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A corollary . . . is the need to stress the practical constitution of the past in the discipline of archaeology. Archaeology is a discursive event.

—Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley (1987a)

Archaeology has been undergoing changes in the way it conceives and conducts its research. Motivated by ethical concerns to address the multiple meanings of the past that descendent societies give to their material heritage, many archaeologists have increasingly turned to ethnography as a means to engage stakeholder communities’ claims of ownership, use-rights, and meanings of the past. Archaeologists, going back to the professionalization of the discipline in the early twentieth century, have, of course, been using ethnography as a research tool to study the archaeological past. In recent years, however, the shift in how it is used as well as the motives and agenda that guide these new practices might very well be defined as the “ethnographic turn” in archaeology. Having disciplinary, professional, personal, and cultural stakes in how archaeology does its business, I am an interested third party in these developments. In particular, as an ethnographer who has investigated archaeology as a social force connected to contemporary processes of identity formation, tourism development, cultural politics, and
nation building, I am an outside observer and, also, an inter-
locutor implicated in and engaged with these processes. This
double position allows me a particular combination of insight
and distance from which to formulate in this chapter a broadly
conceptual commentary on the emergent agenda of incorporat-
ing ethnography into archaeology.

My goal is, first, to provide a broad map of three general
ways in which ethnography can be associated with archaeol-
ogy. In the next section I briefly discuss these in turn as the
background for the remainder of the chapter. In the second sec-
tion, I discuss forms of reflexivity and uses of subjectivity in
ethnography. My second goal is to suggest that the pursuit of
reflexive methods in archaeology might be misdirected effort,
on the one hand, and to offer my notion of research positioning
as an alternative way to problematize certain issues with which
some postprocessualist archaeologies are concerned, on the
other hand. My third goal is to lay out a schematic agenda of
how ethnography might be focused as a series of practices in-
tegrated into archaeological research. This discussion, there-
fore, is initially “descriptive” and “classificatory” and then
suggestive in the sense of offering principles and issues that
may be useful for archaeologists to consider in their own inno-
native work in this emergent area. In presenting these ideas, it
is necessary to reiterate that my position on the outside of ar-
chaeology as an attentive and informed interlocutor situates
my knowledge and perspective: In other words, my subject
and disciplinary position both constricts my understandings of
archaeology and, yet, facilitates insights that inform this view
of ethnographic archaeology. In this chapter I assume the task
of imagining—as an ethnographer—what I might do with
ethnography if I were an archaeologist dedicated not only to in-
vestigating the past, but also to actively analyzing the social
contexts, political dynamics, and communicative processes of
my research—including engagement with the meanings, iden-
tities, claims of ownership, and forms of use that different
publics, descendent communities, and stakeholders claim and
assert over archaeological heritage.
Ethnography (in, of, for) Archaeology

The use of ethnography in archaeology is not at all new and includes a wide range of forms. The professionalization of the discipline in the early twentieth century as a university-based science may have only formalized a limited number of the most explicit uses while allowing for other forms to remain active in a diffuse and pervasive manner within archaeology (see Hollowell and Nicholas, chapter 3). Despite the range of uses and forms of combining archaeology and ethnography, there is a bit of inconsistency and lack of consensus in the labeling of past and present-day initiatives. For example, while “ethnoarchaeology” has a well-established meaning, “archaeological ethnography” and “ethnographic archaeology” have no definitive or consistent meaning. At times these phrases refer to the same or opposite thing, and sometimes to different approaches, methods, or problems.

It is not surprising, then, that the variety of ways in which ethnography has been, is, and can be used within archaeology might appear as a GOK pile—a “god only knows” of diversity of practices and possibilities. Consider, for example, Edgeworth’s (2003:11–13) use of the term “ethnoarchaeology” as shorthand for what he calls the “ethnography of archaeology.” Meanwhile, Meskell (2005a,b) uses the phrase “archaeological ethnography” to do what is clearly ethnography (without adjectival qualification) of “archaeology” but in a dramatically different, perhaps incompatible, manner than that envisioned practiced by Edgeworth. To complicate even further, Hodder’s discussions (e.g., 1999:80–104) of archaeological excavation practices “at the trowel’s edge” are also clearly ethnographic, yet his presentation of this as “ethnographic” is mostly rhetorical given that his “thick description” of practices primarily functions as evidence in an argument about epistemology that advocates creating archaeological methods that are reflexive and multivocal.

This chapter, therefore, has a primary task of providing a frame by which to sort out this confusion of labels and activities by categorically and conceptually differentiating three distinct
types or modes of associating ethnography and archaeology. These are: (1) archaeological ethnography; (2) ethnography of ar-
chaeology; and (3) ethnographic archaeology. These three modes are identified and differentiated according to four criteria or axes: first, the definition of the basic research agenda; second, the specification of the object of study; third, the role of ethnography and its relationship to archaeology; and, fourth, the goal or purpose and rationale of the research. Table 1.1 maps these three general modes of articulating ethnography and archaeology along these four axes of differentiation and table 1.2 delineates the uses of ethnography in archaeological research.

The first mode is labeled “archaeological ethnography” and defined by the use of ethnography as a method of studying the past in terms of traditionally conceived archaeological purposes and goals. Ethnography is thus a subordinated method of producing diverse types of information (i.e., data, knowledge, models, hypotheses, etc.) that are directly and only applied to the understanding and explanation of the past. The well-known, classic examples of ethnoarchaeology and ethnographic analogy illustrate that the use of ethnography is limited as a method aimed primarily to produce knowledge that will contribute to understanding the past as a given, material reality that is epistemologically, but not ontologically, separate from the present. Thus, in processual/new archaeology, ethnography is used to focus on behavioral patterns in association with material culture to derive signature patterns by which to explain site formation (Binford 1978, 1983; Gould 1974, 1978; David and Kramer 2001). Similarly, the different initiatives in “experimental archaeology” are fundamentally based on the use of ethnography shaped in particular ways (Coles 1979; Ingersoll, Yellen and Macdonald 1977; Mathieu 2002; Stone and Planel 1999): Specifically, participant observation, practically reshaped as a type of ethnomethodology (see Garfinkel 1967; Coulon 1995; Pollner and Emerson 2001), is used to reenact or restage lived experience in a past society/culture. The goal is often to theorize or explain prehistoric technology or to gain a phenomenological interpretation of everyday life in the past.
Ultimately, these methodological strategies tend to rely upon analogy of the present to the past. This analogy takes the form of an analysis and interpretation of the value of the results of the archaeological ethnography. On this point, a crucial difference between archaeological ethnography and ethnographic archaeology can be identified. In the latter, ethnography is used to produce knowledge about the present to understand something about the present. In the former, ethnography is used to produce knowledge about and in the present that is theoretically or analytically positioned as analogous to the past as way to explain the past—for example, material patterns in the formation of sites. Thus, this first mode is based on specific theories that provide a strategic use of ethnography as a methodology subordinated to the archaeological agenda oriented by the problem of the past.

Thus, interpretive postprocessual archaeology also has recourse to ethnoarchaeology, which is nonetheless distinctly inflected. Ethnography can be used as a method to study the contemporary meanings of archaeological materials as held by descendant cultural communities and stakeholders that identify with the material past (e.g., Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999). At Çatalhöyük, for example, framed as ethnoarchaeology, ethnography was the central methodology in the interdisciplinary study of contemporary materiality (Matthews, Hastorf, and Ergenekon 2000). The ethnographic exploration of these meanings and materiality, nonetheless, are still subordinate to the epistemological frame of analogy and the task of defining an archaeological interpretation of the site. That this interpretation is construed to be fluid and flexible or “momentary and always subject to change” (Hodder 2000a:9, 1997) does not radically change the strategic use, meaning, and practice of ethnography in the categorical sense outlined here as a subordinated tool to study the past. Ethnography has a different relationship to archaeology in types two and three.

The second mode is termed the “anthropology of archaeology.” In this broad category it should be clear, first, that anthropology references (sociocultural) anthropological approaches and agendas. Second, therefore, this category is best divided between studies that deploy an array of methods in which ethnography is, nonetheless, the primary methodological axis and those in which...
Table 1.1. Three Modes of Articulating Ethnography to Archaeology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode/Type Characterization</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Basic Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To study archaeological “pasts” and/or the material patterns of archaeological record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Object of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the past”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Role of Ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnographic methodologies are used in archaeology as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnographic methods are used to investigate archaeology in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnographic methods are incorporated into the doing of archaeological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Archaeological Ethnography” Ethnography is a Method of Archaeology

“Anthropology of Archaeology” Archaeology is an Object of Ethnography

“Ethnographic Archaeology” Archaeology is a Subject of Ethnography (Ethnographic Subject)
a tool to investigate specific faces of the past or of the present and material and dynamics in the world, no necessary relation to archaeology as science or scientific archaeology. See Castañeda n.d.b.

...ethnography, as a different discipline concerned with contemporary processes...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodologies</th>
<th>Method and Goal</th>
<th>Research Problem</th>
<th>Logic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Archaeology</td>
<td>Spatial analyses of contemporary material culture to explain patterns in the archaeological record</td>
<td>Functional patterns of material culture and behavior (processes of site formation)</td>
<td>Behavior that results in patterns of material culture today causes similar patterns in the archaeological past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Analogy</td>
<td>Identification and application of contemporary cultural practices and customs as probable analogies for behavioral patterns in the past</td>
<td>Patterns of ideas and symbols and formal patterns in material culture</td>
<td>Assumption of cultural continuity; present cultural forms (traditions, customs) derive from past forms and explain nonfunctional patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral History and Interviewing</td>
<td>Elicit contemporary descendents of past societies to derive culturally situated explanations and meanings of material culture and past behavior</td>
<td>Meaning of (material and immaterial) past for cultural descendents</td>
<td>“Native” or “insider” cultural interpretations can approximate meanings given to past (material) culture and thus be used to inform interpretations by archaeologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observation—“Experimental Archaeology”</td>
<td>Using a form of participant observation to “relive,” “recreate,” or otherwise “stage” experiences of the past</td>
<td>To resolve questions about technologies of the past or to create phenomenological and “experiential” understandings of the past</td>
<td>Archaeologists can experience vicariously what it was like to be a person of that past era or somewhat more directly as a reproduction of how the society overcame technological problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Participant Observation</td>
<td>Understanding of the social, political, economic, cultural contexts of a specific archaeological research project</td>
<td>Get along with local publics and community to conduct research</td>
<td>Archaeologists of a research project need to understand the social-political actors and communities in which research is conducted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ethnography is a secondary method if used at all. Thus, social and political histories of archaeology (Patterson 1986, 1994, 1999, 2003; Rutsch 2002; Kehoe 1998) as well as many of the “internal” analyses of the sociopolitical dimensions of archaeological practices, epistemology, and interpretations (Leone, Potter, and Schakel 1987; Gero and Conkey 1991; Gero, Lacy, and Blakey 1983; Shanks and Tilley 1987a, b; Pinsky and Wylie 1990; Meskell 1998) can be viewed as contributing to an “anthropology of archaeology” without being based in ethnography (or at least formally being an ethnographic study or relying on explicit ethnographic method). From another perspective, however, these studies are primarily generated from within archaeology and from a variety of post-processual positions, might simply be viewed as a part of archaeology itself. Furthermore, as such, this diversity of critical analyses of archaeology by archaeologists can be conceptualized as embodying a general drive to reformulate archaeology into a “reflexive science” or “reflexive archaeology.” While the issue of reflexivity is developed in the next section, these nonethnographic studies of archaeology are not a topic of discussion in this chapter. Further, although the ethnographic investigation of archaeology conducted according to disciplinary or other ethnographic criteria can provide some sense of reflexivity, “archaeology” in this categorical type is positioned as an external, distanced object of study.

This “outside” relation derives, first, from the fact that the goal of the study is not the production or increase of knowledge, data, or understanding of “the past” per se: The past, either as a generalized facet of humanity or as particular heritage of specific cultures or civilizations, is not the object of study. Rather, the anthropology of archaeology is primarily focused on the political, economic, and social dimensions of how archaeology constructs, produces, disseminates, markets, and even consumes “the past.” Thus, the “past” shifts from being the sole object of study to become an analytical problem embedded in a nexus of research issues related to the present; significantly, the past therefore becomes, as it were, the historically substantive and analytical space in which archaeology is investigated as any number of different specific analytical objects, using a range of theoretical approaches, with a variety of analytical methods, and in relation to diverse social agents, contexts, and processes (see table 1.3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeology as Specific Analytical Object</th>
<th>Associated Disciplinary Approaches and Fields of Study</th>
<th>Correlated Types of Possible Research Problems and Issues (list is suggestive, not exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse and Representation</td>
<td>Cultural Anthropology, Cultural Studies, Postcolonial Studies, Political Anthropology</td>
<td>Scientific “knowledge” is analyzed in relation to social, political, and economic forces, factors, conditions, projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology is studied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems include how archaeology is linked to fields of power, sociopolitical processes, and formation of identity of differing scale (cultural communities, nations, humanity, races, genders, etc.), and to commercialization of knowledge in popular media (films, magazines, TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Tourism Industry</td>
<td>Anthropology of Tourism, Cultural and Economic Anthropology, Political Economy, Postcolonial Studies</td>
<td>Archaeological production, marketing, representation, and consumption of heritage is analyzed in relation to processes of “globalization,” nation building, identity politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology is studied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems include how archaeology is intertwined with tourism (tourism development and markets), museum institutions and discourses, mass media and communication technologies, economic basis of research; role in and relationship to black markets, antiquities trading, art worlds, indigenous artisanry; politics of heritage ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Economic and Political</td>
<td>Organization of archaeology in different institutional forms, national contexts, and disciplinary modes is analyzed in relation to the public spheres and civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology is studied as social organization, sets of actors, networks</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Problems include institutional bases (e.g., university, museums, government, private sector), funding politics, governmentality, formation of expertise and knowledge specialists, public debates/dissemination; roles in formation of transnational civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology is studied practices of knowledge production</td>
<td>Anthropology of Science, History and Philosophy of Science, Sociology of Knowledge, Intellectual History</td>
<td>Institutionalization of discipline, practices, and knowledge and their articulation to sociopolitical contexts/dynamics in national and international arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems include forms of training, sociology of communities of practitioners; social influences on and effects of archaeology; social-political histories of archaeological sciences; professionalization and relation to rise of modern science; relation to modernity, the West, colonialism; ethics and politics of archaeological science; sociopolitical bases of different disciplinary modes of national traditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, there is a concomitant difference between the methods of ethnography, which primarily focus on present day, lived/live information and data, and the inherited (or traditional) archaeological methods, which primarily focus on the past and its materially accessible manifestations. The relation of externality is not based on the subjectivity or subjective positioning of the researcher but on the epistemological positioning of archaeology as the object of inquiry and the concomitant methods of analysis.

Thus, the outside/external relationship is not altered or changed, even if a professionally trained archaeologist were to conduct an ethnographic study of archaeology. This point is implicitly assumed when archaeologists that have conducted ethnographies of archaeological research projects discuss their “double” or “split” positioning as simultaneously “insider” and “outsider” (e.g., Edgeworth 2003; Edgeworth 2006b; Holtorf 2006; Van Reybrouck and Jacobs 2006). They are “insiders” not simply due to their training and knowledge as archaeologists, but (typically) as participants in the archaeological research that is being investigated. The assumption is that by then “turning” ethnography “back onto” archaeology, an insider/outsider subjectivity is created, which in turn—it is assumed—creates reflexivity. Note that this “double” positioning of the researcher as insider/outsider has no necessary (i.e., intrinsic, given, or determinate) value for those doing ethnographies of archaeology (type two) for the sake of ethnography (cultural anthropology). In contrast, for those doing or advocating ethnographies of archaeology for the sake of archaeology (type three, i.e., ethnographic archaeologies) it is held to be significant as way to create “reflexivity.” The value of this reflexivity is an important issue to which I return in the next section in the context of the discussion of research positioning.

The ethnographies of archaeological projects, research sites, and discourses that began to emerge in the mid-1990s has so far remained a series of disparate and interstitial inquiries that work at the intersections of other defined fields of study, e.g., tourism, heritage, museums, nationalism, indigenous identity. Thus, despite important initiatives by archaeologists and ethnographers,
the "anthropology of archaeology" has yet to consolidate as a field of study that can be identified or defined by a discrete agenda, set or series of primary issues, and essential, much less canonical or paradigmatic, debates. In this regard the prospects of an ethnography of archaeology is wide open for innovative and ambitious research that not only engages the existing, if also scattered, literature, but also provides scope and vision to establish points of debate that can consolidate a research agenda and chart courses for future work.

In this context of disjunction, it should not be surprising that this initial body of ethnographic research is often grounded on the study of specific sites of heritage and the particular archaeological research projects—whether completed, in process, ongoing, or multiple. In this regard, site-specific ethnographies of archaeology (e.g., Potter 1994; Castañeda 1996; Shankland 2000; Bartu 2000; Abu El-Haj 2001; Benavides 2004; Meskell 2005a,b; Breglia 2006a, b) are closely related to ethnographic research on heritage tourism, historical preservation sites, and living museums (e.g., Handler and Gable 1997; Edensor 1998; Stanton 2006; Silverman 2006). There is no question that heritage sites have ambiguous or contested boundaries and that they are inherently multidimensional or "multiple" as per Hodder and Bartu’s conception of the inherent plurality of the archaeological field site and irremediably "ambivalent" (see Breglia 2006a, b) or fraught with contending claims of ownership, identity, and use-rights. Nonetheless, the ethnographic focus on relatively discrete geophysical sites of archaeology makes sense given that these are most amenable to ethnographic investigation via participant and immersive forms of fieldwork. In other words, these ethnographies are primarily conducted in situ at the research locations of those projects under investigation in conjunction with a secondary site that can be another archaeological research location selected for comparative analysis. More typically, the second research sites are the discourses associated with the archaeological project or with the archaeological heritage of the region/nation, whether these are produced by archaeologists or other social agents that can range from international organizations, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and
state institutions, such as tourism offices, to descendant stakeholders and new age spiritual communities. In this way, these and other investigations also study to different degrees the nongeographically localized manifestations of archaeological research practices, such as discourses and bodies of knowledge, that circulate in a diversity of other sites, such as museums, educational and TV documentaries, popular science magazines, tourism literatures, indigenous politics, and nationalism (Abu El-Haj 2001; Be.navides 2004; Rowan and Baram 2004; Silverman 2006; Meskell 2005c; Castañeda 1996, 2000). The problems addressed by these studies should not be viewed as confining future research by delimited the only or “best” paths to take; rather, as an initial foundation, they should stimulate new approaches, questions, and issues so that the anthropology of archaeology can develop a wide range of problems and debates that have broad relevance and significance (see table 1.3).

Conceptualizing archaeology as these four types of analytical objects—that is, as discourse and representation, as heritage and tourism industry, as institution, and as science—provides focal points for investigation, topics of contention for debate, and intersecting issues for research agendas. These four overlapping approaches, issues, and objects are neither exhaustive nor exclusive. In short, these are loose boundary markers for the emergent field of study that nonetheless enable an opening of problems. Further elaboration of these possibilities is better reserved for another occasion. Nonetheless, in summary, it can be seen that all four analytical constructs of the object are undergirded by a broader anthropological concern for three series of problems:

1. Agency—the sociological agency of archaeology, including its organizational structures, hierarchies of status and expertise, institutional and economic bases, ideologies of identity and mission, practices and bodies of knowledge, systems of communication and dissemination, disciplinary modes, forms of training and recruitment, cultures of work/research;
2. Contexts and Interlocutors—the sociopolitical contexts in which archaeology is situated, including both the imme-
diate local dynamics and broader historical processes in which it participates, and the social agents (stakeholders, publics, communities, audiences, funders, consumers, etc.) that it encounters in these contexts, processes, and dynamics.

3. **Situated Action**—the specific practices by which archaeology intervenes in the world as ways to work, engage, conflict, collaborate, collude, and otherwise interact with the social agents that intersect with archaeology in the course of constructing, managing, interpreting, and disseminating the past.

These three concerns can be summarized as being questions of agency, contexts and interlocutors, and situated action that are posed to archaeology as an agent whose fundamental purpose and agenda is to “make the past.” While ethnography-focused studies of archaeology may certainly take these three focal points as springboards to investigate other issues, I suggest that ethnographic archaeologies may be contrasted from the general ethnography of archaeology for their concentrated attention on these three topics as they pertain to specific, situated archaeological projects. I therefore want to synthesize and summarize these wide-ranging and diverse issues of agency, context, interlocutors, and action with the concept-phrase “research positioning” to indicate one of three central notions that configure ethnographic archaeology.

This third mode, “ethnographic archaeology” is based on the use of ethnography within archaeology “for the sake of archaeology” as in archaeological ethnographies (type one), yet with a fundamental twist. Because the object of study is no longer the “past” per se, as in archaeological ethnographies (type one), but rather the present-day contexts and processes of archaeology itself (as in type two), the overarching goal also changes from the explanation of the past to the practical uses of ethnography to study archaeology. By using ethnography to study what archaeology is and how it “makes the past” in situated contexts of research projects, ethnography can therefore also become a means and mode of engaging and interacting with (a) heritage stakeholders, (b) the
diverse, and often conflicted, public and popular meanings and interpretations of the past, and (c) the multiple claims of ownership and use-rights of archaeological heritage. Thus, the rationale for ethnographic archaeology is fundamentally and crucially different than archaeological ethnographies and ethnographies of archaeology: It is motivated by the desire to substantiate an ethics of responsibility that archaeology and archaeologists have with descendent and stakeholder communities and with the public investment in (the meanings, interpretations, identity, display, use, control, and ownership) of archaeological pasts.

Ethnographic archaeology, as conceived here is, therefore, not the use of a method that is subordinated to the goal of the archaeological interpretation of the past, but rather the pervasive integration of ethnographic processes into the doing of archaeology in several different registers and domains of the research project. This integration fundamentally shifts the relationship between archaeology and ethnography. Archaeology is not simply the object of ethnographic study nor is ethnography just one tool among others. Rather, archaeology becomes the subject of ethnography, that is, archaeology is the ethnographic subject. More concretely this means that the archaeological project is the agent (subject) that does ethnography of it—"self"—that is, of its own activities, processes, contexts, agency, and interactions with other social actors (whether groups, communities, audiences, states, or institutions). Thus, ethnographic archaeology, defined in this way, necessarily provokes the question of reflexivity, which is the topic of the second section of this chapter. While the remainder of this first section further characterizes in a general way ethnographic archaeology, the third section presents a more tangible elaboration of what might be involved in this notion.

This concern with the present-day contexts of archaeology makes ethnographic archaeology (type three) quite “close” to ethnographies of archaeology (type two). There are additional differences to note, especially with regard to the focus and scope of these two types. Whereas ethnographies of archaeology can involve the study of a single research project, this field of study should continue to develop by investigating the diverse forms, expressions, practices, and institutional contexts of archaeology.
In contrast, the use of ethnography as an integrated part of an archaeological research project is circumscribed by the very project of which it is a part. This should not be considered an absolute difference, but primarily a heuristic and categorical, but also a practical, criterion by which to differentiate these two ways of using ethnography to study archaeology. With these distinctions in place, I now turn in greater detail to elaborate a vision of ethnographic archaeology and how this might serve the ethical agenda of an archaeology aimed at a social commitment with the world.

**Reflexivity, Subjectivity, and Research Positioning**

The difficulties involved in being a kind of ethnographer of one’s own practices are clear. It is difficult from an intellectual standpoint to distance oneself from the familiar. It is also challenging from a practical standpoint—it is yet another task added onto an already burdensome suite of daily duties. (Roveland 2006:65)

Ethnographic archaeology—that is, the integration of ethnographic study of different aspects of archaeology into the project and processes of archaeological research—raises questions about reflexivity. Reflexivity in anthropology has a long, varied, and hotly debated presence. To generalize, three broad trends can be identified. First, there is a reflexivity that is concerned with the role of subjectivity and the researcher in the dynamics of knowledge production as this occurs in the time and space of fieldwork. This is known as researcher positioning. Second, there is a reflexivity that is concerned with the effects and practical consequences of anthropology in the world; although this interest can be focused on the “present” of research it more clearly represented by the questioning of the sociopolitical history of anthropology, especially regarding the sins of colonial complicity (e.g., Dell Hymes, Bob Scholte, Talal Asad; see Pels and Salemink 2000). In this chapter I elaborate a particular conception of this under the notion of research positioning. While the latter is viewed as a form of reflexive analysis, it has little to do with subjectivity,
the former is deeply associated with and defined by subjectivity. In this section I move from a discussion of researcher positioning to research positioning as way to assess how ethnography can contribute to the reflexivity of archaeology.

Researcher positioning in ethnography is a methodological principle by which the ethnographer seeks to take account of and make use of their subjectivity and situated knowledge in the course of fieldwork. This principle stands in opposition to positivist conceptions of objectivity and value-free research whereby bias (subjectivity) is sought to be eliminated. In contrast, advocates of subjectivity argue that fieldworkers will always and only have a partial perspective and a situated understanding of what they investigate. Thus, instead of seeking to eliminate this partiality and positioning, it should necessarily form the sociological grounding of the knowledge produced in fieldwork; specifically the partiality and subjectivity of researcher positioning can productively reveal cultural meanings, values, and attitudes that are otherwise skipped over or hidden by prescriptions of objectivity and objectivism. The significance of researcher positioning and subjectivity is closely developed in relation to feminist notions of the “politics of location” and “situated knowledges” (Haraway 1991).

Ethnographic literature provides plenty of examples in which researcher positioning—that is, the analytical reflection on the subjectivity and situated knowledges of the fieldworker—is a crucial generator of anthropological understandings and analyses. In his widely read discussion of “subjectivity in social analysis,” Renato Rosaldo (1989:168–195) counters the Weberian ethic of objectivity and value-free research in a persuasive argument for the methodological value of subjective experience in fieldwork and, thus, the reflexive analysis of subjectivity and situated knowledge in anthropological knowledge production. He provides four examples as the basis of his argument. The first is that of Clifford Geertz, who learns about rules of reciprocity and gifting when his research assistant fails to return a borrowed typewriter. The second example is that of Jean Briggs (1970) whose personal difficulties in adjusting to fieldwork and strained social relationships that resulted when
living among the Eskimo, enabled her to write an ethnography of emotions. The third example is that of Dorinne Kondo (1986, 1990) whose fraught and ambivalent experience as a Japanese American woman in Tokyo gave her analytical insight on Japanese business-world construction of female gender. The fourth example that Rosaldo (1989:1–19) discusses is his own experience of coming to have deeper cultural understanding of the grief that motivates Ilongot headhunting through his own grieving processes over the loss of his wife. Building on Rosaldo, Ruth Behar (1996) develops a more elaborate argument for subjectivity, situated knowledge, and reflexivity as ethnographic strategies and research values.¹⁰

As a fieldwork dynamic (versus as a strategy for writing ethnography), reflexivity can be characterized in the following. The fieldworker scrutinizes—that is, “reflects upon”—their own subjective experience, interactions, engagements, dynamics, social location, and positioning in fieldwork to produce knowledge—partial and situated knowledge (Haraway 1991). Reflexivity is an after-the-fact analysis and interpretation that makes sense of one’s subjective responses to interactions and engagement with others in the process of fieldwork. But one might very well ask, when does one not think about or reflect upon what one is doing, especially during ethnographic fieldwork? Given the nature of fieldwork there is always an ongoing internal dialogue that questions, assesses, and comments on one’s activities, whether or not they are consciously viewed as “research” or considered “off-time.” The point being that ethnographic reflexivity is not a method, not a procedure or technique amenable to routinization (see Handler this volume).¹¹ Thus, it is a principle of self-awareness elaborated as a strategy (not so much a method) of making use of the subjective, contingent, partial, and ambivalent insights. This has implications for assessing the prospects of a “reflexive method,” as called for by Hodder (1999, 2000a, 2003), that works in tandem with (enables and is enabled by) multivocality in excavation research.

On the one hand, “reflexivity” in this guise as strategic self-awareness is already a part of the process of knowledge creation that exists within both ethnography and archaeology. It is however
skipped over, down-played, and otherwise erased in inherited positivist approaches. While the recovery of researcher positioning began to occur in cultural anthropology and ethnography in the 1980s, as noted above, archaeology has only recently begun to recuperate the meaning and value of subjectivity. Thus, one aspect of Hodder’s argument for reflexivity, and, for example, its practical elaboration at Çatalhöyük, might be better understood as a mandate for increased recognition and use of the subjectivity, partiality, perspectivism, contingency, indeterminacy, and ambivalence that necessarily inhabit knowledge production on the part of archaeologists and project members. Researcher positioning in archaeology is a strategic principle of self-awareness and use of the situatedness of fieldworker knowledge. While reflection itself is after the fact and contingent, the principle of using situated, subjective knowledge is shaped into a replicable method based on a determinate set of procedures, techniques, and activities.

In the Çatalhöyük project these include expanded diary keeping, intraspecialist dialogues, lab and excavation site tours by fieldworkers that don’t typically work in those locations, and extensive video documentation. Thus ethnography or ethnographic processes are crucially, if also perhaps implicitly, defined as the means and mode of this reflexivity in two ways: the increased social interaction and dialogical observation amongst project members and the multiple modes of documenting and recording these exchanges and dynamics of knowledge production. The use of multimedia methodologies is an especially noteworthy form of documenting and analyzing the interpretive and dialogical processes of research at the interface between and among: the various members of the research team, the materiality and visuality of the archaeological record, and the technologies that operate to simultaneously produce-represent-preserve data (Hodder 2000b; Hamilton 2000; Swogger 2000, Brill 2000, Stevanovic 2000). These self-monitoring procedures for observing, recognizing, enabling, recording, and using, the situatedness of knowledge construction subsume the subjectivity of ethnographic researcher positioning within an encompassing collective, social reflexivity in
archaeology for which ethnography can play a crucial role in the thick description and documentation.

On the other hand, Hodder’s call for “reflexivity” also references a completely different set of issues that are not at all about subjectivity, researcher positioning, and situated/perspectival knowledge of individual researchers. Reflexivity in this second sense has a different register of meaning: Instead of indexing the individuated fieldworker and their interactions with other such researchers and team members, reflexivity is forged by shifting the level or unit of reference from the fieldworker to the archaeological project as the agent or subject of “self-awareness.” Thus, the degree to which one equates “subjectivity” and “individual subjects” with “reflexivity” is the degree to which this second register of self-awareness appears to be “reflexivity” in an extended, analytical, even metaphoric, sense of the “doubling” or “folding back” and “mirroring” of the “self.” It is this second sense of reflexivity in the context of archaeology—and, more generally anthropology—that I suggest be conceptualized and developed as research positioning (versus researcher positioning).

The conceptual extension of reflexivity beyond individual subjects and subjectivity has been elaborated in a variety of different philosophical and social science theories. Systems feedback in functionalism (e.g., Bateson 2000) and Giddens’s (1991; Beck, Giddens and Lash 1994) theory of the political self-monitoring of institutions within modernity are just two examples. Bourdieu’s vision of reflexive sociology (Bourdieu 1990, 2004; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992) is another example that has particular relevance to postprocessual archaeologies: He advocates the folding into sociological research a sociology of knowledge of sociology itself as way to create an epistemological and social critique of sociology, its knowledge production, and, in a broader scope, society at large. While one may consider the ethnographic study of research positioning as one element within this conception of reflexivity, I view the Bourdieu type of “reflexivity” as a distinct form that builds itself up from nonfieldwork methods of analysis of texts, discourses, and epistemology (see table 1.4). Further, a key difference of Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology from research and researcher positioning is that the former takes as its agent neither
the researcher nor the research project, but science as it is materially organized and practiced as an institution, field of study, discipline, and body of knowledge. However, his program of reflexive science is pertinent to the present discussion of archaeology: As an objective and collective assessment of the field, it may very well provide an adequate descriptive characterization of the overall rationality, agenda and motivation of the range of (critical, feminist, Marxist, social, and indigenous) archaeologies that are grouped under the rubric of postprocessualism and that seek to critically understand, analyze and reformulate what archaeology as a science and discipline are all about.

Ethnography, understood as an array of methods and techniques producing and recording information in the field, would seem to be an ideal, if not privileged, set of strategies for creating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.4. Three Forms of Reflexivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements of Reflexivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agent (the &quot;self&quot; and subject of self-awareness)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium/mode</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form of reflection and analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflexivity in the second sense of the investigation of research positioning. The Çatalhöyük Project has exemplified this notion by incorporating into the archaeological research design ethnographic investigation of the encompassing social contexts and processes of research, of the transcultural exchange between project and community, and of local conceptions of the past and changes in these conceptions (Hodder 2000b; Bartu 2000; Shankland 2000). The notion of research positioning allows us to identify and target contexts, interlocutors, agency, and situated action of archaeological projects as objects of ethnographic investigation.

In practical terms—that is, on the ground in the sites of excavation, lab work, and other archaeological research—ethnography as the documentation of the already existing, ongoing reflexivity of the researcher positionings of archaeologists and as the study of the research positioning of projects contributes a double “dose” of reflexivity to the archaeological process.

**Making Use of Ethnography**

In this chapter I have defined ethnographic archaeology as the integrated use of ethnography in archaeological research to investigate, first, the archaeological practices of knowledge production and, second, the research positioning of projects. These two functions create a foundation for ethnography to be used, in a third way, as the mode of proactively engaging stakeholder communities in terms of the diverse public meanings, interpretations, identities, ownership, and use-rights that they hold and claim over archaeological heritage. As noted in the previous section, the integration of ethnography facilitates two registers of reflexivity that can be activated in the research process. In addition, by using ethnography as a means and mode of “public outreach,” this integration can also help to substantiate an ethics of responsibility that archaeology and archaeologists have with publics and with the public investment in the past. In this section, I focus on this third strategic use of ethnography to facilitate, enlarge, and reconceptualize the exchange and communication with publics that constitutes the goals and function of public
outreach. By way of brief synthesis of the argument to this point, table 1.5 is offered as a summary of three strategies by which ethnography can be useful for and productively incorporated into archaeology.

Thick Description and Documentation of Archaeological Research Processes

First, ethnography can provide documentation of the production of knowledge “at the trowel’s edge” and facilitate the multivocality of interpretation inherent in the social dimensions of research. This documentation can be understood to focus on crucial points of intersection between (a) the subjectivity of individual researchers; (b) the materiality of the archaeological record; (c) the technologies of producing, collecting, preserving, recording, and representing data; and (d) the dialogical interactions between researchers, technologies, and materiality. In other words, this ethnographic documentation provides a “thick description” not simply of the practices and techniques of archaeological research in the range of sites in which archaeology is carried out, but of researcher positioning of project members and the social dynamics and processes in which research is embedded.

Ethnographies of Archaeological Research Positioning

Second, ethnography can provide valuable studies of the research positioning of the archaeological project. The problems that come under investigation in this area include a broad array of issues, including the relationship of the research project to the history of archaeology in the area, especially the sociopolitical effects and entanglements with communities. This issue in turn necessarily implies the need to conduct baseline research on the present-day communities that are near at hand and the sociopolitical, economic, and cultural effects of the project on these communities and groups. This in turn also implicates study of the interaction and dynamics of the project with diverse groups, from workers, community members, and descendant groups to
private-sector interests and state agencies and the documentation of the social, cultural, political, and legal meanings, interpretations, claims, rights, ownerships, and use of the archaeological past by nearby communities and stakeholder groups. Ethnographic archaeology in this way can provide a record of the social landscape in which the project is situated and the social actors, including the publics, stakeholders, governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, and civil society agencies, with which a given archaeological project may be engaged.

The integration of ethnography into archaeology as part of the research endeavor of archaeology necessarily requires a transformation of the operational concept of “archaeological record.” The ethnographic materials—data, records, documentation, reports, analyses—that are created by these two strategies of research must necessarily be incorporated into the material record and database of the archaeological research project.

**Ethnography and Transcultural Exchange**

The third strategy operates in the space of “outreach” as a way to further extend the interactive forms of engagement with local communities, audiences, publics, and stakeholders that archaeologists have been creating over the last decade or more. As discussed in the introduction to this volume, public archaeology is historically speaking premised on a conception of the “public” as a primarily passive and even disinterested audience that receives the knowledge that archaeology creates. In this inherited conception, “outreach” is a one-way, unilateral process. The publics are less stakeholders than audiences that are essentially “disinterested”—by which I mean it is a public that has some curiosity about the past and a generic, universal-civic relationship to the past, but it does not have a tangible, immediate stake in the archaeology in the sense of a political, cultural, economic, or social interest in and claim over the past.

There is no doubt that many archaeologists have made great strides to shift these notions of “public” and of “outreach” toward more interactive, dialogical, and reciprocal relationships between archaeology and differentially located stakeholders. For
### Table 1.5. The Agenda of Ethnographic Archaeology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic “Thick Description” and Documentation</td>
<td>Ethnographic study of:</td>
<td>• Produce an ethnographic record—thick description and documentation of practices and processes of the research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the actual interpretive practices of archaeology “at the trowel’s</td>
<td>• Maintain archive of these ethnographic materials, including research reports, as a historical database accessible to researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>edge” based in项目 members’ researcher positioning and in</td>
<td>• Materially incorporate the ethnographic archive into the “archaeological record”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the social dimensions (interactive processes, dynamics, social</td>
<td>• Expand the ethical, theoretical, and legal concept of “archaeological record” to include this ethnographic-historical archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relations, dialogues, etc.) of archaeological knowledge production</td>
<td>• Produce “ethnographies” and “research reports” of the studied project as part of the conception of archaeological knowledge production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Positioning (Ethnography of the Social Fields &amp; Processes in</td>
<td>Ethnographic study of the archaeological project in terms of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which the Project Intervenes)</td>
<td>• Contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publics and Interlocutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Situated action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural Exchange and Engagement with Publics</td>
<td>On-site, interactive outreach: Exhibitions, tours, workshops, focus</td>
<td>Creation of local audiences and stakeholders that are engaged with archaeology and empowered as “owners” of the past as proper heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups, forums, and related activities structured as two-way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exchange of knowledge, interpretations, exploration of the meanings,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value, ownership and use of the past by different interest groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example, this volume continues these initiatives not only by explicitly or implicitly advocating the need to reformulate notions of publics, audiences, and stakeholders but by devising new practices of interactive engagement and dynamic exchange of understandings of the past with stakeholders. Also along these same lines, Ardren (2002), Potter (1994), Bartu (2000), Shankland (2000), and Hodder (2000a,b) are among those that have developed sophisticated site tours, public workshops, and ongoing exhibitions for locals as methodologies of interactive and dialogical “outreach.” My contribution to this work is therefore limited to a single idea, which is that ethnography can and should be integrated into these diverse outreach practices.

In the context of an ethnography field school program, I developed a three-year project that investigated the history of archaeology at Chichén Itzá as remembered and perceived by the nearby Maya community of Pisté, Yucatán, Mexico.15 Based on my previous archival research of the archaeological excavations sponsored by the Carnegie Institutions of Washington from 1923 to 1941, I developed a project that has strong affinities to “archaeological outreach.”16 In the summers of 1997–1999 the ethnography teams created exhibitions of the historical materials, both photographic images and written texts, that I had been collecting since 1985 and that illustrate the archaeological work of reconstructing Chichén Itzá and the interactions of archaeologists and ethnographers with the Pisté community. It is important to clarify, first, that the ethnography did not have the goal of analytically synthesizing this wide range of disparate materials into an ethnographic history of the community, the reconstruction of Chichén or the historical interface of community and archaeology. Although these materials were “historical” there certainly was not a singular and univocal (ethnographic) history to create out of these stories, texts, fieldnotes, letters, and reports. Approached from an applied anthropological standpoint, the goal, instead, was to create an opportunity for the community to see, read, think about, and experience these materials as triggers to begin to lay claim to and appropriate these dimensions of their own community history that might otherwise remain inaccessible to them. Realization of this objective
was therefore geared toward providing locals with some of the knowledge produced by anthropology in order to enable local interest in and claims over the content of their past.

Second, the agenda of creating an exhibit for local community to lay claim to this heritage—which, to reiterate, is a legacy of transcultural exchange between community and archaeology (or anthropology more generally)—was to develop a methodological practice that would radically extend the dialogical interactions stimulated by the exhibitionary materials and to investigate these transcultural encounters and dynamics as our subjects of ethnographic research. Building on the critiques of static and univocal museum display and pushing beyond the curatorial solutions of interactive and dialogical exhibition, we sought to convert the space of exhibition into a site of ethnographic fieldwork.

We called this methodological practice ethnographic installation. While asserting a specific vision of the past, the exhibition was structured to elicit, not exclude, alternative understandings and memories of the past. Using multimedia we documented the interaction of exhibit-goers with the exhibited material, with each other, and with fieldworkers, who used informal, unstructured conversation to answer questions about the exhibit and to elicit alternative stories, memories, experiences, viewpoints, and commentaries. Thus, the resulting fieldwork consisted of dialogical exchanges involving transcultural dynamics of give and take, borrowing and adapting, asserting and revising opinions between differently positioned agents who each asked of and discussed with the other what they knew and thought about the past and its relevance in the present.

Just as the dialogs between the specialists of an archaeology project are recognized as crucial moments in the interpretation of the materiality of the archaeological record, so too must these exchanges be recognized and documented as a part of the social construction of the past. This research can certainly be “written up” into an ethnography, but the significance of this outreach-turned-fieldwork is its role in transforming the hierarchical relationship between scientific experts and lay audiences and its grounding opposition of expert knowledge versus public meanings. Thus, the documentation and materials produced in this type of outreach-ethnography should be brought back into circulation in subse-
quent events of transcultural exchange with stakeholder publics as tools and triggers that stimulate further the exchange and even debate of knowledge, values, interpretations, and meanings of the past. Through ethnography, outreach becomes an ongoing forum for all stakeholders, whether these are archaeologists, workers, local communities, or other publics, to engage each other and to engage the social construction of the past.

**Ethics of Responsibility**

Letting go of absolute archaeological authority is not a fall into nihilism and anarchy—although there are risks, dangers, and perils to be experienced (see Meskell and Pels 2005; Vitelli and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006; Castañeda 2006, n.d.). Archaeologists are still knowledge specialists, but their authority on site and in stakeholder communities must be based—beyond their official credentials, including the size and status of their grants—on how they negotiate stakeholder interpretations and meanings of the past, engage claims of ownership and use-rights, and interactively integrate public participation into the making of the meanings of the past. Certainly this is not a new perspective, as increasing number of archaeologists throughout the world recognize expanded ethical responsibilities to stakeholders, descendant communities, and diverse publics, if not also identify with critical, social, feminist, reflexive agendas of archaeology.

This release of power and the pluralization of participation in the process of “making the past” does not entail the utter collapse of science, the end of reason, or the demise of humanity. Yet, there is no doubt, however, that the increased “involvement of non-archaeologists puts at least some of the control of research itself into hands other than [archaeologists and this is] an approach that will fundamentally change archaeology” (Zimmerman 1995:66, quoted in Kehoe 1998:214). At stake, therefore, is a decolonization of the past and how archaeology engages diverse publics and stakeholders in its production, protection, and dissemination of the past as heritage.

In the midst of this ongoing decolonization of archaeology, I find myself, nonetheless, agreeing with Hodder (2000a). In the
face of anticipated charges of nihilism, he advocates that the archaeologist “must take a stand” in the conflicts of multiple interpretations and in the contestation of rights and claims over the past. Indeed, the archaeologist as knowledge expert is still a specialist. The crucial questions, therefore, are how such interpretations and knowledge are produced in relation to stakeholders and how resulting expertise is to be used in shifting fields of power, belonging, identity, and claims of ownership. Without denying that the archaeologist’s knowledge is indeed knowledge, the issue is how to use expertise not as immutable truth but as fluid, contextual, and momentary understandings and as flexible, strategic practices. Recognition of the multilayered and pervasive politics of archaeology, especially at the level of the interpretive production of knowledge in the field, does require taking a stand. But, taking a stand is not determined by one’s methods; rather, different and other aspects of archaeologists’ person shapes the political and ethical stands they choose to assert.

What ethnography offers archaeology, therefore, is not just a set of methods that can be subordinated to a (narrowly constructed) explanation of the materiality and meanings of the past, as in ethnoarchaeological studies of site formation. Rather, ethnography as an integrated component of the process and dynamics of archaeological research can become the means, mode, and basis for interactive processes between archaeologists, stakeholders, and publics and transcultural exchange of interpretations, forms of ownership, use-rights, claims, and meanings of pasts. Ethnography situated in this way within the processes of archaeological research expands the meanings and materiality of the past by engaging the social construction of both “the past” and of “archaeology” as one particular mode among others of socially constructing pasts in which we all have stakes.

Notes

1. “GOK” is borrowed from Bill Fash and the Copan Project as reported in *Lost Kingdoms of the Maya* a National Geographic Society film (Christine Weber, producer, Washington, DC, 1993).
2. Without minimizing the value, interest, meaning, actuality, or future possibilities of integrating “archaeology” into “ethnography,” “ethnology,” or “cultural anthropology,” it is important to reiterate that this chapter, as well as the other chapters of this volume, are focused on the one-way benefit and articulation to archaeology of ethnography.

3. It is important to note two very distinct ways of doing “ethnographic analogy” that are based on two different kinds of cultural patterns, one of which is primarily ideational-meaningful and the other material-practical. The former is associated with the tradition of culture history archaeology and the latter with the tradition of new archaeology and processualism.

4. The phenomenological form of experimental archaeology is, of course, quite a different kind of archaeology than both processualism and postprocessualism. The technology-focused form of experimental archaeology seems to have emerged in great part out of the ethnoarchaeological approach in the processual tradition.

5. Significantly Hodder (1999:30–65) points out that analogy is a pervasive form of logic and reasoning in archaeology that extends beyond the way ethnography as a method or as a database of knowledge about cultures is used.

6. This point is implicitly assumed when archaeologists that have conducted ethnographies of archaeological research projects discuss their “double” or “split” positioning as simultaneously “insider” and “outsider” (e.g., Edgeworth 2003; Edgeworth 2006b; Holtorf 2006). This raises issues of reflexivity and the problem of how archaeologists can negotiate their own specific blind spots and insights in the conduct of their research on archaeology.

7. Fieldworkers are always already necessarily both “insiders” and “outsiders” in diverse kinds of ways and along a range of axes including professional, personal, and identitarian. The crucial issue has always been how does each individual ethnographer make productive use of the insights and blindness that derive from these split and multiple positionings.

8. There is a third genre of anthropological reflexivity that emerged in the 1970s and that renewed itself in the experimental ethnography and autoethnography of the 1980s and 1990s. This form of reflexivity has been mostly discredited for turning ethnography, that is ethnographic writing and representation, into autobiography, self-exploration, experiential narrative, and exegesis of the person of the researcher. In any case, due to its indissociable connection to issues of representation, versus fieldwork, this form is not relevant to this chapter.


10. Behar extends the argument to propose that it is the experiential meanings and understandings created through subjectivity and situated knowledge that are the ultimate measure of value for ethnography. See Lynch (2000), Pels (2000), Robertson (2002), Salzman (2002) and Handler (this volume) for critical assessments of reflexivity.
11. See, however, Davies (1999) for an opposing view that seeks to methodologize reflexivity, that is, to make reflexivity into a method with definite procedures and techniques. Hodder’s (2003) defense of reflexivity in the context of archaeology strikes me less as an attempt to methodologize reflexivity so much as to make it a strategic principle of research design and research practices with the goal of enlarging and positively valorizing multivocality.


13. Bourdieu’s vision has parallels to the poststructuralist agenda of defining and analyzing the institutional, sociopolitical, and epistemological bases of Western sciences and knowledge production in diverse fields (e.g., the corpus of Foucault’s work). One can note two key differences. First, the poststructuralists do not conceive of their work or develop it within the frame of reflexivity, in part due to the sustained critique of the subject and subject positioning. Second, Bourdieu’s analytical strategies and research problems cannot be construed as participating in or having affinity to poststructural methodologies, which prioritizes agency of individuals in relation to structures.

14. “Research positioning” is a notion that I have developed based on my own work on the history of anthropology and its concrete effects, practical consequences, and sociopolitical entanglements in Yucatán, México (see Castañeda 1996, 2003b, 2005a, b, 2006a), in relation to other intellectual sources and inspirations. Complementing the sociology of knowledge approach that asks about what are the sociohistorical and political conditions that shape science and its knowledge production is the Foucaultian agenda that investigates the real-world effects of the human sciences in shaping the contemporary reality in which we live. In anthropology, see the ethnographies of Rosaldo (1985), Dumont (1991), Fabian (1983), Boon (1977, 1983), Limón (1994), Price and Price (1992), and Wagner (1981).

15. The social history of Pisté, located three kilometers from Chichén Itzá, is deeply intertwined with Chichén. Pisté was part of the pre-Columbian city and was then refounded as a colonial town in the seventeenth century while Chichén “lay in ruins” as a cattle hacienda. Beginning with the reconstruction of Chichén in the 1920s, Pisté has become the center that provides services to tourists, anthropologists, and archaeologists alike. See Castañeda (1996, 2000, 2003a; Breglia 2006b:65–173) for details.

16. Most of this material remains unpublished (Castañeda and Breglia 1998), although correlated research conducted at the same as that discussed here is published in Castañeda (2005a).
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