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The research questions:
The term ‘gender’ as defined by Gilchrist (1999) is “The cultural interpretation of sexual difference that results in the categorization of individuals, artifacts, spaces and bodies.” It is not stable, but contradictory, accumulative, and changeable across time and place, an “inconsistent but permanent part of history and life” (Sorensen 1988:17). 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. It can also 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. 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 and 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.

It follows then that ‘gender archaeology’ is the study of gender roles, ideologies, identities and other such manifestations in the past. Gender is now recognized as a necessary part of any social theory. But, across the discipline of archaeology, and despite scholarship directed towards this field, the basic meanings of the word gender are often limited and confused, as is knowledge and understanding of its nature in past and present societies.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the platform of gender archaeology and the gains made over the past three decades and to assess the influence of such an approach. It will examine whether the traction gained throughout the 1980s and 1990s for a more rigorous inclusion of gender, built from feminist theory, has resulted in a more evenhanded, progressive archaeology, with concepts of gender permeating mainstream theory and method, or whether gender has been reduced to merely an area of specialization or sometimes applied category of analysis.

Gender archaeology has its roots in the feminist archaeology that began to emerge in the 1960s and is influenced by post modernist debate. The first significant argument for a feminist approach to archaeological research was the publication of Conkey and Spector’s 1984 article “Archaeology and the study of gender”. Since then, considerable work has been directed into gender in archaeology (see Conkey 2003, 2007, Englestad 1991, 2007, Gero & Conkey 1991, Gilchrist 1999, Nelson 1997, 2006, 2007, Sorensen 2000, Walde & Willows 1991, Wylie 1991, 2001). Some early research is now seen as 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). Acknowledging a significant paradigm lag in archaeology – “traditions of feminist research were already well established in socio-cultural anthropology, history, and geography, among other closely aligned fields, the feminist affiliations of ‘gender archeology’
have always been vexed” (Wylie: 2007). Throughout the 1990s increasingly difficult questions were being addressed, conferences and publications intensified, and indeed some consensus around theory was beginning to be formed (see Nelson 2006). However, since the end of the 1990s there is perceptively less discussion and consideration of gender in archaeology, and particularly a disassociation with feminism in work in the area of gender archaeology (Engelstad 2007, Geller 2009). 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? Has the politics of erasure and distortion been replaced by ambivalence and apathy? In essence, has gender archaeology evolved to frequently be used as a means of addressing or muting anything to do with women in archaeology, as opposed to part of the interpretation of the human past? In a 2003 paper Conkey asserts that despite an ‘explosive’ amount of work in feminist-inspired archaeology, such research is still ‘relatively ghettoized’, mostly about women, by women, reduced to specialist publications, or included as ‘token’ articles or chapters about women. Engelstad (2007) states:

Despite the significant gains in engendering research and practice, gender archaeology is at risk of becoming a narrow specialty with little left of its initial critical feminist and theoretical edge.

Another 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?

This thesis 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?
5. Has gender archaeology had any broader impacts outside of the discipline such as mainstream media (documentaries, magazines, internet) or museum displays of archaeological subject matter?
The research gap

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.

This will be the first study to apply the linguistic methods of corpus analysis, concordance and collocation to archaeology, and specifically to the theme of gender. While Joyce (2002) has addressed the language of the discipline, and also the applicability of hypertext and multimedia to a feminist approach (Joyce and Tringham 2007), and Preucel (2006) semiotics, there is not a body of work that applies linguistic techniques to investigate the dominant voice regarding gender. This is important as the language of the discipline, as expressed in journals, and in books, has an impact on the way that gender is read, or not read into our interpretations of the past. By closely examining language, it will be possible to assess and quantify the current state of gender archaeology. This approach can potentially generate a ‘snapshot’ of what archaeologists are writing about at different points in time and the frequencies and content of writing on gender, what is deemed important and what the overarching narrative is regarding gender is. Following Hutson (2002), citation practices will also be considered, but will examine the citation of work on gender archaeology.

In addition, there will be an analysis of the use of imagery surrounding gender archaeology, specifically regarding the mediums that reach a broader public. A consideration of the messages that archaeological practice gives about gender in the past outside the discipline, to museums and to mainstream media, and in materials directed towards children, will highlight what biases may persist, what messages the discipline is generating, and in turn influence archaeologists themselves. This is important as examining such media will potentially assist in identifying some of the
answers as to why there is a decline in the popularity of in particular, feminism, and the wider opinion and understanding of gender roles in the past and the resistance to change it.

A third avenue of investigation will be the use of both surveys and interviews. Questionnaires of undergraduate students will provide an insight into current attitudes and understandings of gender archaeology that will elucidate perceptions of gender archaeology, the main messages that are cutting through and influencing their decisions and mind-set in this area. Interviews will be conducted with leading archaeologists, working both in and outside the area of gender archaeology. This qualitative study will generate responses as to the question of why there is a reluctance to incorporate gender into ‘mainstream’ archaeology, if this is the case, and their verdict on merits and failures of such an approach.

There is a need for a reference point in order to understand where the successes or failures of gender archaeology have been. This research will potentially impact the discipline of archaeology by educating archaeologists about their own assumptions, their own narratives, and in turn a more self conscious, better archaeology will be produced. It will draw attention to pervasive biases and assumptions in writing of the discipline, to elucidate where the biases are (if there are any) and where improvements need to be made. By holding a ‘mirror’ to the disciplinary culture it will be possible to see problems and solicit change. It aims to promote a more self-conscious discipline and to reinvigorate the debate on gender archaeology. This is also important in a broader sense, as the value that archaeology places on gender creates a legacy that effects the perception and understanding of men and women in the past and in contemporary practice.

**The theoretical platform**

Gender archaeology is represented by a multiplicity of approaches. However, the progression of such studies in archaeology can be traced to the emergence of feminism and the women’s movement. The most common characterization is that there are three main ‘waves’ (see Gilchrist 1999, Geller 2009). The first can be seen in relation to the suffrage and emancipation movements between 1880 and 1920. The second wave, beginning in the in 1960s is tied to the identification of the causes of women’s oppression, to theories of patriarchy, power and the seeking of personal equality (Tong 1989). As part of this, inequalities and male biases across academic disciplines were highlighted (Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974, du Cros and Smith 1993). The third wave surfaced in the 1980s and was influenced by postmodernism and standpoint feminism. It rejects the notion of essentialism and considers gender as a process and considers other forms of difference – such as race, class, ethnicity and age, and is often associated with post-processual archaeology. It has developed from merely identifying male bias to examining how knowledge production is gendered. However, as stated by Conkey in 2003, “at least 80 percent of the literature that one might consider under the rubric of feminist archaeology in its broadest sense is literature about women, females, and recovering and “finding” women and gender relations”. Further, there can be seen to be a divergence within archaeology with those of the third ‘wave’, those studying gender archaeology disengaging, indeed distancing themselves from feminism (such as Sorensen 2000).
It is not possible to pick up a standard text to find prescribed methodological and analytical frameworks for the interpretation of gender. This is as both the dominant models for interpretation have concealed and ignored gender in the past, and that it is a difficult concept to discern through material remains - it can take both material and symbolic form, differs across, time, place and culture. Because of this gender cannot simply be observed, nor can there be one formula to find ‘it’. In a nutshell, the development of a paradigm for interpreting gender in the archaeological record is difficult (but not impossible and there is considerable and indeed exceptional work in this area) and there is often referred to a ‘paradigm lag’ in archaeology. The absence of a pervasive paradigm for gender in archaeology means traditional social biases in interpretation persist. The reluctance across archaeology to extrapolate the more social, spiritual and symbolic or what are perceived to be unknowables regarding gender can best be demonstrated for example, 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, and thus sexual divisions of labour remained unquestioned until feminist archaeologists addressed these assumptions and the universal subordination of women – but they persist.

However, a further problem associated with gender in archaeology (apart from it’s lack of practice, lack of definition and the absence of usable models for interpretation) is that it is often read to mean only women’s issues. Gender in archaeology is correctly associated with feminism (but the two are not mutually exclusive). And feminism (or what it is perceived to mean in western liberal democracies) has become unpopular. 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, or in effect, male becomes the standard against what female is measured:

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)

It could also be said that the overarching narrative of the archaeological discipline has predominantly assumed that males have always existed, and that the archaeological
evidence thereof exists on sites. It is that archaeologists assume that males (or a type of man) exists in archaeology, but that the evidence for women (and children) on sites must be found, proven and substantiated. As argued by Engelstad (2007) given the distancing of much of gender archaeology from feminism, the discipline is still in the process of ‘adding women’ (proving their existence), and thus simply a “cosmetic change” to our interpretations of our understanding of past societies. In this sense distancing gender from the political, and from theorising, even within the gender archaeology ‘camp’ may have contributed to the decline in inclusion and relevance – simply finding a ‘female’ is not the same as interpreting gender, and as such it is much easier to not to find, or consider gender in archaeology.

**Methodology**

There will be four main facets of investigation in this thesis, literature, language, imagery, and survey.

**Literature review**

It will be essential to position and define gender in archaeological theory thoroughly and to explore the so called ‘waves’ of feminist archaeology and their link and divergence to and from gender archaeology. The major themes and voices in this area will be explored as well as the linkages to practice. The ‘variables’ such as models or paradigms, strategies, and relationships to materiality, ideologies, style, space, production and to biological determinism will be discussed. Important will be the linkages to power, colonialism and academia. In examining whether or not gender archaeology is an Anglo-Americanist tradition, there will be an exploration of the work in this area across non-western regions which, although addressed by Nelson (2006) are often still written about by European or American practitioners. Therefore a consideration of Indigenous perspective from regions such as Australia, Asia, India, Africa and the Middle East must be investigated. This component of research will examine and compare publications originating from these regions to assess cultural differences in the consideration and application of gender. So to the impact of gender archaeology within the fields of archaeology such as maritime, classical and paleoanthropology must be addressed by comparing and contrasting gender as a theme in literature of these areas.

**Language**

**Strategy and rationale**

The impetus for a methodology that primarily analyses language comes from a 2007 volume of the *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*. Conkey has reviewed the contents of four Readers of Archaeological Theory in order to consider how the discipline considers feminist theory in significant works. In the same volume Engelstad raises the issue of language and themes of gender and feminism in what are considered to be ‘mainstream’ archaeology theory texts. Engelstad also raises the usefulness of citation studies which (at a cursory look at eight books), shows much work on gender is self-referential and showed few or no references to feminist critique or theory.
In order to answer the overarching question – what the impact of gender archaeology has been across the discipline, the ideas from these two relatively small studies will be expanded and built upon with the application of techniques from linguistics research and applied to a significant sample of work. In her 2009 article, Geller assesses the impact of gender archaeology by examining the body of literature on gender archaeology. She states:

Assessment of work form 2000 to the present reveals that archaeologists’ study of gender has innovated and transformed the discipline. At best this review is representative because it cannot be comprehensive. At worst, I generalize to underscore conceptual trends” (Geller 2009: 66).

Whilst underscoring the important and influential work in the area, such studies can be seen as failing to address the nature of this ‘transformative’ aspect of gender archaeology by looking only at the production of such work, rather than the broader impacts, or take up of this work. In addressing the impacts on the discipline, analysing the language of the discipline is a means to assess whether or not this work has been influential, or largely ignored across a broad range of journals and texts, or if it is contained to specialist publications.

**Corpus linguistics**

Corpus linguistics is a relatively new and increasingly popular field in linguistics that involves the analysis of large collections of electronically stored texts aided by computer software (Baker 2010). McEnery and Wilson (1996) characterise it as a methodology, and it is rooted in an empirical, inductive form of analysis, relying on real-world instances of language use in order to determine and explore trends or derive rules in the way language is actually used and produced. The theoretical justification of such an analysis is that people often make subjective judgements about language, as social and cognitive bias and can be relied upon – we see what we want to see. Thus by studying language using software, trends, patterns and frequencies can be ascertained quickly and in a way which was previously inaccessible. An hypothesis of language use can be confirmed or refuted and such analysis can also generate new research questions. It is also advantageous to be able to quantify linguistic patterns, provide more solid conclusions, for example, ‘that men are mentioned more frequently in human origin publications’ – can be proven or refuted, but also quantified – by what proportion. Baker (2006) argues that corpus techniques can be used to show the “incremental effect of the discourse” (2006:13). Associating words occurring repetitively and naturally (or in this instance an expected absence of words) is strong evidence for an underlying hegemonic discourse, and a measure of structural inequality.

This study will include a “specialised corpus”, that is a corpus restricted to the genre of archaeological texts, and only texts written after 1970. Kennedy (1998) suggests a corpus should be at least 100,000 words in order to make generalisations. The corpus in this thesis is envisaged to be 100s of thousands of words, or greater, and one that will be large enough and diverse enough to provide a substantive analysis of trends within the discipline. It will include monographs and journal articles but restricted to those that are at least 5000 words in length and look at whole texts, not samples. It may use languages other than English, however, this is dependent upon the ability of
the software application chosen to provide results which can be directly compared. It will analyse articles from the following preliminary list of journals:

*American Antiquity*
*American Journal of Archaeology*
*Antiquity*
*Archaeologies*
*Asian Perspectives: the Journal of Archaeology for Asia and the Pacific*
*Archaeology in Oceania*
*Australasian Journal of Historical Archaeology*
*Australian Archaeology*
*Cambridge Archaeological Journal*
*European Journal of Archaeology*
*International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*
*Journal of African Archaeology*
*Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*
*Journal of Archaeological Research*
*The Journal of Human Evolution*
*World Archaeology*

Key text books, which give an overview of archaeology and often used in teaching will also be used, Preliminary these include:

*Fagan (2005) A brief history of archaeology : classical times to the twenty-first century*
*Gamble (2008) Archaeology: the basics*
*Grant and Gorin (2005) The archaeology coursebook : an introduction to study skills, topics, and methods*
*Hodder(2001) Archaeological theory today*
*Preucel and Mrozowski (2010) Contemporary archaeology in theory : the new pragmatism*
*Renfrew and Bahn (2004) Archaeology : theories, methods and practice*
*Tilley(2006) Handbook of material culture*

Many corpus- based analyses are based around the concept of frequencies of particular words, or keywords. For the purposes of this investigation, and in order to determine whether gender is a consideration within a body of work, each article or text will be searched using indicator words. Seven indicator words have been initially selected as they are logically and commonly associated with the concept of gender:

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

References and citations where indicator words appear will be omitted, as these are not taken as not necessarily indicative of a focused discussion on gender for this component of analysis. Software packages (*Concordance, WordSmith Tools, Xaira*) will be run on the texts in order to determine the most effective and efficient, in counting, sorting and presentation of language features for interpretation. The keywords can be presented as percentages of all words and compared across points in time. For example the frequency of the word gender published in 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, and so forth. Baker (2010) has demonstrated male bias in a study of
British English through a change in keywords in 1961 compared to 1991 with the keywords ‘man’ and ‘he’, occurring with greater frequency in 1961, and ‘women’ in 1991 (interpreted as directly related to the women’s movement). While this method of analysis is useful but concordance and collocation will also be required to further extrapolate context.

**Concordance and Collocation Study**

A concordance is a list of words or a phrase, with a few words of context on either side so that the use of the word can be ascertained and is therefore both a quantitative and qualitative method of analysis. The corpus software that will be used allows concordances to appear with selected keywords, thus more detail can be analysed. For example, in the aforementioned study by Baker, the word ‘girl’ was preceded by adjectives describing appearance, occupation, morality or sexuality (‘semantic preference’), whereas ‘boy’ was not, instead employment, and the conclusion drawn from this study of a patronising attitude towards women. Thus, in addition to the frequencies of words in determining whether gendered words permeate text, the context of the use of such words will also be analysed. In conjunction with concordance, collocation will be used to identify types of patterns. This is a statistical procedure and assists in managing the data pool to isolate the statistical significant co-occurrence of words and to locate the tendency of words to be biased in the way they co-occur. This will be used to manage the information chosen for analysis and will focus on verbs and adjectives.

**Citation analysis**

Citations can be seen as “an overt form of revoicing, through which new texts engage in dialogue with previous works” (Joyce 2002), and in academia, a judgement of importance, of what is being read and heard. Joyce (2002) also sees citations as shaping the construction of knowledge. Beaudry and White (1994) initiated the analysis of gender differentiation in citation practices in archaeology and such studies are seen as valid across the social sciences. Hutson (2002) has studied citation practices in four archaeological journals in detail, finding that both men and women cite women less that the expected rate for which they publish (Hutson 2002: 331). His analysis concludes that women’s archaeological labour is devalued. Such an analysis can therefore be applied to elucidate whether or not the literature produced on gender archaeology has also been devalued, and it is therefore suitable that, in conjunction with a corpus and concordance analysis of texts, bibliometric analysis be considered. This is useful in determining if and to what extent gender based literature is being overlooked, and the degree to which the literature in this area is self-referential or contained to other types of publications. In this way it aims to uncover whether writing on gender is being used, read, or applied outside the gender ‘genre’.

Citation studies have been shown to be tedious and time consuming (Moravscik 1988). This study will thus consider citations of work on gender archaeology in a selection of journals and texts published after 2000. This study will also examine context, and if cited, the nature of that work, and who is being cited, and the percentage of references they constitute (for example, x volume contained x number of articles with a total number of x citations of gender archaeology. This represents x% of citations. The most frequent citation was *Conkey and Spector 1984*).
The preliminary list of journals that will be examined include:

*Australian Archaeology*
*Australasian Journal of Historical Archaeology*
*Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*
*Journal of Archaeological Research*
*World Archaeology*

**Surveys**

**Questionnaires**
Surveys are one of the most common methods of information collection across social sciences, and a variety of methods of investigation are also consistent with feminist research. The primary goal of conducting a questionnaire in this research is gain further insight into attitudes towards, and perceptions of gender archaeology. These will be semi-standardised, containing both questions with answers limited to those set out in the questionnaire, formulated using a Likert-scale, as well as open questions, allowing respondents to formulate answers in the way that they want. Key questions will be formulated on both gender, feminism and gender archaeology. The size of the survey will be hoped to be more than 200 respondents. These will be undergraduate students in archaeology, in first and second years of study. This rationale for this is that these students will have some exposure to archaeology, but may have their opinions structured by both opinions from general ‘bigger picture’ archaeological study as well as their own life experiences, and likely not to have studied gender or feminist archaeology in any real depth. In this manner responses can be seen as representative of both the messages students receive from ‘mainstream’ or popular archaeological literature as well as reflective of the general attitude in most of the student population. Surveys will be given in hard copy to increase the rate or response as well as online, which will increase the number of respondents.

**Qualitative Interviews**
In addition to the questionnaires, interviews will also be conducted to compliment the survey. These will be semi-structured, that is there will be a prescribed set of questions, worded the same for each interviewee, in order to achieve a greater objectivity and responses for comparison, as well as open ended questions, which allow for flexibility or the reformulating of some questions depending on responses and also more depth of response. This methodology is applied are employed in qualitative and feminist research (Sarantakos 2005: 271).

These interviews will be conducted with some of the leading exponents of gender archaeology, as well as professional archaeologists, and those adverse to such an approach. This research will provide an insight into attitude and perception of gender archaeology within the discipline, and in contrast to those starting their studies in archaeology. It will investigate the perceptions of success and failure, merits and weaknesses of such an approach and responses collated. It is envisioned that these will be face-to-face interviews where possible, but *Skype* or telephone interviews may
also be conducted. Interviewees would be able to remain anonymous, as this may allow more honest responses.

**Analysis of Imagery and Presentation**

The masculinist subject position is enacted and reinforced through the use of imagery, whether with the actual illustrations accompanying the texts in the presentation of knowledge or in the ways of representing the practice of archaeology. (Conkey 2007: 303)

**Children’s Books, media and the school curriculum**

Drawing on my recent experience tutoring first year archaeology students, a group was asked to explain what influenced their decision to choose a particular artefact to replicate for an assignment. It was surprising that five students in this group cited Disney movies as their source. It is important to acknowledge that the perceptions of what both gender and archaeology are, are learnt from a young age and these perceptions can be pervasive and difficult to ‘unlearn’ by the time a student may encounter text or debate on gender archaeology in their second or third years of undergraduate study. It is therefore essential in an evaluation of the impact of gender archaeology to examine what materials continue to have an influence on younger generations and set up a resistance to change an already formulated mind-set. In many ways this is a cyclical process, archaeology informs the production of this material, and archaeologists themselves may have been influenced by such materials. As Lutz (1995) states “Theory is …clearly about the politics of all culture, not just academic culture”. This study will thus examine a selection of children’s books, television, movies, and games which have the theme of archaeology to examine how gender roles are portrayed.

A preliminary list of children’s books includes:

- **Elena and the Coin**. E. Buckman. (2000) Center for Desert Archaeology, Tucson, Arizona
- **Archaeologists Dig for Clues** (Let's-Read-and-Find-Out Science 2) by Kate Duke
- **Archaeology**. J. McIntosh (1990) Eyewitness Books
- **Dig In Time**. P. R Griffin, (1992) Puffin Books
- **Early Man: The story of the First People on the Earth**. A. McCord (1979) EDC
- **First Civilisations** (Cultural Atlas for young children) E. Hunter (1994) Andromeda Books
- **Prehistoric Life W. Kindsay** (1994) Knopf
Interestingly, from an initial collection of over 200 titles, approximately 90% of authors of books on archaeology for children are female.

Nichols, Pragnell & Haslam (2005) argue that the school education system is an important public sphere where popular notions of archaeology and the archaeological past are produced and reproduced. Ninnes (2000) also argues that there is a growing recognition that presenting principally western perspectives in science texts is a form of ethnocentrism, racism or cultural imperialism. He has employed discourse analysis to two junior secondary science texts, one used in Australia and the other in Canada, with a specific focus on the incorporation of indigenous knowledges into the texts. In such a way an analysis of gender in texts used for teaching archaeology in Australian schools will be undertaken.

Magazines, Documentaries and the Internet

As is discussed by Holtorf (2007) the main sources from which the general public receive information about archaeology are television, books, magazines and newspapers. Such work does not consider gender as a line of enquiry though there has been significant debate and discussion of Indiana Jones and Lara Croft archaeology heroes. But as recently as the July 2010 covers of the magazines Australiasian Science, National Geographic and Origins demonstrate, there is a definite location of these images in the 1950s model of (white) man evolving from ape. This component of research will explore the why such publication so heavily masculinist, who the archaeologists are that inform such publications and why these images persist. It will sample issues published from 2008-2012 from these three magazines and collate the images of archaeology. Also, why recent documentaries produced by the BBC such as ‘Journey of Mankind’, and Canada’s ‘The Naked Archaeologist’ taint otherwise good archaeology by falling back on old stereotypes of cavemen and male misogynists. An exploration of what images of gender are being produced in documentaries, which are in fact sanctioned by archaeologists, will be undertaken in a selection of popular episodes and evaluated in terms of representation of gender, and contrasted to the archaeological evidence for such depictions.

Museum collections

Representations of gender in archaeology are also most visible in museum displays. Museums are a forum for the creation of meaning and the interpretation of the past, and reach a broad cross section of the community. There has been significant analysis of stereotypes of women’s roles in museums (see Sorensen 2000) and attempts to readdress bias has even been characterized as ‘misery research and dignity research’ (Lind 1993, cited in Sorensen 2000). In the same sense that popular media receive information about archaeology from archaeologists to create their ‘product’, so too do museums. An evaluation of a selection of contemporary museum exhibitions on archaeology will be undertaken in terms of critiquing the presentation of gender. Some of these can be viewed online by way of ‘virtual museums’. Some of the displays to be critiqued may include:

Archaeology displays at the National Museum of Australia
• Archaeology displays held as part of the annual ‘National Archaeology Week’ across museums in Australia
• Permanent archaeology collections in museums across Australia, such as the Museum of WA, South Australian Museum
• The Origins room at the American Museum of Natural History
• The archaeology collections of the Smithsonian
• Neanderthal Museum, Mettmann, Germany
• Regional Museum of Prehistory, Germany
• The Iceman display at the South Tyrol Museum of Archaeology in Bolzano (South Tyrol, Italy)
• The British Museum

Analysis and expected outcomes

The analysis of all four components – literature, language, imagery and surveys will be done individually and then framed as an overall perspective and on that will explicitly answer the research questions against the backdrop of the theoretical framework taken.

An initial corpus analysis has been undertaken as to test the merits of this component of the research design on two selected journals on all article published between 2000 and 2010. This used the selected indicator words reveal some very distinct and surprising results.

Examining the frequency of the indicator words for all issues of Australian Archaeology, (116 articles) 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.

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.

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 25 of the 70 do not use the terms at all or in any combination. 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. 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.

What this is believed to indicate is that an objective analysis using a linguistics methodology can be applied to investigate both the frequency of discussion of gender, and with concordance, the nature of that discussion. It is anticipated that this trend will follow across all mainstream journals and texts analysed, but it is not predictable at this stage of the research whether there is any increase or decrease over time. The question of how much (or what percentage of words) indicates a significant discussion on gender and by what proportion will be complex. Interestingly the permeation of any discussions on gender are less than anticipated, supporting the notion that gender archaeology is ‘contained’ within specialist publications or volumes, and not a feature of ‘mainstream’ discussion in at least, Australian publications.

In a similar sense the initial investigations into theory have shown gender has not taken a central, nor even significant place in some of the key archaeological texts, and certainly not since the 1990s. Much media analysed thus far- magazines, imagery about archaeology, is heavily masculinist, and certainly Eurocentric. An analysis of the Origins room of the American Museum of Natural History has also shown to include insidious yet subtle gender bias in the presentation of dioramas. Such initial results vindicate the merit of the proposed methodology. Surveys, which will be undertaken in the last third of the research timeline will be useful in contributing to an understanding why there is such a reluctance or resistance to the inclusion of gender, particularly regarding women, in the narratives of the discipline.
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