**Excavation Report/Reflection**

Purpose: This assignment is designed to help you connect Units I and II of the course: to critically evaluate the use of archaeological methods and theories and to whom they matter. You will learn to craft hypotheses and to defend them based on their relevance to multiple stakeholders. You will also connect your analysis of the excavated site’s (“Tallman II”) remains to trends in archaeological theory.

Assignment details: You will work on this in pairs to produce a single report/reflection. This report and reflection builds on the in-class excavation simulation (Mon. 9/11) at the Tallman II site. The site you excavated included “Historic” (Level 1) and “Prehistoric” (Level 2) layers from a hypothetical local site similar to that analyzed by Starck and Green (2014). You will focus only on the results from Level 1. All artifacts are photographed and accessible in a Moodle folder and all your unit forms will be scanned and available in a Moodle folder, too.

The format of this assignment includes a hypothesis and a brief report of your results and interpretation. You will also reflect on the relevance of archaeological research at the Tallman II site and how your interpretation of the site fits with trends in archaeological theory. Here are the recommended steps to crafting your report/reflection:

1. Consider the excavation simulation, your reading of Starck and Green (2014), and your understanding of archaeology: what hypothesis or research question could you pose for the historic period at Tallman II?
2. To whom does this hypothesis matter? Defend the hypothesis and explain who is helped and who is harmed by testing the hypothesis and coming up with results. (If you cannot figure out how this hypothesis matters to someone, craft a new hypothesis.)
3. What conclusions about 19th century life can you make by analyzing the excavated remains at Tallman II, specifically as relates to your hypothesis or research question?
4. Discuss any limitations or biases to the sampling method, the study method, or your perspective as the researcher.
5. In addition to the excavation and visual analysis you have conducted at Tallman II, what archaeological methods could you use to study the site and its assemblage if you had the opportunity to do more work there?
6. What kinds of archaeological theory(ies) could be used to further assess the hypothesis or research question you are exploring? Here we are looking for you to connect your perspectives on the site to bodies of archaeological theory or schools of archaeological thought (for example, feminist archaeology or cultural materialism). Remember: archaeological theory is anthropological theory about the past.
7. How does your worldview and/or identity impact your analysis of the site?

Evaluation: You will be graded out of a total of 70 possible points. You may earn no credit, partial credit, or full credit for each criterion.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Points possible** | **Comments** | **Points earned** |
| Includes hypothesis or research question | 10 |  |  |
| Discusses relevance of hypothesis and to whom it matters | 10 |  |  |
| Describes what is learned about 19th c. life related to hypothesis | 10 |  |  |
| Discusses limitations and biases of methods and perspectives | 10 |  |  |
| Lists additional archaeological methods that could be used – how and why | 10 |  |  |
| Connects student’s perspective to trends in archaeological theory | 10 |  |  |
| Reflects on how worldview and/or identity impact analysis | 10 |  |  |
| **Total points earned** | **70** |  |  |
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