

# Replication report

 Published Edit \_

The **goal** of this assignment is to understand the analytical and theoretical approaches used in one published study stone artefact assemblages, and to engage with data to evaluate the validity of the claims made in the publication.

This is an individual assignment, everyone needs to submit their own work to Canvas. Please continue the excellent discussions that you have been having in your groups so far. And please feel free to write R code together with your group members. Your code may be identical to the code used by other members of your group, that is fine. However, we expect the narrative text to be your unique work, and not be identical to the narrative text of anyone else in your group or the class.

Here are the basic requirements for **content**:

- You need to write a R Markdown document that includes your report text and all the R code to produce the plots and other results in your report. Write your Rmd by downloading this [template](#) and writing your text and code in it. In addition to your (1) a **R Markdown document**, you also need to submit (2) the **raw data file**, and (3) the **output document** (e.g. Microsoft Word document that is produced when you knit your Rmd file). To learn how to submit multiple files to a canvas assignment, take a look [here](https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-10663-421254353) [\\_ \(https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-10663-421254353\)](https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-10663-421254353) (please don't zip the files together). If you encounter any issues while writing R code that holds you up for more than a few minutes, please contact us on Slack so we can get you going again!
- Maximum of 500 words (including title, citations and everything in the main body text, excludes the reference list). Do not include an abstract, footnotes, endnotes, a table of contents or cover sheet.
- Minimum of 4 scholarly items in the reference list (see [our guidelines](#) for determining what is a scholarly source). These should be scholarly journal articles or book chapters. It is fine to cite works that we've read for the seminars or discussed in the lectures. You may count the paper you are replicating in these four items. You should not cite any non-scholarly items in your paper. Use the [APA \(http://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/citations/apa-style\)](http://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/citations/apa-style) or [Chicago \(https://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/citations/chicago-nb\)](https://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/citations/chicago-nb) citation style

Here are the basic requirements for **structure**

- Your introduction needs a heading, “**Introduction**”, and should start with a clear statement of the specific purpose of the report. The general purpose of your report is to validate the archaeological claims of a recent scholarly publication.
  - In your introduction, you need to state the specific claims of the publication you have chosen.
  - Your introduction needs a few sentences of background context to describe the broader archaeological debate that these claims are part of. Give enough detail for an archaeologist who is not familiar with the article you are studying to understand the background to your report.

- Your introduction needs to briefly mention the names, locations, and basic chronology of the archaeological sites discussed in the publication you are working on.
- You need a section with a heading “**Methods**” that briefly describes what you did to validate the claims in the paper.
  - You need to start by describing the specific results published in the paper that you focussed on for your validation.
  - You need to describe the specific methods that you used to validate these results. These should not be highly complex, it should be things like, for example, ‘we compared the percentage of X from site A to site B’, and ‘we compared the proportions of X by visualizing the data in a boxplot’.
- You need a section with a heading “**Results**” that includes 1-2 original plots that you produced with R code to validate the claims.
  - Your results section needs several sentences of text that describe the plot(s), and compares them to the plot(s) in the publication.
  - Please reference the specific figure in the paper that you reproduced by mentioning the figure number.
- You need a section with a heading “**Conclusion**”.
  - This section needs to include a sentence that restates the purpose of your report (in past tense).
  - You need a few sentences that conclude if you could successfully validate the author’s claims or not. You need to state your conclusion about whether the author’s claims appear to be robust, trustworthy, unreliable, overstated, understated, etc.

Here are the basic requirements for **style**:

- Use efficient and succinct sentences. Avoid wordy and long sentences. See the excellent style tips here: <http://depts.washington.edu/owrc/Handouts/Attending%20to%20Style.pdf> (<http://depts.washington.edu/owrc/Handouts/Attending%20to%20Style.pdf>)
- Direct quotations from any sources you cite are not allowed
- Use grammatical sentences, ensure they have at least one noun and one verb
- Use commas and apostrophes correctly. See here for details on frequent grammatical problems in student writing and how to avoid them: <http://depts.washington.edu/owrc/Handouts/Attending%20to%20Grammar.pdf> (<http://depts.washington.edu/owrc/Handouts/Attending%20to%20Grammar.pdf>)
- Spell correctly. American or Australian spelling is fine so long as you consistently use one and don’t mix them.
- Consult the [Anthropology Writing Center](https://anthropology.washington.edu/anthropology-writing-center) (<https://anthropology.washington.edu/anthropology-writing-center>) for free one-on-one tutoring for students by appointment to get feedback on your work-in-progress.

**Points** 30

**Submitting** a file upload

Due	For	Available from	Until
May 17	Everyone	Apr 29 at 12am	-

**Replication report rubric**

You've already rated students with this rubric. Any major changes could affect their assessment results.

Criteria	Ratings		Pts
Content: Submission includes Rmd file, Data file, and Word file	<b>3.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	3.0 pts
Content: Maximum of 500 words (including title, citations and everything in the main body text, excludes the reference list). The Rmd template we have provided will count the words for you to see on the Word document after you knit.	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Content: Minimum of 4 scholarly items in the reference list and no non-scholarly items	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Structure: Your introduction needs a heading, "Introduction", and start with a clear statement of the purpose of the report. The general purpose of your report is validate the archaeological claims of a recent scholarly publication. In your introduction you need to make this more specific, and state the specific claims of the publication you have chosen.	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Structure: Your introduction needs a few sentences of background context to describe the broader archaeological debate that these claims are part of.	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Structure: Your introduction needs to briefly mention the names, locations, and basic chronology of the archaeological sites discussed in the publication you are working on.	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Structure: You need a section with a heading "Methods" that briefly describes what you did to validate the claims in the paper. You need to start by describing the specific archaeological results published in the paper that you focussed on for your validation.	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Structure: In your "Methods" section you need to describe the specific methods that you used to validate these results. These should not be highly complex, it should be things like, for example, 'we compared the percentage of X from site A to site B', and 'we compared the proportions of X by visualising the data in a boxplot'	<b>1.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	1.0 pts
Structure: You need a section with a heading "Results" that includes 1-2 original plots that you produced with R code to validate the claims. Your results section needs several sentences of text that describe the plots.	<b>2.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	2.0 pts

Criteria	Ratings		Pts
Structure: You need a section with a heading "Conclusion". This section needs to include a sentence that restates the purpose of your report (in past tense). You need a few sentences that conclude if you could successfully validate the author's claims or not. You need to state your conclusion about whether the author's claims appear to be robust, trustworthy, unreliable, overstated, understated, etc.	<b>2.0 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	2.0 pts
Style: Use efficient and succinct sentences. Avoid wordy and long sentences or sentences. Direct quotations from any sources you cite are not allowed	<b>0.5 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	0.5 pts
Style: Use commas and apostrophes correctly, and spell consistently (American or English, we don't mind ;)	<b>0.5 pts Full Marks</b>	<b>0.0 pts No Marks</b>	0.5 pts
Total Points: 15.0			