1

The "Ethnographic Turn" in Archaeology

Research Positioning and Reflexivity in Ethnographic Archaeologies

Quetzil E. Castañeda

> 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 interlocutor 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 incorporating ethnography into archaeology.

My goal is~~, first,~~ to provide a broad map of three general ways in which ethnography can be associated with archaeology. In the next section I briefly discuss these ~~in turn~~ as the ~~background~~ for the remainder of the chapter. In the second section, 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 integrated into archaeological research. This discussion, therefore, 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 innovative work in this emergent area. In presenting these ideas, it is necessary to reiterate that my position on the outside of archaeology 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 investigating the past, but also to actively analyzing the social contexts, political dynamics, and communicative processes of my research—including engagement with the meanings, identities, 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 divers~~ity of~~ practices and possibilities.[1] 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 archaeology; 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.~~[2]

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).[3] 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.[4]

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.[5] 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 descendent 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

Mode/Type *Characterization*	"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)*
<u>Criteria</u>			
1. Basic Agenda	To study archaeological "pasts" and/or the material patterns of archaeological record	To study archaeology as a contemporary sociocultural and political phenomenon acting in the present world	To study archaeology's sociological contexts, social agency, and processes of engagement with the world
2. Object of Study	"the past"	"archaeology"	"research positioning" of archaeological projects (the socio-political contexts of archaeology, research dynamics, interaction with stakeholders communities and with their meanings and claims of the past)
3. Role of Ethnography	Ethnographic methodologies are used in archaeology as	Ethnographic methods are used to investigate archaeology in	Ethnographic methods are incorporated into the doing of archaeological

	a tool to investigate specific facets of the past (or of the present) and material culture to understand the past	relation to other contemporary social forces, actors, processes and dynamics in the world; no necessary relation to archaeology	research in order to elucidate both the archaeological past and the present social contexts, dynamics, and processes of archaeology
Relationship	*"Subordinate"*	*"External"*	*"Integrated"*
4. Goal/Purpose	To create understandings of the archaeological past (or the past in general) primarily through material culture	To create understandings of the fields of power and publics in which archaeology exists, is practiced, and effects	To create ways of engaging stake-holders and negotiate the meanings of the past via understandings of research processes and dynamics
Rationale—"for the sake of . . ."	*. . . archaeology as a field of study of the past and/or as a science of the past*	*. . . ethnography, as a different discipline concerned with contemporary processes*	*. . . archaeology as an ethical and ethically engaged scientific enterprise*

[a] The phrasing risks antagonizing scholars who would univocally interpret this phrase as universally presupposing (or implicitly asserting) that other archaeologies were not ethical or do not have an ethics. However, this implication is not at all intended. Rather, the assertion is that archaeology envisioned in any number of processional ways as fundamentally "social" entails a different code of ethics than archaeology as science or scientific archaeology(ies) (see Castañeda n.d.b, Meskell and Pels 2005).

Table 1.2. Archaeological Ethnography—Uses of Ethnography as a Method in the Archaeological Study of "Pasts"

Methodologies	Method and Goal	Research Problem	Logic
Ethno-Archaeology	Spatial analyses of contemporary material culture to explain patterns in the archaeological record	Functional patterns of material culture and behavior (processes of site formation)	Behavior that results in patterns of material culture today causes similar patterns in the archaeological past
Ethnographic Analogy	Identification and application of contemporary cultural practices and customs as probable analogies for behavioral patterns in the past	Patterns of ideas and symbols and formal patterns in material culture	Assumption of cultural continuity; present cultural forms (traditions, customs) derive from past forms and explain nonfunctional patterns
Oral History and Interviewing	Elicit contemporary descendents ~~of past societies to derive culturally situated explanations and meanings of material culture and past "behavior"~~	Meaning of (material and immaterial) past for cultural descendents	"Native" or "insider" cultural interpretations can approximate meanings given to past (material) culture and thus be used to inform interpretations by archaeologists
Participant Observation—"Experimental Archaeology"	Using a form of participant observation to "relive," "recreate," or otherwise "stage" experiences of the past	To resolve questions about technologies of the past or to create phenomenological and "experiential" understandings of the past	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
Informal Participant Observation	~~Understanding~~ of the social, political, economic, cultural contexts of a specific archaeological research project	~~Get along~~ with local publics and community to conduct research	Archaeologists of a research project need to understand the social-political actors and communities in which research is conducted

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 postprocessual 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 1.3. Anthropology of Archaeology—Archaeology as the Object of Ethnographic Study

Archaeology as Specific Analytical Object	Associated Disciplinary Approaches and Fields of Study	Correlated Types of Possible Research Problems and Issues(list is suggestive, not exhaustive)
Discourse and Representation — Archaeology is studied as theories, knowledge, images, and ideologies	Cultural Anthropology, Cultural Studies, Postcolonial Studies, Political Anthropology	Scientific "knowledge" is analyzed in relation to social, political, and economic forces, factors, conditions, projects 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)
Heritage Tourism Industry — Archaeology is studied as a business, i.e., an economic sector, market, agent	Anthropology of Tourism, Cultural and Economic Anthropology, Political Economy, Postcolonial Studies	Archaeological production, marketing, representation, and consumption of heritage is analyzed in relation to processes of "globalization," nation building, identity politics 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

Institution	Economic and Political Anthropology, Historical Anthropology, Social History, Sociology	Organization of archaeology in different institutional forms, national contexts, and disciplinary modes is analyzed in relation to ~~the~~ public spheres and civil society
		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
Science	Anthropology of Science, History and Philosophy of Science, Sociology of Knowledge, Intellectual History	Institutionalization of discipline, practices, and knowledge and their articulation to sociopolitical contexts/dynamics in national and international arenas
		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

Annotations:
- Archaeology is studied as social organization, sets of actors, networks
- Archaeology is studied as practices of knowledge production

~~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.[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; 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).*[7] 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 stake-
holders and new age spiritual communities. In this way, these and
other investigations also study to different degrees the nongeo-
graphically localized manifestations of archaeological research
practices, such as discourses and bodies of knowledge, that circu-
late in a diversity of other sites, such as museums, educational and
TV documentaries, popular science magazines, tourism litera-
tures, 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 de-
limiting the only or "best" paths to take; rather, as an initial foun-
dation, 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 sig-
nificance (see table 1.3).

Conceptualizing archaeology as these four types of analyti-
cal 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 in-
tersecting issues for research agendas. These four overlapping
approaches, issues, and objects are neither exhaustive nor exclu-
sive. 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 ex-
   pertise, institutional and economic bases, ideologies of
   identity and mission, practices and bodies of knowledge,
   systems of communication and dissemination, discipli-
   nary 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~~ "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 archeology. 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 complicities (e.g., Dell Hymes, Bob Scholte, Talal Asad; see Pels and Salemink 2000).[8] 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.[9] 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 the 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 research*er* 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.[12] 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.[13] 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 materi-
ally organized and practiced as an institution, field of study, dis-
cipline, and body of knowledge. However, his program of
reflexive science is pertinent to the present discussion of archaeol-
ogy: 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 tech-
niques producing and recording information in the field, would
seem to be an ideal, if not privileged, set of strategies for creating

Table 1.4.   Three Forms of Reflexivity

Elements of Reflexivity	Researcher Positioning	Research Positioning	Reflexive Science (sociology of knowledge)
Agent (the "self" and subject of self-awareness)	researcher	research project	science (as field, discipline, institution, body of knowledge)
Medium/mode	subjectivity, individual	collective, social interaction	objective, institutional
Form of reflection and analysis	self-awareness—inspection of contingent, after the fact reactions and responses in fieldwork, preconceived dialogical interaction of social relations	self-monitoring and self-analysis—sustained, strategically fieldwork-based study of situated action, contexts, agency of research	critical (or "critical-reflexive") analyses of sociopolitical histories, epistemology, institutional bases, politics, and social production of knowledge
Goal	to create positive knowledge from the situated positioning of researching subjects and their subjective experiences	to investigate the social positioning and contexts of projects in dynamic relation to materiality of record and stakeholder communities	to critique epistemology, science, society (epistemological critique, social-culture critique) as basis to remake the field of study

reflexivity in the second sense of the investigation of research po-sitioning.[14] The Çatalhöyük Project has exemplified this notion by incorporating into the archaeological research design ethno-graphic investigation of the encompassing social contexts and processes of research, of the transcultural exchange between proj-ect and community, and of local conceptions of the past and changes in these conceptions (Hodder 2000b; Bartu 2000; Shank-land 2000). The notion of research positioning allows us to iden-tify 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 ex-cavation, lab work, and other archaeological research—ethnog-raphy 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 in-tegrated use of ethnography in archaeological research to inves-tigate, 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 com-munities in terms of the diverse public meanings, interpreta-tions, identities, ownership, and use-rights that they hold and claim over archaeological heritage. As noted in the previous sec-tion, the integration of ethnography facilitates two registers of reflexivity that can be activated in the research process. In addi-tion, by using ethnography as a means and mode of "public out-reach," 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 sec-tion, 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, interpreta-
tions, claims, rights, ownerships, and use of the archaeological
past by nearby communities and stakeholder groups. Ethno-
graphic archaeology in this way can provide a record of the social
landscape in which the project is situated and the social actors, in-
cluding 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, documenta-
tion, 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 ar-
chaeologists 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 re-
ceives 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 cu-
riosity 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" to-
ward more interactive, dialogical, and reciprocal relationships
between archaeology and differentially located stakeholders. For

Table 1.5.   The Agenda of Ethnographic Archaeology

Strategies	Means	Objectives
Ethnographic "Thick Description" and Documentation	Ethnographic study of: • the actual interpretive practices of archaeology "at the trowel's edge" based in project members' researcher positioning and in • the social dimensions (interactive processes, dynamics, social relations, dialogues, etc.) of archaeological knowledge production	• Produce an ethnographic record—thick description and documentation of practices and processes of the research project • Maintain archive of these ethnographic materials, including research reports, as a historical database accessible to researchers • Materially incorporate the ethnographic archive into the "archaeological record" • Expand the ethical, theoretical, and legal concept of "archaeological record" to include this ethnographic-historical archive • Produce "ethnographies" and "research reports" of the studied project as part of the conception of archaeological knowledge production
Research Positioning (Ethnography of the Social Fields & Processes in which the Project Intervenes)	Ethnographic study of the archaeological project in terms of: • Contexts • Publics and Interlocutors • Agency • Situated action	
Transcultural Exchange and Engagement with Publics	On-site, interactive outreach: Exhibitions, tours, workshops, focus groups, forums, and related activities structured as two-way exchange of knowledge, interpretations, exploration of the meanings, value, ownership and use of the past by different interest groups	Creation of local audiences and stakeholders that are engaged with archaeology and empowered as "owners" of the past as proper heritage

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 ~~an~~ number of archaeologists throughout the world recognize expanded ethical responsibilities to stakeholders, descendent 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 blindnesses 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.

9. A quick short list might include ethnographies by Kondo (1986, 1990), Limón (1994), Crapanzano (1980), Jackson (1995), Visweswaran (1994), Behar (1993), Abu-Lughod (1993), Rosaldo (1985), Dumont (1991).

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 method-ologize reflexivity, that is, to make reflexivity into a method with definite pro-cedures 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.

12. See Marcus (1995), Latour (1988) and Lynch (2000) for discussions of other ideologies and types of reflexivity in anthropology and in science.

13. Bourdieu's vision has parallels to the poststructuralist agenda of defin-ing 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 poststruc-turalists do not conceive of their work or develop it within the frame of reflex-ivity, in part due to the sustained critique of the subject and subject positioning. Second, Bourdieu's analytical strategies and research problems cannot be con-strued 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 conse-quences, and sociopolitical entanglements in Yucatán, Mexico (see Castañeda 1996, 2003b, 2005a, b, 2006a)~~, in relation to other intellectual sources and inspira-tions~~. Complementing the sociology of knowledge approach that asks about what are the sociohistorical and political conditions that shape science and its knowl-edge 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).

References

Abu El-Haj, Nadia 2001 *Facts on the Ground*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Abu-Lughod, Lila 1993 *Writing Women's Worlds*. Berkeley: University of Cali-fornia Press.

Ardren, Traci 2002 Conversations about the Production of Archaeological Knowledge and Community Museums at Chunchucmil and Kochol, Yucatán, México. *World Archaeology* 34(2):379–400.

Bartu, Ayfer 2000 Where Is Çatalhöyük? In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. 101–109. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Bateson, Gregory 2000 *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash 1994 *Reflexive Modernization*. London: Polity Press.

Behar, Ruth 1993 *Translated Woman*. Boston: Beacon Press.
——— 1996 *Vulnerable Observer*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Benavides, O. Hugo 2004 *Making Ecuadorian Histories*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Binford, Lewis R. 1978 *Nunamiut Ethnoarchaeology*. New York: Academic Press.
——— 1983 *In Pursuit of the Past*. New York: Thames and Hudson.

Boon, James 1977 *The Anthropological Romance of Bali*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
——— 1983 *Other Tribes, Other Scribes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1990 *In Other Words*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
——— 2004 *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Lois J. D. Wacquant 1992 *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. London: Polity Press.

Breglia, Lisa C. 2006a Complicit Agendas. In *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice*, M. Edgeworth, ed., pp. 173–184. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
——— 2006b *Monumental Ambivalence*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Briggs, Jean L. 1970 *Never in Anger*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brill, Dorothee 2000 Video-recording as Part of the Critical Archaeological Process. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. xx–xx. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Castañeda, Quetzil E. 1996 *In the Museum of Maya Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
——— 2000 Approaching Ruins. *Visual Anthropology Review* 16(2):43–70.
——— 2003a New and Old Social Movements: Measuring Pisté, From the "Mouth of the Well" to the 107th Municipio of Yucatán. *Ethnohistory* 50(4):611–642.
——— 2003b On Stocking's Historiography of Influence. *Critique of Anthropology* 23(3):235–262.
——— 2005a Between Pure and Applied Research. *NAPA Bulletin* 23:87–118.
——— 2005b The Carnegie Mission and Vision of Science. In *History of Anthropology Annual* Vol. 1, R. Darnell and F. W. Gleach, eds., pp. 37–74. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
——— 2006a Ethnography In the Forest: An Analysis of Ethics in the Morals of Anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology* 21(1):121–145.

——— 2006b What is Ethical in Archaeology? An Analysis of Codes, Value, and Reasoning in Archaeological Ethics. The Open School of Ethnography and Anthropology. Mérida, México.

Castañeda, Quetzil E., and Lisa C. Breglia, eds. 1998 *Monographs of the Field School in Experimental Ethnography*. 2 vols. Unpublished manuscripts, The Open School of Ethnography and Anthropology (Pisté, Yucatán, Mexico).

Coles, John Morton 1979 *Experimental Archaeology*. London: Academic Press.

Coulon, Alain 1995 *Ethnomethodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crapanzano, Vincent 1980 *Tuhami*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

David, Nicholas, and Carol Kramer 2006 *Ethnoarchaeology in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Charlotte Aull 1999 *Reflexive Ethnography*. London: Routledge.

Dumont, Jean-Paul 1991 *The Headman and I*. Re-Issue. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

DeCerteau, Michel 1988 *The Writing of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Edensor, Tim 1998 *Tourists at the Taj*. London: Routledge.

Edgeworth, Matt 2003 *Acts of Discovery*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

——— ed., 2006a *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

——— 2006b Introduction. In *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice*, M. Edgeworth, ed. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Fabian, Johannes 1983. *Time and the Other*. New York : Columbia University Press.

Garfinkel, Harold 1967 *Studies In Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gazin-Schwartz, Amy, and Cornelius Holtorf, eds. 1999 *Archaeology and Folklore*. London: Routledge.

Gero, Joan M., David M. Lacy, and Michael L. Blakey, eds. 1983 *The Socio-Politics of Archaeology*. Amherst: Dept. of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts.

Gero, Joan M., and Margaret Conkey, eds. 1991 *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Giddens, Anthony 1991 *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gould, Richard A. 1974 Some Current Problems in Ethnoarchaeology. In *Ethnoarchaeology*, Monograph 4, C. B. Donnan and C. W. Clewlow, eds., pp. 29–48. Los Angeles: Institute for Archaeology University of California.

——— ed. 1978 *Explorations in Ethnoarchaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Hamilton, Naomi 2000 The Conceptual Archive and the Challenge of Gender. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. xx–xx. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Handler, Richard, and Eric Gable 1997 *The New History in an Old Museum*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Haraway, Donna 1991 Situated Knowledges. In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women*. London: Routledge.

Hodder, Ian 1999 *The Archaeological Process*. London: Blackwell.

——— 2000a Developing a Reflexive Method in Archaeology. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. 3–14. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

——— ed. 2000b *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

——— 2003 Archaeological Reflexivity and the "Local" Voice. *Anthropological Quarterly* 76(1):55–69.

Holtorf, Cornelius 2006 Studying Archaeological Fieldwork in the Field. In *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice*, M. Edgeworth, ed., pp. 81–94. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Ingersoll, Daniel W., John E. Yellen, and William Macdonald, eds. 1977 *Experimental Archaeology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jackson, Michael 1995 *At Home in the World*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kehoe, Alice 1998 *Land of Prehistory*. London: Routledge.

Kondo, Dorinne 1986 Dissolution and Reconstitution of Self: Implications for Anthropological Epistemology. *Cultural Anthropology* 1(1):74–88.

——— 1990 *Crafting Selves*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, Bruno 1988 The Politics of Explanation. In *Knowledge and Reflexivity*, Steve Wolgar, ed., pp. 155–176. London: Sage.

Leone, Mark, Parker B. Potter Jr., and Paul A. Schackel 1987 Toward a Critical Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28(3):283–302.

Limon, José 1994 *Dancing with the Devil*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Lynch, Michael 2000 Against Reflexivity as an Academic Virtue and Source of Privileged Knowledge. *Theory, Culture and Society* 17(3):26–54.

Marcus, George E. 1995 On Ideologies of Reflexivity. In *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*, George E. Marcus, ed., pp. 181–202. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mathieu, James R., ed. 2002 *Experimental Archaeology: Replicating Past Objects, Behaviors and Processes*. Oxford: BAR International Series.

Matthews, Wendy, Christine Hastorf, and Begumsen Ergenekon 2000 Ethnoarchaeology. In *Toward a Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. 177–189. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Meskell, Lynn 2005a Archaeological Ethnography: Conversations Around Kruger National Park. *Archaeologies* 1(1):83–102.

——— 2005b *Fading Walls and Mending Fences: Archaeological Ethnography in Limpopo*. Paper presented at the Wenner Gren Workshop on Sociological Archaeology. Chichén Itzá, Mexico. June 1–5.

——— 2005c Recognition, Restitution, and the Potentials of Postcolonial Liberalism for South African Heritage. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 60(182):72–78.

——— ed. 1998 *Archaeology under Fire*. London: Routledge.

Meskell, Lynn, and Peter Pels, eds. 2005. *Embedding Ethics*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Meskell, Lynn, and Robert W. Preucel, eds. 2004 *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. London: Blackwell Publishing.

Patterson, Thomas C. 1986 The Last Sixty Years. *American Anthropologist* 88:7–26.
——— 1994 *Toward a Social History of Archaeology in the USA*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
——— 1999 The Political Economy of Archaeology in the USA. *Annual Review of Archaeology* 28:155–174.
——— 2003 *Social History of Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
Pels, Dick 2000 Reflexivity One Step Up. *Theory, Culture and Society* 17(3):1–25.
Pinsky, Valerie, and Alison Wylie 1990 Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pollner, Melvin, and Robert M. Emerson 2001 Ethnomethodology and Ethnography. In *Handbook of Ethnography*, P. Atkinson et al., eds., pp. 118–135. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Potter, Parker B. 1994 *Public Archaeology in Annapolis*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
Price, Richard, and Sally Price 1992 *Equatoria*. London: Routledge.
Robertson, Jennifer 2002 Reflexivity Redux: A Pithy Polemic on "Positionality." *Anthropological Quarterly* 75(4)785–792.
Rosaldo, Renato 1985 *Ilongot Headhunting*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
——— 1989 *Culture and Truth*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Rowan, Yorke, and Uzi Baram 2004 *Marketing Heritage*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Roveland, Blythe 2006 Multiple Visions of a Late Paleolithic Site in Germany. In *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice*, M. Edgeworth Rutsch, ed., pp. 56–67. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Rutsch Zehmer, Mechthild I. M. 2002 *Antropología mexicana y antropólogos alemanes en México desde finales del siglo XIX hasta principios del siglo XX*. Doctoral dissertation, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicos. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
Salzman, P. C. 2002 On Reflexivity. *American Anthropologist* 104(3):805–813.
Shankland, David 2000 Villagers and the Distant Past. In *Toward a Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. 167–166. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
Shanks, Michael, and Christopher Tilley 1987a *Social Theory and Archaeology*. London: Polity Press.
——— 1987b *Re-Constructing Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Silverman, Helaine 2006 *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
Stanton, Cathy 2006 *The Lowell Experiment*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
Stevanovic, Mirjana 2000 Visualizing and Vocalizing Archaeological Archival Record: Narrative vs. Image. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. xx–xx. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Stone, Peter, and Phillipe Planel 1999 *The Constructed Past*. London: Routledge.

Swogger, John-Gordon 2000 Image and Interpretation: The Tyranny of Representation. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology*, I. Hodder, ed., pp. xx–xx. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Van Reybrouck, David, and Dirk Jacobs 2006 The Mutual Constitution of Natural and Social Identities. In *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice*, M. Edgeworth Rutsch, ed., pp. 33–44. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Visweswaran, Kamela 1994 *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Viteli, Karen D. and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006 *Archaeological Ethics*. Second edition. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Wagner, Roy 1981 *The Invention of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.