The historiography of landscape research on Crete

Gkiasta, M.

APPENDIX TWO

'SURVEYS' DATABASE: DEFINITION OF DATABASE FIELDS AND DISCUSSION OF TERMS USED

TABLE NAME: SURVEYS

Field Name	Field properties	Combo box values	Explanatory comments
survey id	text		Primary key
location	text		Area within Crete in which the survey took place.
aims	combo box		This field consists of a basic classification of aims so as to clarify the context within which research was undertaken and allow us to study relationships with methods and results The following classification of aims has resulted after grouping together the aims of 35 research projects.
		describe Crete	This class has been primarily the aim of Travellers; usually their interest is in providing a picture of the island, which includes history, natural environment and ethnography.
		describe known sites	Focus on correcting site lists and providing more information.
		describe known sites & discover new	Within the framework of making site inventories.
		discover new sites	Within the framework of making site inventories.
		discover new & settlement geography	Explanation of settlement in relation to geography (within Human Geography tradition). Interest in discovering new sites also, but ones that are relevant to a specific problem orientation.
		urban survey	The study of a single site. Effort to identify remains and extents per period.

		urban & context survey	The study of a site in combination with research of its immediate area, so as to understand the history and character of the site through its relationship to the environment and other sites.
		regional settlement history	Interest in reconstructing the settlement history of a region and study site interrelationships.
		context survey and regional settlement history	Reconstruction of the settlement history of a region over time is triggered by interest in a specific site.
		settlement geography	The aim is to explain settlement location through detailed geographical studies.
site type focus	combo box		
		all site-types	
		site and off-site data	
		settlements	
		road systems	
		refuge sites	
time scale	combo box		
		specific period/s	
		multi-period	
		period/s aim, multi-period recording	
		intentionally diachronic	

period aim	combo box	Palaeo/Meso, N/FN/EM I, PRE-PAL, PAL, PH, LM IIIC/PG, G-O-A, CL-HL, HL-R, R-LR, GR, BYZ, VEN, TUR, BVT, Modern	Palaeolithic/Mesolithic, Neolithic/Final Neolithic/Early Minoan I, Pre-palatial, Palatial, Prehistoric, Late Minoan IIIC/ Proto-Geometric, Geometric-Orientalising-Archaic, Classical-Hellenistic, Hellenistic-Roman, Roman-Late Roman, Graeco-Roman, Byzantine, Venetian, Turkish, Byzantine-Venetian-Turkish, Modern.
multi-period recording	combo box	PH-GR, PH- Arab conquest, PH-BYZ, PH-VEN, PH-TUR, PH-MOD, GR-MOD	
tradition	combo box		The field consists of the main traditions in landscape archaeology, each tradition corresponding to landscape research approaches that share common features. The aims and methods are the main criteria used to classify projects into traditions. Worth noting that although there is some general sequence in time, traditions may co-exist and do not necessarily relate to a linear development. Besides that, traditions share many common characteristics.
		Travellers	Their interests vary and are wider than those of older and contemporary antiquarians. When interested in ancient times their method is similar to that of antiquaries, namely the use of philological and ancient sources and the search for places named in ancient texts. Their interest in past material culture is however balanced with their interest in their contemporary material culture, history, geography, ethnography etc.
		Human Geography	The focus in this tradition is on the relationships between geography and settlement, often seen in a diachronic perspective. Research studies how environmental potential may affect locational choice and seeks patterns of relationships between human activity and physical environment, which are interpreted from a socio-economic perspective. Maps are a crucial part of the method of study and interpretation.

		Topographic	The Topographic Tradition focuses on the recording of site topography, and intra-site architectural mapping, but also on specific site-types whose function and interpretation is heavily depended on topography, e.g. roads and military locations. There are close links with the Culture-History tradition, but also with Human Geography. The typical characteristic of this tradition is the detailed inspection of small areas. Interpretation is guided by topographic studies and research is triggered by interest in specific sites.
		Culture-History	Site inventories and indexes are the main goal of archaeologists within this tradition, who walk the landscape extensively in an effort to enrich archaeological maps. They often focus on one period of interest, which in the case of Crete is the Minoan. Site accounts may include topographic descriptions and architectural recording. The term 'Culture-History' is used here in order to stress the emphasis given to material culture and its spread, to detailed descriptions and typologies. It does not carry the negative meaning of constructing cultures on the basis of material culture condemned by New Archaeology in the case of New World archaeology (see chapter 1).
		Landscape Archaeology	In Crete this tradition starts in the 70's within the framework of settlement archaeology and under the influence of New Archaeology. Researchers adopt a regional approach, seeking patterns of correlations between environmental factors and human activity and asking questions regarding social complexity. They focus on methodology that can allow quantitative measures and promote the intensity of landscape walking. Multi-disciplinarity and an interest in diachronic reconstructions are typical characteristics of this tradition. There are of course influences of all previous traditions and quite often, projects represent the crossroad between them.
people-environment	combo box		
		environmental potential	The environment is studied on the basis of the opportunities it offers to subsistence.
		environmental background	Environmental studies are presented as a separate study in order to place human activity in a context. Correlations between environment and people are not much discussed and there is an implicit belief of a 'common sense' relationship.

		man-env/ment interrelationships	Environmental studies are integrated with archaeological data, in an explanatory framework of how the environment has influenced human societies, and what impact human activity had on the environment. In the best examples, the history of man-environment interactions is studied as landscape ecology.
		basic mention	There are only occasional mentions of environmental characteristics.
choice of area	combo box		The reasons why an area is chosen to be studied are usually stated by the researchers.
		previous exploration	There is a history of archaeological research, sometimes rather intensive. When many sites are known in an area, research focuses on more complex questions of site interrelationships.
		not much previous exploration	The lack of adequate – if any – previous work has often triggered archaeological landscape explorations.
		site(s) of interest in the area	
		topographic characteristics	There is a particular interest in topography.
site definition	memo		The researchers' definitions when available.
rescue	yes/no		
resurvey	yes/no		
multi-disciplinary	yes/no		
environmental studies	yes/no		
date	text		Always the beginning of project
Researcher/s	text		

TABLE NAME: DATA OBSERVED

Field Name	Field properties	Combo box values	Explanatory comments
survey id	text		
variability of archaeological observations	combo box		This field relates to the method of measurement of archaeological remains, or else what is a 'significant archaeological remain' (Orton 2000:28).
		standing monuments	
		ancient architecture & pottery presence	
		pottery concentrations	Observation of higher numbers of sherds in relation to neighbouring areas, but no measurements.
		pottery densities (measured)	In the case of intensive surveys which follow a specific sampling strategy.
routes	combo box		
		consistently	
		occasionally	
elevation	combo box	same as 'routes'	
distance from sea	combo box	same as 'routes'	
descriptive topography	combo box	same as 'routes'	
soils	combo box	same as 'routes'	
landuse	combo box	same as 'routes'	
land potential	combo box	same as 'routes'	
vegetation	combo box	same as 'routes'	

water sources	combo box	same as ‘routes’	
clay sources	combo box	same as ‘routes’	
stone sources	combo box	same as ‘routes’	
mineral sources	combo box	same as ‘routes’	
pollen cores	yes/no		
climate	yes/no		

TABLE NAME: FIELDMETHODS-SAMPLING

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
Survey id	text	
extensive judgmental walking	yes/no	Typical of older traditions, but not only. Archaeological knowledge of site (usually settlement) location is used in the search of new sites.
extensive judgmental driving	yes/no	
extensive random	yes/no	
intensive no sampling	yes/no	Usually based on topographic or geomorphological units it is characteristic of the first projects in the Landscape Tradition. People decide on a day-to-day basis which part of their survey area they will walk, e.g. a particular slope, and they try to explore it as well as possible looking for architectural remains and pottery concentrations. No formal quantification of the data takes place (unless modern techniques employed e.g. San Lorenzo[1]). In the context of the present work densities are estimated upon an assumed person-day work.
intensive sampling	yes/no	A specific sampling strategy is applied.
sampling strategy	memo	e.g. stratified, intensive random, random, etc. In Crete the sample is usually stratified upon environmental criteria.

target population in km²	text	The area stated as the survey boundary. Interpretations usually refer to the whole survey area for which permit was acquired, or which was of interest.
target population on the map	text	The area presented as the survey boundary in maps published. Maps were geo-referenced and the area shown as surveyed was calculated. This figure is used instead of the above field (target population) when it is not stated how big an area was surveyed.
sampled population in km²	text	The result of sampling the target area. This is the sample, which is chosen to be walked.
sampling fraction (%)	text	The percentage which the sample constitutes out of the target population
sampling frame	memo	A list of units measured, which form the sample e.g. grid units, field units, transect lines etc
sampling interval in m	text	The space between field-walkers.
area actually seen in km²	text	The area actually seen out of the sampled population: unless stated otherwise, it is calculated according to the precision estimated. In the case of Ziros survey, where target and sampled population coincided, this is called 'sample'.
precision (%)	text	This figure represents the area scanned by human eyes when walking and is based on the assumption that each walker sees clearly 1m either side. It is estimated upon sampling interval, if e.g. S.I.=15m, 2m out of the 15 are seen, which is 13.33 %. Thus, we have an estimate of the percentage of the area actuallly covered in relation to the sample area. The term should not be confused with accuracy and it is not directly relevant to how precise the number of sites found is. Architecture for example may be spotted 5 or 10m away from a walker's path. A few obsidian flakes or EBA sherds however, would not. Precision should in fact be expressed in ranges of numbers, but is never estimated by researchers.
proportion of unit walked (%)	text	The percentage of the area actually covered per unit, assuming that each fieldwalker can cover a 2m-wide swath and taking into account the number of walkers within the unit.
visibility correction	yes/no	
data recorded	memo	e.g. material finds, landuse, environmental etc. More details are given in the table 'data observed'.
recording method	memo	How archaeological data are recorded. Text description.
average off-site density	text	if stated

average site density	text	if stated
number of fieldwalkers	text	
duration in days	text	1 month (or 4 weeks) is taken to be 25 days although this may slightly vary between projects
area coverable (km²) in person days	text	This figure is estimated upon the assumption that each fieldwalker can cover on average 0,002 km² a day, or else he walks about 1km (ten 100-m tracts) covering a 2m swath .
on-site sampling	memo	Method of sampling e.g. grid, grab, transects, sample along axes etc.
comments	memo	
people x time : area	Text	The relationship between number of people involved in fieldwalking, the time spent and the area covered (target population). When the number of fieldwalkers varies, the average is used. no of people x time spent : area covered. This field is used in order to give a comparable figure between surveys.

TABLE NAME: MULTI-DISCIPLINARITY

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
survey id	text	primary key
Ethnography	yes/no	Ethnographic studies in Crete relate to the traditional mode of living based on agriculture and pastoralism and describe relevant activities, customs and habits.
Social Anthropology	yes/no	Interested in social relationships and identity within the community, it also includes current landuse and relationship between people and the landscape.
Historical Ecology	yes/no	It is the field that studies the history of ecology, namely past ecosystems via charting changes in the landscape, that is changes in the physical environment, plant and animal activities, but also anthropogenic changes. Methods adopted in the Sphakia survey: a) study of present vegetation, b) field recording of fields, terraces etc, c) written records, d) archaeological finds like ancient timber and e) study of soils, sediments, pollen and plant remains.

Historical Data	yes/no	
Geomorphology	yes/no	Most common in the Landscape Tradition, it is very important for the understanding of the surface record and the history of landscape change.
Geology	yes/no	
Fabrics Analysis	yes/no	The study of fabrics helps to establish chronological sequences and resolve provenance issues.
Geophysics	yes/no	At urban surveys, usually in combination with topographic mapping of architecture and excavation.
GIS	yes/no	Geographical Information Systems
IT	yes/no	Information Technology
Remote Sensing	yes/no	Satellite imagery, aerial photography.

TABLE NAME: PRESENTATION

Field Name	Field properties	Combo Box Values	Explanatory comments
survey id	text		
locational info	combo box		The way in which the location of sites is described.
		descriptive	Location is described in terms of distances, direction and time from known or 'easily' found places in the landscape (e.g. villages or topographic features).
		tract number	Other terms: field unit, grid unit
		map coordinates	Map correlation may be required as not the same reference system has always been used.
		gps coordinates	Global Positioning System coordinates
topographic maps scale	text		Topographic maps are basically contour maps, also with roads, spot-heights etc.
geology maps scale	text		

soil maps scale	text		
land-potential maps scale	text		
location of area			General and crude area size
area boundary			More precise boundaries, usually in intensive surveys
general site map			
functions site maps			
period site maps			
density maps			Maps with pottery densities in the form of quantity ranges, presented as a continuous surface.
field units (tracts)			Tracts mapped in the survey area. In Phaistos survey off-site density maps are used to portray pottery spreads of definite or possible occurrence for the various chronological periods, but we do not know how much of it. Kavousi shows again a binary map with fields walked 'intensive' and 'less intensive'.
field forms			Some want to clarify their recording procedures and methodology of data observation. Linked to being 'politically correct'.
graphs	yes/no		
tables	yes/no		
architectural plans	yes/no		May also be plans of other structures e.g. quarries.
geomorphological sketch-maps			
section / stratigraphy plans	yes/no		It shows attention to subsurface.

topographical plans	Yes/no		Plans of the surface showing sites or monuments and topographical and landscape features such as roads, rivers, contours, churches and settlements. The aim is to record accurately the horizontal spread of material culture, the spatial relationships between material culture/sites and topography and the information that assist relocatability. Links with the Topographic Tradition and the detailed architectural mapping of a site (Itanos, Praisos).
topographical sketch-maps			Schematic maps that show approximately the horizontal spread of sites in relation to basic topographic features, e.g. a road, contours (usually no heights given), a river etc. Toponyms may also be given. Such sketch maps provide a visual illustration of the surroundings of sites and help its relocation.
Topographical drawings			Focus on portraying topography, usually of a site, with precise mapping of material remains and other features.
architectural sketch-maps			The aim is to show the horizontal spread of monuments. Basic topographic characteristics may be given schematically, but there is no attention to detail. The relationship between material culture and topography may not be at real scales. Links with Topographic Tradition, but not detailed measuring of spatial relationships.
distribution of finds			Spread of pottery types and other finds. In Katelionas, spread of walls and cairns.
object drawings	yes/no		
object photos			Objects could be architectural walls.
landscape photos	yes/no		Landscape here refers to a concept of space as opposed to object.
aerial/satellite photos			
art drawings	yes/no		Mainly in Travellers. Art drawings of landscape or everyday life themes they discuss.
Schematic diagrams	yes/no		To present e.g. models

TABLE NAME: THEORETICAL / INTERPRETATIVE FRAMEWORK

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
survey id	Text	
surface record bias / recoverability	yes/no	Various biases of the surface record including the relationship between surface/subsurface are considered, whether in a systematic manner when the effects of visibility and geomorphology are studied, or through more general speculations. Survey results are seen with greater attention and the reconstructed pictures of human activity in space over time carry a factor of uncertainty, subject to the data available. At best, different options and possibilities may be suggested or at least taken into account during the interpretative process. Usually however, there are only comments upon surface biases, and it does not seem that there is any conscious effort to assess biases' impact on results.
certain-possible sites distinction	yes/no	Occasionally some researchers make a distinction between certain and possible sites, even though the term 'site' may be meant in various ways. Possible sites, however, do not play a formal, clear role in interpretations. Moreover, it is rarely clear if there is such a distinction or if it is considered self-evident.
description of arch/cal remains	yes/no	A descriptive record of archaeological remains for every site.
geographical descriptions / potential	yes/no	The description of the geographical settings of sites has been a standard procedure in all traditions of landscape research. Site location is often considered in relation to geography and its potential. Geographical impact on sites may be taken as self-explanatory, or at times thoroughly discussed.
historical narrative of settlement	yes/no	
trade / contacts	yes/no	
ecology	yes/no	The scientific study of the interactions between organisms and their environment (Begon *et al* 1990). Focus on the physical environment and its subsistence potential. Site location is often explained on the grounds of geography and ecology. Studies on fauna, flora etc.

cultural ecology	yes/no	It focuses attention on cultural components that influence human interaction with particular physical environments. Evolution is conceived in ecological terms as the adaptation of culture to a specific environment and research methodology includes studies of carrying capacity, SCA, risk (risk minimisation), seasonality and cost-benefit analysis. For Kirch (1981), it is the discipline which seeks an understanding of the functional integration of physical and organic components of environment as a total system.
core-periphery	yes/no	A concept forwarded by Renfrew, stressing the linear economic relationships between a controlling centre and a controlled periphery, which result also in social and political control. The balance of relationships may change in time and the periphery may become core. Related concepts: redistribution model, world systems theory, Marxism.
theory development/test	yes/no	The adoption of a deductive way of thought, where data are sought to prove or disprove a hypothesis. Such an approach was developed within a Middle Range Theory framework.
statistics	yes/no	Statistical analysis is used as an analytical tool, leading to interpretations with a measurable degree of credibility.
hierarchy	yes/no	Hierarchy is a much favoured theme among archaeologists working in Crete. It is based mainly on site size differences, which are taken to correspond to economic and population variations, on a rather linear scale (big=rich=with greater control over other sites). Apart from studying inter-site relationships and social organization, it has also been used as a method for inter-period comparison (in the case of Sphakia they tried to build hierarchies for PH, GR & BVT so as to be able to compare these so different periods).
heterarchy	yes/no	The examination of competition within systems, which can lead to social transformation. The concept favours decentralisation and ideological relationships, promoting a dynamic idea of systemic change on a horizontal level, rather than linear causal and law-like relationships of a systemic thought. Relevant concept: the Peer Polity model (Renfrew & Cherry 1986).
territoriality	yes/no	The concept explores spheres of economic, ideological or other influences. Some sites are seen as having a wide territory of influence and economic exploitation. Usually linked to hierarchy.
dispersal/nucleation	yes/no	This is the most favourite theme in the Landscape Tradition; the quantity in relation to the size of sites is used to infer habitation patterns, economic strategies, and socio-political circumstances.
immigration	yes/no	It may be used as an explanation to population fluctuations and material culture changes.

warfare / defence	yes/no	The material record is recognised as revealing times of warfare and the need for defence (fortifications, refuge settlements). Population fluctuations and settlement movements may be explained as a result of warfare, whether seen as external attacks, or internal conflicts.
population estimates	yes/no	There is an interest in the number of people a site or a region may have supported and perhaps also population size-changes. The theme is relevant to site character and its importance or role in a hierarchical scheme.
chronological gaps(why)	yes/no	The interest in trying to explain chronological 'gaps' in the archaeological record. These may be considered as genuine, or as a result of survey biases, e.g. due to the little known pottery of some periods.
cultural continuity	yes/no	Researchers note cultural continuity between chronological periods and identify cultural behaviour that is common over time. There is an interest in historical continuity when describing transition from one distinct period to another, stressing behaviours and ideology that lasts over time as opposed to sharp changes which imply sudden transformations in ethnicity and/or political life.
regional variation	yes/no	Emphasis is given to regional variation as opposed to a unified picture of cultural behaviour. Cultural influences may spread dissimilarly across the island.
island wide patterns	yes/no	The idea of unified patterns across the island is favoured. Cultural unity and a unified Minoan civilisation is stressed. Relevant themes: Knosian control, Minoan state, Minoan sites throughout the island.
use of analogy	yes/no	Ethnographic studies or the results of other surveys are used; e.g. in Mesara environmental reconstruction is compared with that in the southern Argolid and pre-industrial economic strategies are studied as indicative of prehistoric times. Analogy in cultural and environmental factors may be used as evidence of socio-economic systems and change between them. Used mainly within a systemic approach.
correlative approach	yes/no	Observation of the correlations between variables, usually sites in relation to environmental factors; e.g. such sites happen to be located in such topography, soil, altitude etc. If only a correlative approach is used explanation on the reasons of identified patterns is not pursued and no attention is paid on the exception from the pattern.
explanatory approach	yes/no	Correlations may be observed but explanation is pursued. Settlement location, inter-spatial relationships and relationship to the environment are discussed in terms of subsistence economy, trade, social structure etc. Social explanations are sought when discussing settlement pattern changes and there is an effort to answer 'whys'.
comparability	yes/no	There is an interest in applying similar methods to other surveys so that results can be compared or there is at least some consideration of comparability problems. Characteristic problem orientation of the Landscape Tradition.

comparison with other areas	yes/no	Mainly inside Crete, but also in the wider Aegean.
View	yes/no	The view from a site. Related to aesthetic values, it reminds us of phenomenological concepts.
Visibility	yes/no	Visibility of a site, seen as a factor that played an influential role in the decision of its location. Visibility is typically considered in relation to peak sanctuaries and refuge sites.

TABLE NAME: INTERPRETATIONS

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
Survey id	text	
PH pattern	memo	Summary of text description of the period
GR pattern	memo	
BVT pattern	memo	
gaps	memo	
other	memo	

TABLE NAME: CHRONOLOGY / FUNCTIONS

Field Name	Field properties	Combo box values	Explanatory comments
survey id	text		primary key
site id	text		primary key

Researchers' text/ comments	Memo		Researchers' interpretations/clarifications
Neolithic	combo box		
		settlement	Extensive spread and large quantity of pottery usually in combination with walls. Interpretations such as hamlet, village, and town are also included in this class. Densities around a settlement may be interpreted as settlement-related activity or occupation areas and are not given a separate site id. A settlement of a period that has only a few sherds of another period is not characterized as settlement in all periods, but rather as an occupation site, or unknown activity when material is said to be sparse. Other terms used: settlement and burial, settlement and ritual, permanent installation.
		settlement?	
		habitation	It can be a quite large pottery spread without walls, a building or two interpreted as farms/ farmsteads, isolated houses, villas, huts, refuges, caves, rock-shelters, dispersed settlement of a few houses around. A habitation is usually permanent but it may also be seasonal. Sometimes there may have been burial or religious activity in occupation sites. Other terms used: occupation, habitation and burial, habitation and ritual, house(s), buildings of megalithic or Cyclopean structure (mostly dated in the palatial times and interpreted as 'large farmsteads' or guard-posts. Complex of farm buildings (Lasithi).
		habitation?	Pottery with walls when no interpretative suggestion is given (Vrokastro). The question mark may express uncertainty over researchers' interpretations about a specific period when the site is known to have been a settlement or occupation site at other periods. This includes interpretations such as 'habitation and/or burial', 'habitation and/or ritual.
		habitation/settlement	
		ritual	Temples, sanctuaries, peak-sanctuaries, churches, monasteries, heroons.
		ritual?	
		burial	Cemeteries, tombs, graves, ossuaries, pithos burials. burial may also include ritual

		burial?	
		defence site	Guard-posts or guard houses or 'Minoan Stations' (stressing a guard over route role), watch-towers, forts, towers, castles, defensive structures. Guard houses have sometimes been considered as habitation sites.
		defence site?	
		agro-pastoral activity	Terminology used includes agricultural terraces, enclosure walls, mitata, bee-hives, thressing floors, caves, pyres, storage, seasonal camps (FN/EMI), field houses or metochia (usually for Ven-Turk-Mod). These sites are often seasonal habitation sites. However, remains of field-houses from the PH period are interpreted as habitation sites.
		agro-pastoral activity?	
		Installation/Construction /industrial activity	mill, kiln, anchorage, port, quarry, road, road terrace, aqueduct, clay source, path, well, drain, bridge, retaining wall, theatre, cistern, dump, tank, dam.
		Installation/Construction /industrial activity?	
		unknown activity	A site of unknown activity could be an occupation or agricultural site, a cave of unknown function or whatever else. Usually evidence is not adequate for archaeologists to decide on a specific function. Sites with no interpretations also go in this field, even if settlement activity is probably implied due to the size of the site (e.g.Lasithi). This class is also used in cases where in a settlement a few sherds of a different period were found and this period is not assigned a function, or for parts of a settlement described as separate sites (mainly in urban surveys). Distinction between the class 'unknown activity' and 'presence' is not always clear. Typical site descriptions: a few sherds of xxxperiod, building or structure with no further interpretation, megalithic terracing, walls, walling, ruins, pavement, mosaic, stairway etc. In cases where habitation is defined as 'houses' and the term 'occupation' is also used, the latter is taken to be of an unknown function character e.g. Hood Knossos.

		presence	Spolia, relocated fragments of masonry, a few sherds not considered enough for a site status, isolated finds. Also finds reported by others or rumours; probably a site in the area but exact location not known. It is not always possible to distinguish between presence and unknown activity when quantities are not stated. difficult to be consistent as usually up to 5 sherds should be 'presence' but in some cases researchers may actually assess a site on the basis of 1-3 sherds!
		various findspots	
		not specified	In particular in the Minoan Roads Project, it is not sites that are classified, but areas; these are described as having a specific number of sites and altogether correspond to a variety of uses/functions, but we do not know the function of every site.
Neolithic?		Same as 'Neolithic'	
LN/FN/EM I		Same as 'Neolithic'	Late Neolithic/Final Neolithic/Early Minoan I
LN/FN/EM I?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	
PRE-PALATIAL	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Early Minoan II – III and Middle Minoan IA periods, Early Minoan.
PRE-PALATIAL?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	
PAL- POSTPAL	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	PALATIAL-POSTPALATIAL: The category includes the following chronological characterisations: Middle Minoan IB - Late Minoan IIIB, MM I (when there is no distinction between MM IA and MM IB), Middle Minoan, Late Minoan.
PAL-POSTPAL?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	PALATIAL-POSTPALATIAL? :Also MM I when the main period of site is pre-palatial
PREHISTORIC	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	From Neolithic to the end of the Bronze Age. This field includes all sites which were assigned a more specific chronological period/s from N to final BA, including the transition and continuation from one period to the other, as well as sites for which dating could not be more accurate than 'prehistoric', 'Bronze Age' or 'Minoan'. If a site was occupied in more than one sub-periods in the prehistoric period, it is still treated as 1 prehistoric site. This field includes also 'LM IIIC/PG' interpretations if these are not only PG.

PREHISTORIC?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	
LM IIIC/PG	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Late Minoan IIIC/Proto-Geometric: either of these periods, both, or the transition from one period to the other; the category includes Proto-Geometric (PG) and Sub-Minoan sites.
LM IIIC/PG?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	
G-O-A	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Geometric-Orientalising-Archaic: Either of these periods, or the continuation from one period to the other. Also Iron Age, Early Iron Age.
G-O-A?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Also Greek, Hellenic.
CL-HL	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Classical - Hellenistic: Classical, or the continuation from one period to the other.
CL-HL?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Also Greek, Hellenic.
HL-R	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Hellenistic - Roman: Hellenistic, or the continuation from one period to the other. Also Hellenic (or Greek) and Roman, Early Roman.
HL-R?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	
R-LR	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Roman - Late Roman: Either of the two periods, or the continuation from one period to the other. The term LR is usually used till about the 8th (or even 9th) century A.D., thus an early Christian basilica would be classified in this period.
R-LR?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	
GR	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	Graeco-Roman: From Geometric to Late Roman. This field includes all sites which were assigned a more specific chronological period/s from G to LR, including the transition and continuation from one period to the other, as well as sites described simply as Greek, GR or ‘Greek and Roman’. GR is often used when material can not be dated with accuracy. If a site was occupied in more than one sub-period in the GR period, it is still treated as 1 GR site. This field includes also ‘LM IIIC/PG’ interpretations (if not only LM IIIC). Also Greek, Hellenic, Graeco-Roman, ancient (implying GR e.g. ‘ancient cities’)
GR?	combo box	Same as ‘Neolithic’	

BYZ	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Byzantine: from about the 8th century AD till the Venetian conquest in 1204 AD (or beginning of 13th century). Also Early Medieval. Attention: early Byz interpretations are classified in this category, but the same data could be interpreted as LR by other researchers.
		Same as 'Neolithic'	
BYZ?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	B/V. Included in BVT.
VEN	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Venetian: from about 1204 till Turkish conquest 1666 AD (or mid-17th century depending on area). Also Sites termed 'VT' in Vrokastro.
VEN?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	B/V. Included in BVT. Also V/T
TUR	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Turkish: from mid 17th till 1st world war. Also Sites termed 'VT' (e.g. in Vrokastro).
TUR?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Also V/T
MOD	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Modern: from mid-19th century till the present.
MOD?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	
BVT	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	Byzantine-Venetian-Turkish: Sites of all periods from Byzantine to Modern are included in this field. As with the 'prehistoric' and 'GR' sites, if a site was occupied in more than one periods during this time, it is still treated as 1 site. Also Medieval.
BVT?	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	
unknown	combo box	Same as 'Neolithic'	**1)** Certain sites that their date can not be established – date declared unknown - (e.g. Ayiofar77:W2), remains of an ancient structure, but with no further data (e.g. Praisos:39), **2)** places reported as sites by their researchers, but with no information on their chronology published (e.g. Praisos:26), **3)** possible sites of unknown chronology (e.g. Hood65:C11, Katokhori, Praisos: megalithic terracing in tract 132).

TABLE NAMES: SITIA SITES AND SITIA SITES SUMMARY

These tables are used for chapter 6. Classes are along the same lines as in table 'Chronology / Function'.

TABLE NAME: INTEGRABILITY

Field Name	Field Properties	Combo Box Values	Explanatory Comments
Survey id	text		
Function Definition Confidence	combo box	High, medium-high, medium, medium-low, low.	How confident researchers appear to be of their interpretations. Calculated upon the percentages of certain functions out of all function characterizations in the chronology/ functions table. The estimate is based on the average value, even though confidence may be high in one period and low in another. The values (high, medium-high etc) correspond to percentages of 20: low = 0-20% confidence, medium low = 21-40% etc.
Function Definition Variability	combo box	Same as 'Function Definition Confidence'	Based on the counts of different functions per project. Values (high, medium-high etc) correspond to 5 ranges, defined by the highest and lowest count of functions.
Relocatability	combo box	Same as 'Function Definition Confidence'	
Chronological Definition Precision	combo box	Same as 'Function Definition Confidence'	Assessed on the basis of how specific researchers are in the use of chronological terms, on average. Accuracy can not be estimated because we would have to re-evaluate the material dated. High: distinctions between MM IA and MM IB, early and later phases of periods. Medium High: distinctions between MM I and II, CL, HL, R etc. Medium: EM, MM, CL/HL etc. Medium-low: broad terms e.g. Minoan and only occasional distinctions. Low: prehistoric, Greek or GR, Medieval.
Chronological Definition Variability	combo box	Same as 'Function Definition Confidence'	Based on the counts of different chronological periods per project. Again, values (high, medium-high etc) correspond to 5 ranges, defined by the highest and lowest count of functions.

Chronological Definition Confidence %	number		Based on the proportion of certain chronological characterisations out of the total number of chronological characterisations, including the class of unknown chronology. The table 'total site counts' is used. This is only an approximate estimate as only general chronological periods of PH, GR, BVT and Mod are taken into account and not their sub-periods. There are a few cases where sub-periods are used with question marks by the researchers, but the general period is quoted with certainty.
Assessment of Integrability	combo box	Same as 'Function Definition Confidence'	A rather subjective assessment, which however takes into account the above fields.

TABLE NAME: TOTAL SITE COUNTS

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
survey id	text	primary key
total site count	number	number of sites in site index
possible sites	number	
PH count	number	number of Prehistoric findspots. They may not all be sites as 'presence' is also included
PH? count	number	number of possible Prehistoric sites
Total PH count	number	sum of certain and possible Prehistoric sites
GR count	number	number of GR sites
GR? count	number	number of possible GR sites
Total GR count	number	Sum of certain and possible GR sites
BVT count	number	number of BVT sites
BVT? count	number	number of possible BVT sites
Total BVT count	number	Sum of certain and possible BVT sites

Mod count	number	number of Modern sites
Mod? count	number	number of possible Modern sites
Total Mod count	number	Sum of certain and possible Modern sites
unknown count	number	Number of sites whose chronology is unknown

TABLE NAME: CHRONOLOGICAL VARIABILITY

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
survey id	text	
Palaeo/Meso	yes/no	Palaeolithic / Mesolithic
Neolithic	yes/no	
EN	yes/no	Early Neolithic
EN I	yes/no	
EN II	yes/no	
MN	yes/no	Middle Neolithic
LN	yes/no	Late Neolithic
FN	yes/no	Final Neolithic
Sub-Neolithic	yes/no	
Minoan	yes/no	
Bronze Age	yes/no	
PH	yes/no	Prehistoric
EM	yes/no	Early Minoan

EM I	yes/no	
EM II	yes/no	
EM IIA	yes/no	
EM IIB	yes/no	
EM III	yes/no	
MM	yes/no	Middle Minoan
pre-palatial	yes/no	
Proto-palatial	yes/no	
MM I	yes/no	
MM IA	yes/no	
MM IB	yes/no	
MM II	yes/no	
MM IIA	yes/no	
MM IIB	yes/no	
MM III	yes/no	
MM IIIA	yes/no	
MM IIIB	yes/no	
Neo-palatial	yes/no	
LM	yes/no	Late Minoan. Another term used: Late Bronze Age
LM I	yes/no	
LM IA	yes/no	
LM IB	yes/no	

LM II	yes/no	
LM III	yes/no	
LM IIIA	yes/no	
LM IIIA1	yes/no	
LM IIIA2	yes/no	
LM IIIB	yes/no	
LM IIIC	yes/no	
Subminoan	yes/no	
Iron Age	yes/no	
Greek/Hellenic	yes/no	
Early Greek	yes/no	
Late Greek	yes/no	
GR	yes/no	Graeco-Roman
Geometric	yes/no	
PG	yes/no	Proto-Geometric. Also Early Iron Age
EPG	yes/no	Early Proto-Geometric
MPG	yes/no	Middle Proto-Geometric
LPG	yes/no	Late Proto-Geometric
PGB	yes/no	Protogeometric?
EG	yes/no	Early Geometric
MG	yes/no	Middle Geometric
LG	yes/no	Late Geometric

Tran	yes/no	?
Orientalizing	yes/no	
EO	yes/no	Early Orientalizing
Archaic	yes/no	
Early Archaic	yes/no	
Late Archaic	yes/no	
Classical	yes/no	
Early CL	yes/no	Early Classical
Late CL	yes/no	Late Classical
late 5th BC	yes/no	
Hellenistic	yes/no	
4th BC	yes/no	
3rd BC	yes/no	
Early Hell	yes/no	
Late Hell	yes/no	
Roman	yes/no	
Early Roman	yes/no	
Late Roman	yes/no	
Post-Roman	yes/no	
Early Christian	yes/no	
1st cent AD	yes/no	
2nd AD	yes/no	

late 4th	yes/no	Late Roman C ware
6th AD	yes/no	
7th AD	yes/no	
late 6th-7th cent AD	yes/no	Late Roman C ware
8th AD	yes/no	
Arabic	yes/no	
Early Byz	yes/no	Early Byzantine
Middle Byz	yes/no	Middle Byzantine
Late Byz	yes/no	Late Byzantine
First Byz	yes/no	
Second Byz	yes/no	
Byzantine	yes/no	
Venetian	yes/no	
E Ven	yes/no	Early Venetian
L Ven	yes/no	Late Venetian
Medieval	yes/no	
BM	yes/no	
Turkish	yes/no	
Ottoman	yes/no	
Modern	yes/no	
11th	yes/no	
12th	yes/no	

13th	yes/no	
14th	yes/no	
15th	yes/no	
16th	yes/no	
17th	yes/no	
18th	yes/no	
19th	yes/no	
20th	yes/no	
unknown	yes/no	

TABLE NAME: FUNCTIONS VARIABILITY

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
survey id	text	
no function	yes/no	
town/city	yes/no	
settlement	yes/no	Permanent installation
settl_description		
occupation	yes/no	
habitation single house	yes/no	
habitation	yes/no	Small installation
habitation cave	yes/no	

refuge cave	yes/no	
village	yes/no	
hamlet	yes/no	
farmstead	yes/no	Also Farm, farmhouse, farm establishment, country house
farm_description	text	
building/ structure	yes/no	
house	yes/no	
house walls	yes/no	
field house	yes/no	
hut/s	yes/no	
villa	yes/no	
walls	yes/no	Data
construction	yes/no	Data
spolia	yes/no	Data
defence site	yes/no	
refuge	yes/no	
look-out	yes/no	
tower	yes/no	
castle	yes/no	
fort	yes/no	Also: fortress
guard house	yes/no	
burial	yes/no	

cemetery	yes/no	
tholos tomb	yes/no	Also: Build tomb (Hood65)
chamber tomb	yes/no	
rock-cut tomb	yes/no	Also: Rock-cut grave
tomb	yes/no	
rock-shelter burial	yes/no	
larnax burial	yes/no	
pithos burial	yes/no	
grave	yes/no	
tile grave	yes/no	
ossuary	yes/no	
burial cave	yes/no	
cist grave	yes/no	
shaft grave	yes/no	
temple	yes/no	
shrine	yes/no	
sanctuary	yes/no	
peak sanctuary	yes/no	
sacred hilltop	yes/no	Hilltop ritual place
sacred cave	yes/no	
ritual place	yes/no	Cult place Cult site
basilica	yes/no	

church	yes/no	
monastery	yes/no	
rock shelter	yes/no	Data. also Rock cutting?
cave	yes/no	Data
terrace walls	yes/no	Could be for road, agriculture, building also Terrace, terracing
enclosure	yes/no	Data
agricultural activity	yes/no	Landuse activity
pastoral activity	yes/no	Pastoral site
metochi	yes/no	Seasonal agricultural habitation
mitato	yes/no	Seasonal pastoral habitation
mandra	yes/no	Greek word for a sheepfold Sheep pen, sheepfold
threshing floor	yes/no	
beehive	yes/no	
field walls	yes/no	
field activity	yes/no	
seasonal camp	yes/no	Seasonal activity
spring and material	yes/no	
road	yes/no	
pavement	yes/no	
anchorage	yes/no	quay
harbour	yes/no	
wreck	yes/no	

industrial activity	yes/no	
warehouses	yes/no	
quarry	yes/no	
dam	yes/no	
kiln	yes/no	
mill	yes/no	
well	yes/no	
spring house	yes/no	
pit	yes/no	
pyre	yes/no	
aqueduct	yes/no	
cistern	yes/no	
unknown	yes/no	
scatter	yes/no	Data rather than interpretation
sherd concentration	yes/no	Data rather than interpretation
site	yes/no	
isolated find	yes/no	Data rather than interpretation
bridge	yes/no	
inscription	yes/no	
theatre	yes/no	
permanent character	yes/no	
perm_description	text	Description of permanent character

temporary character	yes/no	
temp_description	text	Description of temporary character

TABLE NAME: REFERENCES

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
ref id	number	
framework	memo	
dates	text	
comments	memo	

TABLE NAME: REFERENCES OF INFLUENCE

Field Name	Field properties	Explanatory comments
survey id	text	primary key
ref id	number	primary key
influence in survey methods	yes/no	The relative reference influenced survey methods. Surveys that influenced a project's methodology are usually stated by the researchers.
influence in interpretation	yes/no	The relative reference influenced interpretations.
sources of information	yes/no	The relative reference was used as information/data source

(Footnotes)

1 A mountainous area was surveyed and collection units were based on geomorphological units. The area of these units can be measured through satellite imagery and GPS.