




1



3




4



5



6



7




8



9




10




11




13




22




23



24



25



26




27

Knowledge organisation paradata (KOP)			
Column	Transformation to data units (DU)	Transformation to archaeological information (AI)	Knowledge-making paradata (KMP)
A*			
B	Relating to site	Contextualising within site defined by the project	Reflects conceptualisation of 'site'
C*	Relating to province	Situating to province	Reflects foregrounded geographical entities
D*	Relating to county	Situating to county	Reflects foregrounded geographical entities
E*	Relating to parish	Situating to parish	Reflects foregrounded geographical entities
F	Relating to origin in between journal	Documenting in between and flow	

**Data tells about itself – when you can read it.**

Börjesson, L., Sköld, O., Friberg, Z., Löwenborg, D., Pålsson, G., & Huvila, I. (2022). Re-purposing Excavation Database Content as Paradata: An Explorative Analysis of Paradata Identification Challenges and Opportunities. *KULA: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination, and Preservation Studies*, 6(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.18357/kula.224>


28



29




30




31




32



35



36



38




39



40



41



42



43




44



45



46



47