

Variation matters: Expanding the scope of experimental archaeology using the Perception-Process-Product conceptual framework

Cheng Liu\*

2023-09-17

Abstract

This paper presents the outline of the Perception-Process-Product ('Triple P') conceptual framework that aims to expand the scope of experimental archaeology. The Triple P framework emphasizes the amplification of multi-level variation and the identification of interacting relationships of variations across the levels of perception, process, and product. Here I propose the following three ontologically and epistemologically based principles to put the Triple P framework into practice: 1) acknowledging the contribution and limitations of actualistic experiments in the trade-off of causality and generalizability; 2) encouraging collaborative projects that involve geographically diverse and non-traditional research participants such as hobbyists and novices; 3) adopting a workflow that normalizes the collection and curation of ethological and ethnographic data in experimental projects.

**Keywords:** Experimental archaeology; Ethological analysis; Ethnographical analysis; Curse of knowledge; Collaborative knowledge production

Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 What good is actualistic experimentation? 3

3 Many places, many voices 4

4 The Triple P framework in action 6

4.1 Product-level data . . . . . 7

4.2 Process-level data . . . . . 7

4.3 Perception-level data . . . . . 9

4.4 Multi-level data curation . . . . . 10

5 Conclusion 10

6 Acknowledgements 11

References 11

\*Department of Anthropology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; [cheng.liu@emory.edu](mailto:cheng.liu@emory.edu)

# 1 Introduction

This paper presents the Perception-Process-Product (hereinafter referred to as ‘Triple P’) conceptual framework to expand the scope of experimental archaeology. Adopting the principle of Occam’s razor (e.g., Domínguez-Rodrigo, 2008; Reeves et al., 2009), whether explicitly or implicitly, the field of experimental archaeology has long tended to center around the reverse engineering of a past technology in a minimal or least-effort manner while ignoring the rich contextual information it affords. Nevertheless, Occam’s razor, this very cornerstone of our field, can be insufficient to infer the preferences of irrational agents possessing incomplete information (Mindermann & Armstrong, 2018) in tool design and use, and the two conditions described here provide a better approximation of past humans displaying extensive cultural variation as opposed to the assumption of omniscient *Homo economicus* for most anthropologists (Henrich et al., 2001). In the evolution of technology, it is rather common that opaque causal perception and its resulting tendency of over-imitation (e.g., Sylvia’s Recipe, Gergely & Csibra, 2006) together with path dependence (e.g., QWERTY keyboard design, Kafae et al., 2022) can lead to the widespread and long-lasting reproduction of technological solutions that are neither optimal in terms of functional efficiency nor minimal in terms of manufacture complexity.

Built upon the *Homo economicus* critique and early works in behavioural archaeology (Schiffer, 2010), here I propose the Triple P framework, which aims to **a**) amplify the expression of variation in experimental replicas (product) and their associated behavioural channels (process) as well as sensory experiences (perception) by experiments in diverse contexts and **b**) better identify the complex interacting relationships across these three levels of variations in real-world conditions. To accomplish these two objectives, I advocate the following three principles as integral components of the Triple P framework. Ontologically speaking, it requires 1) acknowledging the contribution and limitations of actualistic experiments in the trade-off of causality and generalizability and 2) encouraging collaborative projects that involve geographically diverse and non-traditional research participants such as hobbyists and novices. These two principles are developed to advocate a pluralistic approach to the explanation of complex variation, which has received more attention from evolutionary anthropology (Antón & Kuzawa, 2017) to cognitive science (Barrett, 2020), instead of treating the optimization-based research agenda as a panacea. Epistemologically speaking, the Triple P framework 3) adopts a workflow that normalizes the collection and curation of ethological and ethnographic data in experimental projects. There is

no doubt that strategies of data collection and analysis of a given experimental project should be primarily derived from the research question, which can be legitimately narrow in scope, but the awareness of the rich toolkit available can sometimes inspire researchers to ask questions that are bold and transformative (Schmidt & Marwick, 2020). Here I will mainly leverage the extensive corpus in experimental designs and inferences revolving around stone artefacts to clarify its meaning and demonstrate the necessity and potential of this framework.

## 2 What good is actualistic experimentation?

The trade-off between causality (aka ‘internal validity’) and generalizability (aka ‘external validity’) forms a central issue in experimental design across different disciplines (Eren et al., 2016; Roe & Just, 2009: 1266-1267). In fields known for their development of rigorous and well-controlled experimental methods such as cognitive psychology and neuroscience, researchers have started to use naturalistic stimuli more frequently and advocate a paradigm shift to semi-controlled experiments (Nastase et al., 2020; Shamay-Tsoory & Mendelsohn, 2019; Sonkusare et al., 2019; Yarkoni, 2022). In contrast, the past decades have witnessed experimental archaeology’s growing research interests focusing on the causal mechanism at the behavioural level in the explanation of material culture variation (Eren et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2018). In the context of stone artefact replication, one typical research design emphasizing causality over generalizability is the use of knapping machines/robots (Li et al., 2022; Pflieger et al., 2019), which has helped map out the physical constraints of stone artefact manufacture and use through the identification of multiple groups of causal relationships between input (force, exterior platform angle, platform depth, etc.) and outcome variables (flake size, flake shape, wear formation, etc.). All variables of interest in this setting are relatively easy to measure, quantify, and control, but this type of design can be insufficient in inferring how context-generic principles interact in a particular context as reflected in real-world conditions. In addition to the applications of machine knapping, the same problem is also incurred by the introduction of standardized artificial material like bricks (Lombao et al., 2017) or foam blocks (Schillinger et al., 2016) in experimental studies focusing on the transmission of lithic technologies (Liu et al., 2023). In reality, each rock has a different shape and often different physical properties such as inner cracks and inclusions, and this heterogeneity itself represents a critical variable in cultural transmission and skill development (Proffitt et al., 2022). After all, these experimental results can only be as robust as their experimental settings.

On the other hand, actualistic experiments pay more attention to how experimental insights can be generalized to archaeological samples by incorporating authentic materials and plausible social settings with a certain degree of compromised control (Outram, 2008). Back to the cases of cultural transmission experiments, an actualistic experiment would involve the use of natural rocks with varied morphology instead of standardized artificial materials as well as human demonstrators instead of videos of knapping instruction, despite the fact that the latter will remain consistent across individuals. Unlike controlled experiments, variation could be easily observed in actualistic experiments by design. This feature is crucial and cannot be simply replaced by ethnographic records, because many palaeolithic technological components do not have analogues in contemporary non-industrial societies (Arthur, 2018; e.g., Stout, 2002). Furthermore, statistical techniques for developing causal inference from observational data, which essentially represent the nature of results from actualistic experiments, have also been greatly boosted in epidemiology and economics in recent years (Cunningham, 2021; Hernan & Robins, 2023). Lastly, actualistic experiment can serve as a heuristic for hypothesis generation, aligning with the perspective of Lin et al. (2018: 680-681), who proposed that the interaction between actualistic and controlled experiment “operates in a cyclical form of induction and deduction.”

### 3 Many places, many voices

Contemporary practices in experimental archaeology, as manifested by the fact that a majority of scholarly publications are produced as results of experiments conducted by a single knapper with a dual identity of researcher (Whittaker, 2004), tend to be restrained by the cognitive bias known as the ‘curse of knowledge’ or ‘curse of expertise’. This psychological term originally refers to the phenomenon that it is extremely challenging for experts to ignore the information that is held by them but not others, particularly novices (Hinds, 1999), but it has further implications for the sample representativeness in experimental archaeology. When the knapping expertise is gradually formed through multiple years of observations and trial-and-error learning, an expert knapper develops some specific ways of strategic planning, motor habits (and their associated impacts on anatomical forms like wrist and elbow), preferences of percussor and raw material types, as well as familiarity of various techniques that become unforgettable (Moore, 2020: 654). The existence of this cognitive bias is not inherently bad, and these many years of experience should

122 be appreciated and celebrated by experimental archaeologists. However, what is problematic is  
123 that the results of replication experiments conducted by these experienced practitioners, often in  
124 settings of single knapper, has been constantly framed as generalization regarding the evolution  
125 of technology and cognition that masks a huge range of technological diversity.

126 Modern flintknapping techniques, as a research subject and a scientific method, originated  
127 from hobbyists' individualistic trials of reverse engineering during the 19th century (Coles, 1979;  
128 Flenniken, 1984; Johnson, 1978; Whittaker, 1994: 54-61). Hobbyist knappers represent a huge  
129 repertoire of technological knowledge that does not fully overlap with what is acquired by aca-  
130 demic knappers. They tend to come up with ideas that may appear to be counter-intuitive at first  
131 glance for academics. One such example is the utility of obtuse edge angle as demonstrated by  
132 Don Crabtree (1977), a mostly self-educated flintknapper yet one of the most important figures  
133 in experimental archaeology. In his experiment, Crabtree demonstrated the excellent perfor-  
134 mance of blade dorsal ridge on tasks like shaving and cutting hard materials, challenging the  
135 traditional perspective on producing sharp lateral edges as the sole purpose of stone toolmaking  
136 and shedding light on future functional reconstruction through the use-wear analysis. It is rather  
137 unfortunate that collaborations between academics and hobbyists are less common than ex-  
138 pected due to their complicated and uneasy relationships as detailed in Whittaker's (2004) famous  
139 ethnography. Likewise, novices' lack of expertise also helps to mitigate the 'curse of knowledge'  
140 bias that may hinder expert knappers. Their involvement can potentially lead to the discovery of  
141 alternative methods, techniques, and interpretations that may have been overlooked by experts.

142 Emphasizing variation at its core, the Triple P conceptual framework recognizes that experimental  
143 archaeology can greatly benefit from diverse perspectives (Pargeter et al., 2023: 164) and thereby  
144 inherently adopts a collaborative mode of knowledge production, which has been recently advo-  
145 cated in experimental studies (Liu & Stout, 2023; Ranhorn et al., 2020) and museum collection  
146 studies (Timbrell, 2023) of stone artefacts. Furthermore, the Triple P framework acknowledges  
147 that communities living in specific geographical areas possess unique insights and understanding  
148 of their cultural heritage. This emphasis on team efforts and inclusivity allows for a more nuanced  
149 understanding of the complexities of raw material procurement (Batalla, 2016), selection (Arthur,  
150 2021), pre-treatment (Maloney & Street, 2020), production (Griffin et al., 2013), and use (Marte-  
151 lotta et al., 2022) across different regions. Through ethical collaborations with those knapping  
152 practitioners in non-industrial societies in the research process, the framework allows their voices

to be heard and their contributions to be acknowledged. This not only enhances the quality of research outcomes but also fosters a sense of ownership and pride within these communities, strengthening the connection between archaeological research and the people it directly affects (Montgomery & Fryer, 2023).

## 4 The Triple P framework in action

As implied in its name, the implementation of the Triple P framework involves the collection of process-level (ethological) and perception-level (ethnographic) data (Figure 1), which is critical to address equifinality and multifinality (Nami, 2010; Premo, 2010), two daunting challenges in archaeological inference. Equifinality refers to the phenomenon where a similar state or consequence can be achieved through multiple different paths, while multifinality emerges when a similar process can lead to multiple ends. While we cannot fully solve these two problems and accurately reconstruct the past behavioural processes and intentions simply based on materials remains, context-rich experiments involving the collection of ethological and ethnographic data can help us better document an enlarged range of possible combinations of variation at these three levels and thereby evaluate the probability of certain behavioural mechanisms behind a given archaeological assemblage (Reynolds, 1999; Stout & Hecht, 2023). The importance of specifying and documenting the context information of both the experiment as well as the phenomenon of interest has also been recently highlighted in psychological sciences (Holleman et al., 2020).




Figure 1: A schematic diagram demonstrating how to operationalize the Perception-Process-Product conceptual framework.

## 4.1 Product-level data

Traditionally speaking, the product-level data, namely the documentation and analysis of replicas, form the sole research subject of experimental archaeology and serve as the tangible foundation for analogical inference in the interpretation of archaeological materials. It can exist in the form of spreadsheets containing detailed technological attributes, or photos and illustrations, or high-resolution 3D scans of individual artefact or a whole assemblage. No particular modification regarding the collection procedure of product-level data is required in the context of the Triple P framework, although it should be emphasized that the definition of variables measured and the documentation techniques (models of camera/scanners, light setting, processing software version and workflow, etc.) should be always available in the relevant meta-data. Adopting good habits in spreadsheet data organization is also strongly recommended (Broman & Woo, 2018).

## 4.2 Process-level data

While systematic behavioural coding methods that are widely used in the study of non-human animal behaviour (Fragaszy & Mangalam, 2018) still largely neglected among archaeologists, the attempts of reconstructing behavioural sequences involved in the manufacture of material remains are not infrequent. One such example is cognigram, which was first systematically developed and applied in the archaeological research by Haidle (Haidle, 2009, 2014). Cognigram

is a graphical representation of the reconstructed behaviour behind archaeological artefacts in chronological order of appearance (Haidle, 2014), which essentially represents an abstracting process of a series of action sequences achieving a similar goal. This approach is a powerful and elegant yet limited by its normative and analytical orientation, meaning it cannot handle variation very well. To some extent, it describes the minimal steps to achieve a goal from the perspective of reverse engineering and assumes clear causal thinking between each step in an idealistic manner. However, this may be biased given that ethnographic studies demonstrated that expert practitioners in traditional societies can have a different set of causal perception on how certain behaviours will modify the raw materials (Harris et al., 2021).

Consequently, we need to accumulate more real-world data by recording a large amount videos of toolmaking and conducting systematic ethogram analysis. With the emergence of new software platforms such as BORIS (Friard & Gamba, 2016), the difficulty of coding has decreased significantly in recent years (Figure 2). Here I use a modified version of action grammar developed by (Stout et al., 2021) as an example, among multiple coding schemes featuring different research focus (Muller et al., 2023) or granularity (Cueva-Temprana et al., 2019; Mahaney, 2014; Roux & David, 2005). The knapping action recorded in videos can be coded following the ethogram presented in Table 1. Depending on the original research question, sequences of coded actions can then be used in further analysis, such as complexity (Stout et al., 2021), similarity (Mobbs et al., 2021), etc.




Figure 2: An example of coding a handaxe knapping session using the BORIS software.



Table 1: A modified version of the original action grammar presented in (Stout et al., 2021)

Action	Definition
Percussion	Forcefully striking core with percussor (hammerstone or antler billet) in such a way as to potentially remove a flake
Light Percussion	Lower amplitude tangential strike to the tool edge of the kind often employed for platform preparation
Core Move	Movement of the core without a change in grip. Often occurs during core inspection
Core Repositioning	Rotation and/or reorientation of the core involving repositioning of the hand. Often associated with the transition to a new percussion target
Grinding	Abrasion of core edges using a hammerstone
Tool Change	Exchange of one percussor for another

### 4.3 Perception-level data

Ethnographies revolving around experimental archaeology as a field (Reeves Flores, 2012), as well as practices of specific technologies like flintknapping, including contemporary U.S. hobbyists (Whittaker, 2004) and knapping practitioners in various non-industrial societies (Arthur, 2018; Stout, 2002), are far from novel. However, ethnography has never been formally recognized as a legitimate research method in experimental archaeology. Echoing with the recent trends of adopting embodied cognition (Varela et al., 2017) in archaeological research (Malafouris, 2013), ethnographic data and methods can reveal hidden information (e.g., intention) that is otherwise irretrievable and thus should occupy a unique niche in experimental archaeology. This also echoes the post-positivist turn in psychology, a field that is known for the development of experimental methods, in the past decades, particularly the emphasis on the value of incorporating qualitative research (Stout, 2021; Syed & McLean, 2022; Weger et al., 2019).

Through participant observation, interviews, and detailed field notes, ethnography can capture the subtle nuances of perception, such as sensory experiences, social interactions, and cultural meanings associated with the experimental activities (Gowlland, 2019). Compared with the etho-

logical methods, the interview questions and participant observation in ethnographic methods feature an even higher degree of freedom and rely more heavily on the research question as well as ad-hoc interaction. One potential application of ethnographic methods in experimental archaeology of stone artefacts is asking knappers about the intentions of each action and see how it matches with the results as revealed by lithic analysis of replicas, which can provide crucial contextual information addressing the issues of equifinality and multifinality in the formation of lithic assemblage.

#### 4.4 Multi-level data curation

The comparative study and large-scale synthesis of variation data require the building of centralized, open-access, and carefully curated data infrastructure, which unfortunately still does not exist yet in experimental archaeology. Among the three dimensions of the Triple P framework, the product-level data are usually stored in the format of spreadsheets, photos, and 3D models, and the perception-level data formats mainly include audio files and their transcribed texts, whereas videos are the main vector of process-level data, a rather non-traditional data format in archaeological research featuring the highest file size compared with the other two. As such, following data sharing principles of FAIR (Wilkinson et al., 2016) and CARE (Carroll et al., 2020), the Triple P framework recommends Databrary (Simon et al., 2015), a web-based library originally designed for developmental scientists, as the main data curation platform, where researchers can freely upload video files and related metadata that can connect with different types of data within the same project.

## 5 Conclusion

Through the broadening of traditional data types and recording methods revolving around experimental replicas *per se*, the Triple P conceptual framework allows the amplified multiscale expression of material cultural variation. It is also compatible with many theoretical orientations, ranging from behavioural archaeology (emphasis on video recording of behavioural processes) through evolutionary archaeology (emphasis on the amplification of variation) to post-processual archaeology (emphasis on perception through ethnography). In terms of its research practice, it embraces a collaborative mode of knowledge production by involving a more diverse pool of stakeholders. The innovativeness, flexibility, and inclusiveness of the Triple P conceptual frame-

work has a huge potential in redefining what can be and what should be studied by experimental archaeology as a field and thereby contributing to a better understanding of our deep past.

## 6 Acknowledgements

I thank Mark Moore for an inspiring discussion and Dietrich Stout for his helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article. This study was supported by a research grant from the Leakey Foundation titled ‘Inferring skill reproduction from stone artifacts: A middle-range approach.’

## References

- Antón, S. C., & Kuzawa, C. W. (2017). Early homo, plasticity and the extended evolutionary synthesis. *Interface Focus*, 7(5), 20170004. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsfs.2017.0004>
- Arthur, K. W. (2018). *The lives of stone tools: Crafting the status, skill, and identity of flintknappers* (1st edition). University of Arizona Press.
- Arthur, K. W. (2021). Material Scientists: Learning the Importance of Colour and Brightness from Lithic Practitioners. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 31(2), 293–304. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774320000347>
- Barrett, H. C. (2020). Towards a Cognitive Science of the Human: Cross-Cultural Approaches and Their Urgency. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24(8), 620–638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.05.007>
- Batalla, A. N. (2016). Studies of indigenous lithic procurement in Uruguay and their implications for Southern Cone archaeology. *Journal of Lithic Studies*, 3(1), 265–292. <https://doi.org/10.2218/jls.v3i1.1522>
- Broman, K. W., & Woo, K. H. (2018). Data organization in spreadsheets. *The American Statistician*, 72(1), 2–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2017.1375989>
- Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., Holbrook, J., Lovett, R., Materechera, S., Parsons, M., Raseroka, K., Rodriguez-Lonebear, D., Rowe, R., Sara, R., Walker, J. D., Anderson, J., & Hudson, M. (2020). The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance. *Data Science Journal*, 19(1), 43. <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-043>
- Coles, J. M. (1979). *Experimental archaeology*. Academic Press.
- Crabtree, D. E. (1977). *The obtuse angle as a functional edge* (D. Ingersoll, J. E. Yellen, & W. MacDonald, Eds.; pp. 38–51). Columbia University Press.

- Cueva-Temprana, A., Lombao, D., Morales, J. I., Geribàs, N., & Mosquera, M. (2019). Gestures during knapping: A two-perspective approach to pleistocene technologies. *Lithic Technology*, 44(2), 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01977261.2019.1587255>
- Cunningham, S. (2021). *Causal inference: The mixtape*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1c29t27>
- Domínguez-Rodrigo, M. (2008). Conceptual premises in experimental design and their bearing on the use of analogy: An example from experiments on cut marks. *World Archaeology*, 40(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240701843629>
- Eren, M. I., Lycett, S. J., Patten, R. J., Buchanan, B., Pargeter, J., & O'Brien, M. J. (2016). Test, model, and method validation: The role of experimental stone artifact replication in hypothesis-driven archaeology. *Ethnoarchaeology: Journal of Archaeological, Ethnographic and Experimental Studies*, 8(2), 103–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19442890.2016.1213972>
- Flenniken, J. J. (1984). The past, present, and future of flintknapping: An anthropological perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 13(1), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.13.100184.001155>
- Fragaszy, D. M., & Mangalam, M. (2018). *Chapter Five - Tooling* (M. Naguib, L. Barrett, S. D. Healy, J. Podos, L. W. Simmons, & M. Zuk, Eds.; Vol. 50, pp. 177–241). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.asb.2018.01.001>
- Friard, O., & Gamba, M. (2016). BORIS: a free, versatile open-source event-logging software for video/audio coding and live observations. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(11), 1325–1330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12584>
- Gergely, G., & Csibra, G. (2006). *Sylvia's recipe: The role of imitation and pedagogy in the transmission of cultural knowledge* (S. C. Levinson & N. J. Enfield, Eds.; pp. 229–255). Berg Publishers.
- Gowlland, G. (2019). The sociality of enskilment. *Ethnos*, 84(3), 508–524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2018.1455726>
- Griffin, D., Freedman, D. L., Nicholson, B., McConachie, F., & Parmington, A. (2013). The koorong project: Experimental archaeology and wurundjeri continuation of cultural practices. *Excavations, Surveys and Heritage Management in Victoria*, 2, 5965.
- Haidle, M. N. (2009). How to think a simple spear. In S. A. de Beaune, F. L. Coolidge, & T. Wynn (Eds.), *Cognitive archaeology and human evolution* (pp. 57–73). Cambridge University Press.
- Haidle, M. N. (2014). Building a bridge—an archeologist's perspective on the evolution of causal cognition. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.>

01472

- Harris, J. A., Boyd, R., & Wood, B. M. (2021). The role of causal knowledge in the evolution of traditional technology. *Current Biology*, 31(8), 1798–1803.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.01.096>
- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., & McElreath, R. (2001). In Search of Homo Economicus: Behavioral Experiments in 15 Small-Scale Societies. *American Economic Review*, 91(2), 73–78. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.2.73>
- Hernan, M. A., & Robins, J. M. (2023). *Causal inference: What if*. CRC Press.
- Hinds, P. J. (1999). The curse of expertise: The effects of expertise and debiasing methods on prediction of novice performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 5, 205–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.5.2.205>
- Holleman, G. A., Hooge, I. T., Kemner, C., & Hessels, R. S. (2020). The ‘real-world approach’ and its problems: A critique of the term ecological validity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 721.
- Johnson, L. L. (1978). A history of flint-knapping experimentation, 1838–1976 [and comments and reply]. *Current Anthropology*, 19(2), 337–372. <https://doi.org/10.1086/202078>
- Kafaei, M., Daviran, E., & Taqavi, M. (2022). The QWERTY keyboard from the perspective of the Collingridge dilemma: lessons for co-construction of human-technology. *AI & SOCIETY*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01573-1>
- Li, L., Lin, S. C., McPherron, S. P., Abdolazadeh, A., Chan, A., Dogandžić, T., Iovita, R., Leader, G. M., Magnani, M., Rezek, Z., & Dibble, H. L. (2022). A Synthesis of the Dibble et al. Controlled Experiments into the Mechanics of Lithic Production. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-022-09586-2>
- Lin, S. C., Rezek, Z., & Dibble, H. L. (2018). Experimental Design and Experimental Inference in Stone Artifact Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 25(3), 663–688. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-017-9351-1>
- Liu, C., Khreisheh, N., Stout, D., & Pargeter, J. (2023). Differential effects of knapping skill acquisition on the cultural reproduction of Late Acheulean handaxe morphology: Archaeological and experimental insights. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 49, 103974. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2023.103974>
- Liu, C., & Stout, D. (2023). Inferring cultural reproduction from lithic data: A critical review. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 32(2), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21964>

- Lombao, D., Guardiola, M., & Mosquera, M. (2017). Teaching to make stone tools: new experimental evidence supporting a technological hypothesis for the origins of language. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 14394. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-14322-y>
- Mahaney, R. A. (2014). Exploring the complexity and structure of acheulean stoneknapping in relation to natural language. *PaleoAnthropology*, 2014, 586606. <https://doi.org/10.4207/PA.2014.ART90>
- Malafouris, L. (2013). *How things shape the mind: A theory of material engagement*. The MIT Press.
- Maloney, T. R., & Street, M. (2020). Hot debate: Identifying heat treatment in Australian archaeology using science and modern indigenous knowledge. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 241, 106431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2020.106431>
- Martellotta, E. F., Perston, Y. L., Craft, P., Wilkins, J., & Langley, M. C. (2022). Beyond the main function: An experimental study of the use of hardwood boomerangs in retouching activities. *PLOS ONE*, 17(8), e0273118. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0273118>
- Mindermann, S., & Armstrong, S. (2018). Occam's razor is insufficient to infer the preferences of irrational agents. *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 5603–5614.
- Mobbs, D., Wise, T., Suthana, N., Guzmán, N., Kriegeskorte, N., & Leibo, J. Z. (2021). Promises and challenges of human computational ethology. *Neuron*, 109(14), 2224–2238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2021.05.021>
- Montgomery, L. M., & Fryer, T. C. (2023). The future of archaeology is (still) community collaboration. *Antiquity*, 97(394), 795–809. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2023.98>
- Moore, M. W. (2020). Hominin Stone Flaking and the Emergence of 'Top-down' Design in Human Evolution. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 30(4), 647–664. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774320000190>
- Muller, A., Shipton, C., & Clarkson, C. (2023). The Proceduralization of Hominin Knapping Skill: Memorizing Different Lithic Technologies. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774323000070>
- Nami, H., G. (2010). Theoretical Reflections on Experimental Archaeology and Lithic Technology: Issues on Actualistic Stone Tools Analysis and Interpretation. In H. Nami G. (Ed.), *Experiments and Interpretation of Traditional Technologies: Essays in Honor of Errett Callahan* (pp. 91–168). Ediciones de Arqueología Contemporánea.

- Nastase, S. A., Goldstein, A., & Hasson, U. (2020). Keep it real: rethinking the primacy of experimental control in cognitive neuroscience. *NeuroImage*, 222, 117254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117254>
- Outram, A. K. (2008). Introduction to experimental archaeology. *World Archaeology*, 40(1), 1–6. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40025310>
- Pargeter, J., Liu, C., Kilgore, M. B., Majoe, A., & Stout, D. (2023). Testing the Effect of Learning Conditions and Individual Motor/Cognitive Differences on Knapping Skill Acquisition. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 30(1), 127–171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-022-09592-4>
- Pfleging, J., Iovita, R., & Buchli, J. (2019). Influence of force and duration on stone tool wear: results from experiments with a force-controlled robot. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*, 11(11), 5921–5935. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-018-0729-0>
- Premo, L. S. (2010). Equifinality and explanation: Thoughts on the role of agent-based modeling in postpositivist archaeology. In A. Costopoulos & M. W. Lake (Eds.), *Simulating Change: Archaeology Into the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 28–37). University of Utah Press.
- Proffitt, T., Bargalló, A., & Torre, I. de la. (2022). The Effect of Raw Material on the Identification of Knapping Skill: a Case Study from Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 29(1), 50–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-021-09511-z>
- Ranhorn, K. L., Pargeter, J., & Premo, L. S. (2020). Investigating the evolution of human social learning through collaborative experimental archaeology. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 29(2), 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21823>
- Reeves, D., Bury, R., & Robinson, D. W. (2009). Invoking occam's razor: Experimental pigment processing and an hypothesis concerning emigdiano chumash rock art. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, 29(1), 59–67. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27825902>
- Reeves Flores, J. (2012). *Experimental archaeology: an ethnography of its perceived value and impact in archaeological research* [PhD thesis]. <https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/handle/10871/9041>
- Reynolds, P. J. (1999). *The nature of experiment in archaeology* (A. Harding, Ed.; pp. 156–162). Oxbow Books.
- Roe, B. E., & Just, D. R. (2009). Internal and external validity in economics research: Tradeoffs between experiments, field experiments, natural experiments, and field data. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 91(5), 1266–1271. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20616293>



- Roux, V., & David, É. (2005). *Planning abilities as a dynamic perceptual-motor skill: an actualist study of different levels of expertise involved in stone knapping* (V. Roux & B. Bril, Eds.; pp. 91–108). McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00120262>
- Schiffer, M. B. (2010). *Behavioral Archaeology: Principles and Practice*. Routledge.
- Schillinger, K., Mesoudi, A., & Lycett, S. J. (2016). Copying error, evolution, and phylogenetic signal in artifactual traditions: An experimental approach using “model artifacts”. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 70, 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2016.04.013>
- Schmidt, S. C., & Marwick, B. (2020). Tool-Driven Revolutions in Archaeological Science. *Journal of Computer Applications in Archaeology*, 3(1), 1832. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jcaa.29>
- Shamay-Tsoory, S. G., & Mendelsohn, A. (2019). Real-Life Neuroscience: An Ecological Approach to Brain and Behavior Research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(5), 841–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619856350>
- Simon, D. A., Gordon, A. S., Steiger, L., & Gilmore, R. O. (2015). *Databrary: Enabling sharing and reuse of research video*. 279280. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2756406.2756951>
- Sonkusare, S., Breakspear, M., & Guo, C. (2019). Naturalistic Stimuli in Neuroscience: Critically Acclaimed. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(8), 699–714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.05.004>
- Stout, D. (2002). Skill and cognition in stone tool production: An ethnographic case study from irian jaya. *Current Anthropology*, 43(5), 693–722. <https://doi.org/10.1086/342638>
- Stout, D. (2021). The cognitive science of technology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(11), 964–977. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.07.005>
- Stout, D., Chaminade, T., Apel, J., Shafti, A., & Faisal, A. A. (2021). The measurement, evolution, and neural representation of action grammars of human behavior. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-92992-5>
- Stout, D., & Hecht, E. (2023). *Evolutionary neuroarchaeology* (T. Wynn, K. A. Overmann, & F. L. Coolidge, Eds.; pp. C14.S1–C14.S11). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192895950.013.14>
- Syed, M., & McLean, K. C. (2022). Disentangling paradigm and method can help bring qualitative research to post-positivist psychology and address the generalizability crisis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 45, e32. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X21000431>
- Timbrell, L. (2023). A Collaborative Model for Lithic Shape Digitization in Museum Settings. *Lithic*



- 441 *Technology*, 48(1), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01977261.2022.2092299>
- 442 Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (2017). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human*  
 443 *Experience* (revised edition). The MIT Press.
- 444 Weger, U. W., Wagemann, J., & Tewes, C. (2019). Editorial: The challenges and opportunities  
 445 of introspection in psychology: Theory and method. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. [https://](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02196)  
 446 [www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02196](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02196)
- 447 Whittaker, J. C. (1994). *Flintknapping: Making and Understanding Stone Tools*. University of Texas  
 448 Press.
- 449 Whittaker, J. C. (2004). *American Flintknappers: Stone Age Art in the Age of Computers*. University  
 450 of Texas Press.
- 451 Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, Ij. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg,  
 452 N., Boiten, J.-W., Silva Santos, L. B. da, Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T.,  
 453 Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., . . . Mons, B. (2016). The  
 454 FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, 3(1),  
 455 160018. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>
- 456 Yarkoni, T. (2022). The generalizability crisis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 45, e1. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X20001685)  
 457 [doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X20001685](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X20001685)