

Evaluating Sources

Source 1: (Moshenska, G, editor. *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. UCL Press, 2017. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1vxm8r7. Accessed 30 Oct. 2020)

Source 2: (Parcak, S. Holt, H. Merchant, J, editor) *Adventures of a Space Archaeologist*. 2019. [Nature.com/articles/d41586-019-01972-3](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-01972-3). Accessed 30th Oct. 2020)

To start, both sources have pros and cons; some of which weighted unequally. Where the aim of both sources is to provide an understanding into their two vastly different fields within archaeology, both reach that goal by taking very distinct paths.

Source 1, right at the very beginning, presents the reader with quotes and cites to back up its basic principles. This is a very effective way to let the reader know that information within the source is credible and reliable. This is quickly followed up with the author addressing the reader directly and establishing a target audience - people who want to learn more about the “study and practice in the field of public archaeology” (Moshenska, 2017 p.2). This can also be interpreted as the author establishing a purpose for the book, as he aims to offer a “series of snapshots of important ideas and areas of work, brought together as an introduction.” (Moshenska, 2017, p2); This informs the reader that they will become enlightened upon the important and essential pieces of knowledge used in public archaeology.

The chronological accuracy of the book is slightly sub-par, brought to light later within the writing. Where archaeologists are heavily involved with working in and around the natural environment; means weather and seasonal conditions can have great effects in determining suitably do excavate or study. Where the author has not provided any information on the times of year in which conditions are prime for excavations. Another factor in influence, is the failure to mention how public archaeology can vary. The author first acknowledges the idea the ‘public’ archaeology refers to the State, rather than its population. “McGimsey’s meaning of ‘public’ refers to the state rather than its people.” (Moshenska, 2017, p7.)

Another aspect which can influence this articles ability to effectively serve its purpose, is the authors bias’ and objectivities. Further into the book, the author explains the relevance of Archaeology to governments today - the main factor which can inhibit its relevancy is its economic value. “‘Economics’ and economic value means two interrelated but separate things.” (Moshenska, 2017, p31). This shows bias, as both factors merged into one could provide substantial means that archaeology is not worth a governments efforts to sustain its operation. Many other areas such as Cultural and Ethical have to be considered.

Source 2 has a very different structure to Source 1 but aims to convey the same message - informing the reader of the key information and knowledge used in their field.

Firstly, the article is portrayed to be accurate and have a well met authority throughout the text - the author is constantly referencing and backing up her informations to provide a wider insight. Examples include referencing of “1960s NASA mission” and the “Flying Priest - a 1920s photographer” (Parcak, S. Holt, H. Merchant, J. 2019).

Secondly, the article has a very good chronological and timely aspect - presenting information and showing a development from eras like the 1920s to a present day society. This development through the different time periods allows readers to fully understand the change and adaptation of archaeology and its equipment over time. This links in with the establishment of a target audience (people who want to learn more about space archaeology and its respective methodology). This is something that the authors convey energetically as they have tailored the language and cites used in order to have the greatest effect on the reader.

Finally, in contrast, this article’s target audience could be considered to be too specific. This is due to the fact that the authors focus on providing information to people who are presumed to have background knowledge, rather than people who are unaware of the basic principles of archaeology and its disciplines. As a result of this, to the average reader, the article may be difficult to understand. This could limit the potential reader-base, as well as potentially turning people away from the idea and encouragement to learn about Space Archaeology.

In conclusion, both sources benefit and contrast their original purposes. Both sources provide good knowledge - and the means to back it up.

Source 1 is a better source to study for academic reasons as it expands upon its main idea, which provides the reader with more useful information for consumption.

On the other hand, Source 2 is far better for a beginner as it uses less academic terms and displays appealing qualities within the field; bear in mind it does have some setbacks which could deter potential interest.