

Table 16:

	Random sampling a	Judgement samples b	Mapping samples	Total less mapp. samples	Total IA c	Unsieved IA bones	D. F200,203,206		Random sampling	
							a) wet/rand.	b) dry/judg.	a) pits	b) ditches
<i>n</i> (all bones)	752	1255	1018	989	2007	3727	156	643	423	307
% of mammalian bones identified	16	21	13	21	17	48	22	21	15	18
X^2 ident. And unident. frags	0.48				525.19					
% of burnt bones	11	9	14	7	10	2	6	6	15	7
X^2 burnt and unburnt frags	1.37				2		0.01		1.2	
Mean number of all frags/ bucket	5.6	4.6	7.9	3.5f	4.9f	nc	4.7	18 - 4 f	8.3	3.8
Mean number of all burnt frags/ bucket	0.6	0.4	1.1	0.2f	0.5f	nc	0.3	0.1 - 0.2f	1.3	0.2

a) Randomly collected soil samples were obtained almost entirely by wet sieving

b) Judgement or non random samples were obtained by dry sieving. Most are from Iron Age ditches, below.

c) Iron Age total of sieved bones is the summed results from wet and dry sieving.

d) Best comparison of wet and dry sieving methods is of bones collected from IA ditches F200, F203 and F206.

e) 2x2 contingency tables using fragment frequencies where a significant difference ($p < 0.05$;ldf) is given by $X^2 > 3.84$ only selective testing of results

f) estimates

Table 17:

	Random sampling	Judgement samples	Mapping samples	Total, less mapp. Samples	IA totals		Random sampling from...		Ditches F200,203 and 206	
					a) sieved bones	b) unsieved	a) pits	b) ditches/ gullies	a) wet/ random	B)Dry/Judgement
n	119	215	134	200	334	1763	63	54	35	138
%										
Cattle	25	24	22	26	24	42	22	28	29	26
Sheep/Goat	59	57	60	56	58	42	68	48	54	53
Pig	13	13	16	12	13	8	10	19	14	13
Horse	2	6	1	6	4	7		4	3	7
Dog	1	1	2	1	1	1		2		1
<i>X² tests of fragment frequencies, usually of 4 major species and where significant difference (p . .05; 3df) is given by X² >/- 7.82 (siegel 1956, pp 104-107)</i>		2.95		977		50.23		4.27		0.9
<i>Comparison of 3 species (p. 05; 2 df) where X² >/- 5.99. Test would be significant if n1 and n2 were about double those given.</i>			6.95							

Table 18: Comparison of species and often percentages of sieved bones according to feature type

	EIA b		IA				RB			Saxon		
	p (N)	p (S)	other pits	ditch 200/203	ditch 206	other ditches	waterholes	pits	ditches	waterholes	pits	waterholes
<i>n a</i>	52	14	58	70	102	31	4	7	25	1	22	7
%												
<i>Cattle</i>	17	43	16	29	25	35		14	24		45	29
<i>Sheep</i>	75	43	69	50	56	42	75	72	60	100	36	43
<i>Pig</i>	8	7	16	16	12	19	25	14	24		9	29
<i>Horse</i>		7		6	7	3					9	
<i>% identified in total sample</i>	12	17	17	24	21	11	10	7	11	7	11	12
<i>% burnt</i>	17	6	11	3	7	12	2	21	12	20	8	12
<i>Density of all fragments per bucketful</i>	9	7	10	5c	7c	8	4	7	4	5	17	5
<i>Density of burnt fragments per bucketful</i>	1.6	0.4	1.1	0.2c	0.5c	0.9	0.1	1.4	0.4	1	1.3	0.6

a) Allowance made for inclusion of other species frequencies

b) 3 species comparison between pit X 2 >/- 3.84 not significant p = 0.5 (fragment frequencies not percentages were tested)

c) Approximate figures for F200, F206 = may be overestimated

Table 19: Chi square results of testing tallies of sheep and pig bones against cattle and horse for different feature types (Table 14) in 2 x 2 contingency tables at the 5 % level of significance

<i>EIA p N</i>					
<i>EIA p S</i>	4.76 a				
<i>Other IA p</i>	0.00 +	5.89			
<i>dF200/203</i>	3.54	2.00	4.90		
<i>dF206</i>	3.26	1.01	4.58	0.01	
<i>IA d</i>	4.02 a	0.09	5.25	0.60	0.31
	<i>EIA p N</i>	<i>EIA p S</i>	<i>IA p d 200</i>	<i>d 206</i>	<i>IA d</i>

Table 20: Percentages of head, foot and body bones of sheep and cattle among sieved and unsieved debris

<i>Period</i>	<i>Sheep</i>			<i>Cattle</i>		
	<i>IA-RB</i>	<i>IA-RB</i>	<i>IA-RB</i>	<i>IA-RB</i>	<i>IA-RB</i>	<i>IA-RB</i>
<i>Feature type</i>	<i>Pits</i>	<i>Ditches</i>	<i>Unsieved</i>	<i>Pits</i>	<i>Ditches</i>	<i>Unsieved</i>
<i>No.</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>%</i>
			<i>range n>50</i>			<i>range n>50</i>
<i>Head</i>	46	45	17 to 30	28	34	6 to 39
<i>Feet</i>	21	18	13 to 25	32	15	13 to 25
<i>Body</i>	33	36	51 to 63	40	52	37 to 64
<i>Loose teeth</i>	29	31	2 to 11	16	15	0 to 12
<i>Mandible</i>	8	11	9 to 23	4	18	nc
<i>Ventelova</i>	11	10	0 to 10	16	13	7 to 21
<i>Small bones</i>	10	11	0 to 4	12	6	41 to 34
<i>Radius and Tibia</i>	13	13	19 to 47	4	-	nc
<i>Degradation index</i>	51	55	22 to 72	nc	nc	nc
<i>X² testing of to ma ti and ra versus other fragments where X² >/- 3.84 (ldf and p >/- 0.05</i>			$X^2 = 0.32$			

Table 21: Frequencies and percentages of four skeletal elements of Iron age and Roman sheep obtained by normal excavation and by sieving (explanation on actual sheet)

	<i>Normal excavation</i>		<i>All elements obtained by sieving</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	
<i>To.</i>	51	13	62	57	113
<i>Ma.</i>	97	25	19	18	116
<i>ra.</i>	106	27	15	14	121
<i>ti.</i>	136	35	12	11	148
Total	390		108		498

Table 22: Frequencies and percentages of other sieved elements of iron Age and Roman sheep obtained by normal excavation and sieving

	Unsieved bones		Sieved bones	
	(Major feature groups)		All elements collected	
	f	%	f	%
<i>hc</i>	8	2	4	4
<i>cr</i>	31	8	8	8
<i>mx</i>	2	1	2	2
<i>ve</i>	27	8	21	22
<i>sc</i>	26	7	3	3
<i>pe</i>	29	8	1	1
<i>hu</i>	41	12	5	5
<i>fe</i>	30	8	8	8
<i>ul</i>	12	3	5	5
<i>mc</i>	56	16	4	4
<i>mt</i>	72	20	14	14
<i>ca</i>	6	2	4	4
<i>ast</i>	2	1	2	2
<i>jt</i>	1		1	1
<i>ph1</i>	10	3	7	7
<i>ph2</i>			5	5
<i>ph3</i>			3	3
Total	353		97	

Table 23: Frequencies and percentages of elements of Iron Age and Roman sheep to indicate the overall difference in the recovery of small identifiable bones (explanation of method on sheet)

	<i>Normal recovery</i>		<i>Sieving</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>
<i>to, ve, carpal, tarsal and phalangeal bones</i>	97	13	105	51	148
<i>Other elements recorded</i>	646	87	100	49	746
<i>Total</i>	743		205		948

Table 24: Frequencies and percentages of elements of Iron age and Roman sheep in order to compare the indices of degradation in groups of sieved and unsieved bones

	<i>Normally collected</i>		<i>Sieved</i>		<i>Total f</i>
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	
<i>to, ma, ra and ti and index of degradation %</i>	390	52	108	53	498
<i>Other skeletal elements</i>	353	48	97	47	450
<i>Total</i>	743		205		948

Table 25: Indices of bone degradation from sieved bones of sheep according to type of feature. Explanation on additional sheet

	<i>Pits</i>		<i>Ditches</i>					
	<i>EIA N</i>	<i>EIA S</i>	<i>Iap</i>	<i>Sax p</i>	<i>c/200/203</i>	<i>d 206</i>	<i>od</i>	<i>RB</i>
<i>n</i>	45	6	35	10	35	57	13	16
<i>%</i>								
<i>Loose teeth</i>	24	17	40		31	25	23	56
<i>Degradation index from sieved bones</i>	44	33	66	10	46	51	69	75
<i>Degradation index from unsieved bones</i>	34	43	43	nc	66	48	62 - 64	54 - 61

Table 26: Percentages of head, foot and body bones of sheep in sieved debris collected by different methods

Period Sampling Sieving	All groups are comprised of Iron Age and Roman bone debris				
	Random mostly wet pits	ditches	Judgement dry pits	d.F200, 203 and 206	Random wet d. 200, 203, 206
n	38	38	51	78	13
%					
Head	50	58	43	41	46
Foot	18	11	24	22	15
Body	32	32	33	37	38
Teeth	37	42	24	26	38
Mandible	11	13	6	9	
Vertebra	11	5	12	12	15
Small bones	5	5	14	10	
Radius and Tibia	16	16	12	12	23
Degradation index (sieved b) %	63	71	41	46	62
X ² testing at frequency of to, ma, ti, and ra versus other elements, where X ² >/- 3.84 at p .05 and ldf.			6.67	5.42	
		3.38			
			2.32		
				2.24	

Table 27: Frequencies and percentages of four elements of Iron Age and Roman sheep obtained by different methods of sampling and sieving (additional information on separate sheet)

<i>Sampling Sieving</i>	<i>Random</i>		<i>Judgement</i>		<i>Total f</i>
	<i>mostly wet f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>dry f</i>	<i>%</i>	
<i>to</i>	30	59	32	56	62
<i>ma</i>	9	18	10	18	19
<i>ra</i>	7	14	8	14	15
<i>ti</i>	5	10	7	12	12
<i>Total f</i>	51		57		108

Table 28: frequencies and percentages of other sieved elements of Iron Age and Roman sheep obtained by different methods of sampling and sieving

Sampling Sieving	Random mostly wet		Judgement dry	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>hc</i>	1	4	3	4
<i>cr</i>	1	4	7	10
<i>mx</i>			2	3
<i>ve</i>	6	24	15	21
<i>sc</i>	2	8	1	1
<i>pe</i>			1	1
<i>hu</i>	1	4	4	6
<i>fe</i>	2	8	6	8
<i>ul</i>	1	4	4	6
<i>mc</i>	2	8	2	3
<i>mt</i>	5	20	9	13
<i>ca</i>			4	6
<i>ast</i>			2	3
<i>jt</i>			1	1
<i>ph1</i>	2	8	5	7
<i>ph2</i>	1	4	4	6
<i>ph3</i>	1	4	2	3
Total	25		72	

Table 29:

	<i>Pits</i>				<i>Ditches</i>				<i>Waterholes</i>	
	<i>EIA P a</i>	<i>EIA p 2 a</i>	<i>MIA and unphase IA p a</i>	<i>LIA - RB</i>	<i>F200, 203 and 206</i>	<i>Other IA d</i>	<i>RB</i>	<i>IA</i>	<i>RB</i>	
<i>n (a)</i>	178	66	86	42	228	150	246	51	63	
	37	42	52	45	53	64	55	71	70	
<i>Index of degradation X² testing of frequencies of the degradation indices where X² > 3.84 at p 0.05: 1 df</i>			5.33			3.98				

a) includes features which were extensively bulk sieved for bones.

Table 30:

<i>Feature group</i>	<i>Bucketfuls of soil</i>	<i>Total weight of bone (g)</i>	<i>Mean weight (g) / bucketful</i>	<i>% of bones by weight (a) identified</i>	<i>% of bones by weight (b) burnt</i>	<i>% of species weight among identified bones</i>						
						<i>Cattle</i>	<i>Sheep</i>	<i>Pig</i>	<i>Horse</i>	<i>Dog</i>	<i>Rodent</i>	<i>Human</i>
<i>Random sampling</i>												
<i>IA-R ditch</i>	53	1508	28	73	3.9	86	8	4			0.8	
<i>IA ditches and gullies</i>	72	804	11	72	3.3	56	21	7	14	1		
<i>RB ditches and gullies</i>	36	561	16	62	3.6	71	8	18			2.9	
<i>Judgement sampling</i>												
<i>IA - R pits</i>	56	1990	36	72	5.3	39	16	14	30 b		0.2	0.1
<i>IA ditches/gullies</i>	120 - 210	4056	19 - 34 (c)	78	2.2	61	11	6	21	1		0.1
<i>Totals</i>												
<i>IA-R pits</i>	109	3498	32	72	4.7	60	13	10	17			0.4
<i>IA-R ditches</i>	228 - 318	5531	17 - 24 (c)	75	2.6	61	12	7	18	1	0.1	0.4
<i>Totals</i>	327 - 427	9029	21 - 27 (c)	74	3.4	60.5	12.4	8.3	17.5	0.7		0.4

a) Ditches F200, 203 and 206

b) Presence of one large horse bone

c) Probable figure