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digital archaeology...

“...explores the basic relationships that archaeologists have with Information and Communication Technology (ICT) ...”

P. Daly & T. L. Evans 2006
digital archaeology

• different terms, similar definitions
  ◦ e-archaeology
  ◦ computational archaeology
  ◦ archaeological computing
  ◦ etc.
digital archaeology

• theory and practice of digital tools and methods used *in archaeology*
  ◦ input: e. g. total stations
  ◦ management: e. g. relational database systems
  ◦ analysis: e. g. geographic information systems
  ◦ publication: e. g. social media → „digital (public) archaeology“
digital archaeology

„Evidence of the reality of digital archeology is all around us in the discipline’s data collection and curation (…), analysis [mainly through GIS, (…)], visualization (…), public outreach and participation (…), and training methods.”

Costopulos 2016

„In short, digital archaeology uses future technology to understand past behaviour…”

Zubrow 2006
implementation of social media in archaeology

• combination of archaeology and computer & information technology focusing on communication

➔ use of social media in archaeology can be seen as interdisciplinarity itself

➔ social media and archaeology are integrated into a holistic scientific communication tool

➔ social network applications as tools for interactive communication
social media
possibilities using Twitter (in archaeology)

• real time information
• permanent links
• hashtags as ‘labels‘ (e. g. #archaeology)
• dissemination of
  ◦ texts
  ◦ images
  ◦ videos
  ◦ embeds

• live-tweeted excavations
• conference communication
• interactive archaeological information
  ◦ science to science → networking
  ◦ science to public → public engagement
other disciplines using twitter

- economics: modeling customer service conversations
- medicine: traumatic brain injuries
- social sciences: urban land use based on mobility patterns
Twitter: impressions of 06/2017 to 09/2017 (n = 46)

@rrl_univie tweets 01/06/2017 – 22/09/2017

average: 609.2
std. dv.: 1140.8
minimum: 75
maximum: 5497
Twitter: impressions of 08/2017 in 09/2017 and 10/2017 (n = 23)

@rrl_univie tweets 09/2017

average: 784,7
std. dv.: 1349,9
minimum: 105
maximum: 5497

@rrl_univie tweets 10/2017

average: 856,1
std. dv.: 1345,3
minimum: 193
maximum: 5558

Growth rate: 9%
conclusion

• difficulty to decide which factors influence the perception and distribution of the tweets
• most of the interactions seem to be restricted to a ‘core audience’, following Richardson 2012
• do only scientists read the ‘serious’ tweets, while the non-scientists simply just respond on ‘fancy’ tweets?
• longer observation times and a much larger record has to be checked for further interpretations, also regarding retweets and interactions
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