as the analytical and descriptive aspects of the job (i.e., artifact logging and mapping). Collaboration in archaeology can take many different shapes, but the one I am concerned with is collaboration in analysis. Participants explained that they often try to gather as many opinions as possible when analyzing and collecting artifacts, especially at the field level. I experienced this during my time in the field, often asking those around me, "does this look like anything to you?" Unsurprisingly, they often had helpful and (sometimes) different perspectives.

During our interview, Roberta told me that she "think[s] it's so important to be collaborative," to which I responded, "Yeah. Well, and it's even the amount of times that we would all spend staring at a piece of rock, and we're… everyone has a different opinion." We had a good laugh about this, as we spent many hours during my time in the field in groups of archaeologists standing in a circle, contemplating if we were looking at something culturally modified or something crushed by the constantly present heavy machinery. These are only two of many examples of consistent collaboration in CRM, which participants also explain is important to archaeology within and outside of their place of employment. They recognize the benefit of having as many archaeologists' perspectives on an artifact as possible, because each person brings a unique skillset and

level of experience that affects their work. Participants attribute these differing perspectives to influences like years of experience and knowledge backgrounds (e.g., different university degrees, like Roberta's degree in biochemistry). However, collaboration under the guise of garnering perspectives can have its issues as well. Certain individuals were seen as having more authority/seniority, more "experience" like Daphne talks about, or they would simply say something in a more authoritative way, so these individuals would have more of an impact. Their opinions were not only asked for more consistently, but their contributions to collaborative efforts were seen as more valuable, which led to their perspectives being incorporated more.

I was involved multiple times in this exchange rooted in prestige and power dynamics, specifically from the perspective of being the one with less authority/seniority. One day I was processing a context with a participant who, like me, was relatively new to the field. We both looked at an object and thought it was an artifact, but not feeling very confident in our answer, he told me to ask Roberta. When I asked Roberta whether she thought it was an artifact, she said she did not think it was, but ultimately left the decision to me if we would collect the artifact for laboratory analysis. As I trusted her opinion more than my own or the other archaeologist's, I decided to discard the item. This series of events was fairly common, for I asked Roberta's opinion quite often and privileged it over certain other individuals. I believe this was a responsible thing to do, as she was better qualified to answer my questions than certain other individuals, yet this means her voice carries more weight in a supposedly cooperative situation. Roberta was one of many archaeologists on this project whose voices were incorporated more than others, but the opinion of any archaeologist was never unwelcome. So, even though some voices

were heard and incorporated more than others, everyone was still given an opportunity to contribute their perspectives.

Another example of a participant demonstrating the subjective nature of archaeology is Daphne, who explained in our interview that sometimes information about a site can literally die with the archaeologist who excavated and studied there. Unfortunately, this issue can exist in both academic and CRM archaeology, which may or may not be a conscious act by the individuals or teams, but rather a result from systemic issues regarding gatekeeping and accessibility. Daphne explained to me that "it's that publish or perish sort of mentality and a lot of them just perish." Archaeology is a destructive process, meaning once the context has been disturbed, we can never get it back to the historical state; therefore, we can only trust the documentation of the archaeologists who worked on the site and the knowledge they produced. Although the site may still exist, the exact knowledge produced from each excavation is so valuable and unique to the archaeological record that we can lose entire pieces of history from the loss of a single individual. So, how can one disagree that archaeologists subjectively influence knowledge that is produced from their research projects when knowledge about certain sites have died with the archaeologists that kept that knowledge to themselves? Still, though participants acknowledge that individuals provide unique perspectives, they want to remain as objective as possible. This desire is consistent with archaeologists using empirical frameworks to understand the past through material culture. What is curious, though, is the situations where archaeologists are stricter about their objectivity.

Notably, participants rarely, if ever, acknowledge that their gender influences their work through translation and production of knowledge. Sometimes they go so far as to contradict themselves, saying that archaeology can seem "black and white" or

"straightforward," yet also acknowledge that archaeology is subjective. Part of this disconnect is likely to do with the topic of gender (especially ideas of gender associated with femininity) being diminished and devalued by members of the scientific community (Conkey & Spector, 1984; Rutecki & Blackmore, 2016). While participants seem to be somewhat accepting of the subjective nature of archaeology, they do not believe gender ideologies fit within this umbrella of acceptable subjectivity. As gender is one of many ways that societies are organized on a global scale and helps form our day-to-day experience (Rhodes & Baron, 2019), we can assume that our gender and ideas regarding gender play a role in individual subjectivity in knowledge production and translation. The individuals I worked with during this project have shown, however, that even though gender and gendered ideologies may be present, it does not mean that archaeologists often think about it as relevant to the knowledge they translate and produce.

There is a notion amongst participants that including gender in analysis is something to shy away from. Maude, one of the more senior archaeologists who works in both field and laboratory settings, believes that including gender in analysis is not scientific. In our interview she explained,

> "[I]n terms of like, using some sort of perspective based on my gender or any analyst's gender, I don't think that's ever appropriate. That's not scientific. […] I don't like applying those kinds of things to the past because there's simply no way of knowing for sure, […] I don't think that can be universally applied, so I would say in very few circumstances is it appropriate to include gender in analysis."

What this shows is a desire to exclude gendered ideologies from archaeological work to stay as true to the past as possible. However, what Maude and the rest of the participants failed to realize is that the *desire itself* to exclude gender from analysis is a gendered ideology they so desperately want to remove from their work.

The subjective perspective participants have towards gender trickles down into other aspects of CRM work that can reproduce certain gendered ideologies while stifling others. This is one of many ways that participants refuse to acknowledge how much the veneer of objectivity seems to fail the more we examine it critically. By refusing to discuss the existence of gender and gendered ideologies in their work, they are painting the knowledge with a subjective brush because they want the information to be presented in a certain way. While not inherently bad, as all science is subjective to some extent, the silence and refusal to discuss gender reinforces Conkey and Spector's (1984) argument that silence on gender does not mean they have not picked a stance in gendered discourse. In a broader context, when we are not reflexive to acknowledge subjectivity and bias in our work, these biases become problematic because there is no one to keep them in check and ask the tough questions about how to work effectively with them. As I initially set out to queer archaeology by bringing gendered implications to the forefront of archaeological discussions, I now want to focus specifically on the archaeologist's gendered role in knowledge production. How this falls under the umbrella of queer/queering archaeology is that I want to normalize the weird and question what is normalized; the very way this discipline is set up systematically silences these conversations on gender in many forms, so I want to explore how this silence is actually quite loud if you listen closely.

2.6 GENDER'S ROLE

Objectivity and subjectivity influence how CRM archaeologists do each step of their job, from excavation to the laboratory, and the reports that are produced at the end of the research process. Evidence exists in each step showing the participants' strong desire to remain objective in their work, and reasonably so: they want to preserve and represent the past in the most accurate way they can. But when broken down to basic components,

the archaeological record is an interpretation comprised of the work of archaeologists. We cannot confirm our results like biologists and other "hard scientists" can because we cannot discuss these results with the past societies we study, so we will never know an objective truth (if one exists at all). Therefore, it is important that we recognize and work with our own subjectivity, as it influences all aspects of our work.

Most participants have worked in both the laboratory and field contexts and agree that they somewhat influence their work and/or use a form of their own judgement. Though our discipline has empirical roots, the knowledge we produce is still coloured by the individual working on and presenting the data. Yet, at first glance, participants have trouble seeing how their gender and gender more broadly could possibly influence their work, because the assumption of objectivity in this job contradicts theories of gendered subjectivity (e.g., Harding, 1998). With a large focus on cataloging artifacts to include information such as size, weight, material, etc., there is less emphasis on interpretation of meaning beyond description. At surface level this process may seem untouched by gender, which aligns with the participants' desire to exclude gendered ideologies from archaeological work to stay as true to the past as possible. Further, this desire to stay away from gendered discussions was not unexpected. Archaeologists sometimes get confused or feel unclear about including gendered ideas in their work because they often tie their work to materiality, something that does not necessarily align with how gender can be measured/proven/etc. (Conkey & Gero, 1997). However, participants failed to realize that their desire to exclude gender from analysis is a gendered ideology.

Archaeology has its own unique history with gender, where archaeologists have largely ignored gendered discussions for various reasons while falsely believing they had removed themselves from gendered discourse (Conkey & Gero, 1997; Conkey & Spector,

1984; Moser, 2007). However, according to Butler (1990), we are always performing our gender, meaning that gender is not necessarily inherent, but enacted through practices like thoughts and actions. Therefore, participants (and all archaeologists) are constantly performing their gender every day, even without realizing or acknowledging it. This means their gender cannot be removed from their work and the acts of knowledge translation and production, as it is not something they can ever act outside of. One context we perform our gender is the workplace, which means that CRM archaeologists are constantly performing their gender in their work, even though they are adamant about excluding gender from this process.

A common theme I found from participant interviews is that participants do not believe that gender influences their subjectivity, or work in general. Further, they do not believe that it *should* influence these things. Although they argue to exclude gendered discussions, this notion is a gendered ideology, though perhaps not in the most obvious sense. However, once we discussed gender in relation to subjectivity more, participants tended to change their perspective on *if* gender influences their work, though not necessarily their beliefs on if gender *should* influence their work. One part of my interview with Maude comes to mind, specifically when asked when it could be appropriate to include gender in interpretation or analysis of artifacts, she argued that it is neither appropriate nor scientific. I countered this argument with a point she had made earlier in the interview, bringing up her belief that subjectivity is a part of archaeology, and I asked her whether gender, as part of one's identity, would or could influence their subjectivity. Maude responded, "I have a hard time thinking of how it could, um, but it must I suppose?" She could not think of a specific way in which her gender (or anyone's gender) would impact analysis and interpretation, but this thread of reasoning inspired

further conversation about whether gender should be accounted for in CRM work. Overwhelmingly, her belief was still in opposition of including gendered discussions in knowledge translation and production, but for seemingly the first time, she at least had gender in the forefront of her mind. Even as a researcher focusing on gendered ideologies who consistently has gender at the forefront of my interpretive processes, I sometimes do not recognize my implicit gendered biases, so how should CRM archaeologists who are not encouraged to think about gender as frequently, recognize their biases? Especially in a discipline that tends to push a narrative of "black and white" objectivity? A simple answer is that they often do not, so it inspires hope in me that Maude and other participants may think about gender in the context of their future work.

These discussions and thought processes are invaluable to archaeology because gender existed in the past, though perhaps not in the same way we understand it today. It is there, tied to the artifacts archaeologists excavate and examine. Yet participants do not know how, or do not want to, write about or discuss it at any point in the process because it "cannot be proven" or "is not objective." However, ignoring gender outright is not the objective process archaeologists may think it is either. By refusing to have these conversations, archaeologists infuse their biases on the research; in other terms, just because we do not want to talk about it does not mean it does not exist. Conkey and Spector told us this 40 years ago, and other feminist and critical theory archaeologists have been shouting it from the rooftops ever since (e.g., Rolin, 2011; Stockett & Geller, 2006; Voss, 2000; Wylie, 1992; etc.). So, archaeologists cannot say that the work they are doing is "more scientific" or "more objective" when they exclude conversations about gender, because they are still veiling their own assumptions and beliefs over their work.

When participants conduct their work in such a way as to purposefully exclude any discussions of gender, especially because they do not question why they were taught to value objectivity in this way, they are contributing to a problem they either do not acknowledge, or they accept as a very real issue but refuse to acknowledge their role in it. From field school all the way to leadership positions, CRM archaeologists are taught and constantly reproduce the idea that gender does not belong in archaeology. In the specific context of business-informed archaeology like CRM, they are essentially being paid *not* to care about gender and to avoid it so they can spend time completing tasks that help meet deadlines instead. This is why queering archaeology through connecting with critical frameworks and scholars is so important, because it is one of the only ways I see possible to break through the already faltering veneer of objectivity to include conversations of gender in this work.

2.7 HOW OBJECTIVITY BECAME SUBJECTIVITY

As discussed above, subjectivity and archaeology are deeply intertwined—but this is not always the empirical pariah that those who strictly value objectivity think it is. It certainly can be, though, when it is not acknowledged, or is purposefully ignored under a veil of false objectivity. One of the first things ingrained into our heads in "Introduction to Anthropology" (often a Canadian archaeologist's first taste of archaeology, as it falls under the four-field approach in this country) is the concept of reflexivity. The definition of reflexivity as it comes from the Schultz and colleagues' (2023) introductory-level textbook is "thinking about why and how one thinks about specific things," (p. 8) and the authors argue it "is a never-ending process," (p. 14). In the context of this project, it means that archaeologists must examine and challenge the ways that they influence their work and the knowledge being translated and produced from it. Specifically, to be

reflexive in this way means they would need to ask themselves why they are devoted to maintaining the veneer of objectivity archaeologists have been displaying for years, when there are many fault lines in practical application of many methodologies. Further, they must ask themselves how their desire to exclude gendered discussions in archaeological knowledge translation and production is painted by their pursuit for an objective representation of the past. When needing to come across as "scientific" runs the risk of excluding gendered perspectives, arguably an important aspect of the societies we are studying (Rhodes & Baron, 2019), how scientific or objective are archaeologists really being? I argue that by trying to remain objective, archaeologists are swinging the pendulum even further into subjective territory than is necessary, as they are only painting a picture of the past in the way they believe it should be viewed.

One crack in the veneer I saw repeated throughout my data was an attempt at strict exclusion of gender from knowledge translation and production. I say attempt because, as previously stated, the ideology shared among participants and other CRM archaeologists that gender has no place in archaeology is still an ideology regarding gender. Wanting to stay so objective to the point that they refuse to talk about gender at all is not objective, no matter how much CRM archaeologists believe this is true. Participants deeming gender irrelevant to archaeological knowledge was not uncommon, yet they simultaneously highlighted the necessity of collaboration in the name of diverse analysis and discussion. So, if garnering as many perspectives as possible is valuable to archaeological knowledge being produced and translated, is it not logical to include gender in at least some of these discussions? As I conducted this research guided by my research objectives, which largely focused on gender at the outset, much of what I wanted to talk to participants about surrounded this topic. Interestingly though, what I also saw

emerging was a devotion to the false god of objectivity, which inevitably fails because archaeologists cannot help but to be human, and I believe their work suffers when they refuse to acknowledge this humanity.

However, the fault in this attempt at objectivity does not fall to the individual; I saw this desire ingrained in the thought processes and actions of each participant I had the pleasure of working with. Everyone came from different educational backgrounds and levels of experience, yet they all had similar ideologies regarding subjectivity and gender in the context of their work. As archaeologists are constantly learning from each other through knowledge translation, from lessons on how to properly excavate to how to analyze data without coming across as overly subjective, what these participants learn(ed) is tied to who they learned it from. Therefore, if archaeologists are taught to exclude certain narratives from their work by archaeologists with these beliefs, they run the risk of perpetuating this cycle by imposing these ideologies onto those that they go on to teach. This cycle of biases and why we as a discipline must break free of them are explored further in the following chapter.

2.8 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

My goal throughout this chapter was to not only show the cracks in archaeology's veneer of objectivity, but to also start chipping away at the surface-level belief that anything other than a strictly objective archaeology is inherently negative. I want to leave readers with the idea that it is our responsibility to consistently check our own biases, assumptions, and ideologies we bring to the table. In other words, CRM archaeologists can benefit from taking a queer approach to their work, as we can continue having meaningful discussions about our impact on the archaeological record and the discipline of archaeology more broadly. I started this project with a gendered focus, and while I

believe it is important to acknowledge and discuss gender in all of its complex facets, I believe I have made it evident that queering archaeology can and should happen in all aspects of our work.

CHAPTER 3: NARROWING PERSPECTIVES IN CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

3.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

A motif I find myself returning to is the classic game of telephone, where one individual says something to the next person, and the original message gets passed around the circle until they reach the end, where the final message is said aloud. It is not until each individual recounts what they heard, working back to the original source of the message, that the group realizes how much has changed at each stage. Though a game of telephone is most often associated with playgrounds and childhood, what happens during the production and translation of archaeological knowledge in CRM follows a similar pattern. This process begins when one individual (or team) makes an assertion or interpretation based on a set of data. Then this piece of knowledge that has been produced by the first individual gets reproduced throughout literature repeatedly until it is seen as fact, with no one accounting for the context that contributed to its production. While I do not mean to discount the work of CRM (or any) archaeologists as a group, I do wish to highlight the consequences of these interpretive turns for the production of archaeological knowledge. When our interpretive frameworks narrow, we may fail to capture the diversity of human social and cultural expression in the past, which may lead to the erasure of non-dominant subjectivities and identities (e.g., gender non-conforming people, feminine people, children, elderly, etc.). Here I explore how CRM archaeological literature currently contributes to this narrowing of the past through an examination of company-produced documents provided to me by Alberta Archaeology Inc. After providing theoretical context for this discussion, I will introduce and expand on themes I found from primary sources (i.e., the documents produced by Alberta Archaeology Inc.)

and secondary sources (i.e., documents cited in primary and other secondary sources). To do this, I will explore the discourse-centred analysis I conducted, which I anchored in Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional definition of discourse analysis: discourse-as-text (i.e., includes the features of the text like grammar and structure), discourse-as-discursive-practice (i.e., discourse as a concept that exists within the context of a given society), and discourse-as-social-practice (i.e., how discourse is used by members of society). Finally, I will discuss these themes in terms of how knowing this information can help CRM archaeologists interact with literature more critically to expand their current narrow perspectives on the past, and how this broadening can contribute to a holistic and inclusive discipline. I aim to connect how so much is *not* noted in the reports coming from Alberta Archaeology Inc., and the ways they are not engaging critically in the interpretive process but rather inheriting what past archaeologists produced and treating it as fact.

3.2 PARTICIPANT PERSPECTIVES

To briefly summarize this chapter, I will share a quote from my interview with Roberta. Sitting across from me in my office, she said, "I think you need all the different perspectives in order to see all the different angles in order to gather the truth properly." This excerpt comes from a conversation in the interview where she explained that "archaeology is a bit opinionated, and that's how I feel there is so much argument, but you also need that." She continued, telling me about a paper she wrote in a theory course in university where she argued:

> "…all theories in archaeology are important, but in order to get the main answer you need to use all of them. Because, like, if you're only looking at a thing from one lens, you're completely closing off any other aspect of the interpretation because you're only looking at it through your way of looking at archaeology, but somebody else could look at it from a different way. And then eventually, if you

> get all the different perspectives, the truth has to lie within that. And you're never going to know the truth in archaeology. *I think you need all the different perspectives in order to see all the different angles in order to gather the truth properly.*"

What Roberta said builds off the argument that it is important to garner multiple perspectives in archaeology, as each unique subjective assessment offers interpretive value. However, what value is taken away when alternative perspectives are excluded from the archaeological record due to the dedication to strict objectivity? Currently, those publishing archaeological literature use different mechanisms and contexts of silence on certain topics (e.g., gender), making them complicit in letting dominant gender norms continue to reproduce, much to the detriment of the interpretation of human history.

Once all other steps in knowledge production are completed, the information CRM archaeologists have translated and produced is written into reports for various stakeholders. Participants argued throughout participant observation and during interviews that data should not be analyzed from certain perspectives, particularly gendered perspectives, unless explicit evidence supports it. They also argue that gender roles from present day should not be placed on the past, as we can never know what the truth is. While participants argue that this exclusion is due to dedication to objectivity, I argue that by refusing to engage in certain discourses (i.e., gendered discourses), dominant norms and ideologies continue to reproduce while remaining unchecked. This problem exemplifies the theme of silence discussed by Conkey and Spector (1984), Foucault (1978), and many other critical scholars, where implicit biases become problematic when those biases are not acknowledged, and therefore go unaddressed. I want to emphasize that the intentions of the archaeologists are not inherently harmful, as their actions and inactions are caused by a want to remain as close to empirical fact as

possible. Yet, by trying to distance themselves from certain discussions, they are letting dominant ideologies they dislike continue to thrive by refusing to challenge them through rigorous, theoretically backed analysis and discussion. Thus, our collective window to human history continues to get narrower and narrower. To clarify why CRM archaeologists should reflect on these reproduced ideologies critically, I want to define what some of these ideologies are, which I explore below.

3.3 DEFINING DOMINANT IDEOLOGIES

To contextualize this argument, it is helpful to understand how CRM archaeologists are contributing to the narrowing of our perspectives on the human past through publication and subsequent citation. First, however, we must define and explore what dominant ideologies are being reproduced uncritically. The first ideological concept I want to explore is gender, specifically how it has been and continues to be dealt with in archaeological literature. Conkey and Spector (1984) argue that although archaeologists have consistently acted as though gender does not exist in archaeological discourse, it has always been there, thinly veiled behind a lack of proper empirical frameworks for dealing with these discussions. From this empirical scarcity, dominant gendered ideologies (e.g., the gender binary, strict gender roles/expectations, associating one's gender to one's sex, etc.) have been layered onto cultural interpretations of the past. Archaeology, both in CRM and beyond, is built on patriarchal and androcentric ideas that have become so entrenched in the discipline that they become unquestioned. Conkey and Spector (1984) argue that this patriarchal and androcentric bias often leads archaeologists to equate masculine behaviour to overall human behaviour, an argument later reinforced by Conkey and Gero (1997). Essentially, when we do not explicitly account for certain genders in our discussions because we deem gender irrelevant, the discipline's androcentric and

patriarchal bias functions to systematically erase certain demographics from the archaeological record. Unfortunately, we still see this issue today within and outside of archaeology, where many scientific studies are run using masculinity and maleness as a baseline, which not only discredits the value of femininity and femaleness but puts a large portion of the global population at a disadvantage (Criado Perez, 2019). Much of supposed "gender-free" archaeology, which participants seem to value and try to practice, tends to centre masculinity. Though possibly unintentional, they are participating in gendered conversations, and ignoring this participation can be more harmful (and less objective) than openly acknowledging their contribution to gendered discourse. If we want to make meaningful changes to the gender bias and norms in archaeological literature, archaeologists must recognize and challenge their biases towards this veneer of being "gender-free" so they can learn to work with them instead of against them.

3.4 SILENCE AS A COMMUNICATIVE ACT

While participants, and perhaps other CRM archaeologists, who exclude gendered analysis, interpretations, and general discussions in their work want to avoid coming off as "not scientific," like Maude said, they are acting in direct opposition to their intended outcome. Silence is not equivalent to removing oneself from the discussion. Foucault (1978) specifically describes silence as an act, as opposed to mere absence of speech; though we may believe we are not participating in a discussion, staying silent is a choice that we make, and therefore aligns with our position on the matter being discussed, such as gender in this case. He also describes silence in relation to power, specifically that what goes *unsaid* can have as much influence as what *is* said (Foucault, 1978). In the context of this study, when participants say they do not want to participate in gender discourse in their work, this has as much influence on gendered discourse as speaking

directly on the topic. Thus, if they want to navigate the narrative of gender in archaeology away from dominant ideologies they do not agree with, it is more productive to purposefully include empirically driven analysis from a gendered lens in their work. Silence is a communicative act, whether participants realize(d) this or not, which they displayed consistently throughout this study.

Using Foucault (1978) and Conkey and Spector (1984) as a springboard into silence as a communicative act, I want to highlight an example of how a participant uses silence to communicate her gendered beliefs in her work. Many participants presume that through silence, they are communicating their adherence to strict scientific objectivity. Instead, their silence communicates a belief that gender has no place in science, which makes their work more subjective than they thought. Daphne told me in her interview that she does not think discussing gender "adds any value to the interpretation." She explains that when studying a site, archaeologists are looking at (among other things), "what kind of tools they're making, what's the seasonality of it?" She ended by stating, "to parse it down to male versus female, that's me making a guess and… what does that add at the end of the day?" Notably, Daphne directly demonstrates a gender ideology in her statement that gender should not be included in analysis and interpretation. Further, she explains that she does not want to "parse it down to male versus female," which alludes to the gender binary. Who is to say that every culture we study adhered to or believed in the gender binary? Certain societies may have, but this is not always the case. Hiding thinly veiled gendered ideologies behind the guise of objectivity does not remove an archaeologist's subjectivity from their work. So, when Daphne says determining the kind(s) of tools made and used is more valuable than the gender of the individual

making/using them and then chooses not to directly or explicitly address gender, her value and belief system influences her interpretations and analyses.

Within this discussion, I want to give another example of being wary of hypothesizing who used an artifact, specifically from a gendered lens. During the same interview, Daphne explained to me that the only time she ever included discussions of gender in her work was when someone had already addressed it in a historical document from the site. When asked when she thought it would be appropriate to include and account for gender in her work, she said:

> "I think for the most part, the only time we've ever spoken maybe about gender maybe was […] because we had historic documents to back it up, saying that Métis women were doing these activities in town because this surgeon was writing back to his fiancé and saying, 'the Métis women are cleaning hides.' And so, I think that that's one of the few times that, okay, we have documented historic sources that back it up, which most of the time we don't."

Though I think it is important to include this gendered discussion in the report, why are CRM archaeologists so hesitant to discuss gender unless someone else has brought it up? Also, who can say if the historical document from a white settler that Daphne discusses accurately represents Métis history? Is this evidence not also an interpretation, to some extent? In this instance, Daphne is trusting the interpretation of someone else more than she would if she had included her own contemporary gendered discussion. Further, though she does not know the details of the analytical process behind the historical interpretation, she seems to see the value in those written documents. While this individual's claim may accurately represent the material culture Daphne and her team were working on, we have to recognize the value in being critical instead of blindly accepting evidence as fact. Though this is a rare example of when Daphne (or any

participant) included gender in analysis and discussion, this inclusion does minimal work to challenge normative gendered ideologies.

I argue it is important to not only discuss gender and our ideologies toward it, but use critical frameworks to challenge what is normative. Gendered ideologies that have been dominant since the Victorian era can be very rigid and are often based on our own ideas of gender norms, which may then be inaccurately placed on the past (Rosaldo, 1980). For example, looking at gender from a binary perspective when analyzing certain societies who recognize more than two genders makes for an inaccurate representation of the past. One instance where the gender binary does not represent all gender identities in a society is the role of Two-Spirit people in Métis culture. These individuals are seen as embodying masculine and feminine energies and fulfill specific duties and responsibilities in their communities (Métis Nation of Ontario, 2022). In connection to Daphne's example, would this discussion be different if either the author of the historical document or any of the contemporary archaeologists questioned the acceptance of the gender binary? I argue it would, as Two-Spirit individuals play many important and unique roles in Métis culture (Métis Nation of Ontario, 2022). In this case, as with many others, refusing to speak on gender for fear of inaccuracy (or not being scientific like Maude explained in her interview) makes participants complicit in the problem they want to remove themselves from. By staying silent through the mechanism of continuing to situate (the somewhat rare) discussions of gender within pre-existing norms, CRM archaeologists are allowing the dominant narrative they dislike to continue its reign.

Further, archaeologists justifying their removal of gender from the conversation (and I use the term "removing" purposefully) by saying it does not add value to archaeological work, exemplifies how they are complicit in reinforcing gender norms.

Over 40 years ago, Conkey and Spector (1984) eloquently critiqued certain actions that contemporary archaeologists like Daphne still take; they explained that archaeological discourse, while not interacting with and being supported by any theoretical evidence, "is permeated with assumptions, assertions, and statements of 'fact' about gender," (p. 2). Like the authors, I believe this lack of theoretical and empirically based discourse "is a serious problem," (Conkey & Spector, 1984, p. 2). While this is an example of how participants use silence as a communicative act, this is a phenomenon commonly found in archaeological literature, both in company reports (i.e., historical impact assessments) and the literature they are interacting with to inform their work.

3.5 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

In many of the sixteen documents I analyzed, the composition and structure of the reports were roughly the same. These documents were all historical impact assessments, which in simplified terms are written proof that a company can either a) move forward with development/construction/etc., or b) delay or stop their work because more archaeological research/preservation/etc. should be done in that area. The first few pages of each historical impact assessment identified the project, who the author(s) of the report were, laid out the table of contents, etc. Then followed context sections, which were broken down into environmental context (i.e., physical characteristics including stratigraphy, plant life, etc.) and cultural context (i.e., sociopolitical history of the area). As I am mainly concerned with cultural implications, this subsection is where I focused more of my analysis. Notably, as most of the locations highlighted in the historical impact assessments were the same, their cultural context sections were all highly similar, some parts even copied verbatim. After the context sections came methodology, then results, and ended with a summary and recommendations. Notably, what is lacking from these

documents is any discussion and/or analysis section(s). I want to acknowledge that the lack of engagement in an analytical process is also an act of meaning-making; in other terms, this silence is a communicative act (Foucault, 1978). Also included in these reports were bibliographies (which we will return to later) and appendices. In the results section of these documents, results of excavation and analysis were presented using photographic documentation and descriptions of what the artifacts were and where they were found. I believe the authors wanted to clarify their allegiance to objective empiricism, however, they may not realize how much of their influence they are showing regardless.

As explored in the previous chapter, we know that archaeologists influence the interpretations and analyses that eventually become knowledge that is (or is not) accepted as factual truth. This influence can be found at every step in the knowledge production process, including something seemingly simple, such as artifact identification. Employees consistently argued throughout participant observation and interview stages that they believe archaeology can be largely objective, where there is a right or wrong way to conduct their work and produce knowledge. However, this veneer falters when examining these documents from a queer and feminist lens that recognizes author's subjective influence. I want to emphasize that my analysis is not a criticism against this company, its employees, or anyone else involved in the writing process; it is merely an observation and an argument for the importance of queering CRM archaeology.

When I set out to do this project, I expected to find much more meaningful discussions of gender, whether participants were advocating for or against its inclusion in archaeological work. However, participants used silence on this topic to communicate their beliefs regarding gender (i.e., that it does not belong in their work). While this is interesting from a theoretical perspective, it left me with little data to analyze, and the

same is true when it comes to the written documents produced by Alberta Archaeology Inc. I originally planned to conduct discourse analysis on several historical impact assessment reports with a focus on how gender was discussed at this stage in the research process. Yet, I was faced with an overall lack of overt gendered discussion in these reports, save for one document. This document was significantly longer than the rest, coming in at over 1200 pages compared to an average of around 50 pages, and even still, gender was only tangentially discussed once. Though this lack of tangible gendered discussion made analysis more difficult, it pushed me to pivot my lens of analysis to then look at consistent themes I *did* find in their writing.

Overwhelmingly, I found that these documents ignored how the knowledge they were presenting was constructed instead of simply appearing out of thin air as an objectively knowable truth. What I mean is that ideas and interpretations were presented as fact, with the process of knowledge becoming fact purposefully excluded from these reports. This relates back to what Latour and Woolgar (1986) explain as purposeful forgetting as a common issue in scientific work. Further, this purposeful forgetting is similar to Foucault's (1978) stance on silence as a communicative act. These scholars believe that one cannot remove themselves or the process of construction from knowledge, and the attempt to do so still tells us something about the individual making the attempt. What this silence and purposeful forgetting from the historical impact assessments tells me is that the authors want to minimize the visibility of human impact (and error) from readers. This may sound like a harsh criticism or that I believe these authors are being purposefully dishonest, so let me rephrase, as this process is somewhat nuanced. While CRM archaeologists are guided by rigorous frameworks and empirical thought during all stages of their work, including report writing, there are disciplinary

expectations that place pressure on authors to write their findings and interpretations in seemingly objective language that leaves little room for alternative explanations. Again, Foucault's (1978) conceptualization of silence is instrumental here.

In almost every report, there is no explicit discussion of gender at all. The authors reference people or humanity broadly, or an entire culture specifically; however, when these authors say "people," they likely mean men, as the biases of heteronormativity, cisnormativity, and androcentricity are intertwined with nearly every avenue of archaeology. As I continued to encounter these biased generalizations, I want to highlight that this means considerations of gender difference were not even being contemplated in this work/these reports. This lack of gendered consideration (especially that of women and those outside of the gender binary), and really any interpretive decisions, affect how the author and those looking at their work in the future make sense of the data.

As with many sets of rules and expectations, there was one exception to this lack of in-depth analytical discussion of artifacts. One of the historical impact assessments I read stood out because, apart from being over 1200 pages long, it included multiple discussion sections throughout (which was not the case for other reports). Even in these comparatively detailed discussion sections (which were broken up and organized by context), gender was only tangentially mentioned once. Specifically in this report, there is a comparative and analogous mention of a structure that, in certain Indigenous groups from Eastern Canada, may have been used by "young couples." By not using a descriptor beyond the terms "young couple," the authors are likely assuming a heterosexual couple due to the inherent heteronormative bias in archaeology. Without explicitly explaining that the phrase "young couple" could include same-sex or same-gender pairings, the authors have essentially closed off this alternative interpretation from being integrated.

This is not to say the authors were being intentionally harmful, however by not choosing to have discussions about alternative interpretations in perhaps seemingly insignificant instances like this, the authors' silence makes them complicit. Another way they could have written about this analogy is,

> "In this culture, this is a domestic context that is often the site of a young couple. We do not know here what might have been going on, we do not know if those types of relationships were always heterosexual, or if there were multiple ways that intimate relationships were formulated in this society."

They could have also gone into a bigger discussion to make the readers say, "we need to look at this more and try to understand what the different possible meanings of this domicile might have been." Instead, the authors are trying to close the discussion as soon as they opened it; they presented this analogy as fact without acknowledging broader contexts and ideas, like they do with every other piece of evidence they introduce.

Another example from this document was the authors' explanation of how they included a consultation with an Indigenous employee who was working on that site. The archaeologists interpreted certain cultural/symbolic/ritualistic significance associated with one excavation unit that they associated with local Indigenous groups. I want to note that I am purposefully not specifying further than the broader term of "Indigenous" to protect anonymity of all parties involved, although I recognize Indigeneity is not a monolith, and each Indigenous group has their own unique set of cultural/spiritual values and beliefs. After the non-Indigenous archaeologists had made their interpretation of the cultural/symbolic/ritualistic significance associated with the assemblage, the authors mention asking an Indigenous member of the team to come and make their own assessment. Further, the authors state that this individual had been working on a different unit and had no prior information of the interpretations or artifacts that had already been

excavated on this unit. They argue that they wanted this Indigenous archaeologist to come to the table with as little bias as possible so they could make an interpretation based on their own experience with the Indigenous culture. Notably, the authors explain that the Indigenous individual's interpretation of the cultural/symbolic/ritualistic significance aligned with their initial interpretation.

However, what would the authors have done if that one Indigenous archaeologist's perspective was different than theirs? Would they have stuck with their original interpretation, or would they have adopted the new one? This situation exemplifies the way in which Indigenous knowledge and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is useful when it sustains Western theories. There is a widespread practice of using Indigenous knowledge/TEK when it serves white/Western preconceived hypotheses and abandoning it when it goes against these hypotheses. Though these authors consulted with an Indigenous archaeologist who was part of the Indigenous group associated with the context they were studying, Western archaeologists have a long history of privileging their own methodologies and theories over other ways of knowing (Todd, 2016). So, although in this situation, the authors highlighted their interaction with Indigenous ways of knowing through consultation with an Indigenous member of the CRM team, I wonder what would have happened if this person provided a conflicting explanation. While I want to emphasize again that these examples are not my own criticism towards the authors, these discussions lead me to believe the authors are contributing to a narrowing perspective of the archaeological record.

What seems to be standard practice in the reports written by employees of Alberta Archaeology Inc. is very little actual analysis, with the exception of the one outlier mentioned above, which is much longer than the other reports and much more detailed

(likely because of the number and symbolic/cultural significance of the artifacts at the site). Even so, this report is silent on the topic of gender because although there is this larger analysis included in the document, it still treats people as undifferentiated members of a society (i.e., no discussion of gender or gender relations in that context). Though one can argue that treating people this way in this context is an attempt at equality, it is naïve to think that a broad generalization of the human experience is representative of all humans. When we discuss the human experience in this way, it inevitably becomes a discussion of the masculine experience. So, even though the authors may not have intended to erase the experience of around half of the population, they have essentially done so by not providing specificity and/or alternative explanations. Further, erasure can apply to various groups; as archaeology is so rooted in heteronormativity alongside its androcentric bias, by not providing specificity and/or alternative explanations, we stand to risk erasing the experiences of those who did not conform to heteronormative societal expectations. These are only two of many ways that not directly addressing aspects of identity like gender can function to erase various groups from the archaeological record. However, there are many more groups who can and have been underrepresented in the archaeological record through the treatment of all people as undifferentiated members of a society. Thus, we must recognize the importance of not only specifying who we are discussing in the literature/knowledge produced by CRM firms, but providing readers with the knowledge that this is only one interpretation, and there may be others that have not been explored. I want to acknowledge that not every single document, author, etc., can address all that can be interpreted from a single site or artifact. After all, archaeologists are only human. Yet…

3.6 ARE ARCHAEOLOGISTS PRESENTED AS HUMAN?

We know that CRM archeologists are as human as anyone else, though perhaps with more joint pain from constantly leaning over an excavation unit, yet we rarely see their humanity come through in archaeological literature. What I mean is that each archaeologist is different. Participants recognize that archaeologists have different abilities, skills, ways of doing things, and are capable of making mistakes. However, participants also believe they are more objective than subjective. What they fail to realize and/or acknowledge is that while straddling the line between "hard" science and social sciences, they sometimes find themselves in a unique situation that requires both objectivity and subjectivity. Now, my discussion of objectivity and subjectivity may seem as though I am placing the two on a binary, where there does exist objectively knowable truths on one side, versus situations where objectivity is unobtainable. Instead, what I mean is that in certain contexts researchers present their work as though it meets the standards of objectivity, when this is never actually the case.

While the field is built on methods that look standardized on the surface, this is part of the veneer of total objectivity. Instructing someone to excavate a 1M x 1M unit sounds routine at the outset, yet we do not often account for human error or influence. The walls may be slightly slanted, or the bottom/floor is likely not 100% flat or uniform. I can recall a level (i.e., a 10CM deep portion of a 1M x 1M excavation unit) that, because of the consistency and mineral composition of the soil, was so difficult to dig through that we accidentally took out a larger chunk than we should have. This error meant that the bottom of the level had a divot in it that we did not account for in our paperwork. Even our team lead at the time said it was not a detrimental mistake, and errors like that just happen sometimes. So, each 1M x 1M x 10CM level that we excavated was uniform in

theory, but in practice they all looked slightly different. As archaeologists are only human, not machines, there is always the likelihood for marginal errors in their work, though error might be too severe of a term in some cases. Yet these errors are seldom accounted for in reports or any other supporting documents.

Not once in either the primary sources (i.e., historical impact assessments) or any sources I analyzed during bibliography archaeology accounted for what is essentially human nature, especially the further back in time the works were published. Sources that I analyzed from the 1920s were from long before the processual and post-processual eras, so they still were heavily influenced by the overly unpersonal approach of work and reflection that was the only accepted style of empirical work at that time. By positioning themselves under a veneer of objectivity, the past authors consistently presented their work (including interpretations and analysis) as irrefutable fact. Once their work is accepted as fact by their peers/colleagues, archaeologists reproduce these facts repeatedly without critical reflection. Then this work becomes accepted into canon without also accepting the possibility of alternative interpretations and explanations. This is not to say that the original interpretation is wrong, but we are looking at—or rather, we are given—a very narrow history of the past if we only accept one explanation as fact without questioning its production. CRM archaeologists are not asking themselves or others who was involved in this work, why did they come to their conclusions, how did they come to these conclusions, or is there room for other interpretations; instead, they are reading a publication, using it to inform their future work, and continuing the game of telephone without revisiting the context of what was originally produced. To combat this issue, I revisited the primary sources I consulted during discourse analysis and followed the sources they cited back to the original knowledge producers to begin a discussion

previously missing from CRM archaeology. Though this process of analysis may go by different names, I will refer to it as archaeology of bibliographies/bibliography archaeology, as I used the bibliographies of these primary sources as a sort of material culture to understand the discipline's past and how it influences the present.

3.7 ARCHAEOLOGY OF BIBLIOGRAPHIES & KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

To understand why the historical impact assessments produced by Alberta Archaeology Inc. are written in a way that contributes to a narrowed perspective of the past, I feel it best to start at the beginning. So, I started following the interpretive chain of what is continually cited in the reports from this CRM firm all the way back to the original knowledge producers. Through bibliography archaeology, I aimed to explore the sociopolitical contexts from when these sources were written (e.g., written before the feminist turn in anthropology and archaeology). Much of the sources cited in these reports that provided context to various projects was virtually copied verbatim, so I focused my efforts on those sources. I did this because this set of archaeologists and their ideas clearly inform the archaeologists at Alberta Archaeology Inc., if not in practice (i.e., excavation and analysis in the field), then at least at the report writing stages.

What is interesting is going back to these sources and exploring how they show interpretive turns in the ways in which these authors are presenting that material. The knowledge becomes inscribed in the cultural context, and the cultural context is reliant on the interpretations that previous scholars have made. Again, I want to highlight the process' similarity to a game of telephone—one person says something, and it slowly gets repeated but slightly adapted as it moves through the interpretive chain. At that point, it is interesting to analyze the intellectual and cultural contexts in which those previous scholars were working and what that might tell us about the kinds of interpretations they

were making. This is interesting because these interpretations are now no longer being examined critically but instead are simply accepted and reproduced, which is when the practices surrounding citation become problematic, because archaeologists begin to blindly accept what is presented to them by other archaeologists. However, it is worthwhile to reexamine these sources from a lens of acknowledging the biases of researchers and how these biases led to interpretations that are accepted as fact when other interpretations are available.

Another issue I want to highlight is the inaccessibility of the resources cited in the primary resources I analyzed. First, they are inaccessible in a physical and financial sense; one of the most frequently cited reference texts on Alberta archaeology is not available online, and the only free copy I could find was a single copy in the University of Lethbridge library. As this edition was a physical book, it is inaccessible to those outside of the Lethbridge campus, not to mention those who do not have access to the University of Lethbridge library (i.e., not a student or staff member). The text is available for purchase online for a physical copy to be shipped to the purchaser's address, but otherwise I was unable to find a copy of the text. Though I technically have the financial and institutional means to access this text, it seems there is no way for other community members to easily access this information. As this text was repeatedly cited throughout the primary sources, I believe it is likely an important reference material for Alberta Archaeology Inc. Yet, the communities they study that necessitate using this and other resources cannot be easily accessed by these communities. There is a metaphorical and material wall put up around this resource and many other texts cited in the primary sources that I could not access, even as a graduate student with access to various online

databases. If I cannot read and critically analyze these consistently cited texts, how can anyone else other than a select few?

When following this research pathway, I found myself reminded of Martin's (1998) "science as a citadel" metaphor. The author describes science as something kept hidden behind a wall, thus mystifying the process and rendering itself inaccessible to most. What Martin (1998) also explains in the same metaphor, however, is that this so-called "citadel" still exists in society, even when the powers that be try to separate it from the rest of culture. Regarding inaccessible sources hidden behind the barrier of the citadel, I have a stepladder high enough to peer in through a foggy window but not tall enough to crawl over the wall. From this position, I want to emphasize the importance of analyzing these sources in the greater societal context, including the sociopolitical context they were produced in, but especially acknowledging how inaccessible it can become to various groups. Archaeology is often portrayed as very hands on, dirt covering everything, perhaps even blue collar when one considers the ties CRM often has to various industries (e.g., oil and gas, forestry, etc.). However, that does not save its theoretical and literary roots from being locked up in an ivory tower, including some of the texts repeatedly cited in the primary sources from my discourse analysis.

Another context in which dominant ideologies remain unquestioned is the process of reproducing past interpretations through uncritically using sources, especially in citation practices. When archaeologists present information as fact instead of acknowledging the constructive process involved in arriving at these conclusions, they are doing a disservice to the discipline's history. Specifically, the sociopolitical context that cited sources were created in contributes to the information, as it informs how the knowledge was produced; as has been a consistent theme in this project, science

(including social sciences like archaeology) cannot be separated from the culture they exist in (Harding, 1998; Latour & Woolgar, 1986; Martin, 1998). For example, when I looked at who and what was cited in the primary sources, some citations dated back to the 1970s. If we look at where anthropology and archaeology had situated themselves at that time, it takes us back to the reign of Lewis Binford and the commitment to processualism. In other terms, the work produced in archaeology at this time aligned more with the commitment to objectivity and the scientific method that participants are so fond of. Nowadays, archaeologists also face influence from post-processual thought, where we see more scholars challenging the idea of one objective truth that can be simply found. Yet we must acknowledge the journey from point A to point B, as the latter does not exist without the foundation set by the former.

Further, when I followed the trail of citations further back, some of these texts cited in the primary sources were then citing works dated back to the 1920s. In only two degrees of separation, we are back almost a century in the timeline of archaeological knowledge. To me, it seems quite obvious that the knowledge produced in 1925 would have meaningful differences to what is produced in 2025; yet the authors of the primary sources may not be working their way back through the game of theoretical telephone to analyze the knowledge that informs their current work. In the 1920s, the word "processual" had yet to enter the archaeological zeitgeist. Beyond that, there would have been many more limitations on *who* was conducting this work; women like me argue that the field is still an exclusive place, but in the 1920s we would not even be allowed to experience hardships in the field because *we were not allowed in*. Unless, of course, we were the wife of an archaeologist, who would inevitably take any work we had done and publish it under his own name, if he even bothered to read it or deem it valuable. So, if

anyone who did not fit into the acceptable version of what an archaeologist was supposed to look and act like (i.e., white, cisgender, heterosexual, etc.) was kept out of the field, the responsibility to capture the diversity of the human experience through material culture falls to a population that has a comparably narrow perspective.

One of multiple sources from the 1920s that I came across during this analysis is by Seton (1929), who was a widely known zoologist of the time. He is also known for founding the "Woodcraft Indians," which led to increased acceptance of stereotypes regarding various Indigenous groups (Parks Canada, 2024). I came across Seton (1929) during this analysis at two degrees of separation from a primary document, meaning that the steps were (1) primary source, (2) secondary source, and (3) Seton. Even though the authors of the primary source(s) did not cite Seton (1929) directly, his work still informs the knowledge production pathway. In other words, his ideas are spoken earlier in the metaphorical game of telephone. While some may question why this matters to the primary document written almost 100 years later, I want to turn to two examples found in just the first two sections of this text (the preface and introduction, respectively).

In the preface, Seton (1929) explains his hopes for what his work will be used for. He ends this section by saying, "I am merely assembling tools, and some day a great man will come, and with these tools construct a telescope that shall surely reveal to us the vision that the world is awaiting," (Seton, 1929, p. x). This quote astounded me momentarily, until I remembered that this would have been rather indicative of general worldviews in many scientific communities at the time. The first part I want to dissect is his use of the phrase, "a great man." This terminology could be taken two ways. First, that he strictly believes that only a man could every use his assembled tools correctly and meaningfully. Second, that he uses the term "man" to represent the whole of humanity,

which still would imply that he thinks it reasonable to use the experiences of men to generalize for the entirety of the human experience. Either way, this phrasing seems to contribute to a very narrow view of who he sees interacting with this material in the future. The second section of this example that stands out to me is his belief that these tools can be used to "reveal" the truth that "is awaiting." To me this implies that Seton aligns himself with rather positivist views, meaning there is an assumption that an objective truth exists, simply waiting to be known. Though he may not have intended to be so transparent with the terms he used in this single sentence, Seton (1929) reveals many of his perspectives and beliefs that inform his work.

Further, in the introduction, Seton (1929) describes the tropical region of the earth as "the land of the palm trees, the parrots and Monkeys, the home of the black human races," (p. xxiv). Again, two things stand out to me from this sentence. First, the intentional capitalization of "Monkeys," showing how important he views them and their connection to humans. Secondly, the phrasing of "the black human races." Notice here a sense of separation, especially conceptualizing Black people as being a different race than white/European people. I would even go so far as to say it seems that Seton places more importance on "Monkeys" than "the black human races" based on the structure of this sentence. Science has been and continues to be rooted in racism (Todd, 2016), so it would not shock me if a white, settler-colonial zoologist held some of these beliefs and even felt backed up by science in believing them.

Does this mean that we should rebuke anyone who has used his work to inform their own? Not necessarily—but we do need to acknowledge the role Seton (1929), and everyone we cite, plays in the production of knowledge, both in archaeology and in academia more broadly. Though Seton has published works that are foundational to much

of what Western scientists know and accept about wildlife in North America (which is essential to an archaeologist's understanding of the geographical area they work in), he produced this knowledge under colonial conditions, which still happens today. This is not to say his work cannot be cited or used to inform our own. However, when we fail to recognize potential harm the author caused in conducting his work, we are complicit in the problem as we refuse to question how facts are portrayed to us. To queer archaeology, we cannot accept what we are given without first reflecting on how and why it is being given to us in the first place.

As we know that gender was rarely discussed in the past, let alone in a meaningful way with theoretical support (Conkey & Spector, 1984), we can also see some of the same patterns repeating in current reports. In our metaphorical game of telephone, if the original call is missing something, it is unlikely to be introduced farther down the line, unless someone makes a conscious decision to stray from the path. This holds true in the bibliography archaeology I conducted; documents early on in the chain of knowledge production lacked empirical discussions of gender, and so did the primary sources on which I conducted discourse analysis. With a discipline that places high value on masculinity both implicitly and explicitly (Blackmore et al., 2016; Conkey & Spector, 1984), this masculinization has become the deeply rooted norm. When those who choose to challenge these norms are not cited, or even published, alternative views and interpretations become silenced within the discipline. As Foucault (1978) explains, silence is a communicative act that is strongly connected to power dynamics. I initially discussed the act of silence coming from refusing to speak on something ourselves, but the same holds true for when we silence others as well. Citation is inherently political, as we are choosing what voices and what knowledge inform our work, so when we only cite

works that mirror our own sentiments (e.g., voices that uphold the masculinization of the discipline), we are silencing others in a profound way. Although I acknowledge the authors of the primary sources may not have been trying to silence others and may lack awareness of their power, it is important that we recognize our influence on the knowledge we produce through who we cite. If we want to broaden the scope of the archaeological record, we should look to expand the voices we use to inform our work. There are many examples of how the person and/or institution we get our information from impacts the knowledge we are receiving (Schultz et al., 2023), two of which I will explore here.

3.8 THE MARGARET MEAD OF IT ALL

One of the most famous women in anthropology is Margaret Mead, arguably most known for her work in Samoa (Mead, 1928). This study focuses on many aspects of growing up and learning culture in Samoa and features a thought-provoking discussion on the gendered aspects of this social process. However, Mead's work was not without criticism; in the 1980s another notable anthropologist, Derek Freeman, argued that Mead had gotten some things wrong, as he had not observed certain phenomena she discusses in her work (Freeman, 1983). Supporters of Mead's original findings, and the anthropology community more broadly, participated in discourse regarding the influence of the ethnographer on the knowledge produced. For example, Mead entered this society as a female outsider and had a different experience conducting participant observation than Freeman, a male outsider. I do not want to disregard the contributions Freeman made to our understanding of Samoan culture. However, this debate exemplifies how a masculinized interpretation and the individual who made that interpretation reduced what he deemed to be an alternative interpretation to incorrect and unempirical because it did

not match his own narrow perspective. Notably, Mead's interpretation of Samoan culture is still discussed in many anthropological circles, including introductory level textbooks (e.g., Schultz et al., 2023). The Mead-Freeman debate is a widely used example of the importance of cultural relativism and the importance of reflexivity in anthropological inquiry (Schultz et al., 2023). However, Mead (1928) is the exception, not the rule; we still see many interpretations dismissed today that do not fall into disciplinary expectations (Blackmore et al., 2016; Conkey & Spector, 1984; Dowson, 2000), both in archaeology and anthropology more broadly.

The other example I want to explore is the various interpretations of menstrual practices of Yurok women. Initially, Kroeber's (1925) interpretation of how menstruation was situated in Yurok culture was very negative. He understood the various practices to represent removing menstruating women from various aspects of society because he thought they were seen as dirty, or having negative influence on the rest of their community. However, Buckley (1982) came back almost 60 years later to offer an alternative explanation that menstruation was viewed in Yurok culture much more positively than in Kroeber's original fieldnotes. Notably, he returned to these field notes after having a conversation with a friend whose wife had begun connecting more with her Yurok roots. She explained to Buckley that Yurok women separated themselves from their husbands during menstruation because they were more powerful at this time (Buckley, 1982). What I want to contrast against the Mead-Freeman example is that sometimes, critiquing previous interpretations is helpful and rather meaningful. What both examples have in common, though, is that how the anthropologist (or archaeologist) interprets the situation then influences how they present that information and what is eventually accepted as fact/truth. Thus, it is imperative that we constructively critique the work of

those that came before us before blindly accepting what they have presented to us as fact. Though it may be a credible explanation, it may not be the *only* explanation.

What stands out to me here is that this seemingly "alternative explanation" published by Buckley was closer to being "correct" than what was originally accepted as fact. We only know that this alternative interpretation of Yurok culture is relatively accurate because there are living members of this culture who still share the same practices. This is not always the case, though. Sometimes the cultures we study in archaeology belong to past time periods that might not have accessible descendants, let alone that share some of the same practices regarding the material culture we study. Who can say, then, how many alternative interpretations may have been closer to the lived experiences of the past but have been sloughed off because there was no one to say, "hey, this is right! The first guy got it all wrong!" We can never know an objective truth, because we cannot travel back in time to check our accuracy with the people that created the material culture we study. So, to respect these cultures, we must look at how we contribute to narrowing perspectives in our work, and how we may broaden them.

3.9 THE SPEED OF CHANGE (OR LACK THEREOF)

Although gendered discussions and critical reflection in archaeology have increased in academic literature over the past four decades, archaeologists often still refrain from interacting meaningfully with these topics. One possible reason these changes are slow to happen is what Conkey and Spector (1984) call a "paradigm lag." They explain that cultural anthropology is often the first subfield to adapt to changing sociopolitical factors, such as feminist movements or gendered discussions, whereas archaeology can be years behind in making similar disciplinary changes. I argue there is an even further lag before these changes are made in CRM archaeology, as participants

have demonstrated that there is a weak presence of critical theory used in their work even after becoming increasingly used and accepted in academic archaeology. Essentially, if there is a years-long paradigm lag between cultural anthropology and academic archaeology, there will likely be a further lag between academic and CRM archaeology.

One way to frame this paradigm lag is through the evidence-practice gap commonly discussed by public health scholars (e.g., Grimshaw et al., 2012). As CRM archaeology is often framed as applied anthropology, also known as the "fifth field" of anthropology (Schultz et al., 2023), we can view it as the so-called "practice" that has not yet caught up with the evidence. Green and colleagues (2009) explain that there is a 17-year gap before knowledge is adequately translated in a way that practically affects how work is conducted. Though this estimate comes from health sciences, I argue that we can assume there might be a paradigm lag between CRM and academic archaeology.

In our interview, Lauren explained to me that CRM archaeology functions differently than academic archaeology because of its ties to industry and capital, which may influence a potential paradigm lag between the two subfields of archaeology. She told me that she thinks,

> "gender representation really […] percolates into CRM, but I would say that the… the thought processes and the theories behind, say, looking for gender representation at a site is much, much, much more prominent in academia than it is in CRM. Because CRM is focused basically on, almost like, black and white analyses. Like, 'this is here. This is present. This is what this means.' And a lot of time CRM companies really don't have a lot of time, because they're working on really tight budgets to turn around results and get it to 1) the client, and then 2) the government. […] I would say that more often than not, that kind of happens in […] an informal setting when you're, like, done at the end of the day, and you're like, 'oh, we found this. What do you think happened here?'

Essentially, what Lauren is saying here is ideas regarding gender and other dominant frameworks go unchallenged because of the specific expectations and norms of CRM as

opposed to academia. As CRM firms are on deadlines created by contractors and governing bodies, which do not often prioritize purposefully gendered inquiry, these discussions fall to the wayside. Lauren believes that the lower priority given to gendered discussions is more obvious in CRM firms, which clearly exemplifies both the paradigm lag (Conkey & Spector, 1984) and the evidence-practice gap (Grimshaw et al., 2012). Specifically, although experts in the field have shown the importance of having these critical discussions (e.g., Conkey, 2003; Geller, 2009), CRM archaeologists are not adhering to these calls to action. However, the fault may not rest entirely on employees' or participants' shoulders, as there is another key piece to minimizing the evidence-practice gap and paradigm lag I must address.

This lag is also affected by who is translating this knowledge to the ones putting it into practice (Grimshaw et al., 2012). So, someone like me who has only been part of the CRM community for a single field season, is likely not the most effective source for disseminating this knowledge to CRM archaeologists in a way that would inspire actual change. For the results of this study, and any previous work on gender discourse, to inspire widespread positive change in CRM, dominant voices and policy makers must get involved in the process of evidence-informed practice. However, this is not to say that individual archaeologists should not feel any responsibility for their role in potential widespread change. Who we learn from influences what we learn, so anyone in a position to translate knowledge to other CRM archaeologists has the opportunity to break through silence and complicity; and, as I and the participants have demonstrated, *every* CRM archaeologist is in this position, whether they recognize it or not.

3.10 FIGHTING SILENCE

It is rather easy to sit back and allow current narratives to continue reproducing; we can pass blame to others, because we may not think we are directly contributing to a systemic issue. Passing on responsibility happens in CRM archaeology in many ways; as I mentioned earlier, I have lost count of how many times I (and my coworkers) tossed a rock in the artifact bucket to "make it the lab's problem." However, as Foucault (1978) reminds us, silence is not apolitical or inactive, but rather the opposite. Conkey and Spector (1984) tell us that believing we are silent is ignorant to the impact our refusal to speak on a topic is. Therefore, if we want to instigate any actionable change, archaeologists must acknowledge silence as a communicative act, and that silence *does* things and has very real repercussions. For this change to happen, we need to pivot away from silence and begin having empirically, theoretically informed conversations. Throughout this project, participants mentioned a reason they tend to shy away from gendered discussions is because they disagree with many of the ways gender is viewed and discussed in archaeology. They told me they believe that all genders should be treated equally in the field and when interpreting artifacts. They also believe that gender should not matter in archaeology, because they believe it cannot be objectively proven.

Nevertheless, as I explored in this chapter, we cannot escape gender in virtually any aspect of archaeology. It impacts interpretations, analysis, writing, and citation practices. Further, nothing about any human culture can be separated from gender. Labeling something as a hunting tool means it was used by someone in the past as a means to an end. Yet, participants do not want to acknowledge that whoever used that tool existed as a gendered individual in their society. What that looked like may differ from how we view gender now, especially from a Western perspective in which participants

exist and conduct their work. However, by staying silent, we become complicit in a system that works to oppress certain voices. When we look at an artifact, interpret it as a tool used for hunting, but do not say anything beyond that, we are allowing the discipline to continue forming opinions based on common assumptions. If there is no one to advocate for diverse interpretations of the past, we are only going to produce an archaeological record from a narrow frame of mind, which would be a tragedy. Human existence is beautifully diverse now, then, and always, and those tasked with the responsibility of telling our stories should not be afraid to speak up when it goes against what is expected of them.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

I venture it is safe to say that at one point in most people's lives, we have all participated on one (or both) ends of the classic conversation between a toddler and an adult, which goes something like this:

Toddler: "Why?"

Adult: "Because I said so."

Well, for archaeologists, this response when we ask "why?" is often seen as good enough. Further, that is only if the "why?" question gets asked in the first place. Why do we do the things that we do, why do we use the methods we do? Because I said so, because that is the way it has always been done. As a matter of fact, I am your teacher, so just do as I say. Why do we classify objects a certain way? Well, because this author said so, almost 100 years ago. Why do we refrain from discussing things like gender in archaeology, even when it is arguably relevant (which to feminist and queer archaeologists is always)? Well, because disciplinary norms tell us to avoid the topic. Actually, do not ask that question ever again, or face the consequences. It comes down to the fact that *I* am the adult (the institution), and you are the child (the one bold enough to question *why* things are the way they are), so I know more than you about what is right and wrong.

This project has essentially been a long-winded way of pushing against the "because I said so" mentality that seems to have entered archaeology and stuck around since the very beginning. Though there have been many changes made along the way, thanks to voices working in Indigenous, queer, and feminist archaeology, the general belief is that if we follow in the footsteps of those who came before us, this will help our work stay objective and true to the past. If you have read what I have written up to this point, you will know that I believe both absolute objectivity and a single knowable truth

are not exactly possible in this line of work. Through studying Alberta Archaeology Inc. in various contexts (i.e., fieldwork, laboratory, interviews, literature), I learned that participants can sometimes conduct their work on autopilot. What I mean by this is they are taught what to do, in field school, by team leaders, and by those around them, and they accept the information they are fed and use it to go through the motions of their work unquestioningly. Many assumptions are left unchecked, especially the belief that they are conducting rather objective work—like participant Lauren said in her interview, sometimes archaeologists "hide behind methods." I want to emphasize once again that this is not judgement towards them, neither is it their fault. However, it is their (and CRM archaeologists' more broadly) responsibility to unlearn it. To achieve this, it would be revolutionary if more CRM archaeologists worked with the goal to queer archaeology, much like I did with this project.

4.1 THEMATIC SUMMARY

The first theme I discussed back in Chapter 2, which explored how objectivity is a mere veneer over archaeology, exemplifies this need to ask "why" instead of blindly accepting what is being fed to us. In our interviews, when I asked participants if they thought gender was ever appropriate to include in analysis and interpretation, each of them explained that gendered conversations should rarely happen in archaeology because it cannot be proven and is not scientific. Well, the so-called scientific methods they use for interpretation and analysis are about as subjective as the conversations they say are not scientific enough to include. Multiple participants explained that who they learned from, either in field school or on the job (sometimes both), influenced the knowledge they were then able to bring to the table in their own work. Further, they recognize that each archaeologist offers a unique perspective, making it valuable to have as many

perspectives as possible contribute to a conclusion. I could not agree more, and many critical (i.e., feminist, Indigenous, queer, etc.) scholars have published similar sentiments that it is important to include many voices in scientific and archaeological inquiry (e.g., Todd, 2016; Voss, 2000; etc.). However, there is almost a double standard that exists between subjectivity in normalized versus deviant circumstances. Participants' daily practices are built on and continue to reproduce false assumptions that archaeology is an "exact science" because they follow the instructions as best as they can without asking themselves why they are doing it. They learn to expect objectivity and think it is achievable if they follow certain methods and procedures, but as I explained throughout, objectivity is not guaranteed (and I still question if it is even possible). Instead, participants' days are rife with subjective experiences. These experiences are not inherently bad, but it becomes problematic when we pretend that they do not exist just because we are taught that they should not happen. Participants recognize that there are teamwork elements to their job, yet they continue to fail to recognize that this means there is not one right way to do anything. If garnering different perspectives leads to better archaeology, which participants and scholars alike believe it does (Blackmore, 2011; Dowson, 2000; Todd, 2016; Voss, 2000), then that means each person has something unique and different to say. If this is true, how can we look at archaeology as a completely objective science when it is dependent on who is doing the archaeology? As I explained in Chapter 2, instead of making this assumption, we should consistently question the way things have "always been done" with the goal of bettering ourselves and our work.

In Chapter 3, I discussed how once we recognize and deconstruct the idea of archaeology as a strictly standard/objective practice, then we can start to dive in to how and why it is neither of these things from a theoretical lens; this is especially true when

we look at how knowledge is produced and passed down. As contemporary CRM archaeologists, we inherit the assumptions of those that came before us, but if we do not clean out the metaphorical attic of what has begun to gather dust, we carry forward certain harmful things into our new homes (i.e., our research). So, if we want to take what is useful with us, and acknowledge the remainder without bringing it along, we have to examine it and exorcise it. What I mean by this is archaeologists must critically examine whose knowledge we are building on and basing our own work off of. What topics am I avoiding, whether consciously or not? Why am I excluding these topics, and how can I work to integrate these topics (e.g., gender) into empirical research? What assumptions am I working under, and how can I address them responsibly? Where did I get these assumptions, who passed them down to me? A large portion of that chapter was rooted in bibliography archaeology, which involves more specific questions regarding the literature and knowledge we consume in our work. What type of sociopolitical environment was this prior knowledge created in? Whose voices am I looking to for wisdom? Further, as citation practices are political, who are we citing and giving prestige to? Is it the same voices that have been hogging the microphone, or are there others who may not have a seat at the table that we could amplify? Each of these questions, when answered honestly, can help archaeologists regroup and act reflexively in their work, which makes for better archaeology (Conkey & Spector, 1984).

These two concepts, though individually relevant, have interwoven implications regarding their impact on archaeology and the archaeological record. I stated initially and throughout that my goal during this project was to queer archaeology, and the need to peel back the veneer of objectivity and avoid narrowing perspectives of the past are two situations where this is especially important. To queer is to challenge assumptions and ask

questions. I used to think queering was about tearing down preconceived notions and coming to the table with a blank slate, but through conducting this research, I have now learned that a "blank slate" is quite impossible. It is important that we acknowledge what has come before us and influenced how we do our work, which is essentially what the anthropological concept of reflexivity boils down to. Therefore, to queer is inherently anthropological; to queer is not to necessarily tear down assumptions, it is instead to ask more questions.

Even more importantly, to queer is to ask the right kinds of questions (Rosaldo, 1980), which I argue are those that inspire a broader worldview instead of a narrow one. So, to queer is not to rid ourselves of assumptions, it is instead to ask hard and uncomfortable questions. Question everything normative. Question everything weird, and maybe stay with the weird, odd, and unusual. These questions do not always come from a place of judgement, either. Though some questions require us to critically reflect, some questions stem from hopeful curiosity. To queer CRM archaeology, my first step was to question absolutely everything. It led me specifically to question how the CRM community comes to know what they do, and how they interact with and think about this knowing. What I found is not interesting in an arbitrary fashion, but meaningful for the CRM community, and further, what it means to queer archaeology.

4.2 SIGNIFICANCE

One aspect of this project I was especially concerned with was the significance and practicality of my research. Through communication with members of the CRM community, both within and outside the scope of this project, many archaeologists have expressed a desire for archaeology that is more representative of the diversity of the human experience. This sentiment has been mirrored in literature for more than four

decades as well (Blackmore et al., 2016; Clancy et al., 2014; Conkey & Spector, 1984; Dowson, 2000; etc.). From my privileged position as a member of an academic institution, as well as my less privileged position as a queer woman in the archaeological and anthropological communities, I wanted to ensure that their voices were heard. I too want to feel represented in interpretations of the past. As things currently stand, I find it difficult to confidently say that I am satisfied. However, this project becoming a practice of queering archaeology has been a step in a progressive direction.

For example, when I asked participants what their gender identity was during our interviews, I also asked them what the label they chose meant to them. On a theoretical plane, gender can be defined, but in practice, gender is a convoluted concept that can mean something different to each individual. After the initial shock from this question set in, because most had not been confronted with the concept of defining or explaining their own gender outside of simply identifying it, they were often at a loss for words. Many brought up characteristics similar to Butler's (1990) concept of gender performativity, including personality traits and outward appearance to varying degrees, but no one felt sure enough to give a definitive answer. So perhaps that is part of the reason why it is so ignored in archaeology (as demonstrated throughout this project). Participants describe their work as being black and white, which does not necessarily make room for the concept of gender that is more akin to shades of grey. That does not make gender unimportant, it just means it can be difficult to talk about in empirical terms—which connects back to the discussion about lacking empirical and theoretical frameworks to talk about these ideas (Conkey & Spector, 1984; Conkey & Gero, 1997). But to queer archaeology, we must have these conversations that exist in these grey areas. Human life

does not exist in black and white, binary categories, so our recollection of the human experience through material culture should represent the diversity of our history.

Notably, much of the archaeological work I came across while entrenched in the CRM world did not have any grey area conversations regarding cultural aspects like gender. As mentioned previously, these grey area (or subjective) discussions only touched on "acceptable" topics, like whether an artifact was used as a hunting tool or not. Surely there is more to the human experience than hunting, yet parts of contemporary social and cultural life can be swept under the rug (Dowson, 2000), so is it not fair to assume that we are doing the same to social and cultural life of the past? I am also reminded here that nothing we do as scientists, anthropologists, or archaeologists is ever apolitical, which is one of the core tenets of feminist archaeology (Lamphere, 2006; Stockett & Geller, 2006). Taking it one step further, nothing we do is ever free from the influence of gender (Butler, 1990; Conkey & Spector, 1984). Yet, certain privileged individuals see themselves as existing apolitically, whereas marginalized people are always going to be seen as both political and gendered (Haraway, 1988). Queering these notions and retracting the idea that any archaeologist can exist apolitically or uninfluenced by gender makes us better archaeologists. Through this act of reflexivity, we can recognize that interpreting an artifact as a hunting tool is no better or worse than interpreting something as a hunting tool used by a woman, for example. We can recognize that much more exists in this so-called grey area than was previously acknowledged, but that does not mean that we should not study these things and interact with them meaningfully.

4.3 NEXT STEPS

I also want to note that this project is only another small step towards queering archaeology within a broader scope. I am certainly not the first to do so, either; I am

constantly inspired and amazed by those who I am fortunate enough to collaborate and grow with. I am also thankful to be able to build off of those who came before me that I only know through their hard-fought work they have put out into the world. Beyond this, I believe that others can look to my work as a springboard for their own steps towards a queerer archaeology. Every time someone uses their voice in situations where it has previously gone unheard expands our collective outlook, so I hope my addition to the world of archaeology inspires others to do so as well. To me, this process of queering is where the future of archaeology lies, both in CRM and academia; the process of queering is never over, as we continue to reconfigure and reshape the work being done by archaeologists across the world. I studied and queered archaeology in the context of a single CRM firm, but there are boundless arenas where this process can take place. One of the goals I set for myself in this project was to study a community close and accessible to me, instead of traveling to other places to study a community that is somewhat foreign to me. There are plenty of individuals capable of doing this work from within their own cultures, something Indigenous people have been trying to tell us for years (Grenz, 2024). So, to try and combat the colonial nature of these disciplines and distance myself from the Indiana Jones archetype, I chose to study a subsection of my own community as an anthropologist: CRM archaeologists. Though I do not want to diminish the significance of this project, I know there are many other contexts, communities, and cultures that would benefit from a queer lens as well. I recognize it can be hard to break in to these institutions to do such important work, but I know it is possible, because I have seen others set this precedent.

One specific way to meaningfully continue this work is to examine how gendered ideologies influence workplace experiences of CRM archaeologists from an ethnographic

perspective. This was my original research topic for this project, and how I had initially proposed the partnership I made with Alberta Archaeology Inc. As I mentioned previously, many participants did want to discuss these aspects of gender in their work, however I was not able to engage in these conversations within the scope of this research. From an ethical standpoint, I was instructed to exclude this line of questioning for the safety of the participants, which I greatly appreciate and respect. However, participants explicitly told me that they hoped to talk about these issues in their interviews. Further, in discussions with a larger portion of the CRM community at the Canadian Archaeological Association in Edmonton in 2022, multiple members of this community went out of their way to tell me that this type of research is not only wanted, but necessary.

While I want to acknowledge that all research should keep in mind the safety of participants and the inevitable impact it has on them, it is also important to recognize the needs and wants of the communities we study. Underrepresented and marginalized groups in CRM work face difficult and discriminatory circumstances in their workplaces (Blackmore et al., 2016; Clancy et al., 2014), and they deserve to have their experiences validated in a way that is meaningful to them. If that means conducting research that holds merit in an institution, then who are we to deny them of this? Again, we must assess the risks associated with this style of research and ensure that we minimize the potential negative impact. But as I have explained throughout, to queer is to go against the status quo, to normalize the weird, and to question the normalized. We owe this to those whose voices are silenced and pushed aside, or it will continue to happen, which is something that I personally cannot accept. Therefore, I argue it is important for someone (whether myself or someone who may be inspired by this work) to propose a project that directly addresses the gendered and queered workplace experiences of CRM employees.

Archaeology has progressed substantially from where it began, from its colonial, armchair roots, to archaeologies of gender (e.g., Conkey & Spector, 1984), and even archaeogaming (e.g., Aycock & Biittner, 2024). Our discipline can do better and be better if we stay curious and uphold our responsibilities to inclusive representations of the past.

When I was a child, like most, I would constantly ask my mother, "why?" Most often, she would give me an explanation for what I was asking about, even if I had asked "why?" five times already. Every now and then, however, she would give me the response, "because I said so." To that I would say, "wow, you should really be a lawyer." Though perhaps I was too sarcastic as a child (sorry mom), I think we should hold each other to these same standards; "because I said so" was never a good enough answer, and neither is "because that is how it has always been done." We owe ourselves and the cultures we study more than that. We owe them a critical examination of everything, and we should never stop asking "why."

REFERENCES

Altschul, J., & Patterson, T. (2010). Trends in employment and training in American archaeology. In W. Ashmore, D. T. Lippert & B. J. Mills (Eds.), *Voices in American archaeology* (pp. 291-316). The SAA Press.

Amin, K. (2016). Haunted by the 1990s: Queer theory's affective histories. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly, 44*(3&4), 173-189.

Arponen, V., Grimm, S., Käppel, L., Ott, K., Thalheim, B., Kropp, Y., Kittig, K., Brinkmann, J., & Ribeiro, A. (2019). Between natural and human sciences: On the role and character of theory in socio-environmental archeology. *The Holocene, 29*(10), 1671-1676. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959683619857226

Ashley, F. (2020). Accounting for research fatigue in research ethics. *Bioethics, 35*, 270-276.

Aycock, J., & Biittner, K. (2024). Experimental archaeogaming: A case study. *Advances in Archaeological Practice, 12*(2), 75-85. https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2024.5

Behar, R. (1996). Introduction: Out of Exile. In R. G. Behar, Deborah A. (Ed.), *Women writing culture* (pp. 1-29). University of California Press.

Black, S. L., & Jolly, K. (2003). *Archaeology by design.* Altamira Press.

Blackmore, C. (2011). How to queer the past without sex: Queer theory, Feminisms and the archaeology of identity. *Archaeologies, 7*(1), 75-96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-011-9157-9

Blackmore, C., Drane, L., Baldwin, R., & Ellis, D. (2016). Queering fieldwork: Difference and identity in archaeological practice. *Society for American Archaeology, 16*(1), 18-23. http://onlinedigeditions.com/publication/?i=287180&article_id=2367825&view=articleBrowser

Boellstorff, T. (2007). Queer studies in the house of anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 36*(1), 17-35. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.36.081406.094421

Boytner, R. (2012). The changing nature of archaeological field schools. *The SAA Archaeological Record, 12*(1), 29-32.

Buckley, T. (1982). Menstruation and the power of Yurok women: Methods in cultural reconstruction. *American Ethnologist*, *9*(1), 47–60. http://www.jstor.org/stable/644311

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. Routledge.

Byrd, J. A. (2021). What's normative got to do with it? Toward Indigenous queer relationality. *Social Text, 38*(4), 105-123.

Canadian Institutes of Health Research. (2016). *Knowledge mobilization.* Government of Canada. https://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html

Claassen, C. (2000). Homophobia and women archaeologists. *World Archaeology, 32*(2), 173-179. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240050131162

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

Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial truths. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture* (pp. 1-26). University of California Press.

Cobb, H., & Croucher, K. (2016). Personal, political, pedagogic: Challenging the binary bind in archaeological teaching, learning and fieldwork. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 23*(3), 949-969. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43967048

Conkey, M. W. (2003). Has feminism changed archaeology? *Signs*, *28*(3), 867–880. https://doi.org/10.1086/345322

Conkey, M. W., & Gero, J. M. (1997). Programme to practice: Gender and Feminism in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 26*(1), 411-437. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.26.1.411

Conkey, M. W., & Spector, J. D. (1984). Archaeology and the study of gender. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory, 7*, 1–38. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20170176

Connell, S. V. (2012). Broadening the scope of archaeological field schools. *The SAA Archaeological Record, 12*(1), 25-28.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (4th Ed.). SAGE Publications.

Criado Perez, C. (2019). *Invisible women: Exposing data bias in a world designed for men.* Chatto & Windus.

Dowson, T. A. (2000). Why queer archaeology? An introduction. *World Archaeology, 32*(2), 161-165. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240050131144

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Polity Press.

Fields, J. (2016). The racialized erotics of participatory action research: A queer feminist understanding. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly, 44*(3&4), 31-50.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*. Pantheon Books.

Freeman, D. (1983). *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The making and unmaking of an anthropological myth.* Harvard University Press.

Geller, P. L. (2009). Identity and difference: Complicating gender in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *38*, 65–81. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20622641

Green, L. W., Ottoson, J. M., García, C., & Hiatt, R. A. (2009). Diffusion theory and knowledge dissemination, utilization, and integration in public health. *Annual*

review of public health, *30*, 151–174. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.031308.100049

Grenz, J. (2024). *Medicine wheel for the planet: A journey toward personal and ecological healing*. U of Minnesota Press.

Grimshaw, J. M., Eccles, M. P., Lavis, J. N., Hill, S. J., & Squires, J. E. (2012). Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implementation Science, 7*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-7-50

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575-599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Harding, S. G. (1998). *Is science multicultural?: Postcolonialisms, feminisms, and epistemologies.* Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (2011). Chapter 5: Interrogating the modernity vs. tradition contrast: Whose science and technology for whose social progress? In H. E. Grasswick (Ed.), *Feminist epistemology and philosophy of science: Power in knowledge* (pp. 85-108). Springer Netherlands.

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/https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2020.28

Holtorf, C. (2006). Studying archaeological fieldwork in the field: Views from Monte Polizzo. In M. Edgeworth (Ed.), *Ethnographies of archaeological practice: Cultural encounters, material transformations* (pp. 81-94). AltaMira Press.

Kendall, S., & Tannen, D. (2001). Discourse and gender. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 548-567). Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge, and the teachings of plants.* Milkweed Editions.

Kroeber, A. L. (1925). Handbook of the Indians of California. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin*. (78). 1–995. https://repository.si.edu/bitstream/handle/10088/15545/bulletin781925smit.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

KT Pathways. (2024). *What is knowledge translation?* KT Pathways. https://www.ktpathways.ca/about/what-knowledge-translation

Lamphere, L. (2006). Foreword: Taking stock - The transformation of Feminist theorizing in anthropology. In P. L. Geller & M. K. Stockett (Eds.), *Feminist anthropology: Past, present, and future* (pp. ix-xvi). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts.* Princeton University Press.

Love, H. (2011). Queer__This. In Halley, J. & Parker, A. (Eds), *After Sex? On Writing since Queer Theory* (pp. 180-191). Duke University Press.

Manalansan IV, M. F. (2016). Queer anthropology: An introduction. *Cultural Anthropology, 31*(4), 595-597.

Martin, E. (1991). The egg and the sperm: How science has constructed a romance based on stereotypical male-female roles. *Signs, 16*(3), 485-501. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174586

Martin, E. (1998). Anthropology and the cultural study of science. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 23*(1), 24-44. https://www.jstor.org/stable/689947

Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of age in Samoa: A psychological study of primitive youth for western civilization.* William Morrow & Company.

Métis Nation of Ontario (2022). *Two-Spirit Métis awareness resource: A place in the circle.* https://www.metisnation.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/2S-Awareness-Resource_2022a.pdf

Morrison, B. A. (2012). More than digging square holes: The new role of archaeological field schools. *The SAA Archaeological Record, 12*(1), 23-24.

Moser, S. (2007). On disciplinary culture: Archaeology as fieldwork and its gendered associations. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 14*(3), 235-263. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25702343

Parks Canada. (2024). *Ernest Thompson Seton national historic person (1860-1946).* Government of Canada. https://parks.canada.ca/culture/designation/personnage-person/ernest-thompson-seton

Perry, J. E. (2004). Authentic learning in field schools: Preparing future members of the archaeological community. *World Archaeology*, *36*(2), 236–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/0043824042000261004

Peixotto, B., Klehm, C., & Eifling, K. P. (2021). Rethinking research sites as wilderness activity sites: Reframing health, safety, and wellness in archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, *9*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.50

Pratt, M. B. (1984). Identity: Skin, blood, heart. In Bulkin, E., Pratt, M. B., & Smith, B. (Eds), *Yours in struggle: Three feminist perspectives on anti-semitism and racism* (pp. 27-77). Long Haul Press.

Raffles, H. (2002). *In amazonia: A natural history*. Princeton University Press.

Renoe, S. (2003). The Draw-an-Archaeologist test: A good way to get the ball rolling. *Science Activities, 40*(3), 31-36. https://doi:10.1080/00368120309601128

Rhodes, M., & Baron, A. (2019). The Development of social categorization. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology*, *1*, 359–386. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-121318-084824

Rolin, K. (2011). Chapter 2: Contextualism in feminist epistemology and the philosophy of science. In H. E. Grasswick (Ed.), *Feminist epistemology and philosophy of science: Power in knowledge* (pp. 25-44). Springer Netherlands.

Rosaldo, M. Z. (1980). The Use and abuse of anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and cross-cultural understanding. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 5*(31), 29. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3173582

Rutecki, D. M., & Blackmore, C. (2016). Towards an inclusive queer archaeology. *SAA Archaeological Record, 16*(1), 9-39. http://onlinedigeditions.com/display_article.php?id=2367811&view=287180

Seton, E. T. (1929). *Lives of game animals: An account of those land animals in America, north of the Mexican border, which are considered "game," either because they have held the attention of sportsmen, or received the protection of law.* Doubleday, Doran, & Company.

She (2000). Sex and a career. *World Archaeology, 32*(2), 166-172. http://www.jstor.org/stable/827862

Schultz, E. A., Lavenda, R. H., Dods, R. R., & Mulholland, M. (Eds). (2023). *Cultural anthropology: A perspective on the human condition* (5th Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Stockett, M. K., & Geller, P. L. (2006). Introduction: Feminist anthropology: Perspectives on our past, present, and future. In P. L. Geller & M. K. Stockett (Eds.), *Feminist anthropology: Past, present, and future* (pp. 1-19). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Todd, Z. (2016). An Indigenous feminist's take on the ontological turn: 'Ontology' is just another word for colonialism. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 29*(1), 4-22. https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12124

Voss, B. L. (2000). Feminisms, queer theories, and the archaeological study of past sexualities. *World Archaeology, 32*(2), 180-192. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240050131171

Weiss, M. (2016). Always after: Desiring queerness, desiring anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology, 31*(4), 627-638.

Wylie, A. (1992). The Interplay of evidential constraints and political interests: Recent archaeological research on gender. *American Antiquity, 57*(1), 15-35. https://doi.org/10.2307/2694833

APPENDIX 1: INITIAL INTERVIEW GUIDE (USED FOR MAUDE'S INTERVIEW ONLY)

Interview Guide

Introduction

- My name is Madi Badger and I am a graduate student at the University of Lethbridge.
- I am conducting research to study the gendered ideologies present in the Cultural Resource Management workplace using your place of work as an example.
- This interview will be a discussion about your experiences in the workplace from an intersectional perspective, meaning we will talk about your gendered experience as well as any other aspects of your identity that you may wish to discuss.
- If at any time you feel uncomfortable and/or want to stop, please let me know.
- Anything you say in this interview will not affect your position in the company and will only be used for research purposes.
- Do you consent to being interviewed?

If yes, move to next section.

General Questions

- Do you identify as a particular gender?
  - If so, are you comfortable sharing that identity with me?
- What is your position in the company?
- Explain to me what an average workday looks like for you.
- Do you feel as though your gender influences your work?
  - If so, how?
  - If not, why not?
- What is your process for analyzing and interpreting archaeological materials?
- In what contexts do you feel gender is appropriate to include in analysis of materials?
  - How do you go about conducting the analysis?

Closing

- Thank you for your time today. If you have any questions in the future, please reach out to me by email (badgerm@uleth.ca).
- If you are feeling any emotional discomfort following this interview, please refer to the consent form you signed at the beginning of this study, as it has information for free counselling services provided by Wellness Together Canada.

APPENDIX 2: FINAL INTERVIEW GUIDE (USED FOR ALL OTHER INTERVIEWS)

Interview Guide

Introduction

- My name is Madi Badger and I am a graduate student at the University of Lethbridge.
- I am conducting research to study the gendered ideologies present in the Cultural Resource Management workplace using your place of work as an example.
- This interview will be a discussion about your experiences in the workplace from an intersectional perspective, meaning we will talk about your gendered experience as well as any other aspects of your identity that you may wish to discuss.
- If at any time you feel uncomfortable and/or want to stop, please let me know.
- Anything you say in this interview will not affect your position in the company and will only be used for research purposes.
- Do you consent to being interviewed?

If yes, move to next section.

General Questions

- Do you identify as a particular gender?
  - If so, are you comfortable sharing that identity with me?
  - If you're comfortable, what are your pronouns?
- What is your position in the company?
  - Please explain what this position means.
  - Are there any other aspects of your job that you want to mention?
  - How many years have you been working in CRM?
  - How long have you been working in archaeology in general?
- Have you ever been to a field school?
  - How important would you say attending field school is to getting and maintaining a job in CRM?
  - If you have gone to field school, how would you say this choice affects your ability to do your job?
- Explain to me what an average workday looks like for you.
  - How much of your work would you say is based off of your own judgement?
  - How do you feel the amount of personal judgement you have to use may differ depending on what aspect of the job you're doing?
- Do you feel as though your gender influences your work?
  - If so, how?
  - If not, why not?

- What is your process for analyzing and interpreting archaeological materials?
- In what contexts do you feel gender is appropriate to include in analysis of materials?
    - How do you go about conducting the analysis?
- Do you have anything else that you want to discuss that we haven't discussed yet?

Closing

- Thank you for your time today. If you have any questions in the future, please reach out to me by email (badgerm@uleth.ca).
- If you are feeling any emotional discomfort following this interview, please refer to the consent form you signed at the beginning of this study, as it has information for free counselling services provided by Wellness Together Canada.