This thesis aims to review, re-examine and evaluate the concept of ‘gender’ archaeology, and its manifestations that subsequently affect the archaeological record. An evaluation of how gender has appeared in major archaeology journals over the last ten years will be undertaken. A context for gender and its positioning by archaeologists is reviewed in relation to the major theories that have been expounded over the past three decades. The question as to why gender has still not been integrated into mainstream theory and practice is explored.

Is there any merit to a theory of gender in archaeology? The role of women in the past, and in the present, has been openly discussed and debated in archaeology since the 1960s, with a flurry of publications and conferences devoted to the concepts of women in archaeology, a feminist archaeology, and gender and archaeology in the 1980s and particularly the 1990s. With the outpouring of work and efforts to redress the biases in the discipline, one would expect that the Androcentric and Eurocentric approaches of the past would have been eliminated in current theory and method. But has the practice, theory and approach to gender changed at all?

Conkey (2007) asserts that gender issues have become ‘ghettoized’, reduced to specialist publications, readers or included as ‘token’ articles or chapters about women. Other commentators suggest the pendulum has swung back since the 1990s—Teather (2008) states:

The backlash against gendered approaches in the 1980s and 1990s has now resulted in widespread reluctance to raise feminism as a still relevant topic for interpretation.

A third possibility is that gender has simply been incorporated into archaeological theory and practice, so that it is no longer an issue in itself.

Where does this leave concepts of gender in contemporary archaeological theory and practice? Is it of no value, is it too ‘soft’, or too theoretical, or not empirical, or is it just boring and unpopular? These issues are addressed in this paper through a re-examination of what gender is and how it affects archaeology. A review of two of the leading archaeological journals in Australia, Australian Archaeology and The Australasian Journal of Historical Archaeology has been undertaken in order to examine the reality of the appearance of gender in published work and its integration into mainstream practice over the last decade. Though the concept of gender has been explored and debated in publications such as Nelson’s (2006) “Handbook of Gender in Archaeology”, the ‘theory’ is seemingly at present a strand of archaeology and its role in archaeology only understood by those with a vested interest.

Gender - An explanation
The basic meanings of the word gender are often limited and confusing as is our knowledge and understanding of its nature in past and present societies. The term ‘gender’ is used by many feminist archaeologists as a way to refer to the social
categories of masculine and feminine and the relationships between the two. (Conkey and Spector 1984, Walde and Willows 1991, Gero and Conkey 1991, Claassen 1994) As argued by Joan Scott (1986), gender was offered as a term in an attempt to transform disciplinary paradigms, seen as exclusive and biased towards either male or female subjects. Gender asserts a rejection of the use of ‘sex’, the physiological distinction of female from male, and an awareness that the roles and relations between the two are not necessarily ‘natural’, unchangeable or predetermined. It can be seen as a way of defining men and women in relation to one another - an understanding of either cannot be attained without knowledge of the other and their interrelatedness:

if the status and roles of women are misinterpreted and distorted, so inevitably must be those of men. Since the relationships of women and men interlock, the distortion of the roles of men and women leads to a distortion of the total social system (Rohrlich-Leavitt, Sykes & Weatherford, 1975 : 124)

Just as gender is a term that is relational to both men and women, it is, as argued by feminists such as Flax (1987) a concept that is continuously open to change and renegotiation. What is understood to constitute the ‘masculine’ or ‘feminine’ is a result of a culture assigning behaviours and roles to the biological, and thus varies across cultures, time and space, or as Balme and Bulbeck (2008) state:

Gender categories may be an adaptation to biology but, if they are, they are a social adaptation. Gender is then a social human construct an not an inevitable biological given. While gender categories may not have been the first social categories they have persisted in human societies, suggesting they are an adaptive success.

In order to understand the seemingly inherent structuring principles of gender in humans and social culture, and the assumptions we make about identity and nature, its formation in the psychology of humans must be analysed. The concepts used to define reality, and the explanations of what reality is are useful in this way.

What is believed to be ‘reality’, both in wider communities and in each individual is made up of an holistic interconnected group of knowledge, which incorporates what we believe to be real, and how these things are related to one another, both of a physical and mental nature. Through a process of comparison and differentiation, characteristic pieces of information are socially taught, establishing a polarity in an individual’s mind. For example, we learn opposites of good-bad, mind-body, black – white and also masculine and feminine. Smith (1991) argues that the self-other dichotomy is the most significant in any system of knowledge, where we build up a sense of self in terms of a comparison with others, selecting characteristics which are seen to be differences, for example, a child will begin to see differences between itself and its mother, Jung’s archetypes (1968). With a recognition that we are individual biological entities, an identity forms, with differences in sexes being an obvious point of opposition. The identity is built up from a series of contrasts between the sexes (we/they) and in opposition with nature (we/it) (Gibbs 1987). It is this manner that a particular world view is formed, which varies across cultures. The anatomically based sex differences are given primacy over most other bases of differentiation, and being the central feature of selfhood, are extended to the outside environment (Smith 1991). From these oppositions in our minds, we relate to other concepts, which can be seen in degrees of importance.
Gender is internalised as a part of a view of one’s self, but at the same time is formed with a perception of the outside world and of one’s culture. It can be argued that it is through what Smith (1991) calls the ‘self-other social order’ that males in both Eastern and Western cultures have felt a need to see females as inferior, with characteristics such as physical strength and aggression assigned to being male, being dominant over the physically smaller and submissive female. This view was seen to be completely legitimate, or natural, and has its foundations in arguments relating to the biological order of species.

‘Biological essentialism’ is the belief that a women’s ‘nature’ is biologically inevitable, and so cannot be changed. This view has been argued by many authors for many decades (de Beauvoir 1953, MacCormack and Strathern 1980). However, androcentrically based ideas and models were dominant in archaeology, often extrapolated to the past, giving them a greater sense of legitimacy (Hurcombe 1994). Gender and sexual differences would have existed in the past – gender operates by structuring social relations, the division of labour, social stratification and power. As Conkey and Spector (1984) have argued;

this does not mean that archaeologists have not said anything about gender structures or gender behaviour in past human life…Rather it is permeated with assumptions, assertions and statements of fact

Meaning can only be inferred from our own cultural perspective, which influences understandings of the past, of our own gender’s roles, and, in most cases ethnographic and ethno-historical sources which have generally been formulated from a Western male perspective.

As well as these views of realism and essentialism which help us understand what gender is, there is the idea of materialism, which is the notion that matter shapes the intellect, in other words that materials shape culture (Hodder 1986). Archaeological materialism assumes that by understanding the conditions and materials under which an artefact is produced, it is possible to interpret that artefact (Gibbon 1989). Archaeologists have become increasingly aware that the act of observing carries with it a whole set of presuppositions, sensed experiences, distinctions of self and other and constructions of one’s own mental structures. These affect the way gender is read, or not read into artefacts and ideas about how social organization is formed in past societies. Archaeologist such as Trigger (1984; 1989) recognise that gender bias, as well as ethnic and political factors, affect the way material from the past is interpreted.

Gender is a social institution and a social act. Gender roles are crucial in the design and operation of any given society. What was once seen as nature, or natural, is now seen by many as unnecessary, inaccurate, and indeed acknowledged to be incorrect. Women have always existed, with men, together, past and present. A gendered archaeology must be stated to be about men and the masculine, not by women about women. It is about people. Gender must be considered, interpreted, but never assumed as Wylie(1991) argues:

Unacknowledged and unsubstantiated, indeed, manifestly untenable assumptions about gender – assumptions which presume the universality of the sexual division of
labour, gender dimorphism, and commodification of sexuality typical in our own contexts – compromise the credibility of otherwise good archaeology.

The reluctance to incorporate gender as a paradigm

In their 1994 paper Conkey and Spector highlighted the paradigm lag in archaeology and the uncritical use of gender stereotypes. Since then, considerable work has been directed into gender in archaeology (Sorensen 2000; Conkey 2003, Milledge Nelson 2006; 2007, Wylie 2007). Some of this has been relatively naïve, merely ‘adding’ women to the archaeological record yet it was an essential step for dealing with issues previously ignored, as discussed by Balme and Bulbeck (2008). Throughout the 1990s the increasingly difficult questions were being addressed, and indeed some consensus around theory was beginning to be formed (see Nelson 2006). However, since the end of the 1990s it seems that there has been less discussion and consideration of gender in archaeology. With more and more women increasingly entering the discipline one must ask, why? One would assume that an increased gender balance across the discipline in terms of students, teachers, and professionals would result in interest, or at least discussion on gender paradigms and perspectives. In 1993 Truscott and Smith highlighted the statistics on the employment of women in archaeology, indeed even in 1991, 60% of consultant archaeologists were women. In a 2008 paper Conkey stated that archaeology is “saturated” with gender, however anecdotally this does not appear to be the case. As part of an initial investigation and exploration of this issue a survey was undertaken of two leading archaeological journals in Australia, *Australian Archaeology* and *The Journal of Australasian Historical Archaeology* from 2000 to 2009. The motive for this exercise was to explore the reality of and whether or not gender is a ‘mainstream’ topic, whether or not there is a gender paradigm, theory or methodology being used, or discussed in publications, and whether there is a balance of male and female authors and if this has any bearing on gender as a subject for publication.

Methods – A scenario tested

For the purposes of this research proposal, the data collected was restricted to the two journals (*Australian Archaeology* and *Australasian Historical Archaeology*) as these are available online as part of the Humanities and Social Sciences Collection of the Informit e-Library. In addition, the two journals are reflective of two of the main research areas in Australian archaeology, being Indigenous and historical archaeology. All articles analysed were published between January 2000 to December 2009. Issues of *Australasian Historical Archaeology* available on Infomit were limited to the end of 2007. Only articles (5000 words to 8000 words) were analysed. Short reports, editorials, abstracts, book reviews and obituaries were excluded from this study. The number of articles in each issue varied with the minimum number for an issue considered being two and the maximum fourteen, the total number of articles considered for this study from *Australian Archaeology* was 116, and from the *Australasian Historical Archaeology* was 70.

In order to determine whether gender was a consideration within an article, each article was searched using indicator words. This was done by searching each individual article’s content using a ‘search function’ and the frequency of each indicator word was recorded, including those with a zero value. The justification for this approach is that whether an article did or did not contain a gender ‘theme’ was
not subjective nor open to any interpretation. The content *per se* of the discussion was not analysed in terms or ideas or bias, only in terms of the number of times the indicator words appeared in each article. The seven indicator words were selected as they are logically and commonly associated with the concept of gender:

- Gender
- Masculine
- Feminine
- Male
- Female
- Men
- Women

The usage of any indicator words, or a combination of any of the words, more than ten times in one article, for the purposes of this study, was considered significant. For example an article that uses the word gender three times, female three times and men four times (total ten) would be counted as significant.

References and citations where indicator words appeared and were used in titles were also omitted, as these were not taken as not necessarily indicative of a focused discussion on gender.

The sex of each author was also recorded for each article, including multiple authors, and did not consider name order position. Where an author’s sex was unclear, internet searches were undertaken for clarification. Community groups where individuals were not named were not included, as it was impossible to determine the gender and number of authors.

**Results**

The analysis using the selected indicator words reveal some very distinct results. Of the total number of 186 articles that were examined, 22 (or 11.8%) were concluded to include a significant discussion on gender as contained a combination of the seven indicator words ten or more times. For *Australian Archaeology*, nine of the 116 articles had a significant result (or 7.8%) and for *Australasian Historical Archaeology* 13 of 70 (or 18.6%)[see figure 1].

Looking at these results from another perspective, it is also important to consider the total frequency of the use of the key indicator words within articles, as these provide an insight into general patterns across the timeframe considered. To facilitate this perspective, totals for each key word were added together for each issue and ranked.

The results for *Australian Archaeology* across the 20 issues considered, show that the median value for the number of times these key indicator words were used was six times in a given issue. The highest number of times key indicator words were used in the sample, was 431 times in one issue, and three quarters of the issues considered, used the key indicator words 36 times or less per issue. It is interesting to note from the data sets (see Figure 2) that two issues show a distinct higher frequency in the usage of key indicator words which could be attributed to the following situations.

The December 2008 Issue 67 (which used the indicator words 431 times) is a special volume celebrating the career of Sandra Bowdler. As such, there is a higher number
of articles specifically discussing women in archaeology and gender in archaeology. The June 2009 Issue 68 is not a special volume but one article is specifically analyses gender and sex in relation to grants and funding.

The results for *Australasian Historical Archaeology* when total frequency of the use of key indicator words within articles is also considered, show similar skewed patterns to *Australian Archaeology*, with one issue in particular standing out (see Figure 3). The median count across the eight *Australasian Historical Archaeology* issues considered shows that key indicator words were used 52 times per issue, with three quarters of issues in the sample using the key indicator words 63 times or less. The issue with the highest count in this study was 2001, having used the key indicator words 245 times. This can be attributed to the issue having a theme of prisons and convict systems in Australia (for example, included papers on the Ross Female Factory).

**Results for Australian Archaeology**

Examining the frequency of the indicator words for all issues of *Australian Archaeology* [Figure 2], 50 of the 116 articles used an indicator word one or more times. Investigating the total number of articles in more detail [Figure 4], it has been found that 66 do not use any of the terms at all or in any combination. Of the 50 that recorded a positive value, eleven articles used a term once, six twice, and three five times. Hence even those that recorded a positive value only used the term(s) ephemerally, for example ‘men’ or ‘women’ were referred to in a single sentence within that article. It is apparent from this data that by and large articles that have a high usage of the indicator words are minimal, and supports the above stated result signifying that only nine of the 116 articles contained a significant discussion of gender.

The word that appeared with highest frequency was women (384 times in the ten year period), followed by gender (315 times). The terms masculine and feminine – often associated with gender methodology – such as artefact interpretation, barely rated a mention appearing twice and once respectively across the data set. Though not apparent in the figures, what is interesting is that where a high frequency of terms was used in articles the content of all excepting one thematically involved women as archaeologists or a theoretical discussion on gender, but not gender as incorporated into methodology or either gender as subjects of archaeological investigation.

Comparison of *Australian Archaeology* authors by sex was also undertaken to determine whether this was a influential factor in the content of articles examined [Figure 6]. Of the total number of authors considered (n = 234) men represented a higher number 158, with women 76. While twice as many men published articles the conclusion cannot be drawn that the minimal number of articles with gender content cannot be attributed to a small number of women authors, nor that it is exclusively women publishing on gendered themes. One interesting issue that is not apparent from the figures included is that articles written exclusively by groups of men (one or more author) all of these articles returned no mention of any of the terms once or in any combination.

**Results for Australasian Historical Archaeology**
Given that historical information often supports and identifies individuals on sites it was predicated that *Australasian Historical Archaeology* would have a higher frequency of the usage of terms and might be a distinguishing factor between the *Australian Archaeology* data set. Results for *Australasian Historical Archaeology* show 45 of the 70 articles assessed used an indicator word one or more times [Figure 3]. Looking into the articles in more detail, 25 of the 70 do not use the terms at all or in any combination (see Figure 5). Of the 45 that recorded a positive result, eleven used the term once, six two times, and three five times. The remainder of the articles that used the terms in high frequency was minimal. It is interesting that the results for *Australasian Historical Archaeology* mirror those for *Australian Archaeology* (Figures 4 and 5). Where it was anticipated that *Australasian Historical Archaeology* would have a higher frequency of terms male/female/men/women indicating greater discussion on gender there is no manifest difference between the two publications.

Results for the frequency of the specific key indicator words for *Australasian Historical Archaeology* revealed that men were most frequently used (189 times) followed by women (122). The terms masculine appeared four times and feminine twice. The use of the word gender appeared thirty times reflecting minimal discussion on gender as a theory but used gender as a subject of inquiry in the articles.

An analysis of *Australasian Historical Archaeology* authors by sex was also undertaken to determine whether this was a influential factor in the content of articles examined [Figure 7]. Of the total number of authors considered (n = 84) men represented a higher number 49, with women 35. Again with a high proportion of women authors as compared to men, the conclusion cannot be drawn that the minimal number of articles with gender content cannot be attributed to a small number of women authors, nor that it is exclusively women publishing on gendered themes. What is not included in the detail of figures is that the articles that discussed gender in *Australasian Historical Archaeology* were published jointly by both sexes, or by men as single authors in equal numbers to women.

**Discussion**

In general terms, if one is to look at early archaeological publications from the twentieth century it is easy to be critical and perceive they are laden with the inherent biases of past generations regarding race and gender, such as notions of primitive versus advanced or man the hunter versus women the gatherer, for they are indeed a product of their time. On reflection of the decade that has just past what then can we see as a ‘snapshot’ of what current archaeologists are writing about and what is important? What is the overarching narrative regarding gender that is being told? This initial exploratory investigation into two of the major archaeological journals from the beginning of this century indicates that gender has not been incorporated into mainstream practice and theory – with 22 of 189 articles recording some significant discussion of gender, it is difficult to argue that Australian archaeology at least is ‘saturated’ with gender. While gender does not have a place in all articles nor should be a concern in all investigations, it is still surprising that after substantive publication on the issue throughout the 1990s there is a reluctance to incorporate gender into archaeological research papers in Australia, even within the context of historical
archaeology. It cannot be put simply that women are interested in or writing about women, and the data collected reflects this reality.

There are two major factors that have an impact on the reluctance to incorporate a theory and practice of gender in archaeology. Firstly, there is what Smith and O’Donnell (2006) refer to as a reluctance in Australian archaeology to ‘do’ theory, that the focus of many publications is results driven:

Theory is not something that is valued highly by the Australian archaeology community as a whole. Sometimes it is considered to be the intellectual doodlings of “armchair” archaeologists, those who are too soft, mentally or physically, to engage in fieldwork. (Smith and O’Donnell 2006: 694)

There is also the perception that Australian archaeology is to ‘young’ to have a theoretical framework, and indeed there is no one theory, paradigm or framework to apply gender to archaeological sites.

Secondly and perhaps more importantly, is the idea of gender as a category in what Conkey and Williams (1991a) refer to as a ‘hierarchy of knowables’, in other words, that some things are perceived to be more recoverable (or ‘factual’) archaeologically. As Balme and Bulbeck (2008) argue, gender ‘theory’ has made much less of an impact on the archaeology of deep time, which is a main focus of Australian archaeology and of much of the writing in AA. In other words the more social, spiritual and symbolic are increasingly inaccessible or perceived to be unknowables and hence become irrelevant or ignored. Gender, less factual, or readable, is extrapolated to the present, and it loses salience. The lack of ‘evidence’ in the past obscures the locus of women’s power, in particular, further. This can best be demonstrated in explanations regarding early interpretations of the origins of the division of labour. As Balme and Beck (1993) discuss, meat eating, hence hunting and its associated material culture were seen as crucial to the development of early “man”. Writers such as Washburn and Lancaster (1968) assumed men were the primary contributors to this progression, the archaeological data falling within Hawkes’ ‘security of knowledge’ and thus sexual divisions of labour remained unquestioned. Feminist archaeologists from the 1970s to the present have readdressed these assumptions. However, it is not possible to pick up a standard text to find prescribed methodological and analytical frameworks for the interpretation of gender. This is because the dominant models for interpretation have concealed and ignored gender in the past, and it is a difficult concept to discern through material remains— it can take both material and symbolic forms. Because of this it cannot simply be observed, nor can there be one formula to find ‘it’. In a nutshell, is the development of a paradigm for interpreting gender in the archaeological record simply too difficult?

A further problem associated with gender in archaeology (apart from its lack of practice, lack of definition and the absence of usable models for interpretation) is that it is often read to mean women’s issues. Gender in archaeology is associated with feminism. But the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Feminism (or what it is perceived to mean in Western liberal democracies) is unpopular and the idea of women’s archaeology is one of boring, mundane, non-mainstream subjects or menial objects— pins, cooking implements, or Venus statues:
Gender tends to be overlooked in discussions of ‘heritage’. When it is addressed, it is often related to women’s issues. Just a many people tend to believe that ideology is what other people believe, and ethnicity is what people unlike ourselves possess, ‘gender’ all too often gets treated as what women have – a women’s problem – as if men have no gender (Smith 2008: 159)

An archaeology of gender has a serious ‘image’ problem. To provide a contemporary example from an internet site:

In controversial research, which has already been condemned as 'reprehensibly androcentric' by leading feminist archaeologists, it has been suggested that the overwhelming majority of feminist archaeologists are female. Even more controversially, the same study seems to show that a significant proportion have unhappy relationships with men behind them, are overweight or have physical characteristics that would see them classified as 'ugly' or 'disfigured' by most accepted medical benchmarks. Many are thought to fulfil all of these criteria.(Hassan 2009)

Politics, warfare, power structures and economics are examples of words that are still not readily associated with the concept of gender. Is it because they seem to pertain to different spheres of existence which are rooted in notions of roles determined by biology, or is it just an image problem? Or could it be that most, and particularly male archaeologists rarely see their own work as being gendered. “Female’ gendered artefacts are perceived as being the exception, not the norm.

In a wide variety of cultures and discourses, men tend to be seen as free from, or as not determined by gender relations… Male academics do not worry about how being men may distort their intellectual work (Flax 1987: 629)

Evaluation

This initial investigation into the nature and frequency of published articles in Australia on gender has revealed that only 22 of 186 (or 11.8%) include a significant discussion about gender. This represents approximately one article per annum for both AA and AHA which are two of the leading archaeological journals in Australia. Detailed analysis of the frequency of key terms related to gender indicate that where gender(s) are referred to in articles they are so ephemerally and as a concept or as a theory has not become embedded into mainstream archaeological practice in Australia, despite substantial numbers of women publishing and also working within Australian archaeology. This is also despite the past four decades where considerable writing within and outside of the discipline highlighting the importance of gender as a category of analysis. Perhaps it is time to revisit and re-explain the concept of gender and its place in archaeology, and moving the discussion into more popular forums such as AA and AHA, rather than specialist publications on gender and archaeology, which are easy to ignore.

The question must be asked, if gender is has not, or is unable to be incorporated into mainstream theory and practice thus far, then does it have a role or relevance at all in archaeology? I would argue that rigorous standards for interpretations consider social systems as a factor behind the production of cultural materials, and is one way to approach the issues regarding gender in the archaeological record. By educating archaeologists about their own assumptions, and our own narratives, more self-conscious, better archaeology will be produced.
This thesis thus examines the following questions:

1. What is the impact of gender archaeology across the discipline?
2. Has the discipline changed to include more inclusive, balanced accounts of both women and men of the past?
3. As regards to the answer that the impact(s) and changes solicit
   (a) how do we measure this?
   (b) is it possible to examine gender archaeology in terms of success or failure, and relevance in the discipline?
4. Is gender archaeology seen as still valid, and how are archaeologists using it now?
   (a) has there been a decline in the interest in, and publication of gender archaeology?
   (b) has gender archaeology permeated and influenced the discipline in terms of major publications and journals?
   (c) if there is a decline in publication on gender archaeology, then why?
   (d) is gender archaeology part of ‘mainstream’ theory and method or is still marginalised?
   (e) is gender archaeology an Anglo-American phenomena?

Despite the substantive literature on gender in archaeology generated since the 1980s we cannot point to a detailed study that captures the state or influence of gender archaeology across the discipline. There are substantive monographs published, journal articles written and conferences long past on gender in archaeology, gender archaeology, and arguments for the importance of gender in the discipline. But there is no directed study that has assessed the growth or decline of gender archaeology or its uptake in publication or practice.

This dissertation will *not* examine each and every publication, case study or site that has successfully or unsuccessfully considered or applied a gendered approach. Substantive research has been directed into the gendered nature of fieldwork, particularly in Australia (Moser 1995, 2007), gender and funding grants (Bowman and Ulm 2009), and there are numerous papers on the status of women in archaeology (see Balme and Beck 1995, Casey 1998, Claasen 1992, du Cros and Smith 1993, Walde and Willows 1991). But as Conkey (2007) states “so much of archaeological terminology, core questions, categories, language and images are already deeply gendered and must continue to be scrutinized”.

This thesis will scrutinize and locate the answer to the research questions in quantifiable terms, in data and in empirical fact. Indeed a criticism of gender archaeology is that it is too ‘soft’. The primary method of interrogation for this study will therefore be linguistic and literary analysis, using both quantitative and qualitative analysis to locate and the impact of gender archaeology on the discipline. This study will be innovative in that it will seek to assess the impacts of gender archaeology in the discipline by correlating language, gender, and archaeology.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Articles</th>
<th>Gender as significant discussion</th>
<th>Total as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Total number and percentage of articles using indicator words in *Australian Archaeology* and *Australasian Historical Archaeology* 2000 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total no. articles considered</th>
<th>Articles using key words</th>
<th>Key words by frequency/number of times used across articles</th>
<th>Totals for key words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Total frequency of indicator words in *Australian Archaeology* articles, Issues 2000 - 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total no. articles considered</th>
<th>Articles using key words</th>
<th>Key words by frequency/number of times used across articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Total frequency of indicator words in *Australasian Historical Archaeology* articles, Issues 2000 – 2007
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**AA No. of articles by frequency of use of key indicator words (n=116)**
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Figure 4 Breakdown of frequency of indicator words in all *Australian Archaeology* articles 2000-2009
Figure 5  Breakdown of frequency of indicator words in all Australasian Historical Archaeology articles 2000-2007

Figure 6 Australian Archaeology authors by sex for 116 articles considered 2000-2009
Figure 7 Australasian Historical Archaeology authors by sex for 70 articles considered 2000-2007