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Methodological Details of the Recruitment and Survey

### Recruitment

For each journal, I created a spreadsheet of the basic citation information for each article (journal, volume, issue, first page number, author names, author rank), noting author email addresses when they were listed. I then checked the list of authors in the journal against the list of authors already surveyed (after surveying authors from the first journal), and marked any that remained to be surveyed. For those, I searched for email addresses for all authors whose email addresses were not published in the journal. I did this by Google searching for their names, along with the word “archaeology” with more common names (or “arqueología” with common Spanish names). I noted email addresses when I could find them (often on departmental websites, personal websites, or Academia.edu pages), and the urls of Academia.edu pages when no email address was present. Authors whose contact information I could not find were marked as “could not find” (as were those for whom I got automatic replies that the email addresses listed did not exist). Authors whose obituaries appeared in the search results, who had automatic response emails saying they had passed away, or whose articles included a note about their deaths were listed as “deceased.”

Once these addresses were compiled, I sent a survey recruitment letter to the email addresses or used the Academia.edu direct message function to send to people who had pages there with no email address listed. The recruitment letter said:

Hello,

I am writing to you because you have published at least one article in [name of journal]. I am a Ph.D. candidate at Boston University in the Archaeology Department. I am conducting dissertation research on how archaeologists choose what to research, and how these choices may be shaped by their experiences of race, gender, and sexuality. In order to complete this study, I need your help. Please consider spending 2 minutes to fill out this short survey [hyperlink]. Your responses will be kept private and data will only be presented in aggregate, without reference to any particular individuals.

If you need to contact me, I can be reached at lheath@bu.edu. If you have any concerns, you may contact my adviser, David Carballo, at carballo@bu.edu or the Boston University Institutional Review Board at (617) 358-6115.

Thank you for your support in my research.

Sincerely,

Laura Heath-Stout

### The Survey

The hyperlink in the recruitment message led to a Google Form with this survey:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Gender (check all that apply):

\_\_ Gender nonconforming, genderfluid, and/or genderqueer

\_\_ Woman

\_\_ Transgender and/or Two-Spirit

\_\_ Man

\_\_ Agender

\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply):

\_\_ Biracial and/or Multiracial

\_\_ Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander

\_\_ Middle Eastern and/or North African

\_\_ American Indian, Native American, First Nations, and/or Alaskan Native

\_\_ Hispanic and/or Latinx

\_\_ Asian

\_\_ Black, African American, and/or Afro-Latinx

\_\_ White and/or Caucasian

\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sexual Orientation self-identification (check all that apply):

\_\_ Queer

\_\_ Bisexual and/or pansexual

\_\_ Gay, lesbian, and/or homosexual

\_\_ Straight and/or heterosexual

\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Nationality: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

When surveying authors of the two journals that publish Spanish-language articles, *Ancient Mesoamerica* and *Latin American Antiquity*, I included Spanish translations of all questions and answers.

Although it is unusual to ask for names on surveys of this nature, I chose to do so. By asking for names, I made it possible to connect particular survey responses with individual authors and their work. This allowed me to weight authorship data by numbers of publications, associate authors with multiple journals without sending them multiple surveys, and look at which authors wrote about which topics.

The gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation questions all contained a list of randomly-ordered checkboxes, with the option to check all that apply and/or “other,” which had a write-in option. This is because many of these identities are not mutually exclusive: for example, a person may be a transgender man, may be a biracial person of white and African American heritage, or may identify as both queer and a more specific identity such as gay or bisexual. By providing the option to write in, I allowed respondents who did not identify with the options presented to answer nevertheless.

The gender question was written to be inclusive of a variety of gender identities. The two most common answers, “man” and “woman,” were provided: when respondents checked one of these and no other options, they were interpreted to be cisgender (i.e., having been assigned their gender at birth on the basis of their genitalia and continuing to identify with that gender). Although I considered including “cisgender” as an option, I chose not to because many cisgender people do not know the meaning of the word, and the question would thus measure vocabulary more effectively than identity. I lumped together transgender and Two-Spirit, and combined genderqueer, genderfluid, and gender nonconforming (three words often used by people who do not identify with either binary gender). I also included “agender,” a word used by people who do not identify with any gender, or identify as not having a gender at all.

The race/ethnicity question was loosely based on that of the U.S. Census. One major difference was that I combined two U.S. Census questions: the “race” question, and the “ethnicity” question, which asks whether the respondent is or is not Hispanic or Latino. Because my “check all that apply” approach allowed people to check both Hispanic/Latinx and another category, it was not necessary to keep these separate. I titled the question “Race/Ethnicity” because I was combining these two census questions: some respondents protested that there are many ethnic identities that are not included in the question, and that the question title is therefore misleading. I agree that this is a shortcoming of the survey, although I did not come to this understanding until after it had been sent to many respondents, and I chose not to change the survey during distribution. There are also several other small differences from the U.S. Census options. Instead of “Latino,” I used the gender-neutral “Latinx.” I added “First Nations” to the American Indian/Alaskan Native option in order to include indigenous Canadians and added Afro-Latinx to the Black category to be more inclusive. I also added a category for Middle Eastern and/or North African (MENA): MENA people are categorized as white by the U.S. Census but are nonetheless targeted by systemic racism in the United States so I chose to collect data about MENA-identified archaeologists.

For the sexual orientation question, I listed several of the most common identities, grouping gay with lesbian and bisexual with pansexual. I also gave the option of “queer,” a word that can be an umbrella term for a wide variety of sexual minorities, a political orientation against social normativities, or an individual self-identification, depending on the context.

The nationality question was left for write-in answers, allowing people to self-identify or list multiple nations. Their answers were then standardized (e.g., listing “U.S.,” “US,” “U.S.A.,” “USA,” “United States,” “United States of America,” “America,” “American,” etc. as “United States of America”; “France,” “French,” and “Français” as “France”).

### Special Cases of Data Collection

I also collected information from obituaries when I encountered them on departmental websites, in archaeology journals or newsletters, or in local newspapers when searching for contact information. Gender and nationality were the easiest data to collect, as most obituaries explicitly mentioned nationality and used gendered pronouns. Archaeologists were assumed to be white unless obituaries said otherwise, and almost all obituaries included photographs in which the deceased appeared to be white. One deceased author was Japanese and I thus categorized his race as Asian, and another was from Latin America, so he was listed as Latinx. Finally, I listed deceased authors whose obituaries mentioned opposite-sex spouses as straight, and did not note any sexual orientation data for those whose obituaries did not mention marital status or said that they were unmarried. Of course, reading an obituary is not the same as asking someone about their identities. Some of these archaeologists may have been queer or transgender and closeted, or have had a more complex racial identity but passed as white. Some even may have been openly queer while married to someone of the opposite binary gender: many bisexual, pansexual, and queer-identified people marry spouses of the opposite sex. Yet these problems also rear their heads in the survey study. A closeted queer person or white-passing person of color or mixed-race person might well check the “straight” or “white” box. I thus decided that including this relatively small amount of somewhat questionable data was worthwhile.

Nine of the 72 archaeologists that I interviewed for the qualitative interview study for my dissertation work (Heath-Stout 2019:chaps. 8–10) did not fill out my survey, despite having articles in the sample. I decided to include them in the journal study, since they had given me their answers to all five survey questions in the course of the interviews. I added this information in the database alongside data collected from surveys and obituaries.