**INTRODUCTION**

In 2003–2004, students attending Kutztown University’s Archaeology Field School (KUAFS), collected artifacts from pedestrian survey and conducted minimal excavations of the “KU Site” (Quire, 2004). The site was occupied during the Late Archaic through Early Woodland periods. Most of the artifacts collected from the site are lithics, consisting primarily of debitage (the waste products of stone tool manufacture) while also including a variety of formal tools. The assemblage was subjected to only minimal analysis at the time of discovery and the hope of our team was to expand on this research, over 15 years later.

Here, we present the results of a more extensive analysis of this assemblage, under the direction of Dr. Khori Newlander, in an attempt to address questions of site use and occupation span, as well as tool stone procurement and conveyance. Our research illustrates how the analysis of even small lithic assemblages can contribute to an understanding of technological and socioeconomic organization in east-central Pennsylvania, approximately 6,000-3,000 years ago.

**SITE BACKGROUND**

The site is located in a farm field on Kutztown University property. The site may be stratified but we are only working within the first few inches, in the plow zone.

The artifacts recovered point to a Late Archaic to Early Woodland Period site, which was occupied sporadically throughout this time.

**ENVIRONMENT**

In the Mid-Atlantic region, the Archaic was a time of change. Forests were transforming to a deciduous mix of species, while rivers and tributaries were becoming more developed and stable. Generally, food resources were increasing, causing seasonal rounds to shrink in size while still feeding a growing population. Through the Transitional and Woodland Periods, temperature and humidity continued to rise, supporting these changing environmental trends (PHMC, 2015).

The site is situated in an advantageous location: Forests and portions of open grassland dominated the area, there are at least two sources of freshwater within reasonable walking distance, and multiple sources of quality tool stone nearby. Examples of what life may have looked like during these times are included below (courtesy of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission website).

**METHODS**

My team and I analyzed hundreds of artifacts, measuring several characteristics such as:

- The size, shape, weight, and color of both the debitage and the formal tools was analyzed and recorded. The various tool forms allow us to see behaviors conducted at the site while debitage analysis helps to illustrate distances to stone sources (in relation to each other) and the inhabitants’ preferred lithic materials. Generally, larger flakes will be found closer to sources while progressively smaller flakes will occur as you move away from stone sources (Andrefsky, 2008).

**RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

**Assemblage Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chert, Jasper, and Quartzite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Tools</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Quartzite is likely the closest stone source to the site (in relation to chert and jasper outcrops).
- The site was likely a temporary camp used while obtaining resources: hunting/processing of game, procurement of tool stone, etc...
- The processing of grasses, and scraping/working of hides and other materials (suggested by the quantity of scrapers and utilized flakes) can be seen in this assemblage (Vaughn, 1986). The variability in tool form (and inferred function) speaks to the wide range of behaviors and activities which took place at the KU site. (Andrefsky, 1997)

**CONCLUSION**

As our analysis continues, we will: positively determine the function of the tools used at the site (in order to infer function of the site as a whole), chemically identify possible sources of the tool stone in the area around the site, and bring focus back to this assemblage, to encourage future site research.
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