

The Conceptualization of Archival Materials Held in Museums

Štefanac, Tamara

Doctoral thesis / Disertacija

2017

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:162:708968>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-03-11**



Sveučilište u Zadru
Universitas Studiorum
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

Repository / Repozitorij:

[University of Zadar Institutional Repository](#)

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU
POSLIJEDIPLOMSKI SVEUČILIŠNI STUDIJ
DRUŠTVO ZNANJA I PRIJENOS INFORMACIJA

Tamara Štefanac

**THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ARCHIVAL
MATERIALS HELD IN MUSEUMS**

Doktorski rad

Zadar, 2017.

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU
POSLIJEDIPLOMSKI SVEUČILIŠNI STUDIJ
DRUŠTVO ZNANJA I PRIJENOS INFORMACIJA

Tamara Štefanac

**THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ARCHIVAL
MATERIALS HELD IN MUSEUMS**

Doktorski rad

Mentorica

Prof.dr.sc. Anne J. Gilliland

Komentorica

Prof.dr.sc. Mirna Willer

Zadar, 2017.

UNIVERSITY OF ZADAR

BASIC DOCUMENTATION CARD

I. Author and study

Name and surname: Tamara Štefanac

Name of the study programme: Postgraduate doctoral study Knowledge Society and Information Transfer

Mentor: Professor Anne J. Gilliland, PhD

Co-mentor: Professor Mirna Willer, PhD

Date of the defence: 24 March 2017

Scientific area and field in which the PhD is obtained: Social Sciences, Information and Communication Sciences

II. Doctoral dissertation

Title: The Conceptualization of Archival Materials Held in Museums

UDC mark: 930.25:069(497.5)>(043)=111

Number of pages: 179

Number of pictures/graphical representations/tables: 0/10/0

Number of notes: 259

Number of used bibliographic units and sources: 257

Number of appendices: 12

Language of the doctoral dissertation: English

III. Expert committees

Expert committee for the evaluation of the doctoral dissertation:

1. Assistant Professor Marijana Tomić, PhD, chair
2. Professor Anne J. Gilliland, PhD, member
3. Assistant Professor Goran Zlodi, member

Expert committee for the defence of the doctoral dissertation:

1. Assistant Professor Marijana Tomić, PhD, chair
2. Professor Anne J. Gilliland, PhD, member
3. Assistant Professor Goran Zlodi, member

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU

TEMELJNA DOKUMENTACIJSKA KARTICA

I. Autor i studij

Ime i prezime: Tamara Štefanac

Naziv studijskog programa: Poslijediplomski sveučilišni studij Društvo znanja i prijenos informacija

Mentorica: prof.dr.sc. Anne J. Gilliland

Komentorica: prof.dr.sc. Mirna Willer

Datum obrane: 24. ožujka 2017.

Znanstveno područje i polje u kojem je postignut doktorat znanosti: društvene znanosti, informacijske i komunikacijske znanosti

II. Doktorski rad

Naslov: The Conceptualization of Archival Materials Held in Museums

UDK oznaka: 930.25:069(497.5)>(043)=111

Broj stranica: 179

Broj slika/grafičkih prikaza/tablica: 0/10/0

Broj bilježaka: 259

Broj korištenih bibliografskih jedinica i izvora: 257

Broj priloga: 12

Jezik rada: engleski

III. Stručna povjerenstva

Stručno povjerenstvo za ocjenu doktorskog rada:

1. doc.dr.sc. Marijana Tomić, predsjednica
2. prof.dr.sc. Anne J. Gilliland, članica
3. doc. dr. sc. Goran Zlodi, član

Stručno povjerenstvo za obranu doktorskog rada:

1. doc.dr.sc. Marijana Tomić, predsjednica
2. prof.dr.sc. Anne J. Gilliland, članica
3. doc. dr. sc. Goran Zlodi, član



Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Tamara Štefanac**, ovime izjavljujem da je moj **doktorski** rad pod naslovom **The Conceptualization of Archival Materials Held in Museums** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 13. svibnja 2017.

Remarks

For gaining approval to be able to conduct the research presented here in this doctoral thesis, the researcher was required to pass a course on ethical issues associated with conducting research involving human subjects. The course was passed and a report from Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) gained in 2013. The research protocol for this study was subsequently reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of California, Los Angeles.

The citation style used in this doctoral thesis is based on the *Chicago Manual of Style*, which is used by leading publications in the field of Archival Science, including the U.S. journal *The American Archivist* and the Canadian journal *Archivaria*, as well as key scholarly monographs.

A synopsis of this thesis and a review of the early stage of the research was presented at the doctoral colloquium that was held as part of the International Symposium of Information Science at the University of Zadar, 19-21 May, 2015, and subsequently published in the Symposium Proceedings as:

Štefanac, Tamara. "The Conceptualization of Archival Materials Held in Museums." In Pehar, Franjo, Christian Schlögl and Christian Wolff eds., *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Information Science (ISI 2015) Re:inventing Information Science in the Networked Society, Zadar, Croatia, 19-21 May 2015* (University of Zadar, 2015), p.506-514. Available at http://www.vwh-verlag.de/vwh/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/isi15_v1-0_sw_92proz_final-denona_v2_split.pdf

The researcher is responsible for all translations from Croatian to English.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of figures

Chapter I. Introduction	1
1. Overview of the study	1
2. Research goals, objectives and guiding questions	2
3. Significance of the study	4
4. Structure of the thesis	7
Chapter II. Background Review	8
1. Contemplating concepts, categories and context	8
i. Understanding the properties of information objects	10
ii. Acknowledging boundary, syncretic and networked objects	13
iii. Addressing terminological inconsistencies	19
2. Reflections on description in archives and museum settings	20
i. Archival description	21
ii. Museum documentation	28
iii. Archival and museum values	30
iv. Archival records and museum objects	33
v. Records in museums from an archival perspective	36
3. Historical background on collecting records in Croatian museums	37
4. Museum documentation: The Croatian context	44
Chapter III. Methodological Discussion	48
1. Methodological considerations	48
2. Testing the methods in archival research	50
3. Exploring content and structure: Background to the research	51
4. Pilot study results	53
5. Validating the qualitative methodological approaches	53
6. Exploring the concept and context of the research	55

7. Overview of the research design	56
i. Recruitment process and circumstances of the study	56
ii. Data collection	58
a. Data collection: External sources	59
b. Data collection: “I” as a data pool	65
Chapter IV. Data Analysis	68
1. An iterative, layered process of analysis	68
i. Analysis process: first themes sets	69
ii. Analysis process: second themes sets	70
iii. Analysis process: third themes sets	70
2. Results of analysis	71
i. First theme sets	71
a. Museum value framework	81
b. Museum description of archival material held in museums	84
c. Elements of description of archival material held in museums	87
ii. Second theme sets	93
iii. Third theme sets	94
a. Reflective and reflexive autoethnographic account	95
Chapter V. Discussion	106
1. The description of archival material in the context of Croatian archival legislation	107
2. The role played by personal and professional context in the description of archival material in the context of Croatian museums	117
3. Moving up from the catalogue record entry to managing the collections	135
4. Descriptive standards and possible metadata crosswalks	142
Chapter VI. Conclusions and Areas for Further Research	145
1. Conclusions	145
2. Some methodological reflection	150
3. Areas for further research	152

Bibliography	153
Abstract	173
Prošireni (strukturirani sažetak)	175
Appendices	190
Appendix A Copy of the Recruitment material letter	190
Appendix B Copy of the Informed consent form	193
Appendix C Copy of the Interview protocol	197
Appendix D Copy of the photograph: Löwy, Julius “Karlstadt-Fiumaner Bahn: SchlossSvečaj”, Wien, 1873. The Collection of photographs, Croatian Railway Museum	199
Appendix E Copy of the photograph: Löwy, Julius “Karlstadt-Fiumaner Bahn: Kulpa-Brücke”, Wien, 1873. The Collection of photographs, Croatian Railway Museum	200
Appendix F Copy of the architectural drawing: K.K. Österreichische Staatsbahnen, K.K. Eisenbahn-Bauleitung Spalato “Linie Spalato-Sinj; Project für ein Aufnahmsgebäude mit Veranda& Neben Gebäude nach Plan no.5/K Spalato Sinj”, Split, 1901	201
Appendix G Copy of the transfer of employment record: K.und k. Reichs Kriegs-Ministerium “Julius Lehmann – transfer of employment and increase of incomes”, Wien, 1894, The Collection of personal documentation	202

- Appendix H** Copy of the topographic map: Fiume und
Delnice/K.u.K.Militargeographisches Institut -1:75 000.-[Wien]:[s.n.], 1914.,
The Collection of technical documentation, Croatian Railway Museum 203
- Appendix I** Copy of the screen-shot of the web page Archeological Museum
Istanbul / Ancient Orient Museum, representation of Treaty of Kadesh,
[http://www.istanbularkeoloji.gov.tr/web/30-125-1-1/muze -
en/collections/ancient orient museum artifacts/treaty of kadesh](http://www.istanbularkeoloji.gov.tr/web/30-125-1-1/muze-_en/collections/ancient_orient_museum_artifacts/treaty_of_kadesh) 204
- Appendices J and Ja** Copy of the British Museum online database collection:
Buonarotti, Michelangelo, "A ground plan of a chapel Black chalk,"
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=716016&partId=1&searchText=MIchelangelo+architectural+drawing&page=1 205
- Appendix K** Copy of the Jüdisches Museum Berlin webpage, representation of an
item: Red Cross Letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer,
<https://www.jmberlin.de/en/red-cross-letters-proof-life-25-words-or-less> 209
- Appendix L** Copy of the Australian War Memorial webpage representation of an
item: Aerial photograph "SUK14046,"
<https://www.awm.gov.au/collection/SUK14046/> 210

List of figures

Figure 1: Schematic representation of the methods and techniques used in this research

Figure 2: Schematic representation of the process of analysis

Figure 3: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I1

Figure 4: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I2

Figure 5: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I3

Figure 6: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I4

Figure 7: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I5

Figure 8: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I6

Figure 9: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I7

Figure 10: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I8

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. Overview of the Study

Archives, libraries and museums all preserve collections containing a diversity of material. In managing these collections different standards are used, each developed within their own professional community and addressing that community's perspectives and needs. These different descriptive standards and the access points defined by them should be transparent to outside users when they are searching for material preserved in different kinds of institutions regardless of how the describers have categorized the material, and the users should be able to move across institutions and collate resources with ease. However this is not the case. The central thesis of the research is that the arrangement and description of archival and other documentary material found in museum settings are dependent on how curators determine what constitutes archival material, and what constitutes a museum object or museum documentation, and what might potentially be both. Arguing that the path to any kind of interoperability starts with the people who implement these descriptive standards, this exploratory study investigates curators' understandings of archival and documentary materials held in their museums (i.e., rather than in archives) by identifying and analyzing their attitudes towards the records that surround them in their daily professional practice and towards their description of those records. It also contemplates how museum curators perceive the role of the descriptions they create when these are to be placed online in an environment where there are no longer institutional boundaries and the anticipated audience is not socially restricted (e.g., only to "serious" or "expert" scholars).

The historical situation of archival material in Croatian museum collections is also discussed in a way that offers insights into national regulatory practices as well as the perspectives of both archival and museum professionals in Croatia.¹ However it also

¹ Since the thesis is written in English, and presumably will therefore be more accessible intellectually to interested international readers, the intent was also to illuminate the Croatian professional, historical

acknowledges that these problems are not just the result of Croatia's historical particularities but that they are also present worldwide in any situation where archival material constitutes part of museum collections. On a more general level, therefore, this research addresses problems of processing boundary objects in cultural institutions and creating descriptions which are multifunctional in character--that have to respond to the mission and scope of a particular institution, but also to be useful and accessible to outside users.

Finally this study introduces, based on the data collected and analyzed, a contemplation of the individual cognitive processes of those persons who are creating descriptive metadata, and argues that cognitive processes will always affect the creation of metadata, no matter which standard is used. It concludes that the matter of description in the end becomes the matter of access and that descriptive processes that take place in Croatian museums are indeed determined by museum professionals in the course of their daily work, although they are also circumscribed by institutional policies and practices and juridical requirements such as legislation and regulations, and influenced by both historical and contemporary societal contexts.

2. Research Goals, Objectives and Guiding Questions

The main goal of this study was to develop a better understanding of how records of any kind are managed, described and accessed in a museum with a view to making recommendations about how to enhance their accessibility, use and collation by wider audiences. Its primary objectives were to identify, analyze and describe curatorial attitudes and actions regarding different types of records and their description.

The questions that prompted and guided this primarily ethnographic research were, therefore:

- How do museum curators conceptualize archival records and other materials within their institutions?

and juridical contexts and systems of museum documentation, since these differ in some significant ways from those in other regions of the world.

- How and why do records and other archival materials come to be treated as museum objects?
- What happens to archival material in museum settings in terms of its description?
- Do museum professionals see any possible convergences between archives and museum materials in terms of description and access in museum collections, and if so, what might those be?

Positioned within an interpretivistic paradigm, this research contemplates museum description of archival material held in museum as a product of external conceptual representations² which deal with the complex nature of records – both those collected and held within collections and those created by curators in the course of doing description and materialized in the form of museum catalogue records, exhibition labels, online representations of items etc. The philosophical framework for this exploration of the complex nature of records is based on Eleanor Rosch's prototype theory³ and further elaborated through Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer's concept of the boundary object.⁴ Geoffrey Yeo employed a similar framework to explore the concept of a record.⁵ Museum categorization and classification issues are also elaborated as well as reflections of museum

² Aaron Loehrlein, "An Examination of Interdisciplinary Theory Between Cognitive Categorization and Knowledge Organization." In Smiraglia, Richard P., ed. *Proceedings from North American Symposium on Knowledge Organization*, vol.3 (Toronto, 2011), p.122, <http://journals.lib.washington.edu/index.php/nasko/article/view/12796>.

³ Eleanor Rosch. "Principles of Categorization." In Rosch, Eleanor and Barbara B. Lloyd, eds, *Cognition and Categorization* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978), p.28.

⁴ Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer, "Institutional Ecology, 'Translations', and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology 1907-39," *Social Studies of Science* 19, no.3 (1989): 387-420, <http://innovation.ucdavis.edu/people/publications/Star%20Griesemer%201989%20SSS-19.3-387-420.pdf>.

⁵ Geoffrey Yeo, "Concepts of Record (2): Prototypes and Boundary Objects," *The American Archivist* 71 (Spring / Summer 2008): 122.

professionals on descriptive practice. The qualitative methodology and research design included in-depth interviews, focused ethnographic observations, content analysis and autoethnography. Because of the ethnographic methods and techniques employed this research is not generalizable in character or framed with an empirical hypothesis and definitive research questions. Rather it is exploratory, descriptive and indicative.

In terms of parameters that limit this research, interviewees who were part of the research process are anonymized and also, because of its ethnographic character this study cannot be exactly replicated. One further limitation of this study that should be noted is that while institutional context is certainly important, it was not possible to address and analyze all circumstances of this context because it would reveal the identities of the participants.

3. Significance of the Study

The significance of this research lies in its delineation of both theoretical and practical ideas and issues in a way that could help address issues with the description and access of archival material at the level of practice. At the same time it provides insights that might be useful in the development of national cataloguing rules and even relevant international descriptive standards and juridical requirements, as well as contributing to more theoretical aspects of museum studies and archival science. It should be noted in these respects, however, that this is not only exploratory (in that there is no previous research in this area upon which to build), but also basic research, in the sense that it is neither feasible nor appropriate to move to develop or revise professional descriptive standards or the juridical requirements in Croatia without first having obtained this basic on-the-ground sense of the current situation of archival materials and curators' attitudes. Leading Canadian archivist Hugh Taylor suggested that: "the relationship between museums and archives deserves to be examined more fully in an age that is fast becoming dependent on the image, icon, and virtual reality."⁶ Paul Marty, a prominent academic working at the intersection between information science and museum studies observed that although there are a number of research studies that analyze the nature

⁶Hugh Taylor, "'Heritage' Revisited: Documents as Artefacts in the Context of Museums and Material Culture, *Archivaria* 40 (1995): 9.

of users' needs in museums, there are just a few that have focused on the nature and behaviour of museum information professionals.⁷ This research addresses both of these comments by focusing on curatorial descriptive practices relating to records contained in museum collections and produced by creators in the form of catalogue entries, exhibition labels, and so forth. Upon acquisition by a museum, an object first undergoes a process of identification. Every act of identification is some sort of categorization. This is followed by classification. Both acts are products of the human world and have a highly subjective nature as Mai has noted: "Any classification is classification from a particular point of view, for a particular purpose."⁸ Even in these initial processes, subjectivity is an important factor. By placing the object within a specific collection, a decision has been made about the intended descriptive approach. In fact, all descriptive processes are defined subjectively since there can be no representation without interpretation⁹ and the individual view of the professional will always be just one of many possible.

The main difference, however, lies in the curators' point of view and perspective regarding their relation to the materials themselves and the transfer of information about the materials to users. Martin noted that museum professionals derive their identity from their academic discipline and professional practice.¹⁰ Elings and Waibel emphasize that "applying particular data content standards by material type, and not by community affiliation, could lead to greater data interoperability within the cultural heritage community."¹¹ Landis presents

⁷Paul F. Marty, "The Changing Nature of Information Work in Museums," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58, no.1 (2007): 98.

⁸Jens-Erik Mai, "Classification in a Social World: Bias and Trust," *Journal of Documentation* 66, no. 5 (2010): 634.

⁹Wendy Duff and Verne Harris, "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meaning," *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 263-285.

¹⁰Robert S. Martin, "Intersecting Missions, Converging Practice," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 8, no.1 (2007): 85.

¹¹Mary W. Elings and Gunther Waibel, "Metadata for All: Descriptive Standards and Metadata Sharing across Libraries, Archives and Museums," *First Monday* 12, no.3 (2007), <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/1628/1543>.

a different point of view, asserting that:

Nothing about cultural heritage materials themselves indicates that they should be controlled using one framework or another. One cannot pick up a cultural heritage object, for example, and say it is inherently archival. This is a repository based decision, impacted by a host of factors and various collections within a given cultural heritage institution might be controlled differently.¹²

His assertion introduces the level of the institutional or repository-based decision, which, in the Croatian context, must also take place within the parameters set by the prescribed museum documentation regulations that define descriptive framework for Croatian museums.

But if we choose to control the same type of materials in different institutional modes, then metadata about dispersed archival material in various museum holdings remains disconnected and archival units are left without their original documentary and provenancial contextuality. To reestablish their original context, however, it is no longer necessary to physically reunite dispersed materials. New technologies enable us to do so virtually, provided there is a platform of mutually agreed-upon descriptive metadata. And yet we do not have such a platform. Along the continuum of material – curator – computer based retrieval system – user, it is the figure of the curator as manager, describer and mediator that stands out as the lynchpin. With deeper understanding of the reasons why curators choose to describe an object or document in a particular way, e.g., which descriptive standard they employ, we could perhaps better understand areas of possible conflicts and places of convergence between different heritage communities, and between their institutions, professional theories and practices. The dataset that emerged at the end of this research is unique in nature and small, but nevertheless could serve as a starting point for similar explorations from different perspectives, for example, within different professional or disciplinary communities.

¹²William K. Landis, "Plays Well With Others: DACS and CCO as Interoperable Metadata Content Standards," *VRA Bulletin* 34, no.1 (2007): 98.

4. Structure of the Thesis

The presentation of the research is laid out as follows:

Chapter II introduces the philosophical and theoretical framework of the research and includes contemplations on issues of concepts and categories and reflections on description as discussed in the scholarly and professional literature from the archival science and museum studies fields. The chapter continues by elaborating on issues of archival material in museums from both an international and national perspective and gives a brief historical overview of the Croatian situation. The chapter concludes with an elaboration of the nature of museum documentation, as regulated by Croatian legislation.

Chapter III opens with a discussion of methodological considerations and the qualitative research methodology applied in this study. It then provides an overview of the research design and elaborates in detail the data collection techniques used.

Chapter IV provides a detailed presentation of the process of data analysis, and presents the results of the research.

Chapter V presents a discussion of the findings that situates them within the landscape of contemporary Croatian juridical frameworks and professional theoretical and practical knowledge, as well as their application in different descriptive frameworks.

Chapter VI provides a conclusion, and suggests areas for possible future research.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND REVIEW

1. Contemplating Concepts, Categories and Context

We all make multiple personal information decisions on a daily basis. Sometimes we can't name and label them, sometimes they are mixtures of perspectives that are hard to grasp and whose logics, to others, do not seem logical at all. The philosopher with a background in analytical philosophy would probably successfully show how many of our judgments were wrongly concluded. We, however, would equally insist that our information decision, the one that we made based on all information known to us and compiled through our point of view, made perfect logic given our needs at the time and the ways in which our personal context is tacitly or overtly shaped according to our societal and cultural surroundings.

Fryer and Jackson asserted that people process information from their past experiences into "a finite set of bins to be called 'categories'".¹³ But before we can categorize any amount or kind of information we have to grasp the concept of the thing we are about to categorize. In order to sort red from blue things, based on the differences between them, we have to possess concepts of red and blue. In psychology the term "category" refers to a group of things that have the same basic properties. Putting things into categories enables us to relate and order them, and how these categories are organized in our own minds depends on our concept of a specific category. The nature of a concept is addressed within various disciplines, including philosophy, psychology and cognitive science. While disputes over even the concept of a concept as well as its possible properties and metaphysical relationships continue, the notion of a "concept" is widely used in the information and cultural fields. In order to clarify the utility of analyzing different conceptualizations of the concept of "archival material" this thesis will use Aaron Loehrlein's assertion that the "word 'concept' applies to anything for

¹³ Ronald, Fryer and M. Jackson, "Categorical Cognition: A Psychological Model of Categories and Identification in Decision Making: An Extended Abstract." In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge* (2003), p.29, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w9579.pdf>.

which a representation can be made.”¹⁴ The term “archival material,” for the moment, will be used synonymously with the term “records”. Terminological differentiations will be introduced later together with those concepts.

Unlike the physicality-based thinking that remains prevalent in the museum and archive worlds, representations do not have to be in material form. Loehrlein distinguished between internal conceptual representations that are stored in the individual mind and external conceptual representations such as “classification schemes, subject heading systems, thesauri, ontologies, folksonomies and standards for bibliographic description”¹⁵ that are materialized in some fixed form in order to be shareable between people. Loehrlein's list of examples might be expanded to include all descriptive standards and practices used in museums and archives because each constitutes some form of external conceptual representation of agent(s)' activities and thus, in archival terms, can also be conditionally considered to be a record. Although, as discussed above, internal conceptual representations vary in the social and cultural contexts in which are they applied, at the same time Loehrlein perceives them to be shared “between people within a culture, domain, or discipline”,¹⁶ for example, through professional descriptive systems. Because of the professional rules and best practices constraining how such representations are shared, it can be understood that it is expected that one professional in a certain field would bring to bear a similar concept of a record as would another professional in the same field. However, understandings of the concept of a record might differ considerably if these professionals come from different cultures or societies, or live and apply the concept in different time periods.

¹⁴ Aaron Loehrlein, "An Examination of Interdisciplinary Theory Between Cognitive Categorization and Knowledge Organization." In Smiraglia, Richard P., ed. *Proceedings from North American Symposium on Knowledge Organization* vol.3 (Toronto, 2011), p.122, <http://journals.lib.washington.edu/index.php/nasko/article/view/12796>.

¹⁵ Loehrlein, op.cit., 122.

¹⁶ Loehrlein, op.cit., 122.

What then, about professionals from sub-disciplines, how might their concepts or conceptualizations of concepts differ? And would that even matter if professional agreement were to be made on the basis of external conceptual representation?

Answering these questions would depend on the specific structures of concepts in different representations. On the example of the concept “bird”, Loehrlein concludes:

Nevertheless, not all representations of BIRD are necessarily easily sharable. A person may maintain one representation of BIRD for the purpose of communicating with others, and another representation that represents the person’s own idiosyncratic experiences with birds. The means by which ICRs and ECRs are structured is broadly similar. For example, they both consist of groupings that are populated by instances or types. Membership in a grouping is typically based on the rules, characteristics, and/or exemplars that are associated with the grouping. These groupings facilitate information organization and retrieval as well as the transmission of knowledge.¹⁷

The concept might have different conceptions, depending on the properties or features that different viewers attribute to the concept:

Suppose Sam believes a tiger is a striped animal but Paul doesn't. In the light of the concept-conception distinction, we say Sam and Paul possess the concept TIGER but disagree on their conscious conceptions of tigerhood. There being something shared by subjects with different conceptions vindicates the public character of concepts.¹⁸

i. Understanding the properties of information objects

Grasping the concept, or the properties/features of some concept is crucial to the processes of categorization. We all go through these psychological processes in our daily activities, consciously or unconsciously. In our professional lives in the information fields we consciously and carefully apply categorization, for example, through identification and representation, and contribute and add to existing knowledge through our databases, web pages, catalogues and inventories and other forms of knowledge representation. Thus it seems important to understand how individual information professionals in a specific culture

¹⁷ Loehrlein, op.cit., 123.

¹⁸ Maite Ezcurdia, "The Concept-Conception Distinction," *Philosophical Issues* 9 (1998): 188.

determine the features or properties of an information object (IO), why they categorize an IO in particular way, on which basis they identify the properties of an IO, and why they create a representation of an IO in a particular way. It seems equally important to address how and why cultural, social and institutional surroundings influence these actions.

Prior to creating any representation of an IO, we have to identify and name it. Even before that, however, we have probably decided where this IO belongs--in which category of our perceived world system. Often this process is quite conscious, having become naturalized over years of practice. When we are describing one IO, the description that we create becomes another, related IO. In fact, it is also a record of our own activity. The different modes in which we perceive the properties or the features of this descriptive IO that we have created is very important because it should be able to make connections beyond our own personal boundaries with other individuals and groups. We are dealing, therefore, with both the concept of the IO that we are describing and the concept of the IO that we have created (i.e., the description). The latter is one type of metadata that has been created by abstracting perceived properties of the former, and we count upon the quality of that metadata to be able to serve as an effective means of communication with users, between different automated systems, and so forth.

To sum up, then, the description that we create becomes an information object in its own right that can be viewed both as metadata¹⁹ for the information object it represents, and as a record of the activity and choices made by the information professional.

¹⁹ The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) has defined metadata as: "structured information that describes, explains, located, or otherwise makes it easier to retrieve, use, or manage an information resource. Metadata is often called data about data or information about information," and the role of descriptive metadata as "...a resource for purposes such as discovery and identification. It can include elements such as title, abstract, author, and keywords." National Information Standards Organization. *Understanding Metadata* (Bethesda, MD: NISO Press, 2004), p.1.

Regarding the issue of human-created metadata, Gill observes: "However, human-created metadata still has an extremely important role within specific communities and applications, especially in the museum, library, and archive communities for whom metadata is really just cataloging with a different name." Tony Gill, "Metadata and the Web." in *Introduction to Metadata 3.0* Second edition. Murtha Baca, ed. (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2008), p.18.

Information professionals deal with categorization and classification concerns on a daily basis. According to Glushko et al.,²⁰ several forms of categorization can be distinguished. First and most common is cultural categorization because “cultural categories exist for objects, events, settings, mental states, properties, relations and other components of experience (e.g. birds, weddings, parks, serenity, blue and above.” They are shared within culture, put into material form, or transferred through language. Others forms of categorization have been referred to as "categorization in the wild."²¹ These include individual and institutional categorization. All three forms of categorization should be studied together, because they are interrelated. For individual categorization, Glushko et al. take as an example a tagging system (e.g., social tagging) where an individual uses tags to develop their own categorization system within a specific context. The authors claim that by creating shared categories, as in institutional categorization, interoperability is achieved that can increase efficiency. The authors distinguish between two types of institutional classification systems: institutional taxonomies and institutional semantics.²² The example of institutional taxonomy that they cite is the Dewey Decimal system that is used in the classification of books in libraries worldwide. As examples of institutional semantics, they assert that defined common abstractions and semantic equivalents can be observed in commerce, where in order to achieve interoperability amongst buyer, seller and banking payment system “a common set of abstractions about all relevant aspects of transactions must be developed explicitly. Furthermore, this common set must handle diverse instances of transactions, along with the vagaries of inconsistency that occur. Once these abstractions are in place, they create an interface between parties that achieves interoperability; namely, all parties can align various aspects of the transaction.”²³ This example should be particular resonant with archivists, who are quite familiar with how such abstractions are manifested in bureaucratic records.

²⁰Robert J. Glushko, Paul P. Maglio, Teenie Matlock, and Lawrence W. Barsalou, "Categorization in the Wild," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*12, no. 4 (2008): 129.

²¹ Glushko et al., op.cit., 129.

²² Glushko et al, op.cit., 130.

²³ Glushko et al., op.cit., 130.

ii. Acknowledging boundary, syncretic and networked objects

Research on categorization issues shifted in 1978 when psychologist Eleanor Rosch identified psychological principles of categorization and claimed that we form categories based on principles of cognitive economy and perceived world structure.²⁴ Regarding issues of categorization--as categorization is usually understood in heritage institutions--the most influential were shown to be Rosch's assertions that a category is:

a number of objects that are considered equivalent. Categories are generally designated by names (e.g. *dog, animal*). *A taxonomy is a system by which categories are related to one another by means of class inclusion...*²⁵

and that categorization is a comparison process generated by means of prototypes or exemplars. Applying this conceptualization, it might be suggested that a painting or sculpture, because of its status or function in the art world, would more readily be judged to be a museum object than would, for example, a locomotive or aeroplane that performs quotidian functions in the wider world. However when technical and science museums are the institutional frame of reference, the judgment would probably not be so unreflective or unambiguous. Similarly a question such as "does a particular painting belong in the category of museum object" would be answered differently by a museum professional who is an art curator and someone from outside that field, or even by a museum professional from institution A and another from institution B. Rosch's prototype theory also established the potential in information science to develop categorizations with the aid of prototypes. These prototypes could then be put in hierarchical relations to each other where one is seen to be the best example of the prototype and the others are increasingly distanced from it.

However Rosch also made it very clear that "When we speak of the formation of categories, we mean their formation in the culture."²⁶ Perhaps their formation (or the formation of prototypes) even creates distinctions at the institutional level, the institution being a micro-culture with its own context that is embedded in the broader frame. If we

²⁴ Eleanor Rosch. "Principles of Categorization." In Rosch, Eleanor and Barbara B. Lloyd, eds, *Cognition and Categorization* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978), p.28.

²⁵ Rosch, op.cit., 29.

²⁶ Rosch, op.cit., 28.

acknowledge that categories act as structures supporting representation strategies, as suggested by Díaz-Kommonen, it becomes clear how the formation of categories is relevant for description or indeed any representation of knowledge.²⁷ They are containers through which we display our knowledge, using the medium of language and made manifest in some form. While representations can certainly be made in non-tangible form, in heritage institutions textual forms still prevail.

Importantly, Rosch's statement that most categories do not have clear cut boundaries²⁸ takes us further from a classical view on categorization in which categories are separated and members do not overlap. The idea that categories have fuzzy boundaries and that they overlap and are context-dependent was emphasized in Star and Griesemer in their discussion of communities of practices and boundary objects.²⁹ They argued that a given IO could be determined as a boundary object if it is placed on the boundary between two or more categories. Each object may belong to two or more communities of practice that are in turn a frame for recognizing and placing that object in a specific category within that specific context. This object thereby becomes naturalized within a specific community of practice.³⁰ Star and Griesemer's arguments were based on their conclusions from research conducted in a museum environment where they observed how different meanings were assigned to the same bird specimens by different individuals (amateur ornithologists and a professional biologist). As other boundary objects that could be found in this situation, they list:

specimens, field notes, museums and maps of particular territories. Their boundary nature is reflected by the fact that they are simultaneously concrete and abstract,

²⁷ Lily Díaz-Kommonen, "Of Dragons and Classifications", (Helsinki: Media Lab Aalto University, 2001), http://www.mlab.uiah.fi/systems_of_representation/final_dragon_essay.pdf.

²⁸ Rosch, op.cit., 35.

²⁹ Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer, "Institutional Ecology, 'Translations', and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology 1907-39," *Social Studies of Science* 19, no.3 (1989): 387-420, <http://innovation.ucdavis.edu/people/publications/Star%20Griesemer%201989%20SSS-19.3-387-420.pdf>.

³⁰ Star and Griesemer, op.cit., 294.

specific and general, conventionalized and customized. They are often internally heterogeneous.³¹

Star and Griesemer distinguish four types of boundary objects: repositories, ideal type (e.g., “diagram, atlas or other description”), coincident boundaries and standardized forms.³² Both museums and libraries are cited as examples of repositories (interestingly archives were not even mentioned in this 1989 paper), because “[...] repositories are built to deal with problems of heterogeneity caused by differences in unit of analysis.”³³ They note that the advantage of these repositories as “a pile” was that people from different communities of practice could borrow from such piles for their own needs. But what then is the implication for “borrowing” if these “piles” are organized in very specific formulaic and structured ways according to one particular community of practice? It would seem that just as anything can be deemed a museum object, if valorized in such a way, that anything also can serve as boundary object. An IO has only to satisfy the need to fulfill the criteria of the communities of practice where they are present.³⁴ According to Bowker and Star, boundary objects are flexible but at the same time stable enough to keep “a common identity across sites,”³⁵ for example, as archeological reports might with different stakeholders.³⁶ Perhaps though only some properties that form their identity need to be meaningful to multiple stakeholders, for example, a manuscript is an IO that has a certain amount of pages that can be read, regardless of the form and shape in which they are presented. All stakeholders may agree upon that, even though a manuscript placed in different heritage contexts may be perceived differently in other respects.

³¹ Star and Griesemer, op.cit., 408.

³² Star and Griesemer, op.cit., 408.

³³ Star and Griesemer, op.cit., 410.

³⁴ Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star, *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), p.297.

³⁵ Bowker and Star, op.cit., 297.

³⁶ Isto Huvila, "The Politics of Boundary Objects: Hegemonic Interventions and the Making of a Document," *JASIST* 62, no.12 (2011): 2539.

Do these ontological categories reflect our systematization of the world, bearing in mind Westerhoff's exhortation that we look not at universal ontological categories but rather at those that are fundamental to our own world?³⁷ The notion is that categorization is a matter of relativity and that context is what helps to define and delimit categorizations of boundary objects. Writing from a material culture perspective, Díaz-Kommonen introduced an equivalent term, "syncretic objects," for those IOs that in museum classification "can exhibit resistance to formal classification schemas" and whose syncretism reveals itself over time, enriched through all its prior interactions.³⁸

The management of boundary objects deals with more than just adjustment to an "other's" information landscape. Bowker and Star raised the question of morality in the moment "when the categories of the powerful become the taken for granted; when policy decisions are layered into inaccessible technological structures; when one group's visibility comes at the expense of another's suffering."³⁹ Arguing for an ecological understanding of the path of re-representation, they point to several significant considerations closely connected with descriptive practice: the multiple present and past contexts that representation (e.g., description) needs to address; how representation needs to reveal its own structure; and how representation needs to reveal all agents connected with its creation.⁴⁰ The latter is now quite accepted, since it is included as a field in a control area of the descriptive standard, scheme or best practice being applied, but it is still sometimes seen to be burdensome, controversial or both,⁴¹ and it is developed and locally implemented at different levels and with different

³⁷ Jan Westerhoff, *Ontological Categories: Their Nature and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

³⁸ Díaz-Kommonen, op.cit.

³⁹ Bowker and Star, op.cit., 320.

⁴⁰ Bowker and Star, op.cit., 293.

⁴¹ See, for example, Joy R. Novak, *Examining Activism in Practice: A Qualitative Study of Archival Activism*, Ph.D. dissertation (University of California, Los Angeles, 2013), <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/35g4291d> and Michelle Light and Tom Hyry. "Colophons and Annotations: New Directions for the Finding Aid," *The American Archivist* 65, no.2 (Fall/Winter 2002), pp. 216-230, <http://dx.doi.org/10.17723/aarc.65.2.13h27j5x8716586q>.

modes of transparency about how and why local decisions or adaptations were made. This contextual metadata supports linkage of a record in terms of space-time,⁴² keeping in mind that description can be treated as a record in its own right. Bowker and Star concluded that:

... we need to recognize that all information systems are necessarily suffused with ethical and political values, modulated by local administrative procedures. These systems are active creators of categories in the world as well as simulators of existing categories. Remembering this, we keep open and can explore spaces for change and flexibility that are otherwise lost forever.⁴³

Tennis made a similar statement acknowledging classification as interpretive process:

“Placing items in relationship to one another is an act of interpretation,”⁴⁴ although he also states that it isn’t considered to be morally challenged if the dimensions of these relationships are displayed overtly in the information system.⁴⁵ The museum classification scheme and resulting descriptions derived from the early cataloguing and classification practices of the Smithsonian’s National Museum of Natural History led Hannah Turner to point out an unfortunately common practice in the past (and present) in the Museum's systems:

categorizing and classifying indigenous and *other* ethnographic heritage in a mode that is distinctive to the classifier or cataloguer's own environment, without consulting the relevant indigenous taxonomy and, furthermore, using language that could have been or still is offensive or inappropriate to the source community.⁴⁶

⁴² Sue McKemish and Anne J. Gilliland. "Archival and Recordkeeping Research: Past, Present and Future." In *Research Methods: Information Management, Systems, and Contexts*, Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.91.

⁴³ Bowker and Star, op.cit., 321.

⁴⁴ Joseph T. Tennis, "Subject Ontogeny: Subject Access through Time and the Dimensionality of Classification." In *Challenges in Knowledge Representation and Organization for the 21st Century: Integration of Knowledge across Boundaries: Proceedings of the Seventh International ISKO Conference*. López-Huertas, Maria Jose, ed., vol.8. (Würzburg: ErgonVerlag, 2002).

⁴⁵ Tennis, op.cit.

⁴⁶ Hannah Turner, "Decolonizing Ethnographic Documentation: A Critical History of the Early Museum Catalogs at the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, nos.5-6 (2015): 658-676.

Documentation created about some IOs thus reveals and indicates, through its system of categorization and descriptive practice within that system, the ways in which the meaning or value of the IO was created and constructed. Cameron and Mengler similarly remarked:

The formal museum nomenclature impacts on museum documentation and hence the acquisition, storage and display of museum objects. As museum documentation categories have evolved into well-defined classes and nomenclatures, they lose their original flexibility and plasticity, as well as the ability to respond to new patterns.⁴⁷

The authors introduce the concept of the networked object, or virtual collections whose documentation can be constructed virtually out of information that exists beyond the space of the individual museum.⁴⁸ They argue, therefore, that museum classification systems need to be reconfigured in order to function and serve in this meta-world. As the structure of metadata changes online so too do content and access points, and these ultimately could also increase as far as the system allows. Users are increasingly invited to create their own galleries, tagging and folksonomies as part of their online experience. The museum chooses how to deal with these interventions as documentation and the user chooses whether to respond or not to these institutional actions. To address more broadly and, at the same time, respect fully the representation of the IO through constructed documentation, therefore, the repository should seek the involvement of various interested parties.

To the problems of representation of the structure of the metadata for IOs, as well as of their content and the revealing (or reconstructing) of their contexts there can be added another level that could produce an issue with communication – language. Since “description is a language activity”⁴⁹ and can show obsolescence through the ways in which naming and labeling might over time and across disparate communities be deemed to be offensive or

⁴⁷ Fiona Cameron and Sarah Mengler. "Complexity, Transdisciplinarity and Museum Collections Documentation: Emergent Metaphors for a Complex World," *Journal of Material Culture* 14, no.2 (2009): 190.

⁴⁸ Cameron and Mengler, op.cit.,191.

⁴⁹ Michael K. Buckland, "Cultural Heritage (Patrimony): An introduction." In Willer, Mirna, Anne J. Gilliland, and Marijana Tomić, eds, *Records, Archives and Memory: Selected Papers from the Conference and School on Records, Archives and Memory Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia, May 2013*, (Zadar: University of Zadar Press, 2015), p.17.

inappropriate, it also has the potential to provide us with more insight into the construction of knowledge in the time and place when a particular description was created for the IO in question.

iii. Addressing terminological inconsistencies

In addition to the abovementioned complexities, inconsistency in the use of terminology in studies on these issues is an interwoven concern. The term "concept" is often used in classification as a synonym for category and categorization. That term here, as already discussed, is used to denote the mental representation of anything for which a representation can be made.⁵⁰ "Category," on the other hand, is used as a broad term referring to a group of things that share similar properties or features. Categorization differs from classification in several systemic properties that were elaborated by Elin Jacob. According to her, categorization might be considered to be broader and more flexible and context dependent than classification where entities do not overlap, are hierarchically structured, members are equally representative of a class (in categories boundaries are fuzzy), and criteria for assignment into a certain class are predetermined by principles or guidelines.⁵¹

Categorization is not only about basic cognitive categorization of things. It is also about something that surpasses basic processes--to do with the curatorial concept of what some material (event, idea, person) means to the museum, and what role this material/idea/described event might play both within and outside the museum. Categorization is pre-determined by professional constraints and often restricts human interactions.

⁵⁰ Loehrlein, op.cit. 122.

⁵¹ Elin K. Jacob, "Classification and Categorization: A Difference that Makes a Difference," *Library Trends*, 52, no. 3 (Winter 2004): 528.

2. Reflections on Description

As already discussed, the process of description is a relational one. It is carried out between the resource, a human, and different contexts (from personal and institutional contexts all the way to societal contexts), and it is mediated by the affordances of the medium through which is realized. This process results (in the frame of a heritage institution) mostly in a textual account of the content and the context of the resource being described. More differences than similarities seem to exist between institutional contexts and that certainly contributes to the complexity of descriptive practices in general. The agency of the human within the process of description in terms of communication is similar in all institutions, but the professional attitude toward recognizing, acknowledging and being transparent about the role and perspective of that human has changed drastically in recent decades -- shifting from regarding and exhorting the person who created the description to be objective and value neutral and to endeavor only to transfer already existing information and knowledge, to viewing that individual as someone who brings many subjectivities to bear, consciously and unconsciously, and who, through the descriptive process, represents information and knowledge that can exist on multiple levels and with multiple incommensurabilities. The aim of the next section, therefore, is to reflect on different aspects of issues of description, including its content, context, structure and use, as these are framed in the literatures on archival and museum ideas and practices. The first part will discuss the concept of description, the role of the processor and the context and role of description in archival and museum institutions and settings. The second part will address issues of standardization of descriptive practices and questions of interoperability.

The following considerations about description are not meant to be a comprehensive review and examination of the history of description in archival and museum settings, but rather an introduction to concepts and topics relevant to this research. The scholarly thoughts presented in this literature review represent only a small piece of the total scholarship and reflections on issues regarding description. The scholarship discussed originates from various backgrounds and traditions and in itself is also an indicator of how issues of description are of common concern. Moreover, while national and international standards emerged from collaborations of experts various backgrounds and aim to present joint understandings, their

implementation and implicit and explicit values often differ from one national, local and institutional context to another.

At this first stage of contemplation I deliberately choose not to define heritage institutions exclusively as archives, museum, libraries or other collecting institutions in which description is being created. This is because efficient and effective retrieval of information through the description that is provided should not depend on the nature of the institutional or the technological frame. Access to information of any kind is conditioned by the descriptive metadata provided for that information, regardless of whether we are trying to access the information in a physical or electronic environment. The following review begs several very important questions about the future role and scope of description. For example, can description in general be reconceptualized so that it can deal with more demanding roles. For example, unlike library catalogue information, descriptions in archives and museum have not been widely and globally reused. To what extent and how could their descriptions become reusable in character? Is more or different description required to support user needs in online environments that are not mediated by professionals as in more traditional reference encounters, and how might this also promote user interaction in description? Should description present different perspectives, represent multiple voices, confront controversial topics?

i. Archival description

Reviewing the existing body of knowledge on descriptive practices and theories about description one encounters a range of literature that problematizes description from different perspectives and angles. Only when it is put together does one begin to gain in-depth insight into the complexity that can inhere in description. Description, as one component of processing collected or accumulated material, in practice is usually considered to begin when material is already acquired by or transferred to a heritage institution. In fact it starts long before, not just with the work already carried out by the institution in terms of appraisal, categorization and arrangement, but even with the choices made by a creator or collector in terms of structuring, grouping and naming the information objects they create or collect. There are many such choices made before actual description and, while they are reflected to a greater or lesser extent in the final description created by the heritage institution, they are

often not revealed that explicitly. The final products of description that we read in an inventory, catalogue or finding aid resemble an arranged puzzle with pieces that correspond with, reflect upon, and complement each other. If some pieces are missing then the puzzle is incomplete, and someone will likely notice the incompleteness. Sometimes pieces of the puzzle are hard to find, sometimes they are not recognized as vital pieces or are deliberately left out. Sometimes they are named in such a way that the user can't recognize (and access) the object in question.

The process of putting the pieces together is also relevant because the final product is not self-explanatory, although it might seem that way once it has been completed. The term "representation" denotes all the processes used in different types of heritage institutions, although writers such as Yakel, who come from one specific field (in this case, archival science), often use it generically to refer to that field's practices:

Representation refers to both the processes of arrangement (respecting or disrespecting order) and description, such as the creation of access tools (guides, inventories, finding aids, bibliographic records) or systems (card catalogs, bibliographic databases, EAD databases) resulting from those activities.⁵²

Yakel further refers to archival representation as encompassing description, processing, and cataloging, all terms that can also be applied to or that parallel similar processes in other types of heritage institutions. Bearing in mind the wide range of institutional differences and various practices, it might be fruitful first to acknowledge some of their similarities. All heritage institutions exist in order to serve their respective communities, and most face similar challenges in funding and day-to-day practical problems. Many heritage institutions struggle with finding the best way to represent their collections and serve growing users' demands in the online environment.

Reviewing various definitions of the concept of archival description, Luciana Duranti indicated that description can be perceived as a process (of analysis, identification and organization), as a means of control (over a thing being described, physical and intellectual)

⁵² Elizabeth Yakel, "Archival Representation," *Archival Science* 3 (2003): 2.

and as a final product.⁵³ She notes that through centuries of descriptive activities, description itself has undergone different stages of development and that external use of records in the archival context have influenced such change:

By studying the origin and development of the concept of archival description, the main question addressed here was whether description has always been a major archival function. The conclusion is that description has never been an archival function. Instead, it has been one of the means used to accomplish the only two permanent archival functions: (1) preservation (physical, moral and intellectual) and (2) communication of archival documents, that is, of the residue and evidence of societal actions and transactions. This is probably the reason why there is no universally recognized conceptualization of archival description, no steady progress in its use, and not even linear development in its application. Description has been carried out or not carried out depending on specific needs and conditions, attitudes and requirements, and its products have consistently reflected the conceptions about archives held by the society of the time.⁵⁴

In the field of archival science and within the realm of the so-called postmodern "archival turn," the role and influence of the archivist as mediator started to be discussed in the 1990s, albeit in the rather restricted area of the literature and practice of the English-speaking part of the profession. For example, among others, Blouin⁵⁵ called on archivists to be aware of their role; and Deodato asserted that in the postmodern mindset the archivist isn't just a record-keeper but is also the creator and co-creator of narratives about those records through the act of producing descriptions.⁵⁶

⁵³ Luciana Duranti, "The Origin and Development of the Concept of Archival Description."

Archivaria 35 (1993): 48,

<http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/viewFile/11884/12837>.

⁵⁴ Duranti, "Origin and Development," 52.

⁵⁵ Francis X. Blouin, Jr. "Archivists, Mediation, and Constructs of Social Memory," *Archival Issues* 24, no.2 (1999): 111.

⁵⁶ Joseph Deodato, "Becoming Responsible Mediators: The Application of Postmodern Perspectives to Archival Arrangement & Description," *Progressive Librarian* 27 (2006): 59; 62.

This, in turn can reflect on differential power structures that are at work in both the narrower institutional and broader societal frameworks. Dodge reflected on the archivist as “[...] the locus of mediation between the information artefact, the description of it, the digitized simulacrum of it, and the user of it.”⁵⁷ That there exist meta-levels, in this case in archival description, was asserted by Bunn. She suggested that “observing the observing in the observing” was one way to account for the observer’s point of view.⁵⁸ According to her findings, a description can be characterized as a matter of perspective and a question of balance--as “a point of view about how we look at the world and from our point of view, about how we know what we know.”⁵⁹ In this way archival description, as well as the act of description itself, can be considered to be matter of epistemology. Recognition of the personal element of engagement with archival material might also be seen in how the appearance of a collection has been shaped,⁶⁰ as well as in how its structure and content are ultimately reflected in the description.

It is often stated that museum objects are defined as such through the act of interpretation,⁶¹ which can be considered to be a process that involves not just a visitor’s reaction while experiencing the object, but also extends to include the curator’s personality. Curatorial statements are traditionally an integral part of exhibition or other curatorial projects where museums are intending to communicate with an audience and where the position of curator can be understood and accepted as one of only many possible interpretations.

⁵⁷Bernadine Dodge, "Across the Great Divide: Archival Discourse and the (Re)presentations of the Past in Late-Modern Society," *Archivaria* 53 (Spring 2002): 20, <http://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12834>.

⁵⁸ Jennifer J. Bunn, *Multiple Narratives, Multiple Views: Observing Archival Description*. Ph.D. thesis (University College London, 2011), 217, <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1322455/>.

⁵⁹ Bunn, op.cit.

⁶⁰ Sue, Breakell, "Encounters with the Self: Archives and Research". In Hill, Jennie ed. *The Future of Archives and Recordkeeping a Reader* (London: Facet Publishing, 2011), p.31.

⁶¹Sandra H. Dudley, "Encountering a Chinese Horse Engaging with the Thingness of Things." Chapter 1 in *Museum Objects: Experiencing the Properties of Things*, Dudley, Sandra H. ed. (London, New York: Routledge, 2012), p.6, <https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/27883/4/Encountering%20a%20Chinese%20horse.pdf>.

Archivists make no such statements in their finding aids. Considering how the imprint of archivists' historical perspectives on their archival holdings might subsequently be viewed by historians and the consequences of a one-way relationship between the expertise of these two groups, Terry Cook concluded:

In short, what historians would find, if they were to examine the footprints left by archivists by such a historical analysis of the archiving function in society, is a whole series of heavily mediated filters that govern how records first are chosen to come to archives, and then are re-presented to researchers by archivists in various kinds of physical orders and containers and in varying intellectual finding aids and research guides.⁶²

Archival description comprises all previous representations created during processing and arranging material, but within the parameters of the archival principles of provenance and original order (to the extent that this exists for materials acquired by an archive). It strives not to have a creative or overly interpretive character or to be a subjective narrative. Nevertheless, its representational nature cannot be evaded since the material being processed and described is already a representation of past activities by the very fact that it has been through one or more appraisal, selection or arrangement processes. Contemplating the universe of representations that exist for a record and its various duplicates, forms and other copies, Yeo indicated that these form a chain of representations:

A photographic copy of the widow's pension application is a representation of a record, just as the record itself is a representation of the activity of the widow. A set of metadata describing a record is also a representation of the record; and a set of metadata describing a copy is a representation of the copy. There is often a chain of representations, in which one representation represents another.⁶³

⁶² Terry Cook, "The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists and the Changing Archival Landscape," *The American Archivist* 74 (Fall/Winter 2011): 627.

⁶³ Geoffrey Yeo, "Concepts of Record (1): Evidence, Information and Persistent Representations," *The American Archivist* 70 (Fall/Winter 2007): 341.

Description as a product might also serve as a surrogate on a certain indicative level. Consider how missing, destroyed or stolen artifacts might be contextualized or even unknown to posterity without detailed description? Although in this case the description as a product would act only as an indicator of the original existence, ownership or physical condition of objects in question. Description can also act as a surrogate of a record "[...] when users need an overview of a fonds or collection so they can eliminate items irrelevant to their research."⁶⁴

The problems of representing the character of the resources being described, as well as of the determining institutional framework and the individual perspectives of the processor get more complicated as one tries to account for the influence of the historical and societal contexts in which descriptive processes occur. The main issue with describing past contexts of creation is that these are much broader than what the field classically understands to be provenancial context (i.e., the name and circumstances of the personal or juridical authority under which the materials were created, accumulated or collected). The plural, often ambiguous and residual character of material being described, shrouded within its temporal contexts, presents a great challenge. All attempts to create a descriptive account stand as further pieces to add to the broader jigsaw puzzle. This doesn't imply some nihilistic handwringing, only the acknowledgment that description exists in a past, present and unforeseeable future. As descriptive practices reflect certain relationships embedded in broader context so too do descriptive standards⁶⁵ and their implementation in different contexts.⁶⁶

Horsman has pointed out that "context can be seen as everything outside the records that influences their contents and structure" including business processes, persons, technology and society, and that "the only sound method is describing the subsequent contexts and how

⁶⁴ Yeo, op.cit., 342.

⁶⁵ Deodato, op.cit.

⁶⁶ Eunha (Anna) Youn, "Investigating Socio-cultural Aspects of the Implementation of an International Archival Descriptive Standard in Korea in eds. Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J Lau, eds., *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016): 789-811.

these are related to the records.”⁶⁷ Possibly acknowledging subsequent and simultaneous contexts plus adding awareness of the Self and the Other in a given contemporary context could serve as a starting formula for the future conceptualization of description, its consequences and benefits. This view on description is somewhat flattened in its breadth, because it doesn’t refer specifically to other values that are inherent specifically to archival description.

As mentioned earlier, one circumstance shared by heritage institutions that is often overlooked is the fact that description can also be considered to be a record created through the business process of description. This is the case for all institutions and professionals whose responsibilities include creating and providing descriptions of the materials created, accumulated, collected, or otherwise managed by them. Millar, confronting the role of description within the very different Canadian and Australian archival traditions (or as she put it, the "post-hoc" and "continuum" approaches), described how the notion of accountability can be closely connected with issues of archival description.⁶⁸ Setting aside such differences in archival traditions for now (i.e., post-hoc and continuum), the notion that “the recordkeeper and the archivist can be accountable for their actions, but only to the limit of their authority”⁶⁹ can certainly be applied to other heritage institutions. However, what remains unarticulated is what the limits of the processor’s authority actually are. Are they only legal or professional in nature, or do they have a professional ethical or even a personal moral dimension?

⁶⁷Peter Horsman, *Wrapping Records in Narratives: Representing Context through Archival Description*, Ph.D. thesis (University of Amsterdam, 2011).

⁶⁸ Laura Millar, "An Obligation of Trust," *The American Archivist* 69, no.1 (2006): 60-78, <http://americanarchivist.org/doi/pdf/10.17723/aarc.69.1.v88w11m57382087m>.

⁶⁹ Millar, op.cit., 69.

ii. Museum documentation

The question of the role of description again leads us away from similarities across the descriptive practices of heritage institutions and towards their differences and particularities. The different terminologies used in heritage institutions or in the discourses of the fields of archival science, museum studies, museology and library science become the first threshold. While in archival and library discourse the term "description" is often used, is widely accepted and has infiltrated international standards, in the museum spectrum the correlate terms are "cataloguing" or simply "creating documentation" or "documenting." The latter is a complex term that denotes more than creating a final descriptive entry in a database, exhibition catalogue or labels for displays. According to the International Council on Museums (ICOM)'s practical recommendations concerning documenting objects in museums, every museum should create item-level records for each object in its collections, and should continue to extend this documentation over time in such a way that it can be used for a variety of purposes: collection management, security, development, research, public access, exhibitions and education.⁷⁰ In museums, documenting is a never-ending process. This is a major difference from archival practice, where, although it is acknowledged that descriptions should be updated and augmented over time, the reality is that this does not happen routinely, occurring primarily when collections or accumulations are added to or reprocessed, or through retrospective conversion, or social tagging and crowd sourced description. Documenting is one of the major functions of the business of museums, being the major frame through which an object is interpreted and contextualized. Additionally, museum objects have the capacity to be revealed and experienced in aesthetic and sensory modes even without much documentation. Materiality in museums plays a serious role and can invoke affective responses in viewers/users. A typical object in an art museum, for example a painting, can be aesthetically experienced without documentation that explains the object, although certainly not completely understood and appreciated on cognitive level. The sculpture can be touched and its materiality experienced without explanation labels. The question is how much depth and utility can that affect-experience have (i.e., effect) without explanatory documentation?

⁷⁰ International Council on Museums. *Running a Museum: A Practical Handbook*. (Paris: ICOM, 2004), p.33.

According to Coburn, cataloging:

[...] can take the form of vital pieces of information about a work of art handwritten on a sheet of paper that will live in a file cabinet in the hope that one day it will be entered into a collection management system. The other extreme might take the form of a lengthy new acquisition report with information of the artist, descriptive information on the object, its historical significance, and its history of ownership, bibliography, and exhibition history.⁷¹

Sometimes a differentiation between documentation as a product "... a set of very diverse documents in terms of supports, contents, origins and cultural value", and documentation as a process "consisting of various sequences of work involved in producing the different sets of documents or managing the museum" is emphasized.⁷²

The character of museum documentation in the Croatian context was comprehensively elaborated by Ivo Maroević, professor of museology, a branch of Information science that he was instrumental in developing at the University of Zagreb from the 1960s on. According to Maroević, there are several principles of documenting including respect for the objects' value as well as completeness and purposefulness (to ensure that documentation can be applicable). Furthermore, documentation should be precise and exact, timely, comprehensive, gradual, selective and continuous.⁷³ Maroević asserts that the documentation can be categorized as both professional-scientific documentation and museological documentation.⁷⁴ The professional-scientific documentation is based on "...description, appraisal, exploration and comparative examinations of museum's holding."⁷⁵ Such an exhaustive account of the character of museum documentation indicates the role and status of documentation in the Croatian museum context. Attempts to make a scholarly explanation of museum documentation from an information science perspective are less frequently found in other national contexts where analysis of museum documentation takes on a more practical and prescriptive character. This

⁷¹ Erin Coburn, "Beyond Registration: Understanding What Cataloging Means to the Museum Community," *VRA Bulletin* 34, no.1 (2007): 76.

⁷² Francisca Hernández Hernández, "Documentary Sources of Museology: Reflections and Perspectives," *ICOFOM Study Series* 44 (2016): 86.

⁷³ Ivo Maroević, *Uvod u Muzeologiju* (Zagreb: Zavod za Informacijske Studije, 1993), p.194.

⁷⁴ Maroević, *Uvod u Muzeologiju*, op.cit., 197.

⁷⁵ Maroević, *Uvod u Muzeologiju*, op.cit., 197.

scholarly impulse regarding issues of practice can be understood in the Croatian context when viewed through the lens of Croatia's museum history, development of documentation practice, and the detailed and comprehensive legal and regulatory framework in which that practice is situated. These issues will be elaborated in the next section, since they are quite influential with regard to the specific topic of this research.

iii. Archival and museum values

Not every part of museum documentation is presented to the end user but this is the case also in archives, where the documentation made by the archivist while researching and processing material is generally not available to the end user. Which part of museum documentation, then, functions as description that is intended to be accessed by users visiting or outside the institution? Could that description take the form of a catalogue entry in the databases that museums use to describe and manage their holdings? If so, to what extent can visitors or outside users access and consult such database entries? The same questions might of course also be asked in the context of an archive. They raise issues that are intertwined with considerations about the role of representation and description specifically in archive and museum contexts, since divisions in both contexts exist between information that is or could be made available to users and that which is available only to the institution's staff, for example, collection managers and curators. The role of description, therefore, should be analyzed from the perspective of an institution's own needs and uses, as well as from that of other users' needs and uses. While these are often similar they differ in scale and feasibility due to the security, legal and cultural restrictions that the institution is obliged to implement, as well as considerations such as protecting the locations of archaeological sites, and the privacy of donors and purchase prices of objects.

In both institutional contexts the role of description in the eyes of most users consists first in identifying and locating the required object or a record. Through a museum's description, the originality and authenticity of an object must be validated (or contested) and the same is the case for an archival descriptive account, although a different notion of authenticity is often applied. Records being described in an archive have an additional role and value as legal, bureaucratic or historical evidence that should be exposed through

description. To serve as such evidence, their trustworthiness as a record should be demonstrated in terms of their reliability and authenticity. The latter is partly assessed based upon the record's own characteristics but partly also depends on tracking the chain of custody and the order in which the records were created, received and filed, all of which should be manifested in the final description.

Description in both contexts serves to explain the creation of the material and also to expose the “material’s documentary inter-relationship,”⁷⁶ although inter-relationships between materials are conceptualized differently in archives and museums. Duranti defines the concept of the "archival bond" as “the network of relationships that each record has with the records belonging in the same aggregation.”⁷⁷ She asserts that a document qualifies as a record only through its archival bond, which determines the meaning of the record. Within this context archival description becomes “the means of elucidating the nature of archival bond in its documentary context.”⁷⁸ While both archival and museum theory agree that even a forgery may be authentic as forgery, albeit not authentic as something that is purporting to be original, the authenticity of a museum object doesn’t rely on such relationships that go beyond its own boundaries (although proving the object to be authentic necessarily does and this is no self-explanatory action). The museum object is regarded as being authentic in its form, defined by its materiality, structure and meaning. This cannot be proven by simply observing the object itself--its authenticity will be established by documentation that follows the object and records that accompany that documentation.

The interpretation of an object in a museum certainly is a major function of museum description, but that can also be said for archives, although in less opulent mode. In general it is understood that archival description privileges context over content, and museum descriptive practice give more weight to content, because contextualization in an archive is

⁷⁶ Anne J. Gilliland, “Contemplating Co-creator Rights in Archival Description,” *Knowledge Organization* 39, no.5 (September 2012): 341.

⁷⁷ Luciana Duranti, "The Archival Bond," *Archives and Museum Informatics* 11 (1997): 215, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226554280_The_Archival_Bond.

⁷⁸ Duranti, "Archival Bond," op.cit, 217.

driven by the principle of provenance while museum activities are more object-centric.⁷⁹ Dismissing museum ideas about the provenance of an object, the archival understanding of provenance emphasizes the creator (human or juridical) of the material, thus overlooking the role that the notion of creatorship has in the museum. Provenance in the museum context usually refers to the origin of the object within museum holdings, its previous collector, discoverer or owner. To establish and be able to prove the provenance of object is of great value for museum because it has direct implications for its legal (especially ownership) status within the collection and thus influences subsequent uses. The term is usually broadly applied, but it can be distinguished from the archival concept of provenance which is longstanding, complex, traditionally embedded into profession⁸⁰ and increasingly challenged through scholarly writings and new, developing ontologies for cultural heritage information.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Anne J. Gilliland, “Enduring Paradigm, New Opportunities: The Value of the Archival Perspective in the Digital Environment,” in Michèle V. Cloonan, ed. *Preserving Our Heritage: Perspectives from Antiquity to the Digital Age* (Neals-Schuman, ALA Editions, 2014) [excerpted and updated from 2000 CLIR publication with same title].

⁸⁰ Thomas Nesmith, ed., *Canadian Archival Studies and the Rediscovery of Provenance* (Chicago, IL: Scarecrow and Society of American Archivists, 1993).

⁸¹ Anne J. Gilliland and Sue McKemmish. “Rights in Records as a Platform for Participative Archiving,” Chapter 14 in Richard J. Cox, Alison Langmead and Eleanor Mattern, eds. *Archival Education and Research: Selected Papers from the 2014 AERI Conference* (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Press, 2015), pp.355-385.

iv. Archival records and museum objects

The museum can easily be seen as promoting a culture of documentation, even on the highest conceptual level artifacts and their structure within collections could be treated as documents that reflect on broader society. Depending on the perspective of the viewer of the presented objects and their aggregations and depending on the mediator (e.g., the curator), museum objects as documents can also testify to societal value. Understanding a museum object as document is occluded by terminological inconsistencies and overlaps, however, especially in the Croatian language where a document isn't always distinguished from a record in the archival sense.⁸² Although in the archival field all documents constitute some kind of evidence, whether they are considered to be official records or not, the term "document" is also used as a term of art to refer to a specific kind of record (for example, a record with particular legal capacities such as a charter or a contract), in library and information science the term "document" often does not have the same specificity and indeed can be used as a much more overarching term. Michael Buckland's influential article "What is a 'Document'?" and his closely connected earlier paper "Information as a Thing" are perhaps the most cited explications of how these fields conceive of documents and in which contexts.⁸³ Referring to Paul Otlet's documentalist approach, Buckland explained the use of the term "document" in the documentalist sense "as a generic term to denote any physical information resource rather than to limit it to text-bearing objects in specific physical media such as paper, papyrus, vellum or microfilm."⁸⁴

⁸²This is a matter of shared terminology but diverging semantics that adds confusion into discussions about convergences between archives, museums and libraries. "Document" can be translated as "dokument" in Croatian, while "record" can be translated as "zapis," but the professional usage can differ from that of the English term. In the Law on Archives and Archival Institutions archival material is defined as "records or documents" (in Croatian "zapisi ili dokumenti"). However usage of the word *document*, especially in museological discourse can also refer to museum objects (i.e., the objects are referred to as documents).

⁸³ Michael K. Buckland, "What is a 'Document'?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 48, no.9 (1997): 804-809; and "Information as Thing," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 42, no.5 (June 1991): 351-360.

⁸⁴ Buckland, "Information as Thing," op.cit., 154. See also Paul Otlet, *Traité de Documentation* (Bruxelles: Mundaneum, Palais Mondial, 1934) and Paul Otlet, Warden Boyd Raymond,

The influence of this European-centric documentalist approach and semiotics on museum thinking can be noticed in the ICOM-ICOFOM symposium entitled “Object-Document?” that was held in 1994 in Beijing, a forum at which the theoretical discourse of museology notably transcended its practical application. At that symposium, Maroević argued:

We should not forget that the museum object becomes an INDOC (information/documentation) object, because it contains and transmits information and documents different forms of reality through which it has passed. In the context of a museum, it behaves as an object which transmits messages contained in its documentary structure. That part of the museum object which is in the function of a document serves as a sign bearer, the sign being systematically built into the object's physical structure from the moment of its creation and surviving in time despite possible variation of its interpretation.⁸⁵

Conceptualizing museum objects as documentary evidence of past practices and realities corresponds with the documentalist approach and some of Otlet's own ideas about bureaucratic information.

None of these definitions, however, conceptualizes the object or the record to their fullest potential, as probably no definition ever will. For example, there are constitutive properties, such as materiality, that are central to the concept of museum object, and properties that are fundamental to the value ascribed to records such as evidentiarieness, but in the latter case their status of records is easier to determine if there is a clear archival bond. The concept of a museum object as a document does not necessarily imply its recordness, but a record can also be conceptualized as artifact. In the inverse discussion, just a year after the ICOFOM Beijing symposium about object-document relations, archivist Hugh Taylor, writing from a Canadian perspective, offered a view of records as a significant part of material culture:

I want to discuss archives not only as artifacts principally in relation to museums but also as a branch of our heritage that is so often taken for granted, perhaps because we

trans, [*International Organization and Dissemination of Knowledge: Selected Essays*](#) (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1990).

⁸⁵ Ivo Maroević, "The Museum Object as a Document," *ICOFOM Study Series* 33 (1994): 115.

see the documents we handle as simply providing reliable information in support of other material culture. And therefore materially "invisible."⁸⁶

These shared properties--not just their materiality, but also the idea of archival record as an "[...] 'instrument' for the conduct of affairs or relationships as do the artifact in museums"⁸⁷--bring the concepts of object and record into closer proximity. Such properties are today being researched in part by exploring issues of affect in archives.⁸⁸

Katie Rudolf argues that the treatment of artifacts in archives, for example as part of the donation of a personal fond, is an issue worthy of further study.⁸⁹ She argues that an aggregation of artifacts and records in the traditional sense shows traits of the archival bond and asks "Might researchers in archives also find it useful to compare a record creator's documents and artifacts in order to interpret history and biography?"⁹⁰ Physical separation of such aggregations at the points of appraisal and processing (sometimes necessary due to different conservation conditions) doesn't have to imply intellectual separation. Later the separation can be bridged by description (and indeed, international archival description standards make provision for indicating not only related but also separated materials). Rudolf asserts how the archival bond can be retained through archival description.⁹¹ While agreeing with Rudolf that institutions lack effective appraisal concepts when dealing with complex aggregations⁹² and that thoughtful description is a possible *post hoc* solution, the research

⁸⁶ Hugh Taylor, "'Heritage' Revisited: Documents as Artifacts in the Context of Museums and Material Culture," *Archivaria* 40 (1995): 9.

⁸⁷ Taylor, *op.cit.* 9

⁸⁸ See for example, Marika Cifor and Anne J. Gilliland, "Affect and the Archive, Archives and Their Affects: An Introduction to the Special Issue," *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 1-6. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-015-9263-3.

⁸⁹ Katie Rudolf, "Separated at Appraisal: Maintaining the Archival Bond between Archives Collections and Museum Objects," *Archival Issues* 33, no.1 (2011): 25-39.

⁹⁰ Rudolf, *op.cit.* 29.

⁹¹ Rudolf, *op.cit.* 35.

⁹² Rudolf, *op.cit.* 37.

presented in this thesis suggests that description made only in accordance with the principles built into current archival description standards might not be the way to express complexities. This is because archival description is in itself in a challenging stage of development and will likely continue to evolve, thus it is not closed a concept upon which everyone will agree. For example, a recent contribution on the issue of connecting artifacts with archives or records at an inter-institutional level was made in Australia by Mike Jones, whose current research argues that this separation can also be easily bridged through ICT development.⁹³

v. Records in museums from an archival perspective

In 1995, one year after the Beijing ICOFOM Object-Document Symposium, when Hugh Taylor published his perspective on documents as artifacts, the problem of what to do with records that exist in museums was elaborated by Australian archivist Bruce Smith. He argued that there are two types of archives in museums--those that are created during museum business activities and those that are collected within museum collecting activities--and the latter one is problematic.⁹⁴ This is not only an Australian or Croatian phenomenon but also a global fact. Records exist in museums as a result of both functions in various forms and within different national and local contexts. They may also be part of museum collections as a result of local and national history. In some countries, especially former colonies or those that underwent significant changes in national configuration and status, such as in the region of what was to become the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, museums were established before archives and often became the places to which early records, recognized as both historical national documents and cultural artifacts, were consigned (for example, in Osijek

⁹³ Mike Jones, "Artefacts and Archives: Considering Cross-collection Knowledge Networks in Museums," paper presented at the Conference of Museums and the Web in Asia, October 5-8 2015, Melbourne, Australia, <http://mwa2015.museumsandtheweb.com/paper/artefacts-and-archives-considering-cross-collection-knowledge-networks-in-museums/>. It should be noted that the Getty Research Institute, among others, also has a long and distinguished record of promoting standards and crosswalks that might bring together descriptions of different information objects across diverse cultural institutions. See for example, Murtha Baca, ed., *Introduction to Metadata* 3rd edition (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2016).

⁹⁴ Bruce Smith, "Archives in Museums," *Archives and Manuscripts* 23, no. 1 (May 1995): 39.

and Ljubljana). Records held by museums, often functionally disconnected from the bureaucratic, research or personal activity through which they were originally generated, and physically disconnected from other records aggregated in the same process and therefore with broken archival bond, may suffer from significantly diminished recordness. Nevertheless they still are within the boundaries of the concept of record. In these respects, the term "stray records" can perhaps be applied to them.

3. Historical Background on Collecting Records in Croatian Museums

This section will provide a basic overview on the historical background of records that are part of Croatian museum holdings while emphasizing the perspectives of those who work in archives and museums, as drawn from their professional writings.

The modern Croatian state archival system was established in the second half of the 20th century, but the beginnings of archives as institutions designated to preserve state records dates back to the 17th century. The *Archivum Regni*, holding records of the Croatian Parliament and provincial governor, was fulfilling its role of supporting state administrative affairs. Many European states first established their archives in the 19th century, and increasingly did so in the latter part with the rise of the professional academic discipline of modern scientific history that depended upon access to primary documents. In 1870, the Croatian Parliament passed the Law on the Territorial Archive in Zagreb and once that archive opened, the general public was able to access records--mostly for historical research purposes--that were previously publicly unavailable.

By that time some public museums were already open, such as the Archeological Museum in Split, the National Museum in Zadar and the National Museum in Zagreb. With the formation of other museums of a regional and local character, active collecting began that emphasized the importance of such material for local community. Different types of records were collected at that time also, ranging from medieval charters, records of guilds and architectural drawings to personal records and material that would today be categorized as ephemera. It was also considered to be important to collect photographs, largely through

donation or purchase. Such material is today mostly categorized as types of cultural-historical material and kept in museum collections that are still actively evolving and growing through more recent collecting activities.

In the mid 20th century, discussion began among archival, museum and library professionals about whether it would be fruitful to make some kind of demarcation between such materials, including those that were already held by these institutions and those that would be collected and preserved in the future. In *Arhivski Vjesnik*, the national archival journal, Nemeth wrote in 1958 that:

Nowadays we have the artificial phenomenon that some museums in the region keep, among incoherent collections of archives from ancient times, also genuine registries of different institutions, companies and organizations. These include, e.g., museums in Vukovar, Vinkovci, Bjelovar, Karlovac, Šibenik and Split. And memorial museums of the National Liberation Struggle constitute in fact some kind of symbiosis of archives and museums. It is unjustified, and from an archival standpoint inadmissible that written material is kept in museums.⁹⁵

He argues that archival material⁹⁶ should be transferred from museums to archives but acknowledges that museums played a very valuable role in preserving such material in the period before the state archival system was established.

One year later the Archive Council of the People's Republic of Croatia, at its annual meeting, recognizing that this was an "[...] old, difficult, and that is to say – sensitive problem,"⁹⁷ discussed it and concluded that ways to demarcate material were indeed needed to establish the jurisdictions of museums, archives and libraries. In 1960, the Council of Culture

⁹⁵ Krešimir Nemeth, "Prilog Problemu Organizacije Arhivske Službe u NR Hrvatskoj," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 1 (1958): 401.

⁹⁶ It should be noted that his statement refers only to textual ("written") materials although there might well also be maps, plans, photographs and other non-textual materials that could be argued also to be records. This may have reflected prevalent notions of what constituted a record at the time, or may just have been the written convention that he was using.

⁹⁷ Bernard Stulli, "Zasjedanje Arhivskog Savjeta NR Hrvatske 29.12.1959," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 3, no.1 (1959): 498.

and Science of the People's Republic of Croatia passed a Recommendation on such a demarcation of material among archives, libraries and museums. It made three primary stipulations: that the organic integrity of fonds and collections, the principle of heritage integrity that refers to material of complex and polyvalent character, and the conditions under which private donors gave their personal materials to institutions all be observed. Lists of material held in all types of institutions were to be made, and archives were given the jurisdiction to make lists of records that had been collected and/or were held in museums and libraries. While the Recommendation was passed, the situation in practice was that the fields involved were reluctant to make such major changes in existing collections that had been developed over the course of a century. In 1965, curator and museologist Anton Bauer considered the issue of archives in museums and argued that the fact was that most of the archival material held in local museums had been preserved only because it was part of those museums' holdings. He asked:

If these local museums are keepers of heritage and documentation centers for their regions, under what logic would the local archive be segregated from this entirety? ...separated older documents, charters and such are anyway parts of museum collections.⁹⁸

Archivists insisted that a demarcation of collected material should be made, dismissing concerns in the museum community that the concept of "archival material" as defined by the archival legislation was so broadly drawn that it subsumed great parts of museum holdings.⁹⁹ In the years following the recommendation, attempts were made to exchange material between archives and museums, but museums still did not comply. For example, regarding the Historical Archive in Split, Božić-Bužančić wrote of how, in the years following 1961, all attempts by the archivist to exchange material with the City Museum of Split had failed.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ Antun Bauer, "Muzeji kao Dokumentacioni Centri: Dokumentacija u Kompleksnim Muzejima," unpublished manuscript (Zagreb: Museum Documentation Centre R-41, 1965), p.12.

⁹⁹ Bernard Stulli, "'Arhivska Građa' u Novom Arhivskom Zakonodavstvu SR Hrvatske," *Vjesnik Historijskih Arhiva u Rijeci i Pazinu* 10 (1964-1965): 299.

¹⁰⁰ Danica Božić-Bužančić, "Popisivanje Arhivske Građe na Području Historijskog Arhiva u Splitu," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 10 (1967): 141.

The Recommendation also stipulated that archives should make lists--registrations of archival material held in institutions other than archives. That process met with difficulties too:

[a] major part of the unfinished work is on the registration of archival material in museums and libraries, material which museum and library staff can't, don't know how or refuse to register, and don't want to handover to archives!¹⁰¹

The debate continued in the 1970s. Bauer, while arguing for a comprehensive system of museum documentation, asserted that according to the archival legislation framework, a large part of museum material is considered in fact to be archival material, and because of the vagueness of the museum legislation framework it remains unprotected *qua* records, in museums. He argued that:

Archival material often is organically connected to particular museum material which, without archival documentation, doesn't have its historical and cultural value and vice versa. Foremost that is guild material, material of associations with rich museum material, [and] personal archives with complex memorabilia connected with that person.¹⁰²

Another valuable archival perspective on the issue of the demarcation of material acquired by heritage institutions was presented in 1991 by archivist Mladen Radić:

Resistance in museums was also subjective in nature (“we have collected and processed that” or “where were you up to now” etc.) in the sense that cultural heritage has been taken away from their institution, so that historical departments will experience great loss, that the original is the original, etc. Here there is the fear of the general public opinion and that of “founders”, who have often forbidden transmission of material.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Bernard Stulli, "Ustavna Reforma i Revizija Arhivskog Zakonodavstva u SR Hrvatske," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 14, no.1 (1971): 293.

¹⁰²Antun Bauer. "Dokumentacija u zavičajnim muzejima," unpublished manuscript (Zagreb: Museum Documentation Centre R-495, 1978), p.10.

¹⁰³ Mladen Radić, "Stanje Arhivske Građe u Posjedu Muzeja na Području Historijskog Arhiva u Osijeku i Razgraničenje Građe," *Glasnik Arhiv Slavonije i Baranje* 1 (1991): 274.

And,

Aspecial Section within the Alliance of Associations of Croatian Archivists was founded to resolve these problems, but despite the request of this Section that archives provide their requests regarding demarcation among archives and other institutions, none of the archives has delivered any request for demarcation of material within any museums. This is yet another indicator of the absence of coordination and firm will to deal with these problems.¹⁰⁴

The presence of archival material in museum collections was more clearly revealed through the Museum Documentation Centre (MDC)'s project that attempted to make a classification system that would serve to standardize museum documentation practices at the beginning of the 1980s. Interestingly, by elaborating on categories and classes, their research also surfaced various types of archival materials that could be found in museums. A range of types of two-dimensional objects, including the following, were listed: documents, maps, plans, manuscripts, photographs, and audio-video material.¹⁰⁵ The category defined as communication and symbols included albums, greeting cards, certificates, memorabilia, photography, diaries, postcards, ballots, reports, cards from concentration camps, circular letters, police cards, posters, charters and bills, with the stated purpose that they be considered documents. The project also established criteria for museum documentation that in large part remain present in museum documentation practice in Croatia today. This does reflect a certain Yugoslav legacy in museum documentation systems, and further research is needed to delineate the process of evolution of Croatian museum documentation practice--both within the context of museology developing into scholarly field and within the wider societal context that has undergone major political and social changes since the 1990s. On the initiative of museologist (and curator) Antun Bauer, Croatia's Museum Documentation Centre (MDC) was founded in 1955 and still continues to serve as an advisory institution on museum documentation issues. The role played by the MDC in documenting the work and activities of Croatian museums, as well as its advisory capacity, significantly underscores the perceived

¹⁰⁴ Radić, op.cit., 276.

¹⁰⁵ Muzejski Dokumentacioni Centar. "Dokumentacija i Klasifikacija Muzejskih i Galerijskih Predmeta," *Muzeologija* 25 (1987), p.16.

value of museums as institutions within Croatia as a socialist republic and today as a sovereign state.

In the early 1980s, according to *The Register of Archival Fonds and Collections*, archivists identified 282 collections of archival material held in museums.¹⁰⁶ In 2011, a statistical report from *The Register of Museums, Galleries and Collections* reported that there were 281 museums with 2175 museum collections and 879 documentary holdings in Croatia. Only 5 museums explicitly stated that they held collections of archival material (8 archival collections in total), and 68 museums stated that have an institutional archive. The data were gathered by the MDC in its role as a central advisory institution. Each Croatian museum reported its own data to the MDC regarding its collection, types of material that is collected, and so forth. Another source published in 2006, *The General Guide for Archival Fonds and Collections*,¹⁰⁷ also provides basic data on archival holdings in the custody of both archival and non-archival Croatian institutions. Data for this guide were collected and analyzed by an archivist from the Public Archive Service. The *General Guide* reports that there are 54 museums holding a total of 625 archival collections. I used its data while preparing for the pilot study that preceded this thesis research.¹⁰⁸ The data from the 2016 *Register of Museums, Galleries and Collections* reveals how there are many collections in Croatian museums generically titled “Collection of photographs,” “Collection of documentary material” and even “Archival collection.” All of these refer only to collected material and exclude material that was created during a museum business activity.

¹⁰⁶ Lalić, Sredoje, ur. *Arhivski Fondovi i Zbirke u SFRJ* (Belgrade: Socialist Republic of Croatia, 1984), p.27.

¹⁰⁷ Josip Kolanović, ed., *The General Guide for Archival Fonds and Collections* (Pregled arhivskih fondova i zbirki Republike Hrvatske) *Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2006).

¹⁰⁸ Tamara Štefanac, "The Conceptualization of Archival Material held in Museums: A Pilot Study." In *Proceedings of the Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts, Zadar, Croatia, 26-30 September 2011*; Willer, Mirna and Marijana Tomić, eds (University of Zadar, 2012), pp.281-294.

The research presented in this thesis argues that a key point in the conceptualization of archival material in museums is embedded in the curatorial perspective. That there is a collision between archival and museum points of view is evidenced by data on the numbers and nature of registered archival records in Croatian museums. The abovementioned historical dispute between the archival and museum communities supports such an assertion. The major issues that can be noticed in the disagreement over the demarcation of archival material between archives and museums are mutual misunderstanding of professional and institutional values, and assumptions that there is only one way to deal with the complex issue of archival material collected in or created by museums in the course of their business.

The idea of the demarcation of archival material held in museums is still present, as can be seen in the 2014 analysis conducted by Bukvić that expresses concern about both types of archival material held in museums. His overview of archival material held in Croatian museums presents a strictly archival perspective. Although there is an acknowledgement that museum documentation presents but one type of archival material, his perspective lacks understanding of the importance of museum documentation for the basic function of museums. Furthermore, there is also a presumption that archival arrangement and description is the only solution that could address archival materials held in both archival and museum institutions.

4. Museum Documentation: The Croatian Context

Museum documentation is generated during and as a part of a museum's business activities. A museum doesn't produce only museum documentation but also different kinds of records that are intrinsic to many of its business activities such as financial and accounting documentation, personal records of employees, and general correspondence. Such operational records are not part of the concept of museum documentation in the Croatian context. On the theoretical level, museum documentation, according to Maroević, can be generally subsumed under two categories of documentation: one that documents museum holdings/collected objects and another that documents activity of museum as cultural institution.¹⁰⁹ On a practical level, however, the creation of museum documentation in Croatian museums is regulated with regard to the content and management of museum documentation by Regulations about content and management museum documentation on museum material¹¹⁰ that were implemented in 2002 by the Ministry of Culture. These Regulations define the content and structure as well as the management of museum documentation, including its creation and safe-keeping. It requires that museum documentation is created through the activities of inventorying, cataloguing and indexing in an ongoing process of production and updating (Article 2). There are three categories of museum documentation: primary, secondary and tertiary. Primary documentation (Article 5) is the largest and encompasses museum material created as result of the registration, analysis and professional processing of museum objects. It includes inventory books of museum objects, catalogues of museum objects, registers of the ingress of a museum object (for example, an object from another institution is registered in the museum as a loan for display purposes), registers of egress (if a museum lends its object to another institution for exhibition), registers of storage and records of revisions made with regard to museum material (e.g., reprocessing, redescription, deaccessioning, additions).¹¹¹ The processes of inventorying and cataloguing are also defined.

¹⁰⁹Maroević, *Uvod u Muzeologiju*, op.cit., 191.

¹¹⁰ Regulations about content and management museum documentation on museum material (Pravilnik o sadržaju i načinu vođenja muzejske dokumentacije o muzejskoj građi, *Official Gazette* 108 (2002).

¹¹¹ In practice, however, most museums have a single system or database for managing the inventorying and cataloguing processes and they share certain data. Originally an inventory book

Article 9 of the Regulations defines the processes of registration and primary processing of a museum object based on the properties that can be detected from an examination of the object itself and any related data that has been collected. The process of cataloguing the object following inventorying is defined as an ongoing activity recording to the value of the museum object, its processing, and all other data. According to the Regulations, a museum catalogue (in electronic or paper-based form) should have 39 categories of datasets.

Within the category of secondary documentation, museum cultural activities should be recorded within fonds of secondary documentation: inventory books of audio-visual fonds, registers of exhibitions, registers of conservation and restoration activities, registers of pedagogical activities, registers of professional and scholarly work of museum staff, registers of museum publishing activities, registers of museum marketing and public relation activities and documentation about foundation and history of museum. Tertiary documentation comprises different catalogues and indexes, thesauri, and so forth, with the stipulated function of providing quicker ways to search and use data contained in the basic documentation fonds.

Under the regulations of the 2015 Law on Museums, museum material and museum documentation is protected as Croatian cultural heritage, as is archival material in archives. The notion of museum material and museum documentation being part of national heritage and legislative protection was also present in the former 1998 Law on Museums. Defined as movable cultural heritage, museum collections have to be listed in the *National Cultural Property Registry of Republic of Croatia*, run by the Ministry of Culture.¹¹² Each museum that is registered with the State as a museum institution is legally obligated to submit data on their processed collections to a special committee within the Ministry of Culture. That committee decides whether the collection fits the criteria of cultural property before the

would have just listed objects according to their inventory numbers or signatures and would have taken the form of a book. The catalogue would extract certain data elements but would have more details.

¹¹² Anuška Deranja Crnokić, "Nastanak Registra Kulturnih Dobra: Povijest i Sadašnjost Inventariziranja Kulturne Baštine u Hrvatskoj," *Godišnjak Zaštite Spomenika Kulture Hrvatske* 37-38 (2013-2014): 25-38.

collection can be listed in the Cultural Property Registry. Archives must go through a similar process of registration with archival material, which is also listed in the Cultural Property Registry as cultural heritage.

According to Article 9 of the Law on Museums, museums are obligated to provide access to museum collections and documentation “for the purpose of professional and research exploration.” Personal purposes are not explicitly stated in this article. Article 10 of the abovementioned law prescribes that public museums can sell, donate or make an exchange of museum material and museum documentation only if they have the permission of the Ministry of Culture, which would be granted only after the Ministry consults with the Croatian Museum Council.

Documenting objects and activities of museums is also a subjective and personal process that is conducted on multiple levels. As Zlodi asserts:

When we observe the curator as interpreter, it is important to recognize two basic levels. On the first level we observe the interpreter as a person who carries with them different influences such as subjectivity, professionalism, personal value system or matter of a taste. The second level can be conditionally named collective because denotation is surely also a societally conditioned process. Still, in documenting we move beyond the personal, and so it is important to record personal interpretation, and, respectively, the motivation for an object’s acquisition. On a pragmatic level that field is *Purpose of ingress* in *Book of ingress*, and its meaning is further recorded through the activities of inventorying and cataloguing. When in time the objects are further evaluated and their meanings reinterpreted, it is important that the author and time of that particular interpretation is recorded, and the former data preserved.¹¹³

Documentation in Croatian museums is created by curators, conservators and documentarists.¹¹⁴ Primary documentation is mostly created by curators and secondary

¹¹³ Goran Zlodi, *Mogućnosti Uspostavljanja Interoperabilnosti Među Shemama Metapodataka u Muzejskom Okruženju*, Ph.D. thesis (University of Zagreb, 2007), p.85.

¹¹⁴ The term in Croatian for this professional role is "dokumentarist" and it is prescribed in the Law on Museums. Although the English term, "documentalist" comes close, there is no exact equivalent term in English as it pertains to a role that is specific to the region of the former Yugoslavia.

documentation mostly by documentarists. The situation in practice is that often a museum doesn't have any documentarists, however, in which case the curator will be in charge of creating the secondary fonds of museum documentation. Each professional has to pass a state exam in order to practice as a curator or a documentarist.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

1. Methodological Considerations

The following explanation and justification of methods employed in this research will first discuss the reasons why an exploration of methodology in general is of vital importance for archival science. Afterwards the methodology employed in this research will be examined and placed in relation to the particular paradigm within which this study has been conducted.

Literature about the methodological approaches employed in research in archival science is relatively recent. Being quite a young field of scholarly inquiry, archival science is still passing through a period of testing its own methods in an emerging new pluralistically-framed and digitally-enabled paradigm while simultaneously employing methods adapted mainly from the humanities and social sciences. The path from positivistic viewpoints and methodologies has slowly been expanding to embrace qualitative methods and new analytical techniques. In a landmark new volume detailing many of the wide range of methodological approaches that have "accompanied the different epistemological framings of archival and recordkeeping studies" Gilliland, McKemmish and Lau acknowledge:

... the distinctive value of each for studying particular phenomena in the field, but with the understanding that more will inevitably emerge in time and also that frameworks and models will shift or be supplanted over time. While a given framework or model might advance a contemporary state of awareness, it subsequently might also provide a piton or rebuttal point for those who are reformulating old concepts, or discovering new forms of knowledge. ... It should be emphasised that research modes customarily associated with the humanities, social sciences, and engineering and technological fields, at the very least, should all be considered to be equally legitimate when applied appropriately and rigorously.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew Lau. "Preface," in *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, A. Gilliland, A. Lau and S. McKemmish, eds (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016), p.19.

Notwithstanding these recent developments, research by archival practitioners relating to archives and to records is as old as archives themselves.¹¹⁶ For Barbara Craig, research supporting archival theory and practice seems almost axiomatic because:

From the archivist's point of view, the critical processes of structured investigation refine ideas about archival records and services; moreover, in looking out into the wider public sphere, the very purpose of keeping archives is to carry into the future an accountable record of the past whose special qualities as a body of evidence support a variety of research interests and needs.¹¹⁷

Furthermore, Craig asserts that research for archivists is both a practical and an ethical imperative because it is closely related to archivists' mission of keeping records and "communicating their meaning over time."¹¹⁸ A distinction, albeit often blurred, exists between applied research regarding records in archives in order to appraise, describe and use them, and a more theoretical or conceptual interrogation of *models* of appraisal, description and use. Both types of research within the archival landscape need to be further differentiated from investigations of applicable *methods* for studying given phenomena in the field of archival science.

While practicing archivists traditionally employ the methods of content and functional analysis, diplomatics and historiography, researchers of archival concepts use a wide spectrum of methods and techniques. Exploring methodological approaches applied in archival studies represents a further development and maturation of an archival discourse. The evolution of methods used in archival research as summarized by Gilliland, McKemmish and Lau and McKemmish and Gilliland reveals a broad spectrum of not only methodological stances but also numerous possibilities for how different methods and techniques might be

¹¹⁶ Such research should not be confused or conflated with historical or other research by scholars or other members of the public that uses archival sources, however.

¹¹⁷ Barbara Craig, "Serving the Truth: The Importance of Fostering Archives Research in Education Programmes, Including a Modest Proposal for Partnerships with the Workplace," *Archivaria* 1, no. 42 (1996): 107, <http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12159/13166>.

¹¹⁸ Craig, op.cit. 108.

employed.¹¹⁹ They also review various relationships between these methods and techniques and the epistemological paradigm within which specific research is situated. With each of our own research attempts we inscribe our use of methods into that tradition and at the same time we leave behind traces of our personal research perspective. Every piece of research, with its methods--traditional, adapted, reinvented or freshly coined--is unique not just because of the ways in which those methods are employed but also because of how it implicitly or explicitly lays out the methods in relation to the epistemological paradigm within which the research has been situated.

2. Testing the Methods in Archival Research

Research helps in the process of building a field, but more than that it “[...] supports more rigorous and sophisticated conceptualization, articulation and assessment of the field’s central precepts and practices.”¹²⁰ This research, therefore, can also be considered to be addressing questions about what kind of methods and techniques are the most suitable and effective to use in elucidating the nature of the information environment in museum settings. Acknowledging that this research can only address one small investigation within a much broader archival multiverse and that it also presents only one particular perspective embedded in a particular paradigm that is encircled by a contemporary societal spectrum, the following section describes the approaches employed in this research into the concepts and contexts of archival records and recordkeeping in Croatian museums.

¹¹⁹ Gilliland, McKemmish and Lau, op.cit. and Sue McKemmish and Anne J. Gilliland. "Archival and Recordkeeping Research: Past, Present and Future." In *Research Methods: Information Management, Systems, and Contexts*, Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), pp.80-112.

¹²⁰ McKemmish and Gilliland, op.cit., 80.

3. Exploring Content and Structure: Background of the Research

This research considers museums not just as repositories of archival material that has been collected, but also as active businesses that generate records of different kinds on a daily basis both for administrative and professional purposes. Museums as institutions and the practices of museum work have been widely researched. Many studies of visitors' behavior have been conducted internationally, as well as studies examining specific museums or exhibitions in various countries. Marketing in museums and marketing of exhibitions have become essential in the 21st century and therefore such research produces relevant knowledge that supports this growing function as well as more traditional museum activities. The architecture of museum buildings and the design of exhibition spaces and display have also been studied, as have museum employees such as curators, museum directors and museum informatics specialists. Museum professionals from the late 20th century on have increasingly been regarded as active meaning-making actors who exercise power over the structure, content and interpretation of information presented to the public in any form, whether through an answer to a user/visitor question, the text of an exhibition label, or the selection of objects for display.

Awareness of the museum and all of its products as *constructs* was acknowledged by Brulon Soares when he asserted that "The «*real thing*» that can be found [in the museum], is the museological experience in all its possible forms, and this is the most authentic thing the museums can offer."¹²¹ The visitor has an experience, but it is shaped by the representations that are produced by creators of the exhibit, the catalogue and other museum narratives. In the process of creating such narratives, museum staff consult, use (as a source of data or even as exhibition objects) and create various types of records. Although business processes require the creation of documentation, one should not forget the agents that implement these requirements and create the records that, in turn, support further business activities. Moreover,

¹²¹ Bruno C. Brulon Soares, "The Museological Experience: Concepts for a Museum Phenomenology." *ICOFOM. Museology: Back to Basics, Study Series 38* (2009): 144, http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2038-2009.pdf.

records in museums are also collected and allocated into collections. What happens to these collected records with respect to the evidence they provide of someone else's business activity?

This thesis and the research on which it is based emanate from basic questions of "why?" Why might one person, who processes collected material, choose to treat and describe this material as a museum object rather than as archival material (i.e., as a record)? Why and how might this person categorize and classify in this manner? Besides investigating the descriptions of collected records that are part of some museum collections and curators' attitudes about these records, this research investigates how and in which manner curators approach the documentation that they create during their business process (i.e., processing and presenting records in museum environment).

The intent was to make this research as inductive as possible, from data collection to the processes of analysis. Several initial areas of questioning, arising in part out of my own experiences and observations as an archivist working in the museum field, assisted in fleshing out the shape that the full research design would take:

- How do museum curators approach archival records and other materials within their institutions?
- How and why do records and other archival materials come to be treated as museum objects?
- What happens to archival material in museum settings?
- Do museum professionals see any possible convergences between archives and museum materials in terms of description and access in museum collections, and if so, what might those be?

4. Pilot Study Results

In 2011, in order to test the ground for this line of research, I conducted a pilot study on the same topic among the curatorial communities of regions geographically and culturally close to Croatia: Slovenia, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹²² The pilot study used a semi-structured questionnaire that was distributed via e-mail. This method and technique proved to be unsuitable for answering the above questions with any depth, however. The results partly answered the questions of "what (is being done with records in museum)?" and "how (is this being done)?" but the statistical analysis that I used was not able to address the question of "why?". When some practice is deeply embedded and inherited over generations in one institutional context it is very hard for people working in this context to comprehend that it is possibly problematic, or could be updated, or is even worth noticing. To be able to understand why something happens in the first place one needs closer contact that will also capture meaningful experiences, which a quantitative survey and its analysis can't truly deliver. It became apparent that achieving such understanding demands in-person contact--in this case, focused conversations with curators that could gradually be expanded both in breadth and depth. A wide spectrum of qualitative methods could support such an approach.

5. Validating Qualitative Methodological Approaches

In 1996, Craig noted that:

Research in the social sciences using qualitative methods is overshadowed in amount and scale by that using quantitative gauges. However, in social scientific research, qualitative research is on the rise as human responses emerge as an area of research interests.¹²³

Since human responses--in this case, curators'--mental reactions and physical and professional actions toward records are of primary interest in this research, a rich mix of

¹²² Tamara Štefanac, "The Conceptualization of Archival Material held in Museums: A Pilot Study." In *Proceedings of the Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts, Zadar, Croatia, 26-30 September 2011*; Willer, Mirna and Marijana Tomić, eds (University of Zadar, 2012), pp.281-294.

¹²³ Craig, op.cit., 108.

qualitative methods seemed to be the most fruitful solution. Almost twenty years after Craig's thoughts on archival research, through McKemmish and Gilliland presentation of the archival research landscape we can clearly discern a methodological shift connected with changes in researchers' interests and different exploration topics.¹²⁴ A distinct paradigm shift away from a positivistic epistemological perspective resulted from archival science's somewhat slow response (in comparison to other social sciences and humanities) to postmodernist perspectives and critiques as well as to a variety of other so-called "post-" approaches. This shift has subsequently exerted a strong methodological as well as epistemological influence on research studies in the field.¹²⁵

The qualitative methodological approach that was chosen for this research is in line with the interpretivist, constructivist paradigm within which the study is situated. Williamson states that interpretivists "embrace an inductive style of reasoning, emphasize qualitative data and are aware of the impact of context."¹²⁶ The context of the setting being studied also inevitably includes the figure of the researcher as one component that must be taken into account when interpreting research results. This could be interpreted as one of legacies of postmodern philosophy-- as Barthes asserted, texts are constructs that are manifested through the eyes of readers.¹²⁷ Concepts are constructs existing in multiple realities, framed within personal perceptions but also connected and shared to some extent within community and society. What are the areas of intersection of the concept of records when observed from a curatorial perspective and compared with current archival practices?

¹²⁴ McKemmish and Gilliland, op.cit.

¹²⁵ Eric Ketelaar, "Archival Turns and Returns: Studies of the Archive," in *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, A. Gilliland, A. Lau and S. McKemmish, eds. (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016), pp.228-269.

¹²⁶ Kirsty Williamson, "Research Concepts," In *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts*, Williamson, Kirsty and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Prahran, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.9.

¹²⁷ Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author." In *Image, Music, Text: Essays Selected and Translated by Stephen Heath* (London: Fontana Press, 1977), pp.142-149.

6. Exploring the Concept and Context of this Research

Initially, in identifying suitable methods for investigating the research questions, ethnography involving prolonged observation was considered as a promising and insightful method. However, obstacles were soon perceived. Ethnographic research into curators' behavior and handling of records in museums necessitates very intimate contact in the restricted areas of museum offices and repositories that was deemed to be infeasible. Prolonged observation would also not be legally possible because admittance into closed repositories where collections and documentation are kept is authorized, for safety reasons, only to specified museum employees.

Conceptualizations of what constitutes a record are numerous and, as has already been elaborated, are substantially contested even in archival ideas and practices. In the Croatian museum context, those records and documents collected by museums can easily gain the status of museum material, depending on how they are conceptualized by the designated human agent who creates the categories into which they are allocated. But how can one study these human conceptualizations? The methods employed in this research must be able to produce deep insight into curators' cognition and conceptualization of categories as reflected in the descriptive records and other documentation that they create (e.g., the texts of exhibition labels).

7. Overview of the Research Design

This section will address the process of recruiting interviewees and reflect on the techniques used in data collection and analysis, while the discussion of results will be presented in section following.

i. Recruitment process and circumstances of the study

Since museums as institutions are more oriented toward three-dimensional artifact collection, it was important to include curators in this research as a specific type of museum professional. While every curator is also a records creator and manages her/his own created records, in this study an additional criterion that was crucial was that curator be in charge of collecting created materials which would, from the point of current archival practice, be characterized as archival material. This kind of sampling could be labeled as criterion sampling in which “all cases included meet some predetermined criterion of importance.”¹²⁸ Snowball sampling was also applied since the community of museum curators in Croatia is small and close-knit-- individuals frequently share their professional problems based on the types of collection they manage. In line with ethnographic methods, the aim of this study was not to attempt to generalize results but rather to gain more in-depth understanding of different curators' conceptualizations of archival material in museums in the Croatian context. The number of interviewees conducted, therefore, was of less importance than the richness of interviews and interactions with individual curators.

The protocol called for in-depth semi-structured interviews to be conducted as focused conversations around several framing questions. It was prepared in advance and went through institutional ethical review (see Appendix C). Each participant was approached by means of a recruitment letter (see Appendix A) and after they agreed to participate in the study, each signed an informed consent form (see Appendix B). The interviews were conducted in Croatian. Interviewing was conceived of as a process of several meetings with each

¹²⁸ Patton as quoted by Kirsty Williamson in "Populations and Samples in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts." In *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts*, Williamson, Kirsty and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.345.

participant in order to uncover specific issues gradually and also not to reveal various issues and questions that I had but that I wished to address later in the process. This also helped to ensure that the participant wouldn't be completely aware of my own points of view and give answers or opinions that he/she would see as the most appropriate ones or the ones that I might wish to hear.

Initially the plan was to record each interview session using a digital recorder. This plan had to be changed for several participants because I observed that they wouldn't speak candidly and also were attempting to construct their responses in the manner of a written text. Several participants at the beginning of the interview process remarked how they had recently been involved in a similar interview process in another museum research study and that the research had transcribed their sentences exactly as they had been spoken, with all the interviewees' various dialectical turns and speech pauses. When they read the final research paper they felt that the researcher had violated their trust and made them sound uneducated. They also noticed that some of their statements were taken out of context. In order to avoid possible mistakes or perceptions of violating any participant's trust, I made the decision not to record each interview but instead to take extensive notes and reread everything that was said again from my notes with the interviewee to ensure that I had understood their meaning correctly and that they were comfortable with how they were being quoted.

Each interview was written up, including those that were recorded. However, even for those interviews I did record, I had written down important sentences and opinions and double-checked them with the participant while I was recording. I also kept supplementary notes on the participant's non-verbal conduct and any silences that occurred around any topics while I was interviewing.

The process of interviewing took place over a two-year period between 2014 and 2016. The reasons for such a lengthy time span were that each interviewee as well as the researcher was employed full-time and obligated to daily work assignments and that interviews were conducted in several towns across Croatia so traveling arrangements had to be made in advance. Although it was initially planned in the interview protocol to have 5 sessions in total with each interviewee, this number had to be adjusted to fit the interviewee's schedule and the requisites of the research. Each interview session lasted from 90 minutes to two hours, and in total 22 interview sessions were held with 8 different interviewees, and in addition each interviewee completed other assignments for the study.

In addition to the interviews, it was very important to visit each participant at his/her workplace and to observe firsthand the daily processing and description practices as well as the kinds of material on which participants worked. This observation was carried out in a non-obstructive manner and without me participating. Free text notes were taken, and photographs (with permission of the interviewee). During the observation, attention was given primarily to those issues that interviewees first notice as well as to what they don't regard as important, or sometimes even notice at all. This kind of ethnomethodological approach insisted that I regard what to me or to the interviewees was familiar as unfamiliar so that as many nuances as possible could be captured and acknowledged.

ii. Data collection

The process of collecting data had no clear-cut boundaries since the main object of investigations, i.e., curators' descriptive practices, has an iterative, cumulative and reflexive character that cannot be investigated through strictly defined straightforward steps.




Figure 1. Schematic representation of the methods and techniques used in this research

a.Data collection: external sources

In-depth interviews with individual curators¹²⁹ were conducted using general topics for discussion in each session planned in advance, but in a way that could allow for moving gradually to more granular levels of interest. This general topics framework was loosely structured and developed in order to guide the conversation through several areas of interest to this research. Interviews commenced by addressing information about the interviewee's educational and professional background, and preferred aspects of work within the museum, and then opening the topic of the role of records description in the museum. The role of description for the interviewee was further explored in a more inductive manner by addressing several key areas within museum business functions that are inevitably and inseparably connected with description, such as possible uses of archival material in the museum, modes of creating authority names, creation of catalogue entries, and recognition of the informational properties of material being described and reflecting these through description practice. Also closely examined were the modes of creating exhibitions in which original records were displayed, and the elements whereby were they described (e.g., what properties of the original record had the curator perceived to be important and thus emphasized in an exhibition label or exhibition catalogue entry). The role of digitization with regard to both collected and created records in the museum was discussed. It was important to understand how the curators conceptualize the digitized version of an original record and why, and even more so, how they perceive their descriptive practices in the contemporary digital world. Running through all the abovementioned topics, and through all the interview sessions, was the importance of understandings about the specific institutional and individual context. As Fontana and Frey have noted, "We are beginning to realize that we cannot lift the results of interviews out of the context in which they were gathered and claim them as objective data with no strings attached."¹³⁰

¹²⁹Curators are referred to as "interviewee" when elaborating on data collection and analysis that emerged through in-depth interviews. While elaborating on data collected through observation, and the description tasks and content analyses that were undertaken by the curators, they are referred to as "curators."

¹³⁰ Andrea Fontana and James H. Frey. "The Interview: From Structured Questions to Negotiated Text." In Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, second edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000), p.663.

In this study, the in-depth interview is treated as an ethnographic data collection technique. As asserted by McKemmish and Gilliland,¹³¹ ethnography in archival research can be observed as one of the methods and techniques that has been increasingly adopted and adapted to examine and describe complex problems in the field of archival science. According to the authors, ethnography of the archive includes "studies of cultures of documentation, record and archive forms, formative recordkeeping and archiving processes, world views manifested in their classification, the power configurations they reflect, and associated memory and evidence paradigms."¹³²In addition to the observation of practice and of the routine of processing work, curators were given specific description and commentary assignments that I had designed. Curators were asked to describe, as he/she would describe in his/her daily work routine, four digitized copies of material that could be interpreted both as museum and archive material (i.e., the type of material that can readily be found in Croatian museum and archive repositories). The curators were asked to produce these descriptions in written form and to add to the description additional categories that he/she considered to be important. One change in the materials that the curators were asked to describe was made. I replaced one of the planned examples with another before the study started. Initially the intention was to use a copy of a Commission report on the conclusions of Parliament (also from holdings of Croatian Railway Museum), but after further consideration of its contribution to this study, the report was replaced by a copy of a document in a form typical for a railway document from the period of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (see Appendix G)

The commentary task took the form of a free-form conversation held while browsing through the item's description. The goal of this task was to get better insight into what each participant thought the description should have and what the properties are that they might notice in descriptions created by others. The "description task" and the "commentary task" served as complementary to the in-depth interviews. Each example that was chosen used quite different descriptive approaches and was created in a different cultural context, and interviewees were asked to comment on both the properties of the material itself and on the elements of its description.

¹³¹ Gilliland and McKemmish, op.cit., 98.

¹³² Gilliland and McKemmish, op.cit., 98.

A twofold utility of the ethnographic approach might potentially be discerned in that collected and analyzed data can be used to address theoretical as well as practical problems. In order to be able to reflect both on theory and practice it is necessary to ground the research perspective in real world situations.¹³³ Williamson remarks on the bottom-up, inductive approach in ethnography in which a new entity reveals itself: the researcher. Since the premise of the interpretivist ethnographic framework is that “people do not discover knowledge as much as they construct it,”¹³⁴ the researcher is involved in these constructions. The same is acknowledged by Fontana and Frey when asserting that “[e]thnographers have realized for quite some time that researchers are not invisible, neutral entities; rather, they are part of the interactions they seek to study and influence those interactions.”¹³⁵ Even though prolonged observation was not conducted in this study, for the reasons discussed above, short-term but intensive fieldwork was still involved. Interviews with curators were mostly conducted in their working space where observation of the arrangement and description of records (e.g., in the museum's database) was followed by photographing and audio recording. This process might be labeled as “focused ethnography” as suggested by Knoblauch, who defines this approach as a form of sociological ethnography that is “characterized by relatively short-term field visits (i.e., settings that are “part-time” rather than permanent). The short duration of field visits is typically compensated for by the intensive use of audiovisual technologies of data collection and data-analysis.”¹³⁶ Knoblauch also asserts that this kind of data collection “presupposes an intimate knowledge of the fields to be studied,”¹³⁷ which is quite a relevant remark when taking into account that usually observation as a technique is

¹³³ Linda J. Harvey and Michael D. Meyers. "Scholarship and Practice: The Contribution of Ethnographic Research Methods to Bridging the Gap," *Information Technology & People* 8, no.3. (1995): 22.

¹³⁴ Kirsty Williamson, "Ethnographic Research in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts." In Williamson, Kirsty and Graeme Johanson, eds. (Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.291.

¹³⁵ Fontana and Frey, op.cit., 663.

¹³⁶ Hubert Knoblauch, "Focused Ethnography," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6, no.3, art. 44 (September 2005), <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/>.

¹³⁷ Knoblauch, op.cit.

highly exploratory and cannot imply in-depth knowledge of the studied site. The motive for the iterative interview approach that was chosen was the presumption that through a dialectic process more sophisticated understandings of the world of museum documentation could be created. According to Lofland and Lofland, intensive interviewing can be seen also as unstructured interviewing whose goal is “[...]to elicit from the interviewee (usually referred to as the “informant”) rich, detailed materials that can be used in qualitative analysis.”¹³⁸ Further, intensive interviewing has an exploratory quality and is used to “find out what kind of things exist in the first place” by discovering “the informant’s *experience* of a particular topic or situation.”¹³⁹ In the scholarly literature, the technique of the in-depth interview has been widely discussed. These research practices including those labeled as in-depth/semi-structured interviews,¹⁴⁰ in-depth/ethnographic/unstructured interviews,¹⁴¹ or intensive/unstructured interviews¹⁴² have an exploratory character and generative nature in the sense that they permit the creation of new knowledge¹⁴³ and elicit information that is, from perspective of the interviewee, important to address. In this way the interviewer does their utmost not to impose their own perspectives on the research. Since the overall goal of this study is to identify the interpretation and representation of concepts of records in museum from curatorial perspectives and to analyze them through applied descriptive practices, the individual curator’s perspective is a cornerstone of this exploration. Within philosophical theories of concepts it is suggested that individual concepts intersect and shared concepts can be created. Practical embodiment of shared concepts in the information science and archival science fields gets materialized through description, among other activities. The unstructured

¹³⁸ John Lofland and Lyn H. Lofland. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, 3rd edition (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1995), p.18.

¹³⁹ Lofland and Lofland, op.cit., 18.

¹⁴⁰ Williamson, "Questionnaires, Individual Interviews and Focus Group Interviews," op.cit., 361.

¹⁴¹ Fontana and Frey, op.cit., 652.

¹⁴² Lofland and Lofland, op.cit., 18.

¹⁴³ Robin Legard, Jill Keegan and Kit Ward. "In-depth Interviews in Qualitative Research Practice." In *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, Ritchie, Jane and Jane Lewis, eds. (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2003), p.141.

form of the interviews allowed for the eliciting and elucidation of these individual and shared concepts. External sources of data included data collected from works written by curators such as museum database catalogues' entries, exhibition labels, exhibition catalogues and description of objects on museum's website. Content analysis was applied as the primary method of analysis of the documentation created by curators in this study. Aggregations of created documentation and the different functions to which they relate were explored using archival analysis that was balanced with analysis of the concepts that emerged from interviewed individuals relating to museum practice and specific issues of description.

There are multiple elaborations in the scholarly literature that address methodological issues about what content analysis is and how it can be applied in specific research.

According to Williamson qualitative content analysis can be described as:

a method for studying the meaning that is contained in the body of a message. It is done by classifying and organizing the content of a communication systematically into categories that describe the topics, themes and context of that message.¹⁴⁴

It includes thematic analysis as an inductive, *a priori* non-determined process through which categories of meaning emerge. Detected thematic units can be viewed as code categories and can even be quantitatively analyzed. In this case, however, a quantitative approach probably wouldn't contribute to deeper understanding of the topic being investigated. The utility of content analysis in this research proved itself when applied to analyzing (i) research and professional papers from the archival science and museum studies fields on the topic of archival material in museums, (ii) the content of catalogue entries in museum databases created by individual curators, (iii) the content of published catalogues, both in physical and online versions, and the content of other records produced by individual curators in their daily business, (iv) the content of exhibition labels for displayed original records, and (v) the content of working assignments given to individual curators as part of this research (further elaborated later). Thematic units (in ii to v) were treated with regard to individuals' concept of a record and at the same time were compared between themselves in the search for possible convergence points and shared notions of record among curators included in this research.

¹⁴⁴ Kirsty Williamson, Lisa M. Given and Paul Scufflet. "Qualitative Data Analysis in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts," Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds. (Pahran, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.424.

They were further compared with other individual concepts of record that were identified and examined through in-depth interviews. How and why records and other archival materials become treated as museum objects, and how and why archival material is represented in museum exhibitions were primarily examined by employing content analysis.

Content analysis was used to analyze the content of material and the explicit discourse represented in the documents. It was also of great archival importance, however, to analyze the structure and arrangement that was achieved by using archival analysis in a closer examination of the arrangement by curators of collected and created records. The same process of analyzing the arrangement of records would occur in an archive with new acquisitions, although then the structure of the accessioned material would be examined retrospectively while in this case the structure is still “alive” and susceptible to changes and influences that are dependent on the context. The examined structures of records are not fixed, even if a record is part of a museum collection or is inserted as part of created museum documentation. The importance of such analysis from an archival perspective, therefore, is to understand record-keeping practices in museums in order to detect: types of records that have functional value for contemporary museum business; record-keeping deviations from the current legislative frame; influences on the record-keeping practices of individual curators; and dependence of record-keeping practices on the context within which the individual curator works. The archival analysis seeks to understand how and why records and other archival materials become treated as museum objects and what happens to archival material in the museum setting. Through analysis of the structure and arrangement of documentation units present in individual curators' workspaces, a resulting dataset of categories emerged and key points in the document workflow were detected. The influence of individuals on developing the structure of documentation and explicitly or implicitly creating categories and classes was further examined through in-depth interviews with curators.

b. Data collection: “I” as data pool

In this research I would be probably be identified by most scholars as being an insider. I have been working in museums for nine years, mostly as a collections manager. I am in charge of acquisition, processing, describing and displaying collected material as well as working with users. Primarily I am in charge of collections of technical drawings, photographs, personal and official documentation, manuscripts and ephemera. Being an art historian with a museum education background I can connect with interviewees on that level also, since many of them have a similar educational background. The property that distinguishes me is the fact that I am also an archivist by education and professional training. So at the same time I have an intimate knowledge of museum surrounding but I have a slightly distorted perspective because of my archival vocation. As Legard et al. state, in every qualitative research “[...]qualitative research interviewers are, themselves, research instruments.”¹⁴⁵ Recognizing that, it seemed important to expose my role not just as the researcher in this study but also as an insider in the studied museum community. To effectuate that, I also included some autoethnography. Autoethnography is still regarded by some social scientists with a certain skepticism. However, if autoethnography is considered as an example of postmodern ethnography¹⁴⁶ then it seems that there is not the same sense of need to seek ultimate and uniform definitions of the method or the technique themselves, but rather to examine the appropriateness and reflexivity of the different ways in which the method is applied to specific research in the specific context and from that perspective validate results. The characteristic of autoethnography that can be asserted with certainty is that its focal premise is an exploration of relations of the *Self* to the *Other(s)* when there is present a goal to render explanations about cultural environment. The autoethnographic self, as observed by Pensoneau-Conway and Toyosaki:

¹⁴⁵ Legard, Keegan and Ward, op.cit., 142.

¹⁴⁶ Kirsty Williamson, "Ethnographic Research in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts," op.cit. p.284

is a particular kind of full body social actor, constituted, interrogated, revised, and reconstituted within the liminal, intersectional, discursive, and performative space where these multiple layers of ethnographic gazes interact.¹⁴⁷

The properties that an autoethnographic account should have are summarized by Chang, who states that “autoethnography should be ethnographical in its methodological orientation, cultural in its interpretive orientation, and autobiographical in its content orientation.”¹⁴⁸ This implies that self-reflective writings deficient in any one of these ingredients would fall short of “autoethnography.” Parsing the abovementioned properties of autoethnographic approach, in the context of this study, leads toward careful considerations about which research technique to apply in order to collect and interpret data in an ethnographic manner bearing in mind their foundation in a cultural context while using my own professional person as data source. In order not just to “tell my story” I had to approach my personal experience in an analytic manner while ensuring that I “[...]use personal experience to illustrate facets of cultural experience, and, in so doing, make characteristics of a culture familiar for insiders and outsiders.”¹⁴⁹

By reviewing other research conducted in an autoethnographic manner it is quite clear that this method is very difficult to pin down technique-wise. Hryhorczuk’s autoethnographic investigation of Chernobyl as a dark heritage site¹⁵⁰ developed the process of autoethnographic inquiry and represented the results differently from Lomas’s exploration of the engagement of

¹⁴⁷ Sandra Pensoneau-Conway and Toyosaki, Satoshi. "Automethodology: Tracing a Home for Praxis-Oriented Ethnography," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 10, no.4 (2011): 386.

¹⁴⁸ Heewon Chang, *Autoethnography as Method*. (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008), p.48.

¹⁴⁹ Carolyn Ellis, Tony Adams and Arthur P. Bochner. "Autoethnography: An Overview" *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12, no.1, art.10 (2011): 276, <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>.

¹⁵⁰ Nicholar Hryhorczuk, *Radioactive Heritage: An Autoethnographic Investigation of Chernobyl as a Dark Heritage Site*. Ph.D. dissertation (Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013), <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/46781>.

records management through computer-mediated communication.¹⁵¹ These differences at first glance might be confusing while contemplating the key features of the method to use in one's own study. However, that shouldn't be discouraging, given that the process and eventually the product of exploration of the *Self* in relation to the *Other(s)* remains the focal point and because of that every autoethnographic account is supposed to be specific, personalized and contextualized. My (hard) choice of autoethnography sought to make my own identity and assumptions as a museum professional explicit and to explore my own cognition regarding records, attitudes toward daily working tasks in museum related to collection or creation of records, description of records that I myself have produced through my museum employment, and the influence on me of my institutional context. In short, I was my own "data pool" and treated my personal experiences in the same way that I, as a researcher, have treated and analyzed experiences and perspectives offered by the curators I have interviewed. Besides "field" notes that I was making while producing the description of some collected material, I analyzed my correspondence with users' and the queries that my own museum received, as well as correspondence with my colleagues from other museums and archives on topics relating to records and personal notes of my reflections on museum descriptive practice. Finally, the choice to use autoethnography can be viewed as matter of research ethic. I expose my standpoints as both a researcher and as a practitioner, having in mind the simple yet very powerful question, "How could I ask my participants to do this, if I couldn't?"¹⁵²

¹⁵¹ Elizabeth Jane Lomas, *An Autoethnography Exploring the Engagement of Records Management through a Computer Mediated Communication Focused Co-operative Inquiry*. Ph.D. thesis (Newcastle: Northumbria University, 2013).

¹⁵² Carolyn Ellis and Arthur P. Bochner, "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject." In Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, second edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000), p.759, https://works.bepress.com/carolyn_ellis/49/.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

1. An Iterative, Layered Process of Analysis

The process of data analysis was conceived of as an iterative process passing through the datasets at several levels. It was influenced by my background knowledge which, in some cases was an advantage but in others a disadvantage because it enabled or obscured the perspective of viewing the familiar as unfamiliar. The process also required constantly remembering the specific context of the participant and context of the institution in which they work.

Analysis of the interviews was developed using the strategy of concept charting. According to Lofland, the key element of developing an analysis through charting or diagramming is:

[...] a succinct *visual* display of elements among which there is some kind of ordering, line drawing or other use of physical space or distance to denote relationship.

Another way to think of diagramming is as a *display* [...].¹⁵³

The analysis of the data that had been collected was divided into three partly overlapping datasets, each supposed to draw out significant concepts that would afterwards generate a set of themes inherent to the museum context and responding to the research questions. Themes on the first level were extracted from data collected through in-depth interviews, description and commentary tasks. Themes on the second level were drawn out from observation notes and a content analysis of participants' publicly available texts (exhibition labels, exhibition catalogues). The reason for dividing these datasets was twofold: first, to make explicit which are the researcher's observations and which are actual representations of a participant's opinions, and second, to be able to correlate descriptions and opinions already created or expressed by the participants with opinions they expressed in this study. Themes on a third level were extracted from data collected via the autoethnographic methodology.

¹⁵³ John Lofland and Lyn H. Lofland. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, 3rd edition (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1995), p.127.

i. Analysis process – first themes sets

The fundamental idea of the analysis was to use data from in-depth interviews, description and commentary assignments as a ground from which concepts would emerge during analysis. The emerging concepts were then grouped in order to represent a theme relevant to the problem of description in the museum context with attention paid to overlapping concepts.

The process of analysis began with reading and re-reading interviews’ transcripts, paying attention to iterations within interviews such as word repetitions and searching for key words in context. The same was done with each participant's text of the description task and transcript of the commentary assignments. From these, datasets emerged regarding a specific concept that is observed through the features that define it, but only within the context of this exploration of descriptive practice in museums. The same datasets could possibly be put under the umbrella of a different concept and used to analyze other aspects of curatorial work but this is out of the scope of this study. The concepts were called out as such if they could be identified and named, could be related to description issues, and showed properties and specific characteristics. It also should be noted that it was not expected that many unknown or unpredicted concepts would be identified, since the research from the start was framed and focused on certain sets of questions that should be answered in order to gain better insight of curators’ descriptive practices in museums.

After identifying the concepts that emerged from each participant, these were correlated, contextualized and represented as broader themes oriented towards issues of descriptive practice.




Figure 2: Schematic representation of the process of analysis

ii. Analysis process: second themes sets

During the focused observations of participants' practice, notes were taken that later served as memos. They were mostly directed to participants' non-verbal behavior and so-called "issues of silence," for example, questions that were deliberately left un-answered or without intention to explain in depth. In the same manner content analysis of participants' publicly available texts (exhibition labels, exhibition catalogues) was conducted in order to understand participants' understanding of description that was to be available to public. Since the ethical clearance for this study guarantees that participants and their institutions will be anonymous, the specific exhibition/catalogue texts are not shown here, but instead are commented on conceptual and contextual level.

iii. Analysis process: third themes sets

These themes emerged through grouped concepts generated from data that I had collected from my own professional daily practice of processing material in museum. As data sources I analyzed my response to user queries dating from 2007 to 2015 and notes that I made during the research process for material that I have processed. Also I have deliberately tried to show my own point of view on material that curators were asked to describe and comment as well as to explain the specific context of that material within holdings of museum where I work. The concepts identified in the collected data were grouped into themes that represent major issues on the conceptualization of archival material held in Croatian museums. In order to test their validity, as well as to test the researchers' groupings of specific concepts into those specific theme sets, attention was again directed to the data itself to contemplate whether or not the data were conceptualized in a manner that reflected the intended meaning.

2. Results of the analysis

The results of the analysis will be shown as three separate theme sets that emerged from the analysis of all the data collected through the in-depth interviews with curators and their working assignments, content analysis, focused ethnomethodological observations and autoethnography. The main idea was to discern and identify concepts related to description, in the ways in which they are perceived by the curators. The process of analysis will also be presented because the inductive reasoning, which is the grounding of this research, requires that the evolution and generation of thoughts is represented and this aspect of the research is closely connected with the verification of qualitative accounts. Furthermore, the inductive, bottom-up approach presented posits that researchers are "primary analytic agents,"¹⁵⁴ so following this account requires an elaborated explanation of the process of analysis. The presented concepts that are grouped in the general themes refer only to the question of archival material held in museum collections. It should be noted that for the purpose of analysis this type of material that is held within museum collections is named "object," referring to all types of collected objects as information carriers that in archival practice would usually be considered to have qualities of a document and even of records.

The first theme set shows the results of the analysis of the in-depth interviews with curators and their working assignments. The second theme set shows the analysis of published exhibition catalogues and other papers (but in anonymized mode, looking only for concepts important for this research) and points to data collected by means of focused observation. The third theme set refers to the analysis of the autoethnographic data. The presentation of results is shown in detail, and in a way that readers of this thesis can keep track of the process itself.

i. First theme sets

The qualitative content analysis can be defined as "a method for studying the meaning that is contained in the body of a message. It is done by classifying and organizing the content of a communication systematically into categories that describe the topics, themes and context

¹⁵⁴ Williamson, Kirsty, Lisa M. Given and Paul Scufleet. "Qualitative Data Analysis in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts," Williamson, Kirsty and Graeme Johanson, eds. (Pahran, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.417.

of that message.”¹⁵⁵ It seems important to show the major concepts that were identified because this could be the ground upon which descriptive metadata crosswalks could be conceptualized, keeping in mind basic cognitive differences and personal understandings as well as the context of the institution within which the description is being made and the societal context. This could possibly also suggest some transferability of this qualitative research in terms of how the results might be applicable in other context. Lincoln and Guba argue that the notion of transferability is one of the evaluative criteria for verifying qualitative accounts.¹⁵⁶ The lists of concepts that have been identified for each interviewee are shown below. The copies of archival materials that were assigned to curators to describe are shown in the Appendices D to H, and the copies of the descriptions of archival materials created by museums outside Croatia are shown in Appendices I to L.

¹⁵⁵ Williamson et al. op.cit. 424.

¹⁵⁶ Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon Guba. *Naturalistic Inquiry* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1985).




Figure 3: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I1




Figure 4: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I2




Figure 5: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I3




Figure 6: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I4




Figure 7: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I5




Figure 8: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I6




Figure 9: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I7




Figure 10: Identified concepts and themes generated from analysis: interviewee I8

a. Museum value framework

Shared concepts that describe the museum value framework commonly refer to the notion that objects collected in museums are closely related to the theme or topic that is a focus of that institution as part of its mission. For example the focus of a given local city museum might be, at a general level, on the overall historical development of the city in which the institution is located, including the urban and architectural development of the city, and the city's economic and societal progress as represented through its institutions, events and citizens (those that are publicly important and those that represent some idea). If the museum specializes in a particular topic, then its overall interest and collecting policy would be directed to encompass all aspects of that topic. Here it should be noted that the interest for themes, persons and events is mainly expressed at the local or national level, in accordance with the institution's mission. This might be surprising since Croatia and its different parts, during their history, were not part of the political system that is in place today and in fact, historical records relating to the railway system in Croatia can be found in Austria and Hungary, in Belgrade, and even in the U.S. National Archives in Washington, D.C.. It might be fruitful to keep in mind the international character of Croatian historical development because this surely affects existing objects that can be related to it. For example, in the Croatian Railway Museum the main focus is on the railway system, including themes such as building railway infrastructure in the territory of Croatia, the development of railway vehicles and other technical devices used by the railway, the influence of railway development on the national and local economy, transport and society, and the people who worked or were related to the railway system.

The objects and archival material collected by museums reflect this broad thematic interest of specific institutions, and are closely connected in such a way that one reflects and explains the other. The theme is conceptualized broadly and that fact reflects on the requirement to represent the theme through different aspects that are in turn materialized through different types of objects, including archival material. Another issue is the representation of themes that are in fact events, such as a particular person's journey by rail. In discussing such an issue one curator who was interviewed made explicit the differences in focus of collecting activities in archives and museums:

The archive needs the decree about the journey and the museum needs also the travel ticket, menu from the ceremonial lunch, invitation to lunch and bills from the hotel where he stayed (I1).

The conclusion coming from that opinion is that museums need different kinds of objects, two-dimensional as well as three-dimensional, in various kinds of media to be able to contextualize and represent designated themes or topics within a specific institutional context.

A second opinion that was shared is that a theme of interest should be approached in an individualized manner based on how an object could contextualize some aspect of the theme. The object is approached also as an individual set of information whose form, structure, content or meaning are conceptualized and interpreted through in-depth research. The notion of interpretation as a curatorial action is not always explicitly stated and no interviewee stated that interpretation could be a problematic issue because interpretation is an integral part of curatorial work. Moreover, all curators were aware that the product of that interpretation is time-bound, although not in a way that is connected to a specific personal or societal framework, but rather in a way that is the product of research on an object's history. The other factor that curators observed is that researching an object is an ongoing process that forces the curator to return constantly to the object and to augment or edit its description. This iterative process of processing the material is, as one curator stated, "going backward and forward" (I8).

This continuity in research is reflected in description in that it can be regarded as a process, and only a final product at one given moment. This idea is reflected in interviewee statements such as: "Today I don't know what it [i.e., the object] is about, but tomorrow I might recognize the handwriting and then I know" (I1), or "determination is never a finished process. It can always be upgraded. [...] we can only say that at this time we have reached these conclusions" (I2). The same curator described how, "after fifteen years there was an opportunity to determine one item closely, and that was amazing" (I2). This kind of in-depth research reminds us how it could potentially have an affective aspect in that it serves as a connection point between the curator and the designated topic, theme or person. Another example was the statement by a curator that while processing the donation of a personal archive to the museum, "I had the feeling that I was getting to know this man" (i.e., the donor); (I3) and noted that "I wanted to repay him" (I3) with detailed processing.

The conceptualization of the role of archival material in the museum is also shared. As previously discussed, archival material can be perceived as both an object and as record. The curators used the term “document” but also with a twofold meaning. Archival material is always a document, in the sense that it documents past realities, and it is also a document if it is categorized as a document in some official/legal or institutional sense. The latter type of categorization is institutionally dependent, meaning that if there is a collection of documents (named as such, which is a common title for a collection of documents in Croatian museums), any additional documents will probably be categorized as such and placed within that collection. But in most cases, this collection will be treated as a collection of museum objects and described using museum descriptive standards.

The situation becomes more complicated if it is put into a specific context. Curator I1 stated that archival material should be described using archival descriptive standards, even though they are held in a museum. That individual added that photographs collected in that museum should be put in the collection of photographs, which in turn must be treated as a separate collection described as a museum collection, because they are objects and not just records. The same was stated for maps. Another curator (I4) stated that in their museum there is a collection of photographs also, but these are only partly archival material and therefore should be described as would any other museum object. A shared opinion is that any determination about whether archival material in a museum would be treated as museum objects or as archival documents depends, beside institutional context, on the professional background of its curator as well as the function of the item in a specific context (for example, differing treatment might be given to items on display or published in scholarly papers). The closest answer to a definition of what is archival material from the perspective of a museum curator seems to be: “that depends who is working on it” (I6).

b. Museum description of archival material held in museums

At the beginning, when considering curators' perceptions of description, it was important to establish their individual perspectives on description as a process and as a final product. The results indicate that curators' awareness of different descriptive standards across not just different heritage communities but also across different institutional types of museums (within various cultures) varies. Additionally, there are discrepancies among curators' degree of consciousness of multiple possible values adhering to described material as well as of the various roles that description might play. The role of description was conceptualized by some curators only with the internal needs of the institution in mind, without thinking of prospective uses by or utility to users from outside the museum, whether that be in-person or online. As for "internal" use in the museum, the data suggests that the final form of description depends on its function in different situations. Several types of functions played by description were identified: descriptive label placed beside an object on exhibition; description of an object as part of an exhibition catalogue; and full description of an object as an entry in a museum database. The perception of the role of description that was shared across curators was that it serves both the physical and intellectual control of the object:

The descriptions are made in case the object-document might disappear or be extirpated in order to be able to identify the missing or extirpated item. That's why there is a need for such detailed descriptions. Of course, this is the basic motive, but also one needs description for managing the material, public displays, marketing and PR activities, and so on (I2.)

Similarly:

If that isn't inventoried and put under control, it will be scattered (I3).

and:

I think it is necessary to compel museums to inventory that material" (I6).

Expanding on the latter statement, the curator listed different kind of documents and records that would be, according to the Croatian archival legislative framework, perceived as archival material.

Possible uses of description suggest that some curators have a narrow perspective in which "external" uses are not a significantly important factor while others stated that the description should be adjusted to meet the needs of external users and that differences of

opinion should be analyzed and commented upon with two levels of context in mind: personal and institutional. The other belief that curators appeared to hold in common is that description is an ongoing-process, always evolving and closely connected to related research.

One of the most important aspects of description of an object is to reveal its materiality--a quality which supports the object's property of originality. Originality in turn presupposes a higher value for the object: "the original paper--higher value" (I7), while value in this statement is not defined by the commercial value of an object, but rather in accordance with the museum value of originality: "The original is authentic, and we have to have it, and it shouldn't be kept in an archive" (I1). The notion of what is considered to be an authentic document varies among curators. Two distinct sets of opinions can be noticed, and their explanation must take into account the personal context of the individual curator. One opinion holds that the document is authentic if it has a signature and a stamp on it, and the other, closer to archival ideas about authenticity, is that the authenticity of a document depends on its position in the larger aggregation of documents when it is "placed in context" (I6). At the same time, in different documentation units within museums there is an extensive number of copies of documents from various other institutions, made on various media, that are usually used in the preparation of some program or within curatorial research on a specific object or topic. Usually these copies are not considered to have the value assigned to the original and so they are not part of museum collections, although there are some exceptions, again based upon the context of the institution.

Another shared opinion is that description should reveal the context of the object, and yet the contextuality of the description that the curators themselves prepare is rarely perceived, and if it is, it mainly refers to how a curator has applied authority control. The context of the described object is perceived very broadly and in a way that includes the creation of the object, all uses of that object throughout its history, and the contextualized theme, topic or person to which the object can be related or with which it is associated at any point from its creation to its status as museum object. Context perceived as such is not the same as provenancial context, as understood by archivists, but it is integral to the museum interpretation as it is generated from the available facts.

At the same time the description of archival material held in museums is very much content-oriented in a way that puts the focus on the content of, for example, a document, personal papers or medieval charter. By contrast, the context of a specific item is described in

its fullest potential, as potentially perceived, only when that item has great value for the contextualization of a topic, theme, event or person related to it. As one curator noted: “An important element, for me, is the connection of the object with some event or theme, and that should be visible in processing the theme itself and in processing the object” (I5).

There are great differences in the part of the description that is commonly named "free-text entry" in which detailed textual description of the object is supposed to be presented. As part of their assignments for this study, curators were asked to describe digital copies of items that are part of the Croatian Railway Museum's holdings and instructed that the purpose of this exercise was not to produce an exact account of all the facts about the item in question but rather to produce their own description in the way they would do it if the item were part of their collections. They were also asked which elements of description they would single out as important for that material. The free-text entries in these descriptions vary among the curators. While some emphasized the materiality of an item, others described the content of the theme represented by the item. For example, the free-text part of the description of the item that can be seen in Appendix D reads:

Black and white photograph on paper, originally part of album, from 1873. The photographer A.Lowy has photographed scene of the castle in Zvečaj, from an elevated position, with the shore of the Mrežnica River in the forefront. The walls of the castle are on the right of the scene. The photography is clear and clean, mount slightly yellow with stains of foxing. (I3)

On mount of dimensions ...x...cm there is b/w photograph of dimensions ... x The photograph is framed with a white stripe of dimensions ...cm. The photograph shows the curve of the river on whose right bank, on rocks the castle is placed.” (I7).

The other elements of description will be explained later in this section.

Other concepts that were identified through this research are not commonly shared, but they did show up more than once in some cases.

The issue of description as a term differs in two cases where under the term "description" is placed only free-text entry that is one of entry-fields in the museum catalogue database and named as such through legislative regulations.

The issue of making all description-related metadata available, or creating an “open catalogue” needs to be explained having in mind the particular museum context and the kinds

of data that that museum currently can, potentially could, or would be allowed to share because of various restrictions. Personal data protection is only one of the factors to be considered here. The opinion shared by curators is that the institution should decide on that as part of its own policies.

Collection-level description was mentioned as one possible way to bring museum and archival description practices into closer proximity. But this possible convergence point would function better in a museum if, after collection-level description one proceeds down the hierarchy all the way to item-level description.¹⁵⁷ The attitude towards (any) research on descriptive practices also varies, but in most cases such a topic was not perceived as relevant for investigation by curators. However, when the curators, in their commentary assignments, looked at the descriptions made by other curators in museums outside Croatia, and commented on the possible use of these descriptions, it became obvious that the availability of data on some objects depends on its description. After they saw digital copies of items that they could use in their own research of a theme or topic and related this object to objects in collections for which they were responsible, their attitude towards the importance of description shifted a bit. Curators who hadn't seen any value in this research about description quickly understood how descriptive practices might affect end users' access.

c. Elements of description of archival material held in museums

This theme examines the description of archival material held in Croatian museums at a basic cataloguing level by observing authority work through the working assignments of the curators. This process cannot be contemplated without including the issue of context, however. As one curator stated, while talking about “nomenclature”：“The next generations will correct our practices” (I8), suggesting that naming and labeling is a contextual practice.

The digital copies of materials to be described within the working assignments included archival material that can be conceptualized through different perspectives. For the example in Appendix E, curators assigned the following titles:

“Construction of Karlovac-Rijeka railway” (I1)

¹⁵⁷ Indeed, the archival description standard, Encoded Archival Description (EAD), made specific provision for that to address in particular the description of artifacts held in archives.

“Photograph with scene of the Kupa bridge” (I2)

“The bridge over Kupa river” and “The photograph from the album Karlovac-Rijeka railway” (I3)

“Kupa bridge” (I6)

“Kupa bridge” (I8)

Titles were written in Croatian, and are here translated, but the original title in German was also mentioned as a secondary title. One curator stated that “For the creation of the title it is very important to select which is more important: Kupa bridge or the Karlovac-Rijeka railway” (I2). Every curator mentioned that each photograph was part of an album and that the author is the photographer A.Lowy.

With the example shown in Appendix G, curators wrote that it is possibly a blank form that was later filled in with the name of the recipient, Julius Lehmann, and can be classified as an official document. All stated that the creators are both the Austrian Ministry of War and the person who signed the document: Julius Lehmann, an interesting example of the challenge to traditional archival conceptualizations of provenance by what is increasingly referred to in the archival world as "co-creation."

The example shown in Appendix H was described as a topographic map of the territory around Rijeka, in modern-day Croatia. One curator stated:

Considering the authorship, it can be said that the map is of Austrian and Italian provenance. It is very likely that the use of the map was mutual considering that the demarcation line between administrations is shown.” (I4)

Regarding the issue of the author, the curators connected the notion of an author with the immediate creation of the object, and some stated that the term "creator" could be used, but that this would imply a higher level of responsibility, a sentiment that is in line with objections in the archival field to the notion of co-creators when assigning provenance. The copy of the object in question is shown in Appendix F. According to the curators, the creator of this architectural drawing was the architect whose signature is shown at the bottom of the front page. A higher level of responsibility was taken into account when creating authority names but it was not seen as a possible level at which to connect this item to other items that share same provenance. For that example one curator stated that “all persons and institutions that are mentioned on the design I will list as other authors” (I1) because “It is important to write everything you can [about the object being described]” (I1). At the same time, the

physical appearance of the architectural design was described in detail. By observing the working assignment of each curator one can see how the description shifts back and forth between description of the type of object (i.e., an architectural drawing) and description of its motif (what it depicts) (i.e., the station building) or the general theme (i.e., the railway system in Croatia while it was still part of the Austro-Hungarian empire).

All curators stated that the/one or the primary way(s) in which they search through their databases is by using the keywords they created when cataloguing material. Construction of keywords is content-oriented; what is depicted in a scene is used as a keyword, as is the general theme that the object represents. For example, Appendix E shows that the keyword or keyphrase according to one curator might be “construction of the bridge” (I1). The same curator asserted that the keywords are access points to other objects connected to a particular theme because “I write what might be useful for me” (I1). Keywords are seen as a mode to connect one specific object to other objects and to themes, topics and persons related to that object in museum database and beyond. They are considered to have the capacity to serve as cross-references even beyond the museum catalogue database.

The term “cross-references¹⁵⁸” was deliberately used while talking with curators because the term is simple enough and broad enough to envelop all meanings and implementations that curators could think of. The name of the author of an object was also considered to be able to serve as cross-reference but curators stated how, in Croatian museums, there is no system of authority control and that bibliographic practice could help with that. Although all the curators asserted that authority control is one of the most important

¹⁵⁸Cross-reference was used as a broad term. In The Society of American Archivists *Glossary*, a cross-reference is defined as: "An entry in a list, index, or catalog that points to other headings.

NT: broader term, downward reference, narrower term, related term, see also reference, see reference, upward reference

RT: reference, syndetic relationships, thesaurus.

Notes: Cross-references may establish a preferred heading among equivalent headings. For example, a cross-reference from one form of an individual's name to another (Mark Twain, see Samuel Langhorn Clemens). A cross-reference may indicate more general or more specific headings (cats, see pets; cats, see Siamese cats)." Richard Pearce-Moses, *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago, IL: The Society of American Archivists, 2005), p.98. <http://www2.archivists.org/glossary>.

aspects in description, some also suggested that the notion of authority control is too narrow and needs to be expanded to include particularities embedded in already existing institutional practice.

The examples of the description of items on which curators commented are shown in Appendices I, J, K, L in the same form as the pdf document that was shown to the curators. The abovementioned examples were chosen because of their perceived particularities: a record in the form of a three-dimensional object, an architectural drawing-sketch made by a world famous architect and artist, a correspondence card with multiple persons responsible for its creation, and a photograph whose motif is connected with Croatia.

A shared opinion regarding their observations of these descriptions was that the descriptions should include cross-references to other items that share same provenance (creator) or are somehow connected to other persons whose names are mentioned in the description and connected to that particular item. Also shared was a question directed to the researcher: how did these items come to be in that particular museum? The notion of author-creator was investigated using the example of the Treaty of Kadesh¹⁵⁹ from Istanbul's Archeological Museum (Appendix I). The curators contemplated it in different ways but with the assumption that in this case the answer to this question is very hard to establish. The shared opinion was that this description satisfies the requirements of web presentation. Curators stated that this item could be considered both as a record and as an object. The qualifiers for it to be considered as an object were its three-dimensionality (I2), its materiality (I7) and the fact that it belonged to group of archeological artifacts (I5). Its primary categorization, therefore, should be as an archeological artifact and its secondary categorization as a record (I5). However, one curator stated that "if we take into account the significance of the document, that surpasses the significance of the artifact" (I3). Another interesting statement that is connected to the significance of description as such is: "first we describe items with words, because if we were to lose the image, the words would remain. The shape of an object, color, superficies, condition and then what is written on the item" (I7). The curators shared the opinion that this web description gives enough basic information for the external user. One curator stated that it can serve as "invitation for the visitors to come to

¹⁵⁹Considered to be the world's first written peace treaty, the Treaty of Kadesh was signed in 1258 B.C.E. between Egypt and the Hittites.

the museum “(I2), and another that “it is enough for general information, and if someone wants more then there should be a contact person for information” (I4).

The shared commentary on the description of Michelangelo’s architectural drawing from the British Museum (Appendix J) is that there is a lack of information about whether this design was ever realized in the form of an actual building and that there should be a cross-reference to other Michelangelo drawings from the museum’s holdings. Everyone commented on the exhaustiveness of the data presented and yet how they still don’t supply enough contextualization. The comments ranged from: “just technical details” (I3), “all the information they have, they put online” (I4), “one can’t know a great deal about the context of the item” (I5) to “non-user friendly” (I6), “their description hangs in the air” (I7) and “the description is made at a the showbiz level” in which “the name of Michelangelo is exploited” (I8). Another issue was raised while curators commented on this example: how much data should be available over the internet? Some stated concerns that museums need to reconfigure the practice of availability since the data can be used negatively without the museum in question having any control over such uses (I4 and I5).

The comments about the description of the Red Cross letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer from the Jewish Museum, Berlin (Appendix K) revealed that there was a shared opinion that the author of the letter is Marianne Simion, but that the Red Cross has a higher level of responsibility for its creation as an international service that was very important during World War II. Both, therefore, should be listed in the author field. The curators' remarks on this description were that the item itself, as well as its materiality aren't described in enough detail (I2 and I7) and that the description should explain and contextualize how the procedure of sending letters via Red Cross service actually functioned (I6, I2,I7, I8). There was also a thought that translation of the text of the letter is needed (I6). There was an agreement that "Red Cross" could serve as a cross-reference so other letters of that kind could be virtually connected. One curator commented: “One can see that there are other documents. Where are they? Are they in that museum’s possession or with someone else? How much of that is out there?” (I4).

The example of the photograph identified in the online database of the Australian War Memorial with ID number SUK14046 (Appendix L) was shown to curators at the end of the conversation. Each curator showed increased interest, wondering how that photograph came into the possession of the Australian War Memorial and asserting that this information should

be part of the description. They also shared the opinion that this description lacks contextual information of the event that is shown on a photograph. Curators identified it as a military photograph and asked what was the photographer doing in the plane and who was actually photographing? One curator asserted that, “South-African forces is too general a concept to be able to serve as author” (I4). Others asked: “From which type of aeroplane was the bomb dropped?” (I2), “for what purpose was the photograph taken?”(I3), “is there a connection with other photographs taken from other perspectives?” (I4), and “why was the photograph taken in the first place?” (I8).

Each one noticed the lack of information about the materiality of the described item in terms of its dimensions and polarity and of the photographic technique used. They all also noted that “there is no remark as to whether or not there is some text on the back of the photograph” (I6). With this example curators were asked to comment on the terminology presented in the description and to discuss the authority entries used and which one(s) would they use if they were describing this photograph. They perceived the terminology used to be incorrect and imprecise. The use of the term “Yugoslavia” was considered to be “stereotypical and applied uncritically” (I8) and argued that identifying the place where the photograph was taken as Lussin Island was incorrect and “someone should warn them that this is incorrect” (I7¹⁶⁰). One curator noticed that “the dates are kind of strange” (I7) as represented, meaning that the action represented at the photograph couldn’t have taken place in November 1945, but must have been January 1945, although at that time the scene couldn’t be connected with Yugoslavia as the name of the country, because Yugoslavia did not yet officially exist. Their shared opinion was that the authority entries should include all historical contexts including the current one, which is related only geographically with the scene of the photograph, so that users will have easier access to the represented item.

With regard to questions about who might find this photograph and others similar to it, useful, the curators thought it might be useful for historical research on themes such as WWII

¹⁶⁰ Of course, this example clearly illustrates difficulties and incommensurabilities associated with making choices about what is relevant to describe in different historical, political and geographic contexts, or for international dissemination, as well as inevitably differing depths and types of knowledge brought to bear at different museums and their varying reasons for collecting such materials.

and local history, for urban planning research, and in a contemporary context, for architectural conservation purposes.

ii. Second theme sets

While analyzing the curators' descriptions of archival material presented in exhibition catalogues and labels placed beside objects on exhibit, both the content-oriented approach and the contextualization of a theme through the object were detected. Only descriptions made by curators who consulted archivists while processing and describing archival material presented a different structure (although the narratives were still content-based and put in service of the contextualization of a theme, specific topic or a person). The main finding regards the possibility of adaptive, multifunctional and flexible structure and content in description. Although curators stated that collection level description could serve as a means to approximate archival description, their practice in general doesn't show that intention. Particular attention was directed toward their consciousness about the role that description plays in an online surrounding and the awareness that they as heritage professionals contribute through their descriptive practices to the creation of local, national and even global knowledge and narratives. Also, each one of them is in fact a reference service about material that is part of the collection which they manage so contacts with users are direct, without having some online database as a mediator. The question of the availability of all descriptive metadata is partly connected with the institutional framing and partly with the object-documents that represent "difficult" heritage that is hard to process and describe in an objective manner. Even on the level of some authority terms, such a situation can be complicated and dependent on the personal or/and institutional context. For example, would one write "Independent State of Croatia" or "so-called Independent State of Croatia" while referring to the period from 1941 to 1945. At that point there was a silence in our conversation and the notion that description can be a controversial practice became obvious. The cross-references that all the curators stated that they needed to be included in description are, in fact, rarely made, and if they are, they only reference their own museum's holdings. Notes about material held in some other institution, or that shares the same provenance or is related only on a thematic level are kept in their research documentation, but are usually available only to the curators.

During the interviews, the conversation constantly returned to the content of objects-documents and the connections between a particular item and the theme or specific topic that is at the core of the interest of museum. As experts and professionals in some particular scholarly discipline, the curators hardly see that part of themselves which functions as an information professional. When they were working with the descriptive assignments that I gave them, I was wondering would they notice that the digital copy of the archival material also needs to be described, and the closest answer I received was when one curator named this assignment as the “description of five photographs” (I7), unconsciously acknowledging this aspect, but then proceeding to describe the originals. The map shown in Appendix H was deliberately scanned in such a way that it could serve as a hint that there is digital visual documentation (i.e., the digital copy of a original) that needs to be addressed and metadata listed if for no other purpose than that of control of the original (for example, by knowing who and when made the digital copy of the original this low control level could establish a time frame in case the original went missing--an occurrence that is not unheard of in museum or archival practice).

iii. Third theme sets

The following section presents my autoethnographic account that might probably be best characterized as personal narrative.¹⁶¹ It was composed based on the notes and jottings I have created over several years while processing and describing several collections in the Croatian Railway Museum and also researching and responding to users’ queries. These data are created and retained for various purposes, but for the purpose of this research I have used them to try to discern and relate to specific areas already identified from the first two theme sets. Since my personal professional framework is different from that of the colleagues who I interviewed, the reader will surely detect these differences, and this is the point of putting together this reflexive insider/outsider community member narrative.

The utility of the method is its possibility to reflect on oneself within a larger cultural context. The mode in which the autoethnography is conducted, on what data it relies and the

¹⁶¹ Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur P. Bochner. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject." In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, second edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000), pp.740. https://works.bepress.com/carolyn_ellis/49/.

mode of representing the final account are aspects that also reflect on the researcher's personality. Another question to have in mind is the position that autoethnography might be taking in the methodological landscape, especially for fields concerned with cultural documentation--in the time of cultural selfies, have we become a more self-oriented and self-promotional culture or are we finally accepting that we construct our world from our individual points of view and are truly becoming more reflexive? Where are the challenges in reconciling our own perspectives with those of others? And if effective communication is indeed a common goal, what are we doing to understand those others? Other questions I asked myself while preparing for this reflective and reflexive journey were: what are my professional practices and what influenced them? And how did those situations shape my scholarly research interests? Many scholars describe their research as a journey, but in fact every process of acquiring new knowledge is a journey. However my chosen metaphor for this autoethnographic process would be standing in a room of mirrors--adjusting the angles of mirrors without the possibility of escaping and thus being pushed to acknowledge all the various reflections. My autoethnographical narrative, following Duncan Grewcock (adopting Chiseri-Strater's definition), attempts to distinguish between being reflective in reference only to the Self, and reflexive regarding the Other as well as the Self.¹⁶²

a. Reflective and reflexive autoethnographic account

I entered my doctoral program directly from practice knowing in advance the area that I would like to research. My goal was to take the data I collected in the field and to examine them conceptually so that any theoretical conclusions could subsequently be applied and tested in practice. The notion of description and the differences between archival and museum approaches have long been of great research interest to me. My interest arose directly from my practical work processing collections of archival material in the Croatian Railway Museum. When I started to work as an archivist at the Museum I was put in charge of a collection of technical documentation that contained paper-based material that was nevertheless very heterogeneous in content: technical drawings of railway vehicles and their parts, railway maps (both printed and drawn), plans of existing railway lines and plans for the construction of new ones, decisions on the expropriation of land for line constructions,

¹⁶² Duncan Grewcock. *Doing Museology Differently* (Routledge: New York, 2014), p.152-153.

drawings of station buildings, technical reports from the track engineer in charge of maintenance, official business documentation and locomotive logbooks. As I browsed through my first notes (made while drawing up my processing plan for this collection) for my thesis research, I saw that one of my first thoughts was: "How did this material end up in the Museum in the first place?". While researching the origin of this already partially inventoried collection, I managed to find out that the Croatian State Archive has a dossier about it under the heading "Belavić Collection." The backstory was that one retired railway employee, with extraordinary knowledge of railways and a passion for history, Ivan Belavić, collected these materials from various places and used them as sources for his manuscript. He never recorded where he got the material and even used some backsides of the copies for his own writing. So I turned my attention to him as a person--the writer and collector--and found out that he was born in 1894 and died in 1969. After his death, I have concluded, his wife gave boxes of his written and collected material to the railway company (which at that time was owned by the State). There was one news article that stated that in 1973 the boxes of that material were still kept by the railway company but were totally neglected.¹⁶³ The Croatian State Archive did have the information about the material back then. After the Croatian Railway Museum was founded in 1991, its first director transferred these boxes into the museum and inventoried them. The collection was titled by the Museum: Collection of Technical Documentation. The transfer of material was possible since the Museum was, and still is, part of the railway company. Since I was employed as an archivist in the Museum I had to pass the professional exam that is required in order to be considered a professional archivist (although I already had a university diploma in Archivistics). Part of my exam was to make an inventory¹⁶⁴ of the collection, applying ISAD(G) as a descriptive standard. The material in the collection dated from 1860 to present day, and is in German, Italian, Hungarian and Serbo-Croatian¹⁶⁵

¹⁶³O radu Ivana Belavića *Željezničar* 147 (1973):16.

¹⁶⁴ The inventory for the Collection of Technical Documentation is available on the national archival platform ARHiNET at http://arhinet.arhiv.hr/details.aspx?ItemId=1_69489.

¹⁶⁵"Throughout most of the 20th century, the Croatian standard language developed in various South Slavic state units under various names, and was presented as a variant of the so-called Croato-Serbian (Serbo-Croatian) language. This was abandoned during the socio-political changes of 1990." Marko

languages and in Latin and Cyrillic script. This at the time seemed to be the least of the issues with the collection. I had no curatorial mindset back then, although I had taken museology classes as part of my university degree coursework in Art History. My notes from back then were directed toward the question, “where did this item come from?” I now realize that I was trying to describe the archival provenancial context while contemplating how these materials were records that had been removed from their context of creation. An additional problem was that most of these records were actually duplicates or verified copies (which would not have been a problem for someone interested in writing railway history) and I couldn’t know how many of them there had been in the first place (since administrative rules and procedures changed over time) and where their original counterparts might be now. By tracking the creators I first managed to identify several fonds in the Croatian State Archive and the City Archive of Zagreb. Today, after working on that collection for nine years, I realize that the list of fonds and institutions is much longer and that there are still places that I need to identify. At the same time I wasn’t very successful with tracing the materials in the fonds I *had* identified because their inventories, made using ISAD(G), in most cases did not describe the contents down to the item level. I reckoned that maybe railway records didn’t merit such close description since they did not have as much appeal as material that was connected to political history or that had an artistic value. I arranged the material into themes that followed the first arrangement made when the collection came into the Museum. That thematic framework corresponded with the thematic structure of other paper-based collections in the Museum (mostly photographic material). The hierarchical structure seemed to me at the time to be “firm and clear but flexible enough to be able to include other material that will come in the future.” While I was processing, however, it became obvious that some material couldn’t have been collected by Ivan Belavić because they were created after his death. Somehow these were mixed in with the older material, following the thematic framework. At the same time that I was creating an inventory for the collection I was creating catalogue entries in the museum database, item by item. In the free-text entry field I didn’t describe the materiality or

Tadić, Dunja Brozović-Rončević and Amir Kapetanović, *The Croatian Language in the Digital Age = Hrvatski jezik u Digitalnom Dobu* (Berlin; New York: Springer, 2012) p.55, <http://www.meta-net.eu/whitepapers/e-book/croatian.pdf>.

motif of items but instead inserted the original classification and register numbers ¹⁶⁶hoping to identify one day the original aggregation of records in which each item belongs. The author entry field seemed quite easy to complete in terms of naming the creator. However after several examples of multiple creatorship I started to ask myself which one to list. The creator as some railway company or administration seemed more important, but at the same time the document might be signed by an engineer who was a very important figure in railway history. I considered the creator as referring to a larger group of people who in some way had a part in creating the item or items in question. The names of others connected in any way with specific items I organized as keywords, in the manner of authority naming that was already used in the institution. Thematic keywords were the most difficult part because I didn't have in-depth knowledge of the railway system and realized that such knowledge comes from a combination of disciplines such as mechanical and electrical engineering, construction industry, architecture, and telecommunication. I could hardly rely on my own in-depth competence in the subject matter. So at the beginning of processing and describing the collection I had to rely on the thematic structure rather than on the content. Inventory numbers were assigned according to the hierarchical structure of the system of series and sub-series. The current numbering system, as prescribed by museum regulations, was useless since the only control over the complete collection was the original hierarchical system. After a while, each item was processed and relations within the database were established to connect the item with other similar items that shared the same provenance, donor, motives, or history of use. The hierarchical structure wasn't of great use in retrieving items or related information. Only as I have worked with user queries have I managed to comprehend what I have missed or not perceived as important enough to qualify as a keyword.

One user asked to retrieve an old metal plate depicted in an old photograph because of their interest in the history of graphic design. The metal plate was used in railway vehicles, attached near doors and windows in the interior. When I had catalogued photographs of vehicles as the main motif, the plate wasn't of concern to me at all since it is just one tiny part of large vehicles with (to me) other more interesting technical parts. Another user asked for

¹⁶⁶ All documents had original classification and register numbers, but they originated from different periods. For example, there might be the original register number assigned by the creator, and then the register number assigned by the organizational unit that later used these records.

photographs from one specific area to establish what kind of forestry vegetation existed where the railway line passed. But I wasn't cataloguing trees. In other words, my comprehension of archival material and the role of description were probably influenced by users' queries such as these. These types of questions often led me not just to contemplate but also to seek an immediate solution to problems that existed in places where I hadn't even thought problems might exist at all.

Scholarly use of collections and supplying the research needs of scholars with material is often easier. With questions usually prepared in advance and a specific area of research, scholars have a thematic approach to searching. However, the point of frustration comes with the question that is frequently asked: "is there more?" My answer always is "there probably is, but not in our holdings for now" I have one folder titled "unsolved user requests" in my computer where I keep all the queries from users who asked to be informed if I find out something more. Into this frame of "is there more?" fits one query about accessing photographic material and railway line maintenance plans in order to try to identify how the area of and surrounding the railway line was reconfigured over different time periods, thus possibly suggesting concealed locations of mass graves created during the wars of the last century. A similar query was posed by a lawyer regarding the expropriation records for land through which the railway line passed. Another query regarding land issues was about the land and ownership of a land parcel situated just on the border of a railway station. The problem was that this area historically went through various political systems, including the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in which the railway system was a major economic factor. Records created relating to the railway under these administrations were not kept or left in Croatia. They are in various other nation's archives, belonging to these countries as well to Croatia or even to states that no longer exist. Copies of some of these records can be found in the Croatian State Archive, but not all of them, and presumably some were never even appraised for permanent retention. Working on these tasks has an element of discovery and it self-presents as an *intellectual adventure*. These kinds of queries, however, I anticipated. I was, instead, most surprised by the questions of those who were not scholars or officials of some sort, that had very personal aspects to them.

Over the years there has been an increasing number of questions by such individuals. As my scholarly mindset was influenced by my doctoral studies, so my practice started to accept and try to implement the theoretical ideas I was acquiring. In other words my studies

and my practice mutually informed each other, and it became very clear to me how practice in general is so far away from theory, and tends to keep to its own stable, un-reflective and un-reflexive pace. So indeed what I did not expect and was not prepared to think more deeply about was the use of museum collections for private, non-academic purposes. I have spent much time searching for information (of any kind) about people's family members who were connected to railway system. Along with the expected genealogical research there were two requests that particularly influenced me both as a practitioner and as a doctoral student. I must add that I continued to work on these requests even after I managed to identify relevant records and other documents, and I am still keeping in mind one of those requests because I think more material will appear, if not in our own, then in private collections. Both users were highly emotional when I delivered the material that I had found. One wrote in an e-mail that she "was shaking and hasn't stopped crying" because she had been "missing him all the life." Another came in person in the Museum and was actually crying over a photograph of a never-before-seen family member. Both said they had searched in every archive they could think of and were surprised about finding this material in the Museum, but at the end one said that this is "kind of logical, because you are also the museum of the railway workers." The photographs I found of the never-before-seen family members were actually an integral part of their official personal employee dossiers, leading me to wonder how selective / comprehensive our collecting of personal documentation is? I have established criteria, as required by our regulatory framework, regarding which kinds of material are going to be collected and criteria for the collection of personal documentation: is that type of documentation typical or specific¹⁶⁷ and could this material be used to represent a period, place (local history needs), or significant person within the railway system or in a broader context? Is it specific with regard to some other criteria (for example, is it decorative enough for exhibitions? Was it found or collected in some interesting place?). However, being typical

¹⁶⁷ Examples might be typical blank or unfilled forms from a certain period such as those used under Austro Hungarian rule which had neat decorations or those displaying the coat of arms of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. A record that is typical can serve to explain some broader theme. Documents with specific characteristics are ones that deviate from that typical form for whatever reason and that makes them interesting. For example, someone crossed out the name of the railway company on a blank form and inserted its new name after a political change.

and specific excludes the possibility of a comprehensive collection of the ordinary, and many of the trickier reference questions require extensive if not comprehensive collections of the ordinary, such as railway personnel records. The Museum cannot take on the role of an archive, at least not the one in which collections are perceived as museum collections, regardless of the descriptive standard used (and in fact, an archive would be very unlikely to keep *all* personnel records, but rather would sample those that are typical or of some specific interest). As one of my museum colleagues stated, we do need all of types of documents, but only to explain the context we wish to explore.

While exploring the concept of record as representation I have also visited several memorial museums and sites addressing what is sometimes termed "dark heritage". The one that had the most profound effect on my thinking was the display at the Ovčara memorial museum in Vukovar. The following are my own notes on the display that I wrote a few days after my visit in March 2015:

Empty space is surrounded by dark walls with digital display of photographs of murdered people which appear and disappear. Below display, in the very ground of the wall, in a channel that reminds one of a trench, objects and documents are displayed. They are placed on straw that reminds the viewer that this space, before the massacre, served as a barn for keeping animals. The objects and documents are closed from above with glass. Soiled keys, glasses, watches, personal identification cards, birth certificates are placed in transparent forensic envelopes with the examiners' numbers written on them. They hold the objects found on the bodies during excavation. Identifier in identifier. Records on records. If this can be named an exhibition (or rather a display or a memory, existence and the series of events that have destroyed existence) the viewer reacts emotionally. These records, although completely routine records under other circumstances, here trigger powerful emotional reactions. It is about context, about what is here and what is missing. About what remained of the person. Displayed Xerox copies are equally real as originals. They even have another dimension and provoke a question – where are originals? Families keep them, as it is explained by the curator. This question leads from individual suffering to the suffering of family – because the family couldn't bear to give originals to display, or whatever reason. The material was collected by the Croatian Association of Detainees' of Serbian concentration camps.

In this context, it was clear to me that descriptive metadata is a redundant question. If the emotional reaction is what is expected then this would be enough. But at the same time I was wondering what about all those metadata about these objects-documents, where are they written down and how much will they be needed when in time emotional reactions fade and additional kinds of questions begin to be asked, not only by scholars, but by family members, school children, and unforeseeable others? In the course of interviewing curators about their conceptualization of museum values and the description of material which potentially has greater value than *just* as a museum object I have also come to realize that in fact we have all been participating for some time now in a paradigmatic shift in our museum framework. The influence of the new museology movement was hailed as a major breakthrough in museum thinking,¹⁶⁸ but how is that connected with the globalization of business and media, and also museums' rush into marketing? Želimir Košćević's comment from 1977 that the "museum isn't a television, but an intellectual adventure"¹⁶⁹ seems so far away now from the comment made by one of the curators I interviewed that the "museum has become place for indulging carnival needs" (I8). This impression of marketing fever and of producing displays

¹⁶⁸In one of ICOM's publications New Museology is explained thus: "The new museology (*la nouvelle muséologie* in French, where the concept originated) widely influenced museology in the 1980s, first gathering some French theoreticians and then spreading internationally from 1984. Referring to a few pioneers who had published innovative texts since 1970, this current of thought emphasised the social role of museums and its interdisciplinary character, along with its new styles of expression and communication. New museology was particularly interested in new types of museums, conceived in contrast to the classical model in which collections are the centre of interest. These new museums are ecomuseums, social museums, scientific and cultural centres, and generally speaking, most of the new proposals aimed at using the local heritage to promote local development. In English museum literature the term New Museology appeared at the end of the 1980s (Virgo, 1989) and is a critical discourse on the social and political role of museums – lending a certain confusion to the spread of the French term, which is less known to the English-speaking public." André Desvallées and François Mairesse; ICOM International Councils of Museums; Musée Royal de Mariemont, Key Concepts of Museology (Paris: Armand Colin, 2010), p.55, http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_B_D.pdf.

¹⁶⁹ Želimir Košćević. Muzej u prošlosti i sadašnjosti. *Muzeologija* 21 (1977): p.15.

that will have high visitor impact pursued me throughout the interviews. The rebellion of the curators was obvious, since our work of intellectual adventure (which might be an excellent metaphor for description) often falls at the rear of daily activities. After the first three interviews I felt like I was always hearing the same story, just framed within different subject fields, and I can certainly relate from the vantage point of my own institution to most concepts that here appositely form part of the museum value framework. True, materiality or perhaps better put, material appearance creates differences between objects and it is one of the points of intersection between the viewer and the museum experience and its associated affect. True, the context of the object is in its contextual aggregation, defined at the same time from both broad and narrow perspectives. But here I can't help but notice that when context is thus defined there is a gap--the middle perspective is missing. If curators cannot see this middle contextual perspective that is brought by the museum's archival material and how it can be used, then all efforts to bring archival and museum values into closer proximity seem to be in vain. Descriptive ontologies, models and standards may have been successful in bridging this gap technically, but that only partly implies that they will similarly bridge conceptual differences at the practical level. The mostly negatively framed comments on the British Museum Collection database online¹⁷⁰ made by the curators I interviewed led me to wonder how far away museums are in practice in their conceptualization of contemporary information retrieval and if this is even the right question, or maybe it should be asked in reverse? The problem with my conceptualization of the examples I selected for the curators' working descriptive assignments was that I had never categorized them as objects. Yes, I had used them as objects while preparing displays, and I had tried to force them to serve as contextualization of a theme, person or some event. However, I found myself always looking to explain their recordness and to see what activity had created them or they were part of. I am quite sure that the curators' descriptions of these examples would be more extensive in

¹⁷⁰<Michelangelo>, <“ 1946,0713.33.a”>, www.britishmuseum.org/collection. British Museum, Collection Online, http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=716016&partId=1&searchText=Michelangelo&object=24231&page=1.

content and context, and quite possibly differently conceptualized, if they would be part of my institutional context. To be able to comprehend and value all aspects of the object that waits for someone to describe it, I believe one is better off if one can appreciate the impact or affect of this description on the potential user. Working at the item level also implies knowing your subject matter very well. Just as curators knew their subject matter in such detail that they can identify an object only by the handwriting, or date it only on the quality of the paper, the density of its tone or the typicality of the edges of a photograph, I have put into main author name the legal body that created the form and increased Julius Lehmann's salary but I have also added his name (although I am not certain about that since there is no handwriting to compare, but maybe somebody some day in the future will ask for him and I will not be here to remember). The question is, how much does any of this differ from an item-level approach in descriptions of archival holdings?

The issue that surprised me the most during the interviews was how surprised some curators were that I put so much emphasis on the basic description entered into an inventory book or museum cataloguing database. At the same time some of them showed great interest, realizing that in some time (maybe in thirty years, which, as one curator commented, is a short period in the museum world) we are all going to be online with our data. How effectively are we going to share? Are we going to be able to construct or locate currently absent context for our stray or orphaned records? Do we realize that description is our personal and professional contribution to the creation of greater information and even knowledge systems? Do we understand that the personal element in the professional surrounding is interesting and a valuable factor to be acknowledged. This line of thinking is supported by the fact that the MDC maintains a project to document the lives, experiences, activities and personal opinions of prominent museum professionals, gathering oral histories and personal papers from museum workers from Croatia since 2002. In this project, personal data, professional experience and topics related to their practitioner life are valued as important information and as aspects that shaped the cultural scene in a certain period.¹⁷¹ Will the archival community attempt to do the same? And where would those few of us who are museum archivists fit in? My perspective was definitely influenced by my education, and it evolved from a firm belief in classical archival ideas of provenance to the possibility of shared multiple provenances, an

¹⁷¹ <http://www.mdc.hr/hr/mdc/zbirke-fondovi/arhiv/arhivske-zbirke/>.

evolution that was in turn influenced by my museum practice. A few curators commented that professional and personal contacts with archivists influenced their perspectives but mostly only in terms of how to achieve control over a vast amount of material by using collective description. I have always seen myself as a record creator, since one of my work responsibilities it to process material and produce descriptions. This value wasn't shared and the concept did not even appear to exist among interviewees. The closest indication that anyone thought about using description as a product was when one curator stated that in order to be able to advance in vocation (for example from curator to senior curator) one needs to deliver proof about one's collection processing rates (which is manifested through the description of items within the museum database). For most topics the issue of who described some item and how wouldn't make a great difference or, perhaps better to say, public impact. However, for those of us who work with personal materials, or with difficult, dark heritage, queries such as those discussed here are a stark reminder that attributing, naming and describing, both collectively and at the item-level, can be a very sensitive issue and one that can have significant importance to the wider, non-scholar public.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The presentation of this research so far has been straightforward in character. At the outset issues of concepts, categories and context were reviewed in order to establish a conceptual basis for this research. The contemporary archival and museum literature on description was also reviewed, and a summarized historical account of the problems of archival material in museums within the Croatian context was provided. Then the processes of data collection and analysis were described, and findings presented. This chapter first elaborates on the Croatian archival legislation and contemplates the ways in which it, together with international standards and professional ethics mandate or constrain curators' descriptive practices for archival materials held in archives and museums. It then discusses the contexts of the examples that the curators described and commented upon (Appendices D to L), and finally it reflects on issues arising out of the data analysis regarding possible metadata crosswalks and interoperability.

The discussion in each of these sections is inflected with the results of the analysis contained in the prior chapter and positioned within the wider discourse in the contemporary scholarly and professional literatures. One limitation that should be noted, however, is that the institutional context, which is very important, can't be analyzed in detail because to do so could lead to the identification of the museum institution, and this would in turn be considered as a violation of the anonymity guaranteed to those who agreed to participate in interviews and description exercises for this study.

1. The Description of Archival Material in the Context of Croatian Archival Legislation

According to Article 3 of the Law on Archives and Archival Institutions:¹⁷²

Archives are considered to be records or documents created by corporate bodies or persons in pursuance of their activities, being of permanent significance for culture, history and science regardless of the place and time of their creation, not depending on the form and medium they have been preserved thereon.

Records or documents are in particular acts, charters, subsidiary office and business books, card indexes, maps, plans, drawings, placards, blank forms, photographs, moving images (film and video recordings), sound recordings, microforms, machine readable records, databases, including programs and tools for using thereof.¹⁷³

According to Article 3 of the Law on Museums, museum material is defined as:

Natural and cultural goods of our civilization which are part of the national heritage and common heritage of mankind.¹⁷⁴

Defined broadly, therefore, museum material can comprise almost anything, if appraised as such. Some of the material defined as records or documents by archival legislation, such as maps, plans, drawings and especially photographs are integral parts of the documentation created by museums but also constitute parts of the materials held in museum collections. The

¹⁷²Law on Archives and Archival Institutions (Zakon o arhivskom gradivu i arhivima) *Official Gazette* no.105 (1997), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/267275.html> (English translation, <http://zagreb.arhiv.hr/hr/pdf/Zakon%20eng.pdf>); amendments in *Official Gazette* no.64 (2000), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/273432.html> and *Official Gazette* no.65 (2009), http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2009_06_65_1459.html.

¹⁷³Law on Archives and Archival Institutions, op.cit.

¹⁷⁴Law on Museums (Zakon o muzejima) *Official Gazette* no.110 (2015), http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2015_10_110_2121.html.

latter are categorized within various collections mostly by theme, person, event, specific location or time period, material and medium (for example, collections of photographs). The Law on Archives and Archival Institutions enables the establishment of special and private archives if requirements regarding sustainable funding, adequate repository and working premises, and employment of archival professionals are met.¹⁷⁵ In this category, although not often legally registered as special archives within the institution but referred to as collections of archival material by the archival legislation (both types of material--collected and created), belong archives in universities, different research institutes and various religious congregations (for example, the Archive of the Croatian School Museum [Hrvatski školski muzej] is a registered special archive within a museum). Personal archival fonds, that is, documents created by private individuals, are also kept in various locations, including museums, libraries and archives, and Melina Lučić's work discusses the steps that might be taken to physically unify them in an archive tasked with such a responsibility.¹⁷⁶

However it is not only museums that categorize the archival materials they collect within various collections. The same process can be seen in the Croatian State Archives that are parts of the state archival network.¹⁷⁷ Photographs, maps, postcards, placards and a range of ephemera are integrated into various collections of archival material. Sometimes these materials came to an archive through purchase or donation, and sometimes they were part of a larger aggregation of documents and these materials were separated to form a new collection. Today such separation is usually documented but in the past that wasn't always the case, so it is impossible to determine the previous aggregational context of some materials. For example, with regard to the Collection of Photographs from Osijek State Archive (HR DAOS 2035

¹⁷⁵More on the issue of special and private archives can be found in Ornata Tadin, "Specijalizirani arhivi," *Arhivski vjesnik* 44 (2001): 43-51, <http://hrcak.srce.hr/9311>.

¹⁷⁶Melina Lučić, *Osobni arhivski fondovi: arhivistički pogled na prikupljanje, obradbu i interpretaciju rukopisnih ostavština u baštinskim institucijama* (Zagreb: Hrvatski Državni Arhiv, 2014): 66.

¹⁷⁷To read more on the Croatian archive system see: Vlatka Lemić, "Building of Integrated National Archival Network in Croatia: Connecting Administration, Archives and Public in Practice," paper presented at the International Council on Archives Congress, Brisbane, Australia 20th-24th August 2012, <http://ica2012.ica.org/files/pdf/Full%20papers%20upload/ica12Final00019.pdf>.

within the analytic inventory--a form of finding aid--for the collection) an archivist who processed the materials, Erika Žilić Vincetić, stated that it was impossible to determine from which fonds in the archive the photographs had been separated and so the decision was made to divide the photographs into series according to the types of image and then to describe them at the item level.¹⁷⁸ This finding aid was created according to the descriptive principles of the applicable international archival standards, ISAD(G)¹⁷⁹ and ISAAR (CPF).¹⁸⁰ Setting aside the elements of description and other metadata presented in the finding aid, which, as already discussed, would be different from those of a museum, how does this situation of a collection of photographs in an archive differ from that of a collection of photographs in museum?

Realistically it doesn't, because in both cases these collections of photographs are artificially created and are no longer able to reflect adequately or reliably the business functions and the flow of business activities through which they were generated. This is because they have been separated from the context of their original fond. In fact, it is not unusual even for archives to separate out such materials into a fond based on medium that is then described at the item level, often thematically or by name, because it is considered that this arrangement better supports the kinds of reference queries that are received involving photographs (i.e., the photographs are being looked at more for their content as information objects, and less for their evidential value as records) and at the same time it facilitates taking collective preservation measures that are specific to those media. If we compare the description of such photographs at the item level in accordance with ISAD(G) with their

¹⁷⁸Erika Žilić Vincetić, *Analitički inventar: Zbirka fotografija 1865-1972* (Osijek: Državni arhiv u Osijeku, 2011), p.5. This is not an uncommon problem and solution in archives elsewhere also, <http://arhinet.arhiv.hr/Pages/PdfFile.aspx?Id=2655>.

¹⁷⁹ International Council on Archives (ICA). *ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description*, second edition, adopted by the Committee on Descriptive Standards, Stockholm, Sweden, 19-22 September 1999, [http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAD\(G\).pdf](http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAD(G).pdf).

¹⁸⁰ International Council on Archives (ICA). *ISAAR (CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record For Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families*, second edition, adopted by the Committee on Descriptive Standards Canberra, Australia, 27-30 October 2003, [http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR\(CPF\)2ed.pdf](http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR(CPF)2ed.pdf).

description at the item level in accordance with museum regulations on the content and management of museum documentation of museum material¹⁸¹ we can identify some differences: i. authority control over the names of the creator are regulated in archives by ISAAR(CPF) and there is no such control in museum description, ii. museum item level description is much richer in its descriptions of content as well as context. It includes information that explains: “events in the object’s history and context, including use and ownership transfer, associated place, associated time, associated personal name and institution, associated event.”¹⁸² Data from the museum catalogue record are also connected within the museum information system with fonds of secondary documentation that provide information about the object’s use in exhibitions, photographic documentation of an object at various points in its *museum life*¹⁸³ (for a photograph treated as a museum object the photographic documentation would probably be a scan file), conservation and restoration work on the object, and so forth. While such relational connections created between the description of an object in the main museum catalogue and fonds of secondary documentation might be compared to the field that specifies related units of description in ISAD(G), the latter is more provenance-oriented. At the item level, the museum description approach, therefore, provides more information and also more contextualized knowledge.

Elaborating on how ISAD(G) supports the description of the relationships or interdependencies between archival description, authenticity and accountability, MacNeil notes that:

In *ISAD(G)*, the elements that address the extent to which the records’ integrity has been maintained across time and space include *location of originals, related units of description, archival history, appraisal, scheduling and destruction information*, and

¹⁸¹ Ministry of Culture, Republic of Croatia, Regulations about Content and Management of Museum Documentation of Museum Material (Pravilnik o sadržaju i načinu vođenja muzejske dokumentacije o muzejskoj građi), *Official Gazette* 108 (2002).

¹⁸² *Ibidem*.

¹⁸³ Photographic documentation of an object is required by the regulations on documentation and has to be part of the documentation sent to the Ministry of Culture so that the collection can be listed in the registry of cultural property.

system of arrangement. The location of originals element signals that the records being described are copies of records that either have been destroyed or are housed elsewhere, while related units of description identifies other bodies of records that are related by provenance to the records being described. This would include, presumably, records housed in other repositories that once formed part of the same *fonds*.¹⁸⁴

A museum catalogue record doesn't include many of the elements stated above because the focus turns on a specific and particular object that might or might not be part of larger aggregation. However, if it is, usually such an aggregation would also be part of the museum's holdings and its lower levels would be described as constituent parts of that aggregation. It probably would be mentioned if there were a case where the aggregation wasn't a unified body or was partly held in another repository, but this would be stated in order to contextualize the object or the theme that the object can represent, and not to point to its integrity.

Integrity and the related concepts of authenticity and reliability are major points of concern within archival science and diplomatics. A terminological framework built by the InterPARES research project¹⁸⁵ defines these central concepts, which are summarized by Brent Lee:

The central concepts of this framework are: **accuracy** [original highlighted] (the truthfulness of the content of the record), **trustworthiness** (deserving of trust or confidence), **reliability** (the trustworthiness of a record as a statement of fact, created by the completeness of a record's form and the amount of control exercised on the process of its creation), **authentication** (guaranteed genuine by a public authority), **authenticity** (trustworthiness of a record as a record, exhibiting all of the formal elements designed to provide it with authenticity), **identity** (person, dates, matter and archival bond), and **integrity** (whole and unaltered).¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ Heather MacNeil, "Trusting Description: Authenticity, Accountability, and Archival Description Standards," *Journal of Archival Organization* 7 (2009): 94, DOI: 10.1080/15332740903117693.

¹⁸⁵ International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems InterPARES), <http://www.interpares.org/>.

¹⁸⁶ Brent Lee, "Authenticity, Accuracy and Reliability: Reconciling Arts-related and Archival Literature." InterPARES 2 Project, 2005, p.5, http://www.interpares.org/display_file.cfm?doc=ip2_aar_arts_lee.pdf.

The InterPARES dictionary¹⁸⁷ supplements this definition of authenticity and elaborates on how the concept is connected with the concept of originality: “The judgment that something is genuine, based on internal and external evidence, including its physical characteristics, structure, content, and context. [Archives]”¹⁸⁸ A similar definition of the authentic nature of a cultural object is provided by the glossary of the ICOM International Observatory on Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods. It states that the authentic nature of a cultural object “is based on the cultural and spiritual values inherent to the evolution of societies, and is certified by the sources of information regarding the object's origin and signification.”¹⁸⁹ Researching these sources of information is, in the museum context, researching the provenance of an object. As noted by Clifford Lynch, director of the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), “The term provenance comes up often in discussion of authenticity and integrity. Provenance, broadly speaking, is documentation about the origin, characteristics, and history of an object; its chain of custody; and its relationship to other objects.”¹⁹⁰ Research only on provenance, in the museum context, would not be sufficient to prove an object’s authenticity. The expert would have to examine the object’s stylistic properties, and conduct research on the object’s material aspects.¹⁹¹

The authentic object is trusted because of its provenance—but provenance perceived broadly, as in the context of the lifetime of an object.

¹⁸⁷InterPARES Dictionary,

http://www.interpares.org/ip2/display_file.cfm?doc=ip2_dictionary.pdf&CFID=9775856&CFTOKEN=59553050.

¹⁸⁸Ibidem.

¹⁸⁹ICOM International Observatory on Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods http://obstraffic.museum/glossary/letter_a.

¹⁹⁰ Clifford Lynch, "Authenticity and Integrity in the Digital Environment: An Exploratory Analysis of the Central role of Trust." In Ross Parry, ed., *Museums in a Digital Age* (London: Routledge, 2010), p.314.

¹⁹¹For more on the authentication of museum objects see: Sharon Flescher, "A Brief Guide to Provenance Research." In Julia Courtney, ed., *The Legal Guide for Museum Professionals*, (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), p.70.

Why does this even matter, if in a museum collected records are regarded as cultural artifacts? It matters because by addressing only the informational value of an object/record, its other distinctive properties are neglected and the object/record is not described to its fullest potential. The user, consulting the museum collection, or the visitor at the exhibition, trusts that the record/object is authentic because the descriptions provided address or not all the properties of that record/object. MacNeil argues that:

Considerations of authenticity are contingent on a number of factors and circumstances and the question whether an archival description provides grounds on which users might presume the authenticity of the records being described cannot be separated from the question of whether users can trust the archivist's representation of the records.¹⁹²

The curators interviewed in this study mostly considered the object/record to be authentic if there was a stamp and/or signature on it. This they also perceived to be a major way to judge that the object/record is in fact original, together with examining its materiality (paper quality, photographic technique, etc.). Whether the user can indeed trust the facts and opinions that the curator presents depends on who made the description and how it was made, and one may need to examine the supporting documentation to make that judgement. Research that has been carried out on objects in a museum is documented by museum professionals. For example, conservation processes are required by professional conservation ethics to be thoroughly documented and a permanent record of those processes created and maintained,¹⁹³ as is the process of processing the collection (often in the form of a processing plan, although that is not mandatory).¹⁹⁴

¹⁹²MacNeil, op.cit., p.93.

¹⁹³ For example, Section VII. of the American Institute for Conservation of Artistic & Historic Works (AIC)'s *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice* states that "The conservation professional shall document examination, scientific investigation, and treatment by creating permanent records and reports." [http://www.conservation-us.org/our-organizations/association-\(aic\)/governance/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice-\(html\)](http://www.conservation-us.org/our-organizations/association-(aic)/governance/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice-(html)).

¹⁹⁴ For example, before one can describe an item and enter its description into the database, the curator must examine the item or aggregations of items. If there is any kind of complex situation then she/he produces research notes about the item. This usually happens in archival processing also. When

Description in a museum, as the data from the interviews underscores, is an ongoing process, but the process as such is not systematically documented. Sometimes it can be traced through different versions of catalogue entries, but such information is technical in nature and identifies who made the description and when, and it doesn't reveal the background semantics and rationales of the process. However a similar situation can also be found in the archival context.¹⁹⁵ MacNeil considers the issue of the archivist providing an account about the description that he or she created to be a part of the ethics of the archivist.¹⁹⁶ ICOM's Code of Ethics for Museums, regarding the documentation of collections, provides a statement that:

Museum collections should be documented according to accepted professional standards. Such documentation should include a full identification and description of each item, its associations, provenance, condition, treatment and present location. Such data should be kept in a secure environment and be supported by retrieval systems providing access to the information by the museum personnel and other legitimate users.¹⁹⁷

Regarding the interpretation of exhibitions, it states that: "Museums should ensure that the information they present in displays and exhibitions is well-founded, accurate and gives appropriate consideration to represented groups or beliefs."¹⁹⁸ The role of the museum

the archivist prepares to process the collection or fond she/he will make notes about the series and subseries she/he perceives and overall tries to figure out the original order of the fond or collection and to track relevant administrative changes at the creator level, as these are reflected in the material. The description is created after these processes, based on the materials themselves, these notes, and other background research.

¹⁹⁵ Curators keep these files for their own use and in their own manner, whether that be on scraps of paper or in a folder on a computer. Some of them don't retain these notes after the item is initially described (although description is considered to be an ongoing process). Personally I keep all my notes and processing plans, which is why I was able to use them in my autoethnographic account.

¹⁹⁶ MacNeil, *op.cit.*, 93

¹⁹⁷ International Council on Museums (ICOM), *ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums* (2013), p.5. http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Codes/code_ethics2013_eng.pdf.

¹⁹⁸ *ICOM Code of Ethics*, *op.cit.*, 8.

professional while creating description isn't explicitly stated while the ICA Code of Ethics clearly states that: "Archivists should keep a permanent record documenting accessions, conservation and all archival work done."¹⁹⁹ Croatian museum documentation regulations prescribe that the person responsible for creating and adding to or modifying the catalogue record should be listed, but documenting the actual process of description is overlooked.²⁰⁰ While in museums the description is connected with ongoing research about the object, there is no rule requiring explicit elaboration on choices that are made. Rather these are implicit in the curators' research notes. Curatorial statements that often accompany an exhibition or published exhibition catalogue reflect more on the intent behind the exhibition and the methods of display and interpretation of the objects than on how the curator approached their description. The issue of documenting physical changes in the materiality of an object has been extensively elaborated, researched and described in museum work, but the current version of ISAD(G), as MacNeil notes, neglects this aspect, despite it being required by the ICA's own Code of Ethics:

The standard does not include any rules, however, that require the archivist to document preservation actions taken on the records either by creators or custodians, even though these actions may affect the records' physical integrity and reshape their identity in subtle ways. The only element that comes close to addressing physical changes to the records is *physical characteristics and technical requirements* and its scope is limited to physical changes that affect the use of the records, such as poor legibility. Nothing in the rule governing this element suggests that the physical

¹⁹⁹Int International Council on Archives (ICA), *Code of Ethics* (1996), Principle 5, http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/ICA_1996-09-06_code%20of%20ethics_EN.pdf.

²⁰⁰See The London Charter for the Computer-based Visualisation of Cultural Heritage," draft, 2009, http://www.londoncharter.org/fileadmin/templates/main/docs/london_charter_2_1_en.pdf. This document introduced the term "paradata" to refer to the documentation of the process of the creation of computer-based visualisation. It is defined as "Documentation of the evaluative, analytical, deductive, interpretative and creative decisions made in the course of computer-based visualisation should be disseminated in such a way that the relationship between research sources, implicit knowledge, explicit reasoning, and visualisation-based outcomes can be understood."

characteristics of records embody part of their meaning and are not simply a condition that may affect their access and use.²⁰¹

Since the materiality of an object is a major property of its conceptualization as a museum object, any physical changes in the object during its lifetime will be documented and researched in the museum context. How much of that documentation has been made when those objects take the form of records (for example, a medieval charter or Michelangelo's architectural drawing from Appendices J and Ja) remains to be explored in future research. How much of the information that is contained in museum and archival documentation in the Croatian context is actually available to end users? The Regulations about the Conditions and Method of Gaining Access to Museum Material and Museum Documentation²⁰² require that Croatian museums enable access to their holdings on-site, including both collected and created records.²⁰³ The exceptions include situations where material is damaged, is being processed or is already being used by someone else. Other exceptions are regulated through the legislative frame of protecting personal rights. On the general regulatory level there is no great difference between whether one is accessing material in a museum or in an archive. The use of archival material in archives is regulated by Regulations for the Use of Archives²⁰⁴ and article 2 defines the use of archives:

²⁰¹MacNeil, op.cit., p95.

²⁰² Ministry of Culture, Republic of Croatia, Regulations about the Conditions and Method of Gaining Access to Museum Material and Museum Documentation (Pravilnik o uvjetima i načinu ostvarivanja uvida u muzejsku građu i muzejsku dokumentaciju) *Official Gazette*, no.115 (2001), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/233482.html>.

²⁰³For another view on problematic definitions in the Regulations, see: Želimir Laszlo, "Bože sačuvaj! (Ili o Pravilniku o uvjetima i načinu ostvarivanja uvida u muzejsku građu i muzejsku dokumentaciju)," *Vijesti muzealaca i konzervatora*, 2-4 (2002): 91-94.

²⁰⁴ Ministry of Culture, Republic of Croatia, Regulations for the Use of Archives (Pravilnik o korištenju arhivskoga gradiva), *Official Gazette* no.67 (1999), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/270998.html>. An English translation is also available at <http://zagreb.arhiv.hr/hr/pdf/Pravilnik%20o%20korist%20eng.pdf>.

The use of archives is understood to mean the use of finding aids, as well as the use of archives regardless of the medium in which they are preserved. The use of records includes the consultation of archives, transcriptions, publication, exhibition, reproduction, loan and issuing of certified transcripts or copies.²⁰⁵

It is also prescribed that provisions that regulate access to archives apply to archival materials kept in other public institutions, including museums. The ability and responsibility to issue certified transcripts or copies seems to be a key difference in accessing and using material in archives and museums. While a museum can possibly issue validated copies of the documentation and business records it has generated in the course of performing its own institutional functions, it is problematic for it to attempt do the same for records that it has integrated into its collections. This is because the kinds of controls that are put in place by archives to manage the authenticity of the records that they hold, such as maintaining and documenting the archival bond by means of its arrangement and descriptive practices, are likely not in place in the museum.

2. The Role Played by Personal and Professional Context in the Description of Archival Material in Croatian Museums

In the description of archival materials in museums, a layering of personal, professional, institutional (which is partly regulated by different legislative regulations) and societal contexts comes into play. When I first started to think about description, my concerns were focused on how well description supported access, especially descriptions that are available online for objects held by museums. These descriptions of course can be traced back to their creators--curators who apply professional recommendations such as codes of ethics and standards and legislative regulations according to their own personal, professional and disciplinary perspectives on what are the most important aspects of the nature (i.e., the structure, content and value) of the described item. My speculation also was that if there is little or no understanding from the curatorial perspective of what characteristics of an object and its relations to persons, places or events need to be captured in a description and why, then supporting any degree of interoperability between the metadata being created at one

²⁰⁵ Ministry of Culture, Regulations for the Use of Archives, op.cit.

museum and another will be challenging. This thesis research has been dedicated mostly to this level of personal and professional context, therefore, and seeks to explain the influence of personal conceptualizations. The processes of conceptualization are of importance for understanding curatorial descriptive practices and the eventual shape of the descriptions that curators create and their effectiveness for supporting information access as well as for linking related materials in other repositories.

Each of the curators I interviewed has a very different educational background in terms of academic discipline, as well as a different amount of professional experience (this ranged from 8 to 30 years in museum practice). The materials that curators were asked to describe and to comment upon were chosen because of their specific structure, content and context.²⁰⁶The examples shown in Appendices D and E are photographic prints that form part of a photograph album, presumably made around 1873, since the prints show the construction of the Karlovac – Rijeka railway. The album is part of the Croatian Railway Museum holdings because the Museum is part of the national railway company and in the past it was the custom (and in some cases even the requirement) that each railway line be photographed during different phases of its construction. These photographs, usually in the form of a photograph album, were given to different stakeholders who were involved in the process of the construction of the railway. One copy, therefore, ended up in the national railway company and eventually in the Museum, in its capacity as an organizational unit of this company. In the Croatian Railway Museum holdings, these photographs, represented as items within the album, are relationally connected within the database with other material related to the same railway line. This has been done in an effort to establish connections between material created by the same creator or its successor and also with material that can be thematically or associationally connected to a broader topic, place, event or person, or in some cases, with objects that were used as equipment on this particular line. The subsequent task of connecting three-dimensional objects (such as the motifs depicted in the photographs) with the specific site of use is quite difficult because equipment used on the railway was mass-produced in a factory and so it is hard to establish which exact machine is depicted in the

²⁰⁶When I am referring to what I regard as these characteristics, however, it remains important for the reader to consider my own embedded perspective about these materials, not just as the researcher who is trying to draw conclusions, but also as a practitioner.

photographs. It is easier if a machine's serial number can be detected. All these are further related within the database to materials contained in fonds of secondary documentation (exhibitions where this particular photograph was displayed, photodocumentation of museum employees' fieldwork at a particular site, etc.) and with news articles published from various sources that discuss this particular line and other published works that refer to the same topic.

Creating these kinds of connections between the data and then building the knowledge base takes a lot of effort but it supports expanding curatorial knowledge not just about a particular photograph or album but also about a whole theme that is part of the focus of the Museum. Since the Museum uses a database that is locally installed and available only on computers within the institution, this information is available only for internal use, but it is given to users who want to access this particular item in support of their research, if the user is interested in that. A digital copy of the item requested will also be sent to user, if there is a request for that. This is, however, an institutional decision, and one that is always subject to possible future changes. The availability of digital copies or any kind of online metadata about a certain item--as the interviewed curators also noted--is dependent upon the institutional context and internal policy decisions. Nevertheless, as discussed in the previous section, access to the museum institution is mandatory under State regulations.²⁰⁷

The title of the photographs, given at the top of each image, is "Karlstadt-Fiumaner Bahn." That is, in fact, the title of the whole series of photographs, and there is a detailed title of each image in the German, Hungarian and Croatian versions at the bottom of the card to which each image is affixed. In this activity the curators conceptualize titles in similar and yet different ways. Using the original title given for the image was what suited them the most, suggesting that the value of authority control is not understood by curators in the same way that librarians define it. Since the curators are primarily subject-specialists, the notion of authority control is seen to be narrow, especially in determining a title for the image. The curators themselves stated that they are primarily subject-specialists and only then information professionals.

The album contains 36 photographs in total, and because each card with a photograph is uniquely numbered, one can see that some photographs are missing. The album has no value as a unique object on the general level, since there are several duplicate originals of the same

²⁰⁷ Ministry of Culture, Regulations about the Conditions and Method, op.cit.

album. But the uniqueness of this particular copy might be seen in its history of use, since it was, from the time when it was created, part of the railway company, which still today maintains the railway line depicted in the photographs. Other duplicate originals are held in the Croatian State Archive,²⁰⁸ with some also being in the State Archive of Rijeka,²⁰⁹ the University Library in Rijeka²¹⁰ and the Library of the Wolfsonian Museum at Florida International University in Miami in the United States.²¹¹ Particular scenes (same motifs, but photographs taken at different moments and not in the mode of a duplicate original of the abovementioned album) are kept in the Albertina in Vienna.²¹² Conceivably this listing of institutions holding related originals, copies and versions could continue much longer and include those duplicates that are kept in private collections.²¹³ Since the Wolfsonian album isn't available as a digital copy online and the descriptive metadata that are available online are insufficient,²¹⁴ there is no possibility of determining whether its copy of the album is

²⁰⁸Description available at: http://arhinet.arhiv.hr/details.aspx?ItemId=1_120839.

²⁰⁹Description available at: http://arhinet.arhiv.hr/details.aspx?ItemId=1_170784.

²¹⁰Catalogue record available at: <http://libraries.uniri.hr/cgi-bin/unilib.cgi?form=D1470514003> and presentation of the album as part of an online edition available at: <http://www.svkri.uniri.hr/images/Fiume/Adriatica.htm>.

²¹¹Catalogue record available at: <http://digital.wolfsonian.org/WOLF063479/00001/citation>.

²¹² Catalogue record and digital copy available at: [http://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/?query=Inventarnummer=\[FotoGLV2000/22256\]&showtype=record](http://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/?query=Inventarnummer=[FotoGLV2000/22256]&showtype=record).

²¹³ Punzalan talks about "diaspora" of records across archives, museums and other sites, including those in other countries, and discusses the virtual reunification of photograph collections. See Ricardo L. Punzalan "Archival Diasporas: A Framework for Understanding the Complexities and Challenges of Dispersed Photographic Collections," *The American Archivist* 77 no.2 (Fall/Winter 2014): 326-349; and *Virtual Reunification: Bits and Pieces Gathered Together to Represent the Whole*. Doctoral thesis. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2013).

²¹⁴ There are basic bibliographic metadata: name of the author, title of the whole album, place of publication and physical dimensions of the album, but not item level descriptions of photographs.

complete and contains all of the original photographs, 40 in total. The album from the Croatian State Archive is missing several photographs that apparently are the same ones that are held in the State Archive of Rijeka, as is stated in the online description of the items. The relation between these two descriptive records was established within the national archival information system, ARHiNET,²¹⁵ but other extra-Croatia relationships are not mentioned. The items--each photograph--are referred to only at the title level (in the Croatian, German and Hungarian versions), but general details are given about the acquisition as well as technical details about the photographic technique used and the measurements of the image. The catalogue records from the University Library in Rijeka and the Wolfsonian-FIU Library take the form of basic bibliographic records, but the online copy of the album provided by the University Library in Rijeka is for now the only available copy of the album online, although their catalogue record does not mention that more than one photograph is missing.²¹⁶ The title of the album (printed on the leather cover of the album) is "Ansichten der Karlstadt Fiumanerbahn," which is also given in the ARHiNET description. The same title is the only one listed in the catalogue records of the Wolfsonian Library and the University Library of Rijeka. This approach to naming objects/photographs is quite the opposite of how the interviewed curators approached this description task. They mainly listed the titles of the individual photographs and did so in a manner that supplied a more descriptive title than the original one (i.e., the title printed at the bottom of each photograph). But each curator's description referenced the notion of the album as the "container," both physical and intellectual. All their descriptions were more detailed regarding content and motifs presented in the photographs that might serve as keywords, and, despite this being a somewhat artificial exercise, all the curators stated that they would ordinarily use such detailed keywords to describe an object and connect it to other objects and themes at the conceptual level. The question this raises therefore is, could keywords work effectively in an online environment such as a tagging system or would online databases benefit more from authority control over particular descriptive elements such as title and creator? In this example I informed the

²¹⁵ For more on ARHiNET see Lemić, "Building of Integrated National Network," *op.cit.*

²¹⁶ Without research, it is hard to know if there is something missing; the missing photographs are at the end of album so this can't be concluded by tracking the original numbering of the cards.

curators that the photograph was by A.Löwy (Atelier Löwy) since on the examples in hand there were no clear views of the photographer's name. This example was employed in order to discern the curatorial perspective on describing a whole (album), parts (a series of photographs in that album) and an individual part (a particular photograph in the album) and also to understand the curators' preferred choices about adding the title of the item. This example also shows the problem of when aggregated items (with the album being the aggregation in this case) are described at the item level. The museum description gives more insight into the content of the photograph, and through the assignment of keywords it potentially enables much deeper and broader *reading* of the image such that the photographs could provide additional information that is not necessarily connected to the building of a railway line.²¹⁷ Keywords cannot completely replace authority control, but they can certainly add additional informational value about the content. On an institutional level a keyword that represents one theme, or a phrase that represents an event could be controlled in a database system, and a comparison of these with tags already existing online on same topic could possibly provide insight regarding the utility of such keywords in the online environment. Loehrlein perceives folksonomies as external conceptual representations that could possibly be shared among a culture or domain,²¹⁸ but if we allow our professional practices and standards to constrain us, and do not support enough flexibility and thinking outside the institution's immediate context and needs, then the data and knowledge that we potentially could share is challenged at the expense of the end user and also of the collections of material to which we could add value and potential link through enriched description. Physical unification of the photographs from the State Archive of Rijeka and the Croatian State Archive will likely never be achieved, but intellectual unification is provided through the

²¹⁷ The goal was to see which keywords the curators would use since those keywords reflect on their conceptualization of the properties of the item they are describing. They all used similar if not the same keywords, even if they did not all structure them in the same way. This suggests that they were similarly perceiving properties in the image. One could speculate whether this focus on content, rather than the archival focus on context, was because of their outlook as museum professionals, or whether this is a more "natural" human inclination that one might also see if public online tagging or crowd sourced description were to be made available for such photographs online.

²¹⁸ Loehrlein, *op.cit.*, 122.

description that is online. However this conceptualization is only at the level of the archival national information system and has been made a reality as a result of independent decisions taken by the institutions or archivists in question, not as a matter of routine institutional practice. The questions that need to be added to this discussion and that are left without answer because they are out of the scope of this research, are, firstly, why do institutional decisions not promote connecting descriptive metadata with *external* sources? And, secondly, does the online availability of a rich description and digital copy of an item (which has previously been digitized for either access or preservation reasons) depend on that item being viewed by the institution as likely to be a means of financial income (for example, through income generated by licensing copies for external use that might support the push to market museum content that was referenced by the interviewed curators)? Or does it depend on practical issues relating to funding and staff that have an impact upon the sustainable creation and management of metadata and related digital assets?

These photographs fit into the concept of a record in the Croatian juridical context. Again, the concept of a record is contextually dependent, with context in this case being both societal and professional archival practice that is directed by legislation and regulations. So the concern that Buchanan expressed that:

Recognition of the limitations of institutional archives has encouraged “archival turn” scholars to look elsewhere for their source material: to museums, libraries, oral history etc. Again, none of this is new, but the indiscriminate labeling of these resources as “archival” is more modern phenomenon and surely relates to the identification of archival research as a fundamental characteristic of the discipline involved ...²¹⁹

directs our attention towards issues arising from competing or diverging archival conceptualizations of records in particular contexts. It also directs our attention towards the issue of archives, museums and libraries keeping the same or related materials (or certain materials that for one reason or another have been or become separated from their original aggregation) and indiscriminately labeling duplicate originals or different version of copies as non-archival when they are not being managed in an archival context. This leads to the

²¹⁹ Alexandrina Buchanan, "Strangely Unfamiliar: Idea of the Archive from Outside the Discipline." In Hill, Jennie ed., *The Future of Archives and Recordkeeping a Reader* (London: Facet Publishing, 2011), p.44.

conclusion that the concept of what is an archival record differs not just between archives and museums but also between particular archival practices and different types institutions as well as between how the concept of a record is variously understood within archival research elsewhere around the world and from different epistemological standpoints.²²⁰ As Yeo notes: “[...] it can be argued that most archivists and records managers have a prototype of “record”²²¹ and in this case these photographs perhaps are not central to that prototype. Nevertheless they belong to the concept and can serve as boundary objects within all cultural heritage communities of practice. There is also a general presumption that archival description of these records will not be reused but the data analyzed for this study suggests that description that comes down to the item level has potential for use in ways other than originally envisaged, if such reuse or alternative use is perceived by the describer to be one of the aims of the process and product of description. Furthermore, this example points to a common notion that the material held in archives and museums is unique. In large part this is true, but it is not a general rule. The collections are unique by virtue of the distinctive history and circumstances of their collection, as are all fonds,²²² but the actual materials that are contained in a collection do not have to be. This is the case not just for photographs but also for various architectural drawings, correspondence, and especially business records. With the example of architectural drawings, there can easily be a case in which original duplicates or later certified copies participate in several business activities in the various records

²²⁰ Various and diverging conceptualizations of both "record" and "archive" are explicitly discussed by the authors of the essays contained in Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J Lau, eds. *Research in the Archival Multiverse* (Social Informatics Monograph Series, Monash University Press, 2016).

²²¹ Geoffrey Yeo, "Concepts of Record (2): Prototypes and Boundary Objects," *The American Archivist* 71 (Spring/Summer 2008): 122.

²²² Navarrete and Mackenzie Owen make a similar observation that takes the notion of the uniqueness of collections further: "...we should note that that collections, which are always more than arbitrary sets of objects, too require metadata to support interpretation and contextualization: collections are also objects. As such, an object may be interpreted differently when part of a collection made by an artist, a collector or a national museum." Trilce Navarrete and John Mackenzie Owen, "The Museum as Information Space: Metadata and Documentation." In Karol Borowiecki, Neil Forbes and Antonella Fresa, eds., *Cultural Heritage in a Changing World* (Springer, 2016), p115.

management systems, both digital and non-digital, of the different public (and sometimes private) stakeholders whose records (if appraised for permanent retention) end up in different archives, depending on the jurisdiction of the archive over particular stakeholders. For example, duplicates of architectural drawings from the late 19th century (as in Appendix F) of some railway stations could be found in the Croatian State Archive (because it has jurisdiction over records of the railway system as company operating on the national level), in an in-house archive of the same railway company (if it is needed for purposes of maintaining or reconstructing buildings), and in certain state archives of cities in which railway buildings were constructed. There might even be copies in various fonds or collections of other state agencies that participating in the building and whose records are held within the same archives (for example, they might be responsible for issuing a building permit or validating that the building complies with fire protection regulations). This situation can be expanded outside Croatian national borders to include stakeholders who participated in the construction of buildings and whose records are kept in various archives in Austria and Hungary, because Croatia at one time was part of Austro-Hungarian Empire and train tracks (and stations) were planned and records produced from Vienna and Budapest. These recommendations obviously present a museum perspective because in practice archives often don't have the luxury of describing down to the item level. However to generically assert that archival description will not be reused because of the uniqueness of the materials being described is to overlook all the material that is even provenancially or procedurally connected (e.g., architectural drawings sent from one creator to various other stakeholders, or successive versions of the same document containing substantially the same information) and already kept in different institutions. To perceive them as unique cultural artifacts, emphasizing their unique historical use and significance from the perspective of one particular museum means depriving them of their original contexts of creation and therefore also influencing the possibilities of other forms of contextualization or recontextualization.

All the curators interviewed for this study asserted that an architectural drawing can fulfill both the role of museum object and that of archival record but how descriptive metadata is applied to that item will depend on the institutional context within which it is being held and described, how the object is categorized within a specific collection, and the purpose of the description (e.g., as a catalogue record for management purposes, as an exhibition label, or as an online representation of an item). In this case the curators certainly

share with archivists the concept of an architectural drawing as a record, but their conceptions about the "recordness" of a particular record differ because they do not focus on key properties that are part of the recordness of the object. Evidential value as understood by archivists is overlooked and the emphasis is placed primarily on the informational and cultural value of the record. If we can agree that evidential value is a central property of the concept of a record, then such curatorial understandings and priorities would seem to indicate a major difference between archival and museum conceptualizations of a record. This in turn is reflected in their respective descriptive practices. Furthermore, description is primarily conceptualized as a means of physical and intellectual control over the described item within a museum's holdings and only secondarily as means of communicating the object's content and context, predominantly with museum visitors. The function of description in the online environment is conceptualized differently, however, and the curators who were interviewed agreed on the importance of cross-references that can serve as connections to other online descriptions of items. They conceive of cross-references as a way to connect not only by provenance (meaning by linking together materials with the same creator or any kind of duplicate of the item described), but also more broadly by an expanded thematic area. In that way, the choices made by individual curators of which cross-references to use and which not becomes a form of intellectual filter that constitutes another level of contextualization--in other words, this is one point where we can see the personal or institutional frameworks at work. The strengths of the multifunctional character of museum description are also one of the aspects worth considering when creating any kind of description in online environment. Description is not only created as a method of physical and intellectual control over the item (the same functions as in archival description), it is also a method for contextualizing that item (this is also the case in archival description but only in terms of provenancial contextualization. In the museum setting context is broader and includes more than just the creator). Description is also a representation of content (as it is in archival description, but museum description is much wider in scope), a communication mechanism in exhibitions and with users, and a source of curatorial interpretation.

One of the pitfalls of museum description, however, as this study indicates, at least within the Croatian museum context, is in the area of authority work. Elaborating on how differing epistemological perspectives complicate potential convergences among heritage

institutions and surfacing or creating latent new knowledge through virtual linking, Helena Robinson asserted that:

The polysemy of objects is particularly poignant in the context of convergence, as the museum domain has traditionally eschewed universal naming standards, making it problematic to identify common holdings across institutions. The diversity in museum naming conventions also highlights that the meaning of objects is not fixed within their physical fabric, but rather, attributed to them by their institution. Taken together, the diversity between standards of nomenclature across libraries, archives and museums, but also individual organizations within these broad institutional divisions, provides just one example of how a rich, multidimensional information environment for knowledge-creation can be produced via the existence of diverse collecting institutions and disciplinary approaches.²²³

She continues by asking if the subjective approach of any heritage institution isn't in fact a richness that could provide unique information, specifically because of the heterogeneity of the processes and perceptions that influenced its creation of information? In that way, might this heterogeneity not contribute to the creation and access of knowledge more than could be achieved by some "mega-repository"?²²⁴

Each curator interviewed for this study pointed to how they regularly use keywords when creating catalogue records. Their creation of keywords is content-oriented. Sometimes they use one term (ranging from general to very specific) and sometimes a phrase that usually includes a verb and an object. The type of object described, title and author are not part of keyword creation, since there is a designated place for these authority entries in a catalogue. In an 2009 OCLC research report, Jennifer Schaffner examined reports from archive user studies and points out two important aspects regarding keywords:

There is no common understanding of what users and testers mean when they use words like "keyword," "subject," "known item," "name," "phrase" and "browse."

Without that common understanding, it is difficult to compare findings from separate

²²³Helena Robinson, "Knowledge Utopias: An Epistemological Perspective on the Convergence of Museums, Libraries and Archives," *Museum & Society* 12, no.3 (November 2014): 216.

²²⁴Robinson, "Knowledge Utopias" op.cit., 217.

studies. Is a keyword search technique in effect a subject search, from a user's standpoint?²²⁵

And

Users want to search names by keyword, search for subjects by browsing, and browse by keyword or name, too. When it comes to using descriptive metadata to discover archival materials and special collections, users want it all. This is problematic because significant principles of archival theory and practice have been the provenance and description of what the collection is made up of, its *Ofness*. For users, research shows that important elements of description, especially minimum-level description, are keywords and terms that indicate *Aboutness*.²²⁶

If a keyword search is actually a subject search, then which subject will be chosen to represent the object being described? Probably the person who is describing it will include more than one key subject or a motif (on a photograph for example) but this will never anticipate all possible future uses.²²⁷

Murtha Baca and Elizabeth O'Keefe wondered if creating access points for users by including keywords created by curators and other subject specialists when describing special

²²⁵ Jennifer Schaffner, *The Metadata is the Interface: Better Description for Better Discovery of Archives and Special Collections, Synthesized from User Studies*. (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2009), p.6, <http://www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2009-06.pdf>.

²²⁶Schaffner, *The Metadata is the Interface*, op.cit., 8

²²⁷ Soergel has noted that there is a fundamental tension between "content-oriented" and "request-oriented" indexing. See Dagobert Soergel, *Organizing information: Principles of Data Base and Retrieval Systems* (Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 1985), p.230. For more on describing photographs and other image materials in archives and museums, see Sara Shatford, "Analyzing the Subject of a Picture: A Theoretical Approach," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (Spring 1986): 39-62; James Turner, "Representing and Accessing Information in the Stockshot Database at the National Film Board of Canada," *Canadian Journal of Information Science* 15, no. 4 (December 1990): 1-22; and Jane Greenberg, "Intellectual Control of Visual Archives: A Comparison between the Art and Architecture Thesaurus and the Library of Congress Thesaurus for Graphic Materials," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 16, no.1 (1993): 85-117.

collections²²⁸ could bring more richness. They also commented on including input from other individuals who might be considered to be subject experts:

The incorporation of input from curators, scholars, and other subject experts is an area that institutions should actively pursue, if they want to provide rich, accurate descriptions of the non bibliographic works in their collections. Information from non cataloger subject experts could be routinely captured if there are effective methods for communication and collaboration between catalogers and curators. Expert social tagging — that is, the inclusion of keywords, names, and subject designators by experts who are not part of an institution's official cataloging unit — may also prove to be an effective method of enhancing descriptive metadata records. But before that can happen, both the technical infrastructure (appropriate tagging software that can enable the layering of user-created metadata on top of structured metadata records) and the organizational and human behavioral changes (the notion that many people can contribute to the process of cataloging).²²⁹

In some museums these changes have actually happened and they have managed to resolve the difficulties mentioned in the quotation above.²³⁰

²²⁸ "Special collections" is used here to refer to non-bibliographic materials such as personal papers, photographs and graphic materials that are collected, primarily by libraries.

²²⁹ Murtha Baca and Elizabeth O'Keefe, "Sharing Standards and Expertise in the Early 21st Century: Moving Toward a Collaborative, 'Cross-community' Model for Metadata Creation," *International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control* 38, no.4 (October/December 2009): 60.

²³⁰For example, the museum online database of the Australian Powerhouse museum available at: <http://www.powerhousemuseum.com/collection/database/menu.php>. For a presentation of the project see Sebastian Chan, "Tagging and Searching – Serendipity and Museum Collection Database," paper presented at Museums and the Web 2007, April 11-14 2007, San Francisco California, <http://www.museumsandtheweb.com/mw2007/papers/chan/chan.html>. See also Judith Klavans, Robert Stein, Susan Chun and Raul David Guerra, "Computational Linguistics in Museuma: Applications for Cultural Datasets," paper presented at Museums and the Web 2011, April 6-9, 2011 Philadelphia, PA, http://www.museumsandtheweb.com/mw2011/papers/computational_linguistics_in_museums_applicati.html, and Chung-Wen Cho, Ting-Kuang Yeh, Shu-Wen Cheng and Chun-Yen Chang, "The

Curatorial conceptualizations of author and creator and their representations in description can be seen in the examples shown in Appendices F and G. The first is an architectural drawing of railway station buildings in Salona and Dugopolje on the narrow gauge line from Split to Sinj. As can be noticed on the copy of the drawing, several levels of creator authorities are present. The curators stated that the primary author is the engineer whose signature is seen on drawing. But they also said that they would list in the author field in the catalogue all other corporate names that can be seen on the drawing. This is an important consideration for museum practice but if museum descriptions were to be shared more widely online it might be misleading to users in terms of the relevance of research results. If this had been archival description the Austrian Railway Company might have been listed as the provenance as the body responsible for the railway line.

Appendix G is a copy of a document in which a particular individual, Julius Lehmann, is approved for a salary increase and a new position within the railway system at the end of 19th century. In the curatorial conception, Julius Lehmann would also be a creator of this document, if he signed it. Listing both the Austrian Ministry that issued this document and the person who was the other party in the activity or action conveyed by the document directly challenges traditional definitions of provenance in archival science, but it aligns much more closely with more recent interpretations of co-creatorship as a form of provenance. Gilliland writes that:

The archival concept of co-creatorship has been proposed as a way to acknowledge, give voice to, and describe the roles of those who were involved with the creation of the record and its metadata as contributors, subjects, victims, or legatees rather than as the official authors. However the identification of these parties as co-creators challenges traditional archival ideas about provenance. It also elicits controversy as to whether a designation as co-creator would convey a false sense of agency on the part of those who were coerced or unwitting participants in the activity that led to the creation of the record.²³¹

Searching Effectiveness of Social Tagging in Museum Websites," *Educational Technology & Society*, 15 no.4 (2012):126–136, http://www.ifets.info/journals/15_4/12.pdf.

²³¹Anne J. Gilliland. "Contemplating Co-creator Rights in Archival Description," *Knowledge Organization* 39, no.5 (September 2012): 341.

The same acknowledgment of co-creatorship was observed in the curators' comments about the Red Cross letter sent from a daughter to her mother (Appendix K) where the daughter is perceived as the author but here they viewed the Red Cross to be the creator with the higher responsibility because it was the major participant in the activity of providing communication between the daughter and mother. This co-creatorship concepts fits into the museum descriptive perspective because the description of an item is closely related to the description of the theme or person to whom this object is related, both in context and content. The letter presents a communication event in which the major figure is the person who writes while the process is evidenced by the official Red Cross form that is the material carrier of the content. A museum description would probably also further narrate the process of sending the letters via the Red Cross and the circumstances of a particular letter, such as the abovementioned. However this description perspective might nevertheless lack the administrative context and explanation of these activities as one of the functions of the Red Cross as organization in that particular time that would be recorded in the administrative history included in archival description. The question one curator asked, "is there more?" referring to whether there are other similar letters made and sent via the Red Cross service during the Second World War is the same one often heard from museum users, who often assert that there simply has to be more material related to their research request or question. This of course also brings us back to the issues already discussed of dispersion and uniqueness as well as to how museum or archival description copes with inevitable absences of material that has been destroyed, has never been located or perhaps was never created in the first place. While there is usually related material available in other institutions nationally or internationally, when the desire to identify specific or all material is highly affectively charged (as might be the case with a family member who had been a railway worker but whose fate remains unknown), users may pursue or even imagine various historical narratives. Such narratives may provide clues to the existence of the desired material and its possible location but they may also support conjectures about the possibilities, even certainty of its creation that will never be met. Gilliland and Caswell have described such phenomena as imagined records and impossible archival imaginaries.²³²The museum environment, with its

²³²For an exposition of the concept of the archival imaginary see Anne J. Gilliland and Michelle Caswell, "Impossible Archival Imaginaries and Imagined Records," *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 53-

constant re-contextualization, is fruitful ground for such narratives, but they are not part of official description of an item and instead tend to remain in the background in a curator's notes awaiting possible verification or challenge, usually through exhibitions or virtual reunification initiatives such as collaborative virtual museums or international online portals that give access to various types of heritage.

This question, “is there more?” could probably be partly answered by addressing the issue “how did X item come into the museum?” that was elaborated around the example shown in Appendix L. Tracing the source backwards unavoidably brings one first to the history of the transfer of the object into the museum's custody, and then further back again to its creator. The question, “what might this photograph be used for?” which was used as a prompt when the curators were asked to comment, was intended to surface their sense of what kind of contemporary uses might be made of the kind historical material they were provided-- in this case material that is held in the geographically distant Australian repository. Their answers point to possible use in historical research, such as local urbanism history and planning, or history of agriculture and in the current context possibly for purposes of conservation work on the city structure shown in the photograph. At the time of data collection for this Croatia was in the process of verifying buildings that had been illegally constructed (i.e., without requisite permits) after 1968. It was potentially an expensive situation for any citizen who was the owner of building of that kind. There were many conditions and regulations to be met in this process, and one of them was that the owner had to prove whether or not their building was constructed prior to 1968 (in which case the building would not have to go through this process). Besides the documents that could be obtained as proof from the State Geodetic Directorate and other public services, aerial photographs that were kept in the military archive of former Yugoslav National Army were another source that could be used as evidence. This is an example of how historic photographs can be used for contemporary purposes, and have substantial impact on individual lives. The question is would a photograph such as the one from 1945 contained in Appendix L be recognized or even locatable as valid evidence? The description alone, and especially that kind of description that is made as an overview of materials in collections, can't establish the evidential value of material, but it can point to other information and sources. The authority

75. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-015-9259-z.

naming practice in this Australian example was particularly confusing and when viewed by the Croatian curators, the entire description clearly represented that repository's (and possibly that nation's) point of view on Croatian territories at the end of Second World War, when the situation was really very complex.

The development of automated museum databases (developed based on pre-existing catalogue cards) began in Croatia on a small scale in the 1980s, continued in the 1990s (although also constrained, this time due to the political circumstances) and reached a more developed phase at the beginning of the 2000s. The Ministry of Culture financed, as a program of cultural development, the purchase of software for the management of museum material and documentation, and the Museum Documentation Centre was designated as the mediator for the process of museum automation. The software was installed locally on the computer network of Croatian museums that had accepted this software (some others already had different software solutions and weren't eager to make the transition).²³³ Most of the museums still use this database system, which recently was redesigned to be online rather than locally-based. However some museums have been searching for new software solutions that also comply with the prescribed regulations. With this automation, the nature of description became more pressing. As Navarrete and Owen note:

The adoption of the computer meant a new phase in the history of museum documentation. The concept of metadata became central.²³⁴

The advent of digitization also changed the practical day-to-day processing collections.²³⁵ There was also increasing transfer of descriptions and images between local databases and the

²³³ Šimat and Halović present some interesting information on the history of automation of Croatian museums, noting that: "Dr. Bauer contacted for help the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, which in 1976 had donated the SELGEM software package for museum object data management." Mirna Šimat and Ozren Halović, "Informatizacija mreže hrvatskih muzeja," *Muzeologija* 41-42 (2007): 123, <http://hrcak.srce.hr/77468>.

²³⁴ Navarrete and Owen, "The Museum as Information Space," op.cit., p.114.

²³⁵ Breza Salamon-Cindori, Marko Tot and Daniela Živković, "Digitization: Challenges for Croatian Museums," *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML)* 1 (2014): 213-220, http://www.qqml.net/papers/March_2014_Issue/317QQML_Journal_2014_SalamonCindoriTotZivkovic_213-220.pdf.

online environment and new models for representing museum collections on the Internet and different collaborative heritage community projects emerged.²³⁶

However, changes that happened over the last 20 years regarding digitization and online representation have not yet been reflected in the juridical context, which acknowledges and recognizes these changes only on a basic level and does not attempt to address such concerns and aspirations in depth. Moreover the regulations are conceptualized mostly in terms of national context, and fail to address the relationships between the local and global (*glocal*) contexts. Meanwhile the new “networked object”²³⁷ resides in the online environment with the potential ability to surmount all previous obstacles to access, but only insofar as its metadata permit that.

To what extent are these laws and regulations regarding museums (and similarly the juridical framework governing archives) a legacy of the previous political socialist system in Croatia, then part of Yugoslavia? According to Želimir Laszlo the simple, but elaborated, answer to the question “Do Croatian Museums Still Live in Socialism?” in 2003 was “Yes.”²³⁸ The situation expressed in his opinion, more than a decade ago, has only slightly changed so far, with changes mostly oriented to the consolidation of the Croatian legislative framework to address the new context of the European Union.

Finally, the curator as record creator in the creation of descriptions in a museum catalogue is not unlike the archivist as record creator while creating a description in a database or finding aid. It is a very similar professional responsibility that serves both as evidence of a business activity and as an access tool. Problematizing this personal influence on description, in the archival scholarly literature, has been raised as part paradigmatic postmodern turn in archival science.

²³⁶ Sanjica Faletar Tanacković and Boris Badurina, "Collaboration of Croatian Cultural Heritage Institutions: Experiences from Museums" *Museum Management and Curatorship* 24, iss. 4. (2009): 299-321.

²³⁷ Cameron and Mengler, "Complexity, Transdisciplinarity and Museum Collections Documentation," *op.cit.*, p.201.

²³⁸ Želimir Laszlo, “Do Croatian Museums Still Live in Socialism? Yes,” *International Conference on Museums in Transformation Process, November 24-26, 2003, Brno, Czech Republic, Conference Papers*, UNESCO Chair Museology, World Heritage, <http://www.phil.muni.cz/unesco/Conference>.

3. Moving up from the Catalogue Record Entry to Managing the Collections

The inclusion of photographs or maps into museum collections presents problems in terms of categorization. Many collections of photographs likely already exist in the institution, so it is not the inclusion of new acquisitions that is problematic. That kind of collection can be listed in the Registry of cultural property and thereby gain the status of a protected cultural good. The problems are that when the collection is extensive it can be hard quickly to bring it under control at the item level. It is a similar situation when it contains material that is difficult to categorize as museum objects, for example, business or private correspondence from creators that exhibit no great value for the themes or persons that are the focus of the museum, or contracts, bookkeeping and financial documents and other records that for most archivists might very centrally fit into their prototype of a record. Some of these materials might include personal papers (i.e., a personal fond). That kind of archival material can't be easily categorized as museum objects and even the most detail-oriented curators can't manage to describe it at the item level. How to categorize it so that it can fit into the categories already existing within the institution?

Díaz-Kommonen elaborated on categorization in museums, concluding that:

Categorization is not an arbitrary action, but rather one in which consistent and unique principles are implemented. Whereas in the real world reality artifacts are constantly being defined by different communities, in the formal classification systems used in many of the disciplines practiced within the institution of the museum, objects must be adapted to fit, neatly and uniquely, into clearly demarcated categories. In these systems, categories operate as mutually exclusive entities. By virtue of its inclusion in one category, objects are immediately excluded from membership into another class. Moreover, formal classification systems aim to provide total coverage of the matter being described so that no item is left outside. This leaves little room for interpretation and knowledge production that pertains the vast territory encompassed by artifacts of syncretism; items that belong exclusively to none, but which fit into more than one category.²³⁹

²³⁹ Díaz-Kommonen. *Of Dragons and Classifications* op.cit. Quoted from the English version of the essay, http://www.mlab.uiah.fi/systems_of_representation/final_dragon_essay.pdf. The reference in

The chosen categorization will be reflected in the representation, that is, in the description, and especially in a world where museum documentation is highly regulated, as it is in Croatian museums. Another issue raised by this observation of curators' categorization is that if objects are categorized as museum objects, then they would have to be described on item level, in order to be able to be registered in the Registry of cultural property. The curators stated a particular concern – where to process this? It can hardly be processed as museum material and entered into the main museum catalogue because it is hard to conceptualize these materials as museum material. The material can't be processed in the fonds of secondary documentation (which allows for more flexible processing) because the documentation in fonds of secondary documentation is meant to record museum activities and to manage the professional documentation created by the curators as well as documentation that reflects on holdings and museum activities.

The curators who were interviewed see collection level description as the answer to these problems of processing this kind of material.²⁴⁰ The other practical solution would be to establish a special archive in the museum as is allowed and prescribed by the Law on Archives and Archival Institutions. That in practice means implementing new regulations (and descriptive standards) within the museum institution and also having trained archival staff. Collection level description could be used for representation purposes in the online environment²⁴¹ but it also could be used as an efficient management and processing approach for organizing the backlog of collected archival material in a museum that cannot be

the original is "Of Dragons and Classifications". In *Discovering New Media*, Botero, A. & Rantavuo, H. (Eds.), University of Art and Design Helsinki, Working Papers F26, pp. 27-37.

²⁴⁰Regarding collection level description in the Croatian context see: Žarka Vujić and Goran Zlodi, "Opis na razini zbirke na primjeru Strossmayerove galerije u Zagrebu," *7 seminar Arhivi, knjižnice, muzeji: mogućnost suradnje u okruženju globalne informacijske infrastrukture* (Zagreb : Hrvatsko knjižničarsko društvo, 2004), pp. 69-79, http://dzs.ffzg.unizg.hr/text/Vujic_Zlodi_2003.pdf; and Maja Šojat-Bikić, "Nove glazbene zbirke Muzeja grada Zagreba: Zbirka Rudolfa Klepača/ donacija Marine Würth Klepač," *Informatica Museologica* 40 (3-4) 2009: 5, [http://www.mgz.hr/UserFiles/file/Rudolf_Klepac_IM_40_\(3-4\).pdf](http://www.mgz.hr/UserFiles/file/Rudolf_Klepac_IM_40_(3-4).pdf).

²⁴¹Heather Dunn, "Collection Level Description – the Museum Perspective," *D-Lib Magazine* 6.no.9 (September 2000): 1-7, <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september00/dunn/09dunn.html>.

categorized by an individual curator or institution as museum objects. For now, until the contemporary archival and museum conceptual knowledge representation models prove their applicability and use in metadata standards, and/or its implementation, use and sustainability within a particular national or wider international context, collection level description can serve as an approximation of archival and museum conceptualizations of description.

The museum values framework, as it relates to description and as it is indicated by this study, has the following characteristics:

- (i) Indivisibility of themes/persons or other conceptual ideas within the focus of a specific museum and its collections (both artifactual objects and records) and the documentation created about the collections/objects. Together they form a physical and an intellectual unity, although objects don't have to be unique and could also have counterparts located in different repositories.
- (ii) Approaching a theme through the object or vice versa is a process that is based on much individuality on the part of the curator and it is connected with:
 - a. Continuous research about the object and about a theme or other conceptual idea, and,
 - b. The role of the object (if in form of a record), which can be twofold: it is perceived as as museum object (with expressed materiality) and as a record that has value on its own, but this value is perceived mostly as informational, not evidential value. Which status it is assigned when it is included in collections will, depends on that museum's institutional framework and also on individual curatorial choices.

Such a framework has much to offer to records that are processed at the item level. However, not all information and metadata (some of which might be considered to be of great importance in archival theory and practice) will be included in this framework because they are not perceived to be of great importance in the museum context. In some cases, as for collections of photographs, records in museums are in fact privileged compared to how they might be described in an archive because of the attention given to them at the item level museum. In other cases, such as with large aggregations, records are neglected due to fact that museum regulations donot address this issue. Consider, for example a personal fond, donated by a private person to a museum, that contains artifacts, books and private papers. First of all

this collection is worth describing on its own as a unique information object. While the artifacts will fit into the museum's descriptive framework, the books might be catalogued by the museum's library (and intellectually linked to the rest of donation) but personal papers have no place to fit neatly, as the regulations require. Even if this collection is taken apart (as most of them are) and its physical integrity as a collection is destroyed (which would of course be a loss) the intellectual connections can be maintained through description even with other materials that remain outside the boundaries of the institution – if the curator chooses to manage the fond in that way.

Regarding museum description of archival material, curators think of description in terms of its function:

- (i) Description's major function is to serve as method of physical and intellectual control
- (ii) Description is used as a mean to provide contextualization of an object but also of the theme to which it is connected
- (iii) Description has to stress all the former contexts of the object, and so the object's provenance is more broadly conceived than it would be in current archival practice
- (iv) Collection level description is used to deal with aggregations of collected records (not generated by museum documentation units), but only as a temporary management solution until there is a chance to describe to down to the item level
- (v) Description is an ongoing activity, with descriptive metadata being added to the same object during different phases of research about that object.²⁴²

The elements of description of archival material in museums is the third main theme emerging from the data collected and concepts analyzed during this study. Several main conclusions can be drawn:

²⁴² “Metadata is like interest – it accrues over time.” Anne J. Gilliland, *Setting the Stage in Introduction to Metadata 3.0* Second edition. Murtha Baca, ed. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2008), p.18.

- (i) Authorship can be equated to a certain extent with creatorship, but a creator would be considered to be a higher level of authority
- (ii) Metadata about the materiality of an item is as important as it is for an artifactual object and materiality is one of the aspects that defines that object's originality and authenticity and uniqueness
- (iii) In the process of creating descriptions and more broadly, developing newknowledge, cross-references might be used
- (iv) Authority control and vocabularies in museums are not elaborated and implemented and this is the weakest point of the management of archival materials within an institutional framework and also more broadly when descriptions of those materials enter any inter-institutional framework. Cross-references might be created if there is the institutional will and capacity to engage in this hard, research oriented, process. Authority control is timebound and reflects current naming practices so it will be subject to changes in future.
- (v) Availability of descriptions online depends mostly on individual institutional decisions, in accordance with the current societal and institutional circumstances.

Description as such and moreover the issue of research on descriptive practices are indeed conceptualized from personal curator's experience. All of curators who were interviewed serve as the main reference point to collections in their care, in an offline environment. Their contextualized knowledge and awareness of the location of other related resources are of priceless value and yet they are constrained by personal perspectives regarding the value of sharing such information in either physical or online contexts. Furthermore, what is made available online is also constrained by institutional policies and decisions about what data may be made available. These constraints merit more exploration in future research.

The curators who had professional contact with archivists, or who had to manage large aggregations of records considered this research on descriptive practices to be important. Those who had no such experience, and concentrated more on item level description, valued the research as important only when the consequences of insufficient descriptive practices on,

for example, dispersed and displaced records, could be shown to have some historical value for the Croatian context.

The identity (more accurately, the status as original or copy) of records in their digitized form was not recognized as important to address within description. The reason for that might be the fact that curators are more oriented towards the management of originals and that their digital surrogates only exist in the database as a file with accompanying basic metadata. This situation and conceptualization might change when the digitized surrogate becomes a networked object and its management demands attention, at which point similar issues to those of item level description in terms of the metadata for digitized objects will be encountered and might become a point of intersection that could test both archive and museum descriptive practices. Indeed in a contemporary online archive or online museum database, description could play vital role:

Archives online require not just good, but better, description if they are merely to support users in the same level of access that they might have in a mediated physical reference environment. Enabling users to take advantage of all the new ways in which they might find, refind, compile, manipulate, and re-use online resources will require significantly better description yet, as well as the provision of Web-based tools beyond online finding aids.²⁴³

The examples of the records used in this study from four museums outside Croatia (The British Museum, Jüdisches Museum Berlin, The Archaeological Museum – Ancient Orient Museum from Istanbul and the Australian War Memorial) indicate that records treated as museum objects in museum collections are a global phenomenon, and not something idiosyncratic to Croatia. These museums' perspectives are also institutionally and/or nationally driven, but since more museums are presenting their collections and metadata online and dealing with the difficulties that are arising, the solutions they are testing could

²⁴³ Anne J. Gilliland. *Conceptualizing 21st Century Archives*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists; 2014. p.127.

serve as frame of reference for other institutions. Even the British Museum database built on the Semantic Web²⁴⁴ was criticized by interviewed curators for not providing enough context. Ricardo Punzalan writes of the "process of putting together physically dispersed heritage collections in order produce a consolidated digitized representation of scattered artifacts, literary and artistic works, and/or archival records attributable to a single origin or common provenance."²⁴⁵

²⁴⁴The British Museum online database : <http://collection.britishmuseum.org/>.

²⁴⁵Ricardo L. Punzalan, *Virtual Reunification: Bits and Pieces Gathered Together to Represent the Whole*. Ph.D. dissertation (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2013), p.15. See also Ricardo L. Punzalan, "Archival Diasporas: A Framework for Understanding the Complexities and Challenges of Dispersed Photographic Collections" *The American Archivist* 77, no.2 (Fall/Winter 2014): 326-349.

4. Descriptive Standards and Possible Metadata Crosswalks

The benefits of standardization are numerous, but there are also disadvantages. Hannah Turner stressed one issue: “Standards, classification systems, and even ad hoc naming practices thus confine, but also construct what is possible to document about objects.”²⁴⁶ A similar notion was raised by Helena Robinson about shared creation and access to knowledge in heritage institutions:

First of all, ...understanding that the availability of information, either in the digital realm or in a physically integrated setting, does not automatically translate to the acquisition of knowledge, the basic premise upon which many arguments in favour of convergence rest becomes complicated. [...] Second, museums, archives and libraries are not only differentiated by the physical typological distinctions between their collection holdings. Each domain represents a particular epistemological framework, employing specific methodologies for interpreting collections, and producing information that reflects subjective concepts about the identity, value and meaning of objects. However, the ways in which *converged* organizations can acknowledge and leverage existing disciplinary approaches to the arrangement of collection information and the interpretation of collection objects – thereby retaining diverse contexts for users to make meaning around the collections – has yet to be established.²⁴⁷

The development of standards in different cultural heritage professions has resulted in different knowledge representation models such as FRBR,²⁴⁸ FRBRoo,²⁴⁹ CIDOC CRM²⁵⁰

²⁴⁶Hannah Turner, "Decolonizing Ethnographic Documentation: A Critical History of the Early Museum Catalogs at the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, nos.5-6 (2015): 659.

²⁴⁷Robinson, op.cit., p.218.

²⁴⁸International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. Final Report* ed.by IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records; International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Section on Cataloguing. Standing Committee (München : K.G. Saur, 1998).

and now RiC (Records in Contexts),²⁵¹ the newest draft model from the archival community. Representing itself as “multidimensional description”²⁵² this proposed archival conceptual model takes into account relevant archival holdings held at multiple repositories and would describe their inter-relationships (i.e., rather than only mentioning them as holdings in a more general description of the institution that has been created using ISDIAH²⁵³). On the general level, however, the draft of the model recognizes that "Transitioning from the prevailing approach to records description (the single, stand-alone fonds-based hierarchical description) to a more flexible, open, graph- or network-based approach will be gradual."²⁵⁴ The possible shared use and metadata mappings for archival material or rare book materials was already discussed when CIDOC CRM²⁵⁵ was developed, and it now remains to be seen how or the

²⁴⁹FRBR-object oriented. See International Working Group on FRBR and CIDOC CRM Harmonisation Supported by Delos NoE. *FRBR Object-oriented Definition and Mapping from FRBRER, FRAD and FRSAD (version 2.4)*, http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/FRBRoo/frbroo_v_2.4.pdf.

²⁵⁰ International Council on Museums (ICOM) International Committee for Documentation. *CIDOC-Conceptual Reference Model* version 6.2 (May 2015), http://new.cidoc-crm.org/sites/default/files/cidoc_crm_version_6.2.pdf.

²⁵¹ International Council on Archives (ICA) Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD). *Records in Contexts: A Conceptual Model for Archival Description*. Consultation Draft v0.1 (September 2016), <http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/RiC-CM-0.1.pdf>.

²⁵²ICA EGAD, *Records in Contexts* sop.cit., p.10.

²⁵³ International Council on Archives (ICA) Committee on Best Practices and Standards. *ISDIAH: International Standard for Describing Institutions with Archival Holdings* (2008), http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/CBPS_2008_Guidelines_ISDIAH_First-edition_EN.pdf.

²⁵⁴ICA EGAD, *Records in Contexts* sop.cit., p.11.

²⁵⁵For example see: Tony Gill, “Building Semantic Bridges between Museums, Libraries and Archives: The CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model.” *First Monday* 9.no.3 (May 2004), <http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/rt/printerFriendly/1145/1065>; Lina Bountouri and Manolis Gergatsoulis, “The Semantic Mapping of Archival Metadata to the CIDOC CRM Ontology.” *Journal of Archival Organization* 9 (2011): 174-207, DOI: 10.1080/15332748.2011.650124; Steffen Henniecke,

extent to which RiC might be used within a museum context. The question also isn't whether global or national cross-community representation models are possible or worth pursuing, but how likely it is that they are going to be effective given that how different local implementations might be not only in different heritage communities, but also in different socio-political contexts, in daily professional practice where each community is still institutionally-driven in pursuit of its own purposes and functions.

"Representation of Archival User Needs using CIDOC CRM." In Vladimir Alexiev, Vladimir Ivanov, Maurice Grinberg, eds., Practical Experiences with CIDOC CRM and its Extensions (CRMEX 2013) Workshop, 17th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries (TPDL 2013), 26 September 2013, Valetta, Malta, <http://www.ontotext.com/CRMEX and CEUR WS pp.48-61>; Patrick Le Boeuf, "Modeling Rare and Unique Documents: Using FRBROO/CIDOC CRM." *Journal of Archival Organization* 10 (2012): 96–106, DOI: 10.1080/15332748.2012.709164.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Conclusions

The main focus of this study were curatorial perspectives on the description of archival material held in Croatian museums and the ways in which that perspective might be manifested as an external representation of their internal knowledge²⁵⁶ in a museum database catalogue entry. The findings from the study present issues connected with the description and creation of metadata at the most fundamental and primary level – the museum catalogue entry. But it is exactly these entries that are supposed to serve as online access points. Description defines access and this in turn influences possible knowledge creation.

In terms of the questions that guided this research, we can now say the following:

- How do museum curators conceptualize archival records and other materials within their institutions?

Curators value the artifactual aspects of collected archival material because they contribute to their museums' holdings, their missions and their activities. They conceptualized artifactual value mostly in terms of the materiality of the archival materials and their associations with events, person, places and so forth. They also look at these materials in terms of their value as exemplars (for example, for exhibitions). But the “recordness” of a record is not part of their considerations, although curators who had interacted with archivists had come to realize that archival material, especially material that has legal or historical

²⁵⁶ Loehrlein, Aaron. "An Examination of Interdisciplinary Theory Between Cognitive Categorization and Knowledge Organization." In Smiraglia, Richard P., ed., *Proceedings from North American Symposium on Knowledge Organization* vol.3 (Toronto, 2011), pp.122-129, <http://journals.lib.washington.edu/index.php/nasko/article/view/12796>.

evidential value, needs to be approached with more awareness of the kinds of intellectual controls that archivists would exercise to preserve that value.

- How and why do records and other archival materials come to be treated as museum objects?

Archival materials first came to be in museums because of the history of the development of heritage institutions in Croatia, i.e., museums were established before archives and as a result archival material has always been present in Croatian museum collections. However, this material was collected because of its artifactual value, rarity and vulnerability if not preserved. Collections started to be formed that continued to be added to and subsequent acquisitions were incorporated into existing collections and were treated according to museum curatorial practices.

- What happens to archival material in museum settings in terms of its description?

The findings suggest that archival material held within museum collections will be described in the same manner as other museum material. Some aspects of this description are similar to archival description, especially in terms of considering description as a matter of both control and access (with a key difference being that archives are more oriented to users coming in from outside while museums are more inwardly oriented to curatorial and scientific research rather than to use by the general public, with the obvious exception of exhibitions). Museum description is more granular than most archival description, since the desirable level of control is at the item level, although in situations where there is a large accumulation of unprocessed archival material, the findings indicate that the curators would undertake collection level description, but only out of necessity and not out of an evidential imperative (which is the primary rationale for collective description in archives). Each curator stated that the item level is the desirable level of control of access. Moreover, museum description supports assigning multiple creators for a given item, in a manner somewhat like the proposed assignment of a co-creators in archival description, but they do so within a hierarchy that is based upon what they perceive to be the relative responsibility or importance of different creators. Finally, museum description is conceptualized as an ongoing activity and is

continuously updated and revised because curatorial knowledge about the objects and how they are valued keeps changing and evolving. Best practices say that such all updates and revisions should be documented, and in some but not all Croatian museum databases that kind of audit trail is supported.

- Do museum professionals see any possible convergences between archives and museum materials in terms of description and access in museum collections, and if so, what might those be?

As already stated, if curators have had interactions with archivists they are more aware that museum description does not emphasize the ways in which description can document the reliability and preserve the authenticity (and thereby, the evidential capacity) of archival materials. Also, if dealing with a large amount of material, curators understand that there is value in collection level description, but do not conceptualize that as an evidential control but rather as as a measure of necessity. Curators certainly see the value of being able to connect together related records in other institutions and that subject access would help in achieving that, but the authority control that could facilitate that is not practised across different museums. And although their inclusion of keywords enriches their descriptions, without consistent terminology or application, these do not have the capacity to serve as robust way to link related material.

Some additional observations can be made based on the data analysis. What has been learned about these questions reflects only on issues of archival material held in museums in the Croatian context, and the study did not employ a methodology that would allow for any generalizability. Moreover, the museum environment is very heterogenous. Nevertheless, it may serve as an indicator for similar studies in other national and institutional contexts. Regarding the approach of curators who participated in the study to archival material held in museums, while we can observe that it is subjective, it is in line with the overarching museum values framework. Records of special interest for the museum mission are treated as objects and their *recordness* is ignored. Collected material is connected mostly at a thematic level with other objects in the same and other collections and is considered to be an important part of a museum's holdings. At the same time, however, curators acknowledge that some records can be interpreted as records and simultaneously as objects, but interpretations made by

curators suggest that an item in a form of record will more likely be perceived as an object and not a record. The possible uses of description are, for the most part, perceived narrowly, and still within the frame of an offline catalogue (although there were certainly some opposite opinions expressed by curators who acknowledge the conditions and implications of an online museum catalogue). Subject-oriented keywords and possible cross-references are perceived as points of convergence between archival and museum descriptive approaches through which differently conceptualized descriptions might be brought together at the item level as well as at the collection level. The findings also suggest that the concern about convergence between archival and museum descriptive practice with regard to archival materials should be expanded to include how these materials might be connected through description with other copies and versions as well as related materials held in libraries, archives, museums and other repositories elsewhere.

Although collecting materials of shared provenance is important, especially for archives, the results of this research indicate how records can serve so many more purposes, and extremely unexpected ones, than simply being evidence of the business processes through which they were created. Such collaborative projects have cultural value in their own right but they could also present a point of convergence for archivists and museum curators around which not only provenancial concerns could be addressed, but also the materiality of information objects further explored, and digitization and other metadata management practices more closely aligned as a result of greater awareness and understanding of each others values.

Within this conceptualization process one particularly challenging question arose: are we describing only the material held in our repositories, because even at the item level the description of an item that has separated or related (i.e., complementary) materials in other repositories isn't complete? Moreover can fonds be considered and described as a whole by any one repository if some of the records that document certain activities with the same functional provenance have their counterparts in other repositories? This is not to say that curator or archivist must have all the expertise and responsibility of a user who is very familiar with the topic of their research in archival or museum holdings, but it does imply that these professionals have sufficient knowledge about the material in their holdings that they can significantly contribute to producing complete and comprehensive metadata when creating description. That said, can any museum or archival description truly satisfy user needs and

expectations across different temporal, geographic and institutional and disciplinary boundaries? If not, what does that mean for linking up the world's records, artifacts and knowledge? It means it remains a challenge to which each practitioner and theorist has responded according to their own personal, institutional and socio-political capabilities and conceptualizations.

The curators who were interviewed come from a range of different types of museums and themselves have different subject-specialist backgrounds. One might reasonably ask whether any differences could be perceived among them on how they approached the description of archival materials or their reactions to the descriptions done by others. However the only factors that appeared to make any difference between them was whether or not they had had contact with archivists, and whether there were any special local requirements or circumstances within their individual institutions in terms of how they had to categorize material in already existing collections (for example, if that material was deemed to be particularly sensitive).

Reflecting on the questions that were posed at the outset of the research now, having done the research, it should also be noted that there are indications from the review of recent archival literature and discussions about the just-released draft of *Records in Contexts*, the proposed conceptual model for archival description, that archives are actually moving closer to museum description practices, particularly in terms of incorporating item level description, additional forms of relationships between records and contexts, and addressing the material and affective aspects of the materials they are describing. Among the reasons for this are the affordances of new technologies, a major emphasis on digitization initiatives (necessitating item level description of digitized materials) and online descriptions that promote item level description, and also the influence of postmodern ideas that emphasize additional or alternative ways to think about and use archival material.

2. Some Methodological Reflection

A *reality check* should always be considered a vital part of research. However, as Jonathan Furner has observed: “There is no single description or representation of reality that is true. What is called “the facts” at any given point is that set of statements endorsed by the group of people most well equipped to impose their values over others.”²⁵⁷ Because of its very nature, any qualitative account is challenging to verify. Techniques proposed for verifying interpretive inquiry that have been suggested by Angen²⁵⁸ include in-depth consideration of research questions, making the researcher’s choices clear and presenting the biases of the process of research itself, and establishing ethical validity (for example, have the research results actually helped the population in question?) and substantive validity (self-reflections and personal obstacles presented). This research employed triangulation of data (curators, physical documentation produced both by curators and by me) and different methods of data collection: in-depth interviews, content analysis, and autoethnography that included focused ethnomethodological observation. Opposing opinions were articulated, especially because it is exactly in these diverse opinions that points of individual influence on metadata creation can be observed.

The autoethnographic account contributed to the necessary reflexivity and reflectivity (looking at the Self in relation to the Other and surfacing cultural implications), and in a way it added an ethical dimension to the research, because denying my own influence and interest in the matter would be disingenuous at best since it is impossible to separate my identity as researcher from my identity as practitioner. It should be added that the autoethnographical account presents more than a personal narrative. Paralleling the interviews with curators, autoethnography enabled me to track my own professional decisions and reveals the figure of the researcher who is also practitioner. As Duncan elaborated on the techniques that she used in her own autoethnography:

²⁵⁷ Jonathan Furner, "Conceptual Analysis: A Method for Understanding Information as Evidence, and Evidence as Information," *Archival Science* 4 (2004): 243.

²⁵⁸ M.J. Angen, "Evaluating Interpretive Inquiry: Reviewing the Validity Debate and Opening the Dialogue," *Qualitative Health Research* 10 no.3 (2000):378-395.

autoethnographic accounts do not consist solely of the researcher's opinions but are also supported by other data that can confirm or triangulate those opinions. Methods of collecting data include participant observation, reflective writing, interviewing, and gathering documents and artifacts.²⁵⁹

The autoethnographic approach, applied within a framework of postmodern ethnography, was certainly appropriate. In the context of this research, however, it was successful only to the extent that it introduced the reader to my personal context and biases and allowed me also to introduce real life examples of the kinds of issues with description of and access to archival materials that museum professionals encounter every day.

²⁵⁹ Margot Duncan, "Autoethnography: Critical Appreciation of an Emerging Art." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3 no.4 art.3 (2004): 5,
http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_4/html/duncan.html.

3. Areas for Further Research

Because so little is known about the description of archival materials in Croatian museums this research was necessarily conceived as being exploratory and descriptive, as well as analytical. It is one study, limited both in size and also the moment when it has been conducted. With new developments continually occurring in digital information and networking capabilities, as well as in descriptive practices and requirements in the information and cultural heritage fields, it is important that such studies are conducted and potentially repeated at different moments and in different national contexts in order to assess how things might be changing due to such developments, to assess the impact of new descriptive practices and requirements, and to understand the extent to which Croatian experiences are specific to Croatia or are similar to those in the museum field in other nations.

Bibliography

American Institute for Conservation of Artistic & Historic Works (AIC). *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice*, [http://www.conservation-us.org/our-organizations/association-\(aic\)/governance/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice-\(html\)](http://www.conservation-us.org/our-organizations/association-(aic)/governance/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice-(html)).

Angen, M.J. "Evaluating Interpretive Inquiry: Reviewing the Validity Debate and Opening the Dialogue," *Qualitative Health Research* 10, no.3 (2000): 378-395.

Baca, Murtha, ed., *Introduction to Metadata* 3rd edition (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2016).

Baca, Murtha and Elizabeth O'Keefe, "Sharing Standards and Expertise in the Early 21st Century: Moving Toward a Collaborative, 'Cross-community' Model for Metadata Creation," *International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control* 38, no.4 (October/December 2009): 59-67.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." In *Image, Music, Text: Essays Selected and Translated by Stephen Heath* (London: Fontana Press, 1977).

Bauer, Antun. "Dokumentacija u Zavičajnim Muzejima," unpublished manuscript (Zagreb: Museum Documentation Centre R-495, 1978).

Bauer, Antun. "Muzeji kao Dokumentacioni Centri: Dokumentacija u Kompleksnim Muzejima," unpublished manuscript (Zagreb: Museum Documentation Centre R-41, 1965).

Blouin, Francis X. Jr. "Archivists, Mediation, and Constructs of Social Memory," *Archival Issues* 24, no.2 (1999): 101-112.

Bountouri, Lina and Manolis Gergatsoulis, "The Semantic Mapping of Archival Metadata to the CIDOC CRM Ontology," *Journal of Archival Organization* 9 (2011): 174-207, DOI: 10.1080/15332748.2011.650124.

Bowker, C. Geoffrey, and Susan Leigh Star. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999).

Božić-Bužančić, Danica. "Popisivanje Arhivske Građe na Području Historijskog Arhiva u Splitu," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 10 (1967):141-144.

Breakell, Sue. "Encounters with the Self: Archives and Research". In Hill, Jennie ed., *The Future of Archives and Recordkeeping: A Reader* (London: Facet Publishing, 2011), pp. 23-36.

Brulon Soares, Brulon C. "The Museological Experience: Concepts for a Museum Phenomenology." *ICOFOM. Museology: Back to Basics, Study Series*38 (2009): 131-147. 144, http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2038-2009.pdf.

Buchanan, Alexandrina. "Strangely Unfamiliar: Idea of the Archive from Outside the Discipline". In Hill, Jennie ed., *The Future of Archives and Recordkeeping: A Reader* (London: Facet Publishing, 2011), pp. 37-62.

Buckland, Michael K. "Information as Thing," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 42, no.5 (June 1991): 351-360.

Buckland, Michael K. "What is a 'Document'?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 48, no.9 (1997): 804-809.

Buckland, Michael K. "Cultural Heritage (Patrimony): An introduction." In Willer, Mirna, Anne J. Gilliland, and Marijana Tomić, eds., *Records, Archives and Memory: Selected Papers*

from the Conference and School on Records, Archives and Memory Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia, May 2013, (Zadar: University of Zadar Press, 2015), pp.11-27.

Bukvić, Nenad. "Arhivska Služba i Arhivsko Zakonodavstvo u Funkciji Zaštite Gradiva Muzejskih Ustanova," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 57 (2014): 71-111.

Bunn, Jennifer, J. *Multiple Narratives, Multiple Views: Observing Archival Description*. Ph.D. thesis (University College London, 2011), <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1322455/>.

Cameron, Fiona and Arah Mengler. "Complexity, Transdisciplinarity and Museum Collections Documentation: Emergent Metaphors for a Complex World," *Journal of Material Culture* 14, no.2 (2009): 189-218.

Chan, Sebastian. "Tagging and Searching – Serendipity and Museum Collection Database," paper presented at Museums and the Web 2007, April 11-14 2007, San Francisco, California, <http://www.museumsandtheweb.com/mw2007/papers/chan/chan.html>.

Chang, Heewon. *Autoethnography as Method*. (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008).

Cho, Chung-Wen, Ting-Kuang Yeh, Shu-Wen Cheng and Chun-Yen Chang, "The Searching Effectiveness of Social Tagging in Museum Websites," *Educational Technology & Society*, 15, no.4 (2012):126–136, http://www.ifets.info/journals/15_4/12.pdf.

Cifor, Marika and Anne J. Gilliland, "Affect and the Archive, Archives and Their Affects: An Introduction to the Special Issue," *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 1-6. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-015-9263-3.

Coburn, Erin. "Beyond Registration: Understanding What Cataloging Means to the Museum Community," *VRA Bulletin* 34, no.1 (2007).

Cook, Terry. "The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists and the Changing Archival Landscape," *The American Archivist* 74 (Fall/Winter 2011): 600-632.

Craig, Barbara. "Serving the Truth: The Importance of Fostering Archives Research in Education Programmes, Including a Modest Proposal for Partnerships with the Workplace," *Archivaria* 1, no.42 (1996): 105-117,
<http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12159/13166>.

Deodato, Joseph. "Becoming Responsible Mediators: The Application of Postmodern Perspectives to Archival Arrangement & Description," *Progressive Librarian* 27 (2006): 52-64.

Deranja Crnokić, Anuška. "Nastanak Registra Kulturnih Dobra: Povijest i Sadašnjost Inventariziranja Kulturne Baštine u Hrvatskoj," *Godišnjak Zaštite Spomenika Kulture Hrvatske* 37-38 (2013-2014): 25-38.

André Desvallées and Francois Mairesse; ICOM International Councils of Museums; Musée Royal de Mariemont. *Key Concepts of Museology*(Paris: Armand Colin, 2010),
http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf.

Díaz-Kommonen, Lily. "Of Dragons and Classifications", (Helsinki: Media Lab Aalto University, 2001),
http://www.mlab.uiah.fi/systems_of_representation/final_dragon_essay.pdf.

Dodge, Bernadine. "Across the Great Divide: Archival Discourse and the (Re)presentations of the Past in Late-Modern Society," *Archivaria* 53 (Spring 2002): 16-30,
<http://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12834>.

Dudley, Sandra H. "Encountering a Chinese Horse Engaging with the Thingness of Things." Chapter 1 in *Museum Objects: Experiencing the Properties of Things*, Dudley, Sandra H. ed. (London, New York: Routledge, 2012), pp.1-17,
<https://ira.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/27883/4/Encountering%20a%20Chinese%20horse.pdf>.

Duff, Wendy and Verne Harris. "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meaning," *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 263-285.

Duncan, Margot. "Autoethnography: Critical Appreciation of an Emerging Art." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3, no.4, art.3 (2004),
http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_4/html/duncan.html.

Dunn, Heather. "Collection Level Description – the Museum Perspective," *D-Lib Magazine* 6 no.9 (September 2000): 1-7, <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september00/dunn/09dunn.html>.

Duranti, Luciana. "The Archival Bond," *Archives and Museum Informatics* 11 (1997): 213-218, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226554280_The_Archival_Bond.

Duranti, Luciana. "The Origin and Development of the Concept of Archival Description." *Archivaria* 35 (1993): 47-54,
<http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/viewFile/11884/12837>.

Elings, Mary W. and Gunther Waibel. "Metadata for All: Descriptive Standards and Metadata Sharing across Libraries, Archives and Museums," *First Monday* 12, no.3 (2007),
<http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/1628/1543>.

Ellis, Carolyn, Tony Adams and Arthur P. Bochner. "Autoethnography: An Overview" *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12, no.1, art.10 (2011), <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>.

Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur P. Bochner. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject." In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, second edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000), pp.733-768, https://works.bepress.com/carolyn_ellis/49/.

Ezcurdia, Maite. "The Concept-Conception Distinction," *Philosophical Issues* 9 (1998): 187-192.

Faletar Tanacković, Sanjica and Boris Badurina. "Collaboration of Croatian Cultural Heritage Institutions: Experiences from Museums" *Museum Management and Curatorship* 24, iss. 4. (2009): 299-321.

Flescher, Sharon. "A Brief Guide to Provenance Research" in *The Legal Guide for Museum Professionals*, Julia Courtney, ed., (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), p.55-73.

Fontana, Andrea and James H. Frey. "The Interview: From Structured Questions to Negotiated Text." In Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, second edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000), pp.645-673.

Fryer, Ronald and M. Jackson. "Categorical Cognition: A Psychological Model of Categories and Identification in Decision Making: An Extended Abstract." In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge* (2003), pp.29-34, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w9579.pdf>.

Furner, Jonathan. "Conceptual Analysis: A Method for Understanding Information as Evidence, and Evidence as Information," *Archival Science* 4 (2004): 233-265.

Gill, Tony. "Building Semantic Bridges between Museums, Libraries and Archives: The CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model." *First Monday* 9, no.3 (May 2004), <http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/rt/prINTERfriendly/1145/1065>.

Gill, Tony. "Metadata and the Web." In *Introduction to Metadata 3.0* Second edition. Murtha Baca, ed. (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2008), pp.20-38.

Gilliland, Anne J. "Contemplating Co-creator Rights in Archival Description," *Knowledge Organization* 39, no.5 (September 2012): 340-346.

Gilliland, Anne J. "Enduring Paradigm, New Opportunities: The Value of the Archival Perspective in the Digital Environment," in Michèle V. Cloonan, ed., *Preserving Our Heritage: Perspectives from Antiquity to the Digital Age* (Neals-Schuman, ALA Editions, 2014) [excerpted and updated from 2000 CLIR publication with same title].

Gilliland, Anne J. *Setting the Stage in Introduction to Metadata 3.0* Second edition. Murtha Baca, ed. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2008), pp.1-20.

Gilliland, Anne J. and Michelle Caswell. "Impossible Archival Imaginaries and Imagined Records," *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 53-75. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-015-9259-z.

Gilliland, Anne J. and Sue McKemmish. "Rights in Records as a Platform for Participative Archiving," Chapter 14 in Richard J. Cox, Alison Langmead and Eleanor Mattern, eds., *Archival Education and Research: Selected Papers from the 2014 AERI Conference* (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Press, 2015), pp.355-385.

Gilliland, Anne J. Sue McKemmish and Andrew Lau. "Preface," in .Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J Lau eds., *Research in the Archival Multiverse*(Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016), pp.16-30.

Gilliland, Anne J., Sue McKemmish and Andrew J Lau, eds. *Research in the Archival Multiverse* (Social Informatics Monograph Series, Monash University Press, 2016).

Glushko, Robert J., Paul P. Maglio, Teenie Matlock, and Lawrence W. Barsalou. "Categorization in the Wild," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 12, no. 4 (2008): 129-135.

Greenberg, Jane. "Intellectual Control of Visual Archives: A Comparison between the Art and Architecture Thesaurus and the Library of Congress Thesaurus for Graphic Materials," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 16, no.1 (1993): 85-117.

Grewcock, Duncan. *Doing Museology Differently* (Routledge: New York, 2014).

Harvey, Linda J. and Michael D. Meyers. "Scholarship and Practice: The Contribution of Ethnographic Research Methods to Bridging the Gap," *Information Technology & People* 8, no.3. (1995): 13-27.

Hennicke, Steffen. "Representation of Archival User Needs using CIDOC CRM." In Vladimir Alexiev, Vladimir Ivanov, Maurice Grinberg, eds., *Practical Experiences with CIDOC CRM and its Extensions (CRMEX 2013) Workshop, 17th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries (TPDL 2013)*, 26 September 2013, Valetta, Malta, <http://www.ontotext.com/CRMEX and CEUR WS pp.48-61>.

Hernández Hernández, Francisca. "Documentary Sources of Museology: Reflections and Perspectives," *ICOFOM Study Series* 44 (2016): 81-95.

Horsman, Peter. *Wrapping Records in Narratives: Representing Context through Archival Description*, Ph.D. thesis (University of Amsterdam, 2011).

Hryhorczuk, Nicholas. *Radioactive Heritage: An Autoethnographic Investigation of Chernobyl as a Dark Heritage Site*. Ph.D. dissertation (Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013), <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/46781>.

Huvila, Isto. "The Politics of Boundary Objects: Hegemonic Interventions and the Making of a Document," *JASIST* 62, no.12 (2011): 2528-2539.

International Council on Archives (ICA), *Code of Ethics* (1996), http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/ICA_1996-09-06_code%20of%20ethics_EN.pdf.

International Council on Archives (ICA). *ISAAR (CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record For Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families*, second edition, adopted by the Committee on Descriptive Standards Canberra, Australia, 27-30 October 2003, [http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR\(CPF\)2ed.pdf](http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAAR(CPF)2ed.pdf).

International Council on Archives (ICA). *ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description*, second edition, adopted by the Committee on Descriptive Standards, Stockholm, Sweden, 19-22 September 1999, [http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAD\(G\).pdf](http://www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAD(G).pdf).

International Council on Archives (ICA) Committee on Best Practices and Standards. *ISDIAH: International Standard for Describing Institutions with Archival Holdings* (2008), http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/CBPS_2008_Guidelines_ISDIAH_First-edition_EN.pdf.

International Council on Archives (ICA) Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD). *Records in Contexts: A Conceptual Model for Archival Description*. Consultation Draft v.0.1 (September 2016), <http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/RiC-CM-0.1.pdf>.

International Council on Museums (ICOM), *ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums* 2013, http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Codes/code_ethics2013_eng.pdf.

International Council on Museums (ICOM). *Running a Museum: A Practical Handbook*. (Paris: ICOM, 2004).

International Council on Museums (ICOM) International Committee for Documentation. *CIDOC- Conceptual Reference Model* version 6.2 (May 2015), http://new.cidoc-crm.org/sites/default/files/cidoc_crm_version_6.2.pdf.

International Council on Museums (ICOM) International Observatory on Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods, http://obstraffic.museum/glossary/letter_a.

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. Final Report* ed. by IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records; International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Section on Cataloguing. Standing Committee (München: K.G. Saur, 1998).

International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES),
<http://www.interpares.org/>.

InterPARES Dictionary,

http://www.interpares.org/ip2/display_file.cfm?doc=ip2_dictionary.pdf&CFID=9775856&CF_TOKEN=59553050.

International Working Group on FRBR and CIDOC CRM Harmonisation Supported by Delos NoE. *FRBR Object-oriented Definition and Mapping from FRBRER, FRAD and FRSAD (version 2.4)*, http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/FRBRoo/frbroo_v_2.4.pdf.

Jacob, Elin K. "Classification and Categorization: A Difference that Makes a Difference," *Library Trends* 52, no. 3 (Winter 2004): 515–540.

Jones, Mike. "Artefacts and Archives: Considering Cross-collection Knowledge Networks in Museums," paper presented at the Conference of Museums and the Web in Asia, October 5-8 2015, Melbourne, Australia, <http://mwa2015.museumsandtheweb.com/paper/artefacts-and-archives-considering-cross-collection-knowledge-networks-in-museums/>.

Ketelaar, Eric. "Archival Turns and Returns: Studies of the Archive," in eds. Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J Lau, eds., *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016), pp.228-269.

Klavans, Judith, Robert Stein, Susan Chun and Raul David Guerra, "Computational Linguistics in Museum: Applications for Cultural Datasets," paper presented at Museums and the Web 2011, April 6-9, 2011 Philadelphia, PA,
http://www.museumsandtheweb.com/mw2011/papers/computational_linguistics_in_museums_applicati.html.

Knoblauch, Hubert. "Focused Ethnography," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6, no.3, art. 44 (September 2005), <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/>.

Kolanović, Josip ed., *The General Guide for Archival Fonds and Collections* (Pregled arhivskih fondova i zbirke Republike Hrvatske), (Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2006).

Košćević, Želimir. "Muzej u prošlosti i sadašnjosti," *Muzeologija* 21 (1977): 13-74.

Lalić, Sredoje, ur. *Arhivski Fondovi i Zbirke u SFRJ* (Belgrade: Socialist Republic of Croatia, 1984).

Landis, William K. "Plays Well With Others: DACS and CCO as Interoperable Metadata Content Standards," *VRA Bulletin* 34, no.1 (2007): 97-103.

Law on Archives and Archival Institutions (Zakon o arhivskom gradivu i arhivima) *Official Gazette* no.105 (1997), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/267275.html> (English translation, <http://zagreb.arhiv.hr/hr/pdf/Zakon%20eng.pdf>); amendments in *Official Gazette* no.64 (2000), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/273432.html> and *Official Gazette* no.65 (2009), http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2009_06_65_1459.html.

Law on Museums (Zakon o muzejima) *Official Gazette* no.110 (2015), http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2015_10_110_2121.html.

Laszlo, Želimir. "Bože sačuvaj! (Ili o Pravilniku o uvjetima i načinu ostvarivanja uvida u muzejsku građu i muzejsku dokumentaciju." *Vijesti muzealaca i konzervatora* 2-4 (2002): 91-94.

Laszlo, Želimir. "Do Croatian Museums Still Live in Socialism? Yes," *International Conference on Museums in Transformation Process, November 24-26, 2003, Brno, Czech Republic, Conference Papers*, UNESCO Chair Museology, World Heritage, <http://www.phil.muni.cz/unesco/Conference>.

Le Boeuf, Patrick. "Modeling Rare and Unique Documents: Using FRBROO/CIDOC CRM." *Journal of Archival Organization* 10 (2012): 96–106, DOI: 10.1080/15332748.2012.709164.

Lee, Brent. "Authenticity, Accuracy and Reliability: Reconciling Arts-related and Archival Literature." InterPARES 2 Project, 2005, p.5,

http://www.interpares.org/display_file.cfm?doc=ip2_aar_arts_lee.pdf.

Legard, Robin, Jill Keegan and Kit Ward. "In-depth Interviews in Qualitative Research Practice." In Jane Ritchie and Jane Lewis, eds., *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2003), pp.138-170.

Lemić, Vlatka, "Building of Integrated National Archival Network in Croatia: Connecting Administration, Archives and Public in Practice," paper presented at the International Council on Archives Congress, Brisbane, Australia 20th – 24th August 2012,

<http://ica2012.ica.org/files/pdf/Full%20papers%20upload/ica12Final00019.pdf>.

Light, Michelle and Tom Hyry. "Colophons and Annotations: New Directions for the Finding Aid," *The American Archivist* 65, no.2 (Fall/Winter 2002), pp. 216-230,

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17723/aarc.65.2.l3h27j5x8716586q>.

Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Guba, Egon. *Naturalistic Inquiry* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1985).

Loehrlein, Aaron. "An Examination of Interdisciplinary Theory Between Cognitive Categorization and Knowledge Organization." In Smiraglia, Richard P., ed., *Proceedings from North American Symposium on Knowledge Organization* vol.3 (Toronto, 2011), pp.122-129,

<http://journals.lib.washington.edu/index.php/nasko/article/view/12796>.

Lofland, John and Lyn H. Lofland. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, third edition (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1995).

Lomas, Elizabeth Jane. *An Autoethnography Exploring the Engagement of Records Management through a Computer Mediated Communication Focused Co-operative Inquiry*. Ph.D. thesis (Newcastle: Northumbria University, 2013).

The London Charter for the Computer-based Visualisation of Cultural Heritage," draft, 2009, http://www.londoncharter.org/fileadmin/templates/main/docs/london_charter_2_1_en.pdf.

Lučić, Melina. *Osobni arhivski fondovi: arhivistički pogled na prikupljanje, obradbu i interpretaciju rukopisnih ostavština u baštinskim institucijama* (Zagreb: Hrvatski Državni Arhiv, 2014).

Lynch, Clifford. "Authenticity and Integrity in the Digital Environment: An Exploratory Analysis of the Central Role of Trust." In Ross Parry, ed., *Museums in a Digital Age* (London: Routledge, 2010), pp.314-332.

MacNeil, Heather. "Metadata Strategies and Archival Description: Comparing Apples and Oranges," *Archivaria* 39 (1995): 11-21.

MacNeil, Heather, "Trusting Description: Authenticity, Accountability, and Archival Description Standards," *Journal of Archival Organization*, 7 (2009): 89-107, DOI: 10.1080/15332740903117693.

Mai, Jens-Erik. "Classification in a Social World: Bias and Trust," *Journal of Documentation* 66, no. 5 (2010): 627-642.

Maroević, Ivo. "The Museum Object as a Document," *ICOFOM Study Series* 33 (1994): 113-121.

Maroević, Ivo. *Uvod u Muzeologiju* (Zagreb: Zavod za Informacijske Studije, 1993).

Martin, Robert S. "Intersecting Missions, Converging Practice," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 8, no.1 (2007): 80-88.

Marty, Paul F. "The Changing Nature of Information Work in Museums," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58, no.1 (2007): 97-107.

McKemmish, Sue and Anne J. Gilliland. "Archival and Recordkeeping Research: Past, Present and Future." In Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds., *Research Methods: Information Management, Systems, and Contexts*, (Pahran, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), pp.80-112.

Millar, Laura. "An Obligation of Trust," *The American Archivist* 69, no.1 (2006): 60-78, <http://americanarchivist.org/doi/pdf/10.17723/aarc.69.1.v88w11m57382087m>.

Ministry of Culture, Republic of Croatia, Regulations about Content and Management of Museum Documentation of Museum Material (Pravilnik o sadržaju i načinu vođenja muzejske dokumentacije o muzejskoj građi) *Official Gazette* 108 (2002).

Ministry of Culture, Republic of Croatia, Regulations about the Conditions and Method of Gaining Access to Museum Material and Museum Documentation (Pravilnik o uvjetima i načinu ostvarivanja uvida u muzejsku građu i muzejsku dokumentaciju), *Official Gazette* no.115 (2001), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/233482.html>.

Ministry of Culture, Republic of Croatia, Regulations for the Use of Archives (Pravilnik o korištenju arhivskoga gradiva), *Official Gazette* no.67 (1999), <http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/270998.html>.

Muzejski Dokumentacioni Centar. "Dokumentacija i Klasifikacija Muzejskih i Galerijskih Predmeta," *Muzeologija* 25 (1987).

National Information Standards Organization. *Understanding Metadata* (Bethesda, MD: NISO Press, 2004),

Navarrete, Trilce and John Mackenzie Owen. "The Museum as Information Space: Metadata and Documentation." In Karol Borowiecki, Neil Forbes and Antonella Fresa, eds., *Cultural Heritage in a Changing World* (Springer, 2016), pp. 111-123.

Nemeth, Krešimir. "Prilog Problemu Organizacije Arhivske Službe u NR Hrvatskoj," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 1 (1958): 393-408.

Nesmith, Thomas, ed. *Canadian Archival Studies and the Rediscovery of Provenance* (Chicago, IL: Scarecrow and Society of American Archivists, 1993).

Nichols, Margaret F. "The Cataloger and the Archivist Should Be Friends: Or, Herding vs. Milking Special Collections," *RBM* 12, no.1 (2011): 25-33,
<http://rbm.acrl.org/content/12/1/25.full.pdf>

Novak, Joy R. *Examining Activism in Practice: A Qualitative Study of Archival Activism*, Ph.D. dissertation (University of California, Los Angeles, 2013),
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/35g4291d>.

"O radu Ivana Belavića," *Željezničar* 147 (1973):

Otlet, Paul. *Traité de Documentation* (Bruxelles: Mundaneum, Palais Mondial, 1934).

Otlet, Paul and Warden Boyd Rayward, trans, *International Organization and Dissemination of Knowledge: Selected Essays* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1990).

Pearce-Moses, Richard. *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago, IL: The Society of American Archivists, 2005), <http://files.archivists.org/pubs/free/SAA-Glossary-2005.pdf>.

Pensoneau-Conway, Sandra and Toyosaki, Satoshi. "Automethodology: Tracing a Home for Praxis-Oriented Ethnography," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 10, no.4 (2011): 378-399.

"Pravilnik o sadržaju i načinu vođenja muzejske dokumentacije o muzejskoj građi i Muzejskoj dokumentaciji," *Official Gazette* no.108 (2002).

"Preporuka o razgraničenju građe između arhiva, biblioteka i muzeja." In Rastić, Marijan. *Arhivi i arhivsko gradivo: Zbirka pravnih propisa 1828-1997* (Zagreb: Hrvatski Državni Arhiv, 1998): 111-112.

Punzalan, Ricardo L. "Archival Diasporas: A Framework for Understanding the Complexities and Challenges of Dispersed Photographic Collections," *The American Archivist* 77, no.2 (Fall/Winter 2014): 326-349.

Punzalan, Ricardo L. *Virtual Reunification: Bits and Pieces Gathered Together to Represent the Whole*. Ph.D. dissertation. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2013).

Radić, Mladen. "Stanje Arhivske Građe u Posjedu Muzeja na Području Historijskog Arhiva u Osijeku i Razgraničenje Građe," *Glasnik Arhiv Slavonije i Baranje* 1 (1991): 257-277.

Robinson, Helena. "Knowledge Utopias: An Epistemological Perspective on the Convergence of Museums, Libraries and Archives," *Museum & Society* 12, no.3 (November 2014): 210-224.

Rosch, Eleanor. "Principles of Categorization." In Rosch, Eleanor and Barbara B. Lloyd, eds, *Cognition and Categorization* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978), pp.27-48.

Rudolf, Katie. "Separated at Appraisal: Maintaining the Archival Bond between Archives Collections and Museum Objects," *Archival Issues* 33, no.1 (2011): 25-39.

Salamon-Cindori, Breza, Marko Tot and Daniela Živković. "Digitization: Challenges for Croatian Museums," *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML)* 1 (2014): 213-220,

http://www.qqml.net/papers/March_2014_Issue/317QQML_Journal_2014_SalamonCindoriTotZivkovic_213-220.pdf.

Schaffner, Jennifer. *The Metadata is the Interface: Better Description for Better Discovery of Archives and Special Collections, Synthesized from User Studies*. (Dublin, OH: OCLC Research, 2009), <http://www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2009-06.pdf>.

Shatford, Sara. "Analyzing the Subject of a Picture: A Theoretical Approach," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 6, no.3 (Spring 1986): 39-62.

Smith, Bruce. "Archives in Museums," *Archives and Manuscripts* 23, no. 1 (May 1995): 38-47.

Soergel, Dagobert. *Organizing information: Principles of Data Base and Retrieval Systems* (Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 1985).

Star, Susan Leigh and James R. Griesemer. "Institutional Ecology, 'Translations', and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology 1907-39," *Social Studies of Science* 19, no.3 (1989): 387-420, <http://innovation.ucdavis.edu/people/publications/Star%20Griesemer%201989%20SSS-19.3-387-420.pdf>.

Stulli, Bernard. "'Arhivska Građa' u Novom Arhivskom Zakonodavstvu SR Hrvatske," *Vjesnik Historijskih Arhiva u Rijeci i Pazinu* 10 (1964-1965): 291-322.

Stulli, Bernard. "Ustavna Reforma i Revizija Arhivskog Zakonodavstva u SR Hrvatske," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 14, no.1 (1971): 289-304.

Stulli, Bernard. "Zasjedanje Arhivskog Savjeta NR Hrvatske 29.12.1959," *Arhivski Vjesnik* 3, no.1 (1959): 497-499.

Šimat, Mirna and Ozren Halović. "Informatizacija mreže hrvatskih muzeja," *Muzeologija* 41-42 (2007): 123-128, <http://hrcak.srce.hr/77468>.

Šojat-Bikić, Maja. "Nove glazbene zbirke Muzeja grada Zagreba: Zbirka Rudolfa Klepača/ donacija Marine Würth Klepač," *Informatica Museologica* 40, nos.3-4 (2009): 4-65,
[http://www.mgz.hr/UserFiles/file/Rudolf_Klepac_IM_40_\(3-4\).pdf](http://www.mgz.hr/UserFiles/file/Rudolf_Klepac_IM_40_(3-4).pdf).

Štefanac, Tamara. "The Conceptualization of Archival Material held in Museums: APilot Study." In Willer, Mirna and Marijana Tomić, eds., *Proceedings of the Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts, Zadar, Croatia, 26-30 September 2011* (University of Zadar, 2012), p.281-294.

Tadić, Marko, Dunja Brozović-Rončević and Amir Kapetanovič. *The Croatian Language in the Digital Sge = Hrvatski jezik u Digitalnom Dobu* (Berlin; New York: Springer, 2012),
<http://www.meta-net.eu/whitepapers/e-book/croatian.pdf>

Tadin, Ornata. "Specijalizirani arhivi," *Arhivski vjesnik* 44 (2001): 43-51,
<http://hrcak.srce.hr/9311>.

Taylor, Hugh. "'Heritage' Revisited: Documents as Artifacts in the Context of Museums and Material Culture," *Archivaria* 40 (1995): 8-20.

Tennis, Joseph T. "Subject Ontogeny: Subject Access through Time and the Dimensionality of Classification." In *Challenges in Knowledge Representation and Organization for the 21st Century: Integration of Knowledge Across Boundaries: Proceedings of the Seventh International ISKO Conference*. López-Huertas, Maria Jose, ed., vol. 8. (Würzburg: ErgonVerlag, 2002), pp.54-59.

Turner, Hannah. "Decolonizing Ethnographic Documentation: A Critical History of the Early Museum Catalogs at the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, nos.5-6 (2015): 658-676.

Turner, James. "Representing and Accessing Information in the Stockshot Database at the National Film Board of Canada," *Canadian Journal of Information Science* 15, no. 4 (December 1990): 1-22.

Vincetić, Erika Žilić. *Analitički inventar: Zbirka fotografija 1865-1972* (Osijek: Državni arhiv u Osijeku, 2011).

Vujić, Žarka and Goran Zlodi, "Opis na razini zbirke na primjeru Strossmayerove galerije u Zagrebu," *7 seminar Arhivi, knjižnice, muzeji: mogućnost suradnje u okruženju globalne informacijske infrastrukture*(Zagreb: Hrvatsko knjižničarsko društvo, 2004), pp.69-79, http://dzs.ffzg.unizg.hr/text/Vujic_Zlodi_2003.pdf.

Westerhoff, Jan. *Ontological Categories: Their Nature and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

Williamson, Kirsty. "Ethnographic Research in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts." In Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds., *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts*(Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), pp.287-309.

Williamson, Kirsty. "Populations and Samples in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts." In Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds., *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts* (Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), pp.331-348.

Williamson, Kirsty. "Research Concepts." In Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds., *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts* (Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012),pp.9-29.

Williamson, Kirsty. "Questionnaires, Individual Interviews and Focus Group Interviews." In Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds., *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts* (Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), pp.349-371.

Williamson, Kirsty, Lisa M. Given and Paul Scufleet. "Qualitative Data Analysis in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts," Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds., *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts*(Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), pp.417-439.

Yakel, Elizabeth. "Archival Representation," *Archival Science* 3 (2003): 1-25.

Yeo, Geoffrey. "Concepts of Record (1): Evidence, Information and Persistent Representations," *The American Archivist* 70 (Fall/Winter 2007): 315–343.

Yeo, Geoffrey. "Concepts of Record (2): Prototypes and Boundary Objects," *The American Archivist* 71 (Spring/Summer 2008): 118-143.

Youn, Eunha (Anna), "Investigating Socio-cultural Aspects of the Implementation of an International Archival Descriptive Standard in Korea in eds. Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J Lau, eds., *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016): 789-811.

Zakon o Muzejima, *Official Gazette* no.110 (2015).

Zlodi, Goran. *Mogućnosti Uspostavljanja Interoperabilnosti Među Shemama Metapodataka u Muzejskom Okruženju*, Ph.D. thesis (Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 2007).

Abstract

This thesis examines the perspectives of museum curators on the nature and description of archival material held in Croatian museums. The research emanated out of personal speculation that the arrangement and description of archival and other documentary material found in museum settings are dependent on how curators determine what constitutes archival material, what constitutes a museum object or museum documentation, and what might potentially be both. Arguing also that the path to any kind of interoperability starts with the people who implement these descriptive standards, this exploratory study uses ethnographic methods, including interviews, observation and autoethnography to investigate curators' understandings of archival and documentary materials held in their museums (i.e., rather than in archives). The research was guided by the following questions:

- How do museum curators conceptualize archival records and other materials within their institutions?
- How and why do records and other archival materials come to be treated as museum objects?
- What happens to archival material in museum settings in terms of its description?
- Do museum professionals see any possible convergences between archives and museum materials in terms of description and access in museum collections, and if so, what might those be?

The study identifies and analyzes their conceptualizations of and attitudes towards the records that surround them in their daily professional practice (both those they collect and those they create) as well as towards their description of those records. It also contemplates how museum curators perceive the role of the descriptions they create when these are to be placed online in an environment where there are no longer institutional boundaries and the anticipated audience is not socially restricted. The historical situation of archival material in Croatian museum collections is also discussed in a way that offers insights into national regulatory practices as well as the perspectives of both archival and museum professionals in Croatia. However the thesis also points out that these problems are not just the result of Croatia's historical particularities but are also present worldwide in any situation where archival material constitutes part of museum collections.

The findings of the study indicate that the conceptualizations of the museum curators who were interviewed regarding records, properties of those records, and how both are or should be represented through description, vary in relation to how they personally conceive of the concept of a record (their individual cognitive framework), how the concept of a record is discussed in contemporary archival discourse and practice (professional frameworks), the parameters set by relevant archival and museum laws and regulations in Croatia (juridical framework), and the contemporary socio-political context (societal framework).

The thesis concludes that the matter of description in the end becomes the matter of access and that descriptive processes that take place in Croatian museums are indeed determined by museum professionals in the course of their daily work, although they are also circumscribed by institutional policies and practices and juridical requirements such as legislation and regulations, and influenced by both historical and contemporary societal contexts. These findings suggest that description could potentially serve as mechanism by which means the boundaries of individual repositories, professional communities and nations could be bridged. Given that curatorial conceptions are exercised in such a central way in museums, such bridging could only be successful, however, if it were based upon a robust understanding of what curators understand and internalize as significant concepts and values in the museum context, such as those that are surfaced through this research.

Keywords

archival material; archives; museums; Croatia; description; metadata

Prošireni (strukturirani) sažetak

Prošireni sažetak doktorskog rada „Konceptualizacija arhivskog gradiva u muzejima“ predstavlja osnovna poglavlja doktorskog rada, razjašnjava ciljeve i svrhe istraživanja, donosi postupak izvođenja istraživanja te rezultate i zaključke istraživanja.

Doktorski rad “Konceptualizacija arhivskog gradiva u muzejima” ispituje percepciju muzejskih kustosa i načine na koje poimaju karakteristike arhivskog gradiva i posebice način poimanja opisa arhivskog gradiva koje je dio muzejskih zbirki u hrvatskim muzejima. Istraživanje prikazano u radu potaknuto je osobnim promišljanjima da upravo kategorizacija i opis arhivskog i drugog dokumentarnog gradiva u muzejima ovise o tome kako kustosi konceptualiziraju i što zapravo smatraju arhivskim gradivom, što muzejskom građom, a što muzejskom dokumentacijom te definiranjem gdje, kako i zašto se pojmovi istih preklapaju. Stvaranju reprezentacije, odnosno opisa nekog informacijskog objekta prethodi njegova identifikacija i imenovanje. Različiti načini na koje opažamo karakteristike i svojstva ne samo informacijskog objekta kojeg opisujemo, nego i opisa kao zasebnog informacijskog objekta, utječu na daljni tijek komunikacije u kojem je korisniku potrebno pružiti pristup i razumijevanje svih svojstava opisanog informacijskog objekta na nedvosmislen način. Svojstva i karakteristike koje osoba izdvaja kao temeljna svojstva nekog informacijskog objekta, kao karakteristike koje ga definiraju, postat će sastavni dio opisa tog objekta. Istovremeno i opis predstavlja koncept pri čemu će pojedina osoba, stručne zajednice i međunarodna standardizacija izdvojiti odnosno usuglasiti razumijevanje pojedinih karakteristika i svojstava tog koncepta, a u svrhu komunikacije s korisnicima, automatiziranim informacijskim sustavima itd.

Kategorizacija građe i gradiva u zbirke neposredno predstavlja izbor načina na koje će građa ili gradivo biti opisano i samim time dostupno korisnicima unutar i izvan muzeja. Imajući u vidu kako krajnji pristup korisnika ne bi trebao biti otežan zbog različitih praksi kategorizacije i opisa građe i gradiva u različitim institucijama te smatrajući kako način postizanja interoperabilnosti započinje upravo sa stručnjacima koji implementiraju opisne standarde u svakodnevnom radu, ovdje prikazano istraživanje tematski je usmjereno na istraživanje područja opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejskim ustanovama.

Problematiziranje čuvanja i dostupnosti arhivskog gradiva u muzejskim zbirkama prisutno je u Hrvatskoj od 1950-ih godina, a posebice se aktualiziralo 1960. godine kada je

donesena Preporuka o razgraničenju građe između arhiva, biblioteka i muzeja²⁶⁰. Postupanje po Preporuci nije sasvim zaživjelo budući da su muzeji odbijali predati sakupljeno gradivo u zbirka ističući s jedne strane važnost čuvanja originalnih primjeraka dokumenata u muzejskim zbirka, a s druge strane organsku povezanost muzejskog predmeta i dokumentacije kojom se predmet kontekstualizira. Dokumenti prikupljeni u muzejske zbirke kroz povijest su tretirani prvenstveno kao muzejski predmeti, a prikupljena i stručnim radom stvorena dokumentacija organizirana je u fondove sekundarne dokumentacije. Usporedbom podataka 2011. godine²⁶¹ objavljenih u Pregledu arhivskih fondova i zbirki Republike Hrvatske i u Registru muzeja, galerija i zbirki u Republici Hrvatskoj uočen je nesrazmjer arhivskih zbirki u muzejima; muzealci su iskazali ukupno 5 arhivskih zbirki i 879 zbirki dokumentarne građe u muzejima, a arhivisti su iskazali kako u hrvatskim muzejima postoji ukupno 625 zbirki arhivskog gradiva. Ovakav nesrazmjer može se smatrati posljedicom različitih perspektiva, odnosno različitog poimanja koncepta arhivskog gradiva.

Upravo o percepciji kustosa ovisi kategorizacija pojedine zbirke u muzeju i njeno imenovanje arhivskom zbirkom, dokumentarnom, povijesnom itd., te posljedično i razumijevanje svojstava građe u pojedinoj zbirci koje se naposljetku očituje i u opisu jedinice građe. Postupke arhivističkog sređivanja i opisa gradiva Elizabeth Yakel nazvala je reprezentacijom²⁶². Stručnjak koji stvara opis jedinice građe, arhivist ili muzealac, ima ulogu medijatora. Pod utjecajem postmodernističke filozofije na granu arhivistike, razmatranja o ulozi i utjecaju arhivista kao medijatora otpočela su još 1990-ih godina. U arhivskom opisu sadržane su sve prethodne reprezentacije nastale prilikom sređivanja gradiva, uokvirene unutar arhivističkih načela provenijencije i prvobitnog reda.

Iako se u opisu teži izbjeći pristranost i subjektivnost, njegov reprezentacijski karakter nije moguće negirati budući da je gradivo koje se opisuje već reprezentacija nečijih aktivnosti. Tako se stvara niz reprezentacija, kako je ustvrdio Geoffrey Yeo: „Preslika udovičinog mirovinskog zahtjeva jest reprezentacija dokumenta, jednako kao što je dokument

²⁶⁰ „Preporuka o razgraničenju građe između arhiva, biblioteka i muzeja“. U Rastić, Marijan. *Arhivi i arhivsko gradivo: Zbirka pravnih propisa 1828-1997* (Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 1998): 111-112.

²⁶¹ Tamara Štefanac, "The Conceptualization of Archival Material held in Museums: APilot Study." In *Proceedings of the Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts, Zadar, Croatia, 26-30 September 2011*; Willer, Mirna and Marijana Tomić, eds (University of Zadar, 2012), pp.281-294.

²⁶² Elizabeth Yakel, „Archival Representation“, *Archival Science* 3 (2003):2.

reprezentacija udovičine aktivnosti. Metapodaci koji opisuju dokument također su reprezentacija dokumenta; a metapodaci koji opisuju presliku jesu reprezentacija preslike. Često postoji niz reprezentacija, u kojem jedna reprezentacija reprezentira drugu.²⁶³ Na indikativnoj razini opis može preuzeti zamjensku ulogu, primjerice u slučaju korisničkog pretraživanja obavijesnog pomagala ili kataloga kada na temelju dostupnog opisa jedinice građe korisnik odlučuje o potrebi uvida u dokument ili predmet te u slučajevima otuđenja predmeta kada opis u katalogu ili muzejskom inventaru donosi informacije koje kao indikatori usmjeravaju ka drugoj dokumentaciji. Osim svojstava koje opis ima kao reprezentacija, može se smatrati i kontekstualizacijom, kako građe koju predstavlja tako i u vlastitom svojstvu kao produkt određenog konteksta, vremena, mjesta i osoba. Kao jedna od osnovnih stručnih zadaća kustosa, opis može imati i status dokaza obavljanja njihove poslovne aktivnosti. Prema rezultatima istraživanja koje je provela Jennifer Bunn opis je okarakteriziran kao epistemološko pitanje perspektive i ravnoteže, kao „stajalište o tome kako promatramo svijet i kako s našeg stajališta znamo to što znamo.“²⁶⁴ Osim osobnog konteksta i šireg društvenog konteksta kako građe koja se opisuje tako i razumijevanja koncepta opisa, potrebno je uvažiti i institucionalni kontekst, nerijetko definiran korištenjem opisnih standarda namijenjenih muzejskoj ili arhivskoj zajednici i stvarnim praktičnim mogućnostima. Sačuvani dokumenti u arhivskim fondovima imaju dodatnu ulogu i arhivske vrijednosti kao pravni i povijesni dokazi, koja bi se također trebala prikazati u opisu. Pojmovi kao što su vjerodostojnost, pouzdanost i autentičnost usko su povezani s arhivskim gradivom, odnosno ulogom dokumenta. Zbog gubitka arhivske veze, dokumenti prikupljeni u muzejskim zbirkama ne mogu preuzeti dokazne uloge, već prvenstveno prezentiraju obvijesnu i vlastitu povijesnu vrijednost. Umjesto prisilnog razgraničenja građe i gradiva između institucija, ovaj rad sugerira korištenje opisa kao metode kojom bi se približile uloge dokumenta kao arhivskog gradiva i muzejskog predmeta. Da bi se naznačeni pojmovi povezani s konceptom arhivskog gradiva mogli iskazati u muzejskom opisu dokumenata u zbirkama, bilo je potrebno istražiti koja svojstva dokumenata percipiraju kustosi koji stvaraju opise te što podrazumijevaju pod konceptom arhivskog gradiva i muzejskog predmeta te koja bi svojstva dokumenata sadržanih

²⁶³Geoffrey Yeo, "Concepts of Record (1): Evidence, Information and Persistent Representations," *The American Archivist* 70 (Fall/Winter 2007): 341.

²⁶⁴Jennifer J. Bunn, *Multiple Narratives, Multiple Views: Observing Archival Description*. Ph.D. thesis (University College London, 2011), 217, <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1322455/>.

u muzejskim zbirnama opisom trebalo iskazati. U ovom je radu naglašena važnost uloge konteksta (osobnog – institucionalnog – društvenog) u kojem kustos djeluje i njenog/njegovog stvaranja i objašnjavanja značenja pojedinih segmenata prilikom stvaranja opisa.

Nacrt i provođenja istraživanja

U interpretativističkom pristupu ovo istraživanje uokvireno je teorijskim postavkama teorije prototipa Eleanor Rosch²⁶⁵ i konceptom graničnih objekata Susan Leigh Star i Jamesa R. Griesemera²⁶⁶, naznačujući da se upravo arhivsko gradivo u muzejima ali i sam opis mogu promatrati kao granični objekti. Problemi i posljedice opisivanja arhivskog gradiva u muzejskim zbirnama pomoću muzeoloških opisnih modela i standarda nisu svojstveni samo hrvatskoj praksi već su prisutni na globalnoj razini. Na općoj razini ovo istraživanje adresira probleme obrade i opisa graničnih objekata u baštinskim ustanovama i razmatra problematiku stvaranja multifunkcionalnog opisa u kojem se moraju usuglasiti raznovrsne institucionalne potrebe s potrebama i mogućnošću pristupa vanjskih korisnika. Budući da je istraživanje kao glavnu svrhu postavilo razumijevanje na koji način je arhivsko gradivo u muzejima kategorizirano, obrađeno i opisano, bilo je potrebno koristiti odgovarajuću metodologiju koja bi omogućila dubinske odgovore na pitanja kako i zašto. Osnovni ciljevi istraživanja jesu identifikacija, analiza i opis kustoske prakse i stavova prema različitim vrstama arhivskog gradiva te stvaranje opisa istih. Istraživanje je vođeno sljedećim pitanjima:

- Na koji način muzejski kustosi poimaju arhivsko gradivo unutar muzeja ?
- Na koji se način i zašto arhivskim gradivom postupa kao s muzejskom građom?
- Kako je arhivsko gradivo opisano u muzejskom okruženju?
- Vide li kustosi moguću konvergenciju između arhivskih i muzejskih ustanova u odnosu na prakse opisa i pristupa muzejske građe te koja su moguća područja konvergencije

²⁶⁵Eleanor Rosch, "Principles of Categorization." In Rosch, Eleanor and Barbara B. Lloyd, eds, *Cognition and Categorization* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978), p.28.

²⁶⁶Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer, "Institutional Ecology, 'Translations', and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology 1907-39," *Social Studies of Science* 19, no.3 (1989): 387-420, <http://innovation.ucdavis.edu/people/publications/Star%20Griesemer%201989%20SSS-19.3-387-420.pdf>.

Obzirom na metode i tehnike korištene u istraživanju, zaključci ovog rada ne mogu uopćavanjem uputiti k općim vrijednostima, posebice imajući na umu važnost svih razina konteksta koje oblikuju područje istraživanja. Karakter ovog istraživanja je eksplorativan, deskriptivan i indikativan.

Primijenjeno je namjerno uzorkovanje, odnosno izabrani sudionici (kustosi) zadovoljavali su sljedeće kriterije: osoba koja samostalno vodi muzejske zbirke, stvara opise građe i gradiva, kataloga, obavijesnih pomagala i legendi predmeta prilikom izlaganja. Tehnikom snježne grude izabrani su sudionici na koje su uputili drugi sudionici istraživanja prema vlastitim spoznajama i obzirom da je populacija kustosa u Hrvatskoj nije velika te su članovi stručne zajednice upoznati sa stručnim radom i sličnim problemima s kojima se susreću i njihovi kolege. Sudionicima je poslano Pismo namjere (vidjeti prilog A) sudjelovanja u istraživanju, a nakon pristanka sudjelovanja i Informirani pristanak u kojem im se jamčila anonimnost (vidjeti prilog B). Budući da ciljevi ovog istraživanja nisu usmjereni ka stigmatizaciji pojedinih praksi, osoba ili institucija, smatrano je kako će anonimno sudjelovanje sudionicima znatno olakšati slobodu izraza, iskazivanja mišljenja i spontanost u odgovoru, a što će u konačnici pridonijeti induktivnom oblikovanju rezultata i zaključaka. U istraživanju je sudjelovalo ukupno osam sudionika – kustosa iz različitih vrsta muzeja, a koji su zadovoljili gore navedene kriterije.

Istraživanje je temeljeno na etnografskoj metodologiji odnosno dubinskim intervjuima, promatranju i autoetnografiji. Dvostruka korist etnografskog pristupa očituje se u tome što prikupljeni i analizirani podaci mogu adresirati istovremeno teorijska pitanja i probleme u praksi, ali pod uvjetom da je i samo istraživanje temeljeno u stvarnim situacijama i prisutnim problemima u praksi. U induktivnom etnografskom pristupu razaznaje se i osoba istraživača, kao jednog od entiteta u istraživanju²⁶⁷. Budući da je premisa interpretativističkog etnografskog pristupa da „ljudi ne otkrivaju znanje u tolikoj mjeri koliko ga konstruiraju“²⁶⁸ i sama osoba istraživača uključena je konstruiranje. Upravo uključenost osobe istraživača, kako u stvarno područje koje istražuje tako i u samo konstruiranje istraživanja, važan je element koji se u ovom radu preispituje i obrazlaže putem autoetnografije.

²⁶⁷Kirsty Williamson, "Ethnographic Research in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts." In Williamson, Kirsty and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Prahan, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.291.

²⁶⁸Ibid.p.291.

Protokol dubinskih, polustrukturiranih intervjua kao fokusiranih razgovora uokvirenih razrađenim istraživačkim pitanjima odobrio je Etički odbor Sveučilišta u Kaliforniji, Los Angeles (vidjeti prilog C). Dubinski intervjui realizirani su kroz nekoliko sastanaka s pojedinačnim sudionikom, s namjerom postepenog otvaranja tema i na način da se sasvim ne razotkriju problematična područja i pitanja do kojih je tek trebalo u razgovoru doći u sljedećim sesijama. Ovakav je način ujedno omogućio da sudionik ne prejudicira odgovore niti uvažava mišljenja istraživača na zadanu problematiku. Razrađena struktura intervjuiranja inicijalno je uključivala snimanje intervjua, ali je tijekom procesa istraživanja i nakon inicijalnih intervjua plan izvođenja intervjuiranja izmijenjen budući da je zamijećeno kako sudionici konstruiraju svoje odgovore u maniri pisanih izjava. Zbog navedenog, u ovom istraživanju nije korišten snimač zvuka nego su vođene iscrpne bilješke koje su naknadno pročitane sudioniku te je traženo odobrenje, ili eventualni ispravak, da se izjave u takvom obliku mogu dalje upotrebljavati u istraživanju. Tijekom intervjua i opažanja ponašanja sudionika i neverbalne komunikacije, pregleda i proučavanja stvorenih opisa u pojedinoj instituciji također su vođene iscrpne bilješke.

Proces intervjuiranja odvijao se u periodu od 2014. do 2016. godine. Svaki intervju trajao je u rasponu od sat i pol do dva sata, a ukupno je održano 22 intervjua s 8 sudionika. Uz proces intervjuiranja, sudionici su ispunjavali tzv. radne zadatke u kojima su zamoljeni da: a) opišu pet jedinica građe, b) komentiraju opise arhivskog gradiva iz fundusa svjetski poznatih muzeja.

Građu, odnosno gradivo koje su sudionici opisivali u prvom radnom zadatku dostavljeno je sudionicima u obliku digitalnih kopija: fotografije kao dijelovi fotografskog albuma, arhitektonski nacrt, dokument kojim se odobrava premještaj u službi i povećanje plaće željezničkom zaposleniku i topografska karta. Svrha radnih zadataka opisivanja bila je ustanoviti u kojoj mjeri će se opisi sudionika preklapati, odnosno koje će elemente opisa sudionici izraziti i na koji način.

Radni zadaci komentiranja opisa dostupnih na mrežnim stranicama muzeja izvedeni su na sljedećim primjerima: opis Ugovora u Kadešu iz Arheološkog muzeja Istanbul, opis arhitektonske skice kapele Michelangela Buonarottija iz Britanskog muzeja u Londonu, opis dopisnice iz koncentracijskog logora iz Židovskog muzeja u Berlinu, opis aerofotografije iz Australskog ratnog memorijalnog muzeja. Svrha radnog zadatka komentiranja bila je ustanoviti na koji način sudionici percipiraju važnost i način iskazivanja elemenata opisa

obzirom na sadržaj i jedinice građe te što smatraju potrebnim izmijeniti, nadopuniti ili ispraviti kod opisa jedinice građe dostupnog u mrežnom okruženju.

Usporedo s intervjuiranjem i opservacijom provedena je i analiza sadržaja opisa koji su sudionici izradili u svom stručnom radu dostupnih kao predmetna kartica u bazi podataka, legenda predmeta izloženog na izložbi i opis u katalogu izložbe, opis jedinice građe dostupan na mrežnim stranicama, opis jedinice građe u drugim stručnim publikacijama te dokumenti nastali u tzv. radnim zadacima opisa tijekom ovog istraživanja. Prema Kirsty Williamson kvalitativnom analizom sadržaja proučava se značenje i to na način, „[...] klasificiranja i organiziranja sadržaja komunikacije sistematski u kategorije koje opisuju predmete, teme i kontekst te poruke.“²⁶⁹ Analiza sadržaja uključuje tematsku analizu kao induktivan, prethodno neodređen proces kroz kojeg se pojavljuju značenjske kategorije. Detektirane tematske jedinice (kao kodne kategorije) tekstova i izraza svih sudionika uspoređene su međusobno te naposljetku komparirane s identificiranim konceptima i kategorijama proizašlim iz analize dubinskih intervjuja. Navedene tehnike prikupljanja podataka svrstane su pod nazivnik vanjskih izvora obzirom da je istraživanje uključivalo i korištenje metodologije autoetnografije odnosno prikupljanje podataka iz osobne prakse istraživača u radu u muzeju te podataka odnosno refleksija stvorenih tijekom samog procesa istraživanja. Budući da u svom muzejskom radu obavljam jednak opseg posla kao i intervjuirani sudionici, vodim zbirke arhivskog gradiva u muzeju te stvaram opise građe i gradiva, smatrala sam važnim autoetnografskim pristupom istražiti vlastitu praksu kao stručnjaka, a ujedno i izložiti vlastita razmišljanja kao istraživača koji je i sam sudionik zajednice čiju opisnu praksu članova istražuje, a čija je perspektiva dodatno iskrivljena i pod utjecajem formalnog obrazovanja u grani arhivistike.

Metoda autoetnografije, iako sve više korištena u područjima društvenih znanosti, još uvijek se promatra s određenim skepticizmom obzirom na poteškoće pri dokazivanju kredibiliteta istraživanja. Ukoliko se autoetnografija može smatrati primjerom postmoderne etnografije²⁷⁰ upitno je poimanje metode i primijenjenih tehnika kao krajnjih i nepromjenjivih. Ovisna je o

²⁶⁹Kirsty Williamson, Lisa M. Given and Paul Scufleet. "Qualitative Data Analysis in Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts," Kirsty Williamson and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Pahran, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p.424.

²⁷⁰Kirsty Williamson, "Research Concepts," In *Research Methods: Information, Systems and Contexts*, Williamson, Kirsty and Graeme Johanson, eds.(Pahran, Vic: Tilde University Press, 2012), p..284

kontekstu i nizu čimbenika koji utječu na sve razine istraživanja. Stoga pozornost valja usmjeriti na provjeru unutarnje valjanosti i dosljednosti. Svojstva koja bi autoetnografski narativ trebao iskazati sumirala je Chang navodeći da „autoetnografija treba biti etnografska u svojoj metodološkoj orijentaciji, kulturalna u interpretativnoj orijentaciji i autobiografska u svojoj sadržajnoj orijentaciji.“²⁷¹ Kako bi autoetnografski narativ stvoren tijekom ovog istraživanja i prikazan kao dio rezultata zadovoljio navedene kriterije, posebna je pozornost posvećena tehnikama prikupljanja i analize podataka koji su bili sadržani u mojim odgovorima na korisničke upite tijekom višegodišnjeg rada u muzeju, opisanim jedinicama građe u katalogu, legendama i katalozima izložaba, korespondenciji vezanoj uz opis i dostupnost građiva iz zbirke s kolegama iz drugih muzeja i arhiva te u bilješkama koje sam vodila tijekom samog istraživanja. Svrha provođenja istraživanja uz pomoć autoetnografije jest osvjetljivanje područja interesa iz perspektive arhivista koji obrađuje i opisuje građu muzejskih zbirki, a jedan od ciljeva svakako jest i razotkrivanje moguće pristranosti istraživača. Primjena navedenih istraživačkih metoda i tehnika u ovom istraživanju ujedno se može smatrati ispitivanjem uporabe i korisnosti primijenjenih metoda i tehnika u polju informacijskih znanosti i grani arhivistike koja prolazi kroz period ispitivanja vlastitih metoda u novoj pluralističkoj i digitalnoj paradigmi istovremeno koristeći prilagođene metode posuđene iz humanističkih i društvenih znanosti. Pritom valja podsjetiti kako postoji razlika između primijenjenog istraživanja dokumenata u arhivu u svrhu njihovog vrednovanja, opisa i korištenja i konceptualno-teorijskog propitivanja modela vrednovanja, opisa i korištenja. Obje vrste istraživanja potrebno je dodatno razlikovati od metoda prikladnih za ispitivanje tih istih fenomena u arhivistici kao grani informacijskih znanosti. Dok arhivisti u praktičnom radu najčešće primjenjuju metode sadržajne i funkcionalne analize te metode i tehnike diplomatike i historiografije, istraživači arhivskih i arhivističkih koncepata koriste širok spektar metoda i tehnika, često posuđenih iz srodnih znanstvenih područja i prilagođenih potrebama pojedinačnog istraživanja. Propitivanje metodoloških pristupa u arhivistici ujedno predstavlja i daljnji razvoj i sazrijevanje arhivističkog diskursa.

Analiza podataka zamišljena je kao iterativan proces u kojem se skupovima podataka pristupa s nekoliko razina pri čemu jekorištena strategija vizualizacije koncepata. Nakon identificiranja, imenovanja koncepata i identifikacije temeljnih karakteristika koncepata,

²⁷¹ Heewon Chang, *Autoethnography as Method*. (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008), p.48.

dobiveni skupovi podataka grupirani su u šira tematska područja, a koja korespondiraju s istraživačkim problemom iskazanim kroz istraživačka pitanja. Teme tzv. prve razine stvorene su pomoću skupova podataka prikupljenih putem dubinskih intervjuja, teme tzv. druge razine kreirane su putem skupova podataka prikupljenih opažanjem i analizom sadržaja, a teme tzv. treće razine generirane su iz skupova autoetnografskih podataka.

Rezultati istraživanja

Induktivnim rasuđivanjem definirane su tri obuhvatne teme: muzejske vrijednosti, opis arhivskog gradiva u muzejima, elementi opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejima. Za svakog pojedinačnog sudionika izrađena je lista identificiranih koncepata grupiranih u navedena tematska područja. Dijeljeni koncepti identificirani i analizirani u tematskom okviru muzejskih vrijednosti ukazuju na nedjeljivost građe i gradiva u zbirkama od teme ili područja bavljenja muzeja kao dio njihove misije, gradivo i građa te tema kojom se muzej bavi reflektirani su jedni u drugom i percipirani kao nedjeljivi. Predmet se percipira (i opisuje) vodeći računa o načinu na koji će predmet doprinijeti kontekstualizaciji teme ili područja kojom se muzej bavi. Interpretacija koja se događa prilikom opisa jedinice građe percipirana je kao integralna karakteristika muzejskog rada i muzejskog opisa, određena svojstvom vremenske i kontekstualne ograničenosti u smislu da je nastala kao produkt stručnog istraživačkog rada i u jednom obliku prisutna samo u određenom vremenu, dok se ne nadopuni ili izmijeni novim informacijama. Svi sudionici kao glavna svojstva opisa percipiraju njegovu kontinuiranost i sveobuhvatnost te opis definiraju kao proces i samo u određenom trenutku proizvod, koji se opet u drugom kontekstu (prostornom ili vremenskom) može nadopuniti ili izmijeniti. Dijeljeno mišljenje sudionika jest da arhivsko gradivo u muzejima ima ulogu dokumenta i ulogu predmeta. Karakteristike uloge gradiva kao dokumenta raščlanjene su na karakteristike dokumenta kao povijesne vrijednosti same po sebi i ulogu dokumenta kao arhivskog gradiva koji ima moć dokazivanja činjenica iznesenih prvenstveno svojim sadržajem. Druge vrijednosti dokumenta kojim bi se mogla iskazati njegova autentičnost kod većine sudionika nisu percipirane važnima. Koncept autentičnosti povezan je kod većine sudionika samo sa materijalnim svojstvima dokumenta. Tema opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejima obrazložena je putem funkcija koje bi, prema mišljenju sudionika, opis trebao preuzeti. Osim fizičke i intelektualne kontrole, opis prvenstveno služi kontekstualizaciji predmeta i donosi njegovu interpretaciju. Kontekst

jedinice građe koja se opisuje definiran je znatno šire nego arhivistički koncept provenijencije. Kontekst koji bi valjalo opisati osim stvaratelja uključuje sve povijesne i muzejske uporabe jedinice građe, odnosno sve uporabe koje su se događale od trenutka stvaranja do danas. Pritom funkcionalna analiza procesa stvaranja nije percipirana kao važan aspekt konteksta nastanka jedinice građe kojeg bi valjalo opisati. Kontekstualizacija jedinice građe, prema mišljenjima sudionika, uključuje i opis sadržaja jedinice građe koji se dalje usmjerava, proširuje i nadopunjuje ovisno o svrsi opisa. Prema izjavama sudionika, opis materijalnosti predmeta/dokumenta jedan je od najvažnijih aspekata opisa i treba biti detaljno razrađen budući da se pojam materijalnosti usko povezuje s konceptom originala i njegove autentičnosti.

Dok su neki sudionici povezali važnost opisa samo sa unutarnjom kontrolom jedinice građe u muzeju i upotrebljivosti za stručnjaka koji ga izrađuje (i upravlja predmetom kojeg opisuje), drugi su uzeli u obzir i vanjske korisnike i mogućnost korištenja proširenog opisa na mrežnim stranicama muzeja. Koji elementi opisa će biti dostupni korisnicima u digitalnom i virtualnom okruženju i na koji će način biti izraženi, prema mišljenjima sudionika, ovisi o odlukama na razini institucije. Takav stav zastupa većina sudionika ovog istraživanja objašnjavajući ga s jedne strane praktičnim problemima tehnoloških i financijskih mogućnosti pojedinog muzeja ali s druge strane izražavajući upitnost vrijednosti neograničene dostupnosti svih opisnih podataka jedinice građe u mrežnom okruženju čije krajnje korištenje u mrežnom okruženju više nije moguće kontrolirati.

Kao način kontrole i opisa većih količina arhivskog i dokumentarnog gradiva u muzejskim zbirkama sudionici navode opis na razini zbirke kojeg ujedno percipiraju kao način približavanja praksama opisa gradiva u arhivima.

U trećoj tematskoj cjelini koja se bavi elementima opisa odnosno ispituje koncepte i izraze problematike opisa raščlanjene na osnovne elemente iskazane u inventarnoj (kataloškoj) kartici jedinice građe profilirali su se koncepti autorstva, korištenja autoriziranog nazivlja, izrade i korištenja ključnih riječi kao pristupnica. Drugačijim promišljanjem autorstva u odnosu na arhivistički koncept provenijencije i stvaratelja, sudionici su izrazili prihvaćanje koncepta ko-autorstva u smislu navođenja imena osobe na koju se određeni dokument odnosi kao ko-autora, ukoliko je nekim svojim činjenjem izravno na dokument (npr. potpisom) ta osoba sudjelovala u stvaranju dokumenta. Sudionici

su naveli da je pojam autora povezan s pojmom stvaratelja, te se isti tek djelomično mogu smatrati sinonimima budući da stvaratelj predstavlja višu razinu odgovornosti.

Sudionici su naveli kako je uporaba autoriziranog nazivlja jedan od najvažnijih elemenata opisa u povezivanju pojedine jedinice građe kako sa ostalim relevantnim jedinicama građe iz fundusa institucije, ali i u komuniciranju u mrežnom okruženju. Kao uzoran primjer kontole nazivlja naveli su bibliotekarsku praksu, ali uz opasku da je u nekim slučajevima kontrola nazivlja zamišljena preusko i ograničavajuće te kako bi je bilo potrebno proširiti tako da uključuje posebnosti koje već postoje u katalogima muzejskih institucija.

Ključne riječi profilirale su se kao jedan od elemenata kojim sudionici pretražuju pojedinačni muzejski katalog i vlastite ranije stvorene zapise, kao element za koji sudionici smatraju da bi mogao kvalitetno služiti u mrežnom okruženju na način sličan tagiranju te kao element stvoren prema vlastitom definiranju važnih svojstava jedinice građe koja se opisuje.

Razmatranja o profiliranim temama muzejskih vrijednosti, opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejima te elemenata opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejima, slijedeći principe autoetnografske metode, u ovom su radu predstavljena kroz reflektivan i refleksivan narativ. Problemi opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejskoj zbirci predstavljani su kroz pitanja provenijencije prikupljenog gradiva, razmatranja o važnosti razlikovanja izvornika i različitih oblika kopija u opisu, otkrivenih nedostataka u pojedinim elementima opisa na temelju korisničkih upita te osvrta na rješenja specifičnih neočekivanih upita korisnika.

Obzirom na istraživačka pitanja postavljena u ovom istraživanju, autoetnografski narativ otkriva u mnogočemu različito poimanje koncepta arhivskog gradiva kod istraživača i drugih sudionika u istraživanju te posljedično i različito poimanje funkcije opisa na nižim razinama. Kao temeljne karakteristike arhivskog gradiva naznačene su njegova prvotna funkcija ali i različite vrijednosti (koje je potrebno adresirati u opisu) te njegova mogućnost zadržavanja istovremeno karaktera dokumenta i predmeta ukoliko se opisom iskažu elementi kojima se takva dihotomija omogućuje. Navedeno je moguće ostvariti opisom i to prvenstveno opisom stvoriti arhivsku vezu koju je nužno prethodno ustanoviti, a imajući na umu da su u velikom broju slučajeva dokumenti u muzejskim zbirkama ipak sačuvani komadno. Praktičan rad u stvaranju opisa, na primjerima iz autoetnografskog narativa, otkriva kako je moguće usvojiti i implementirati odnosno iskazati višestruku provenijenciju i ko-stvaratelja. Autoetnografski osvrt također postavlja pitanje što je potrebno adresirati opisom? Dokument ili skup dokumenata koji se čuva u jednoj instituciji ili je moguće i potrebno opisom izaći iz vlastitih

institucionalnih okvira opisujući dijelove koji nedostaju, pritom imajući na umu postojeće standarde opisa iz muzejske i arhivske zajednice, ali i stvarne mogućnosti u praksi. U cjelini autoetnografski narativ otkriva koliko je pri stvaranju opisa važan element osobne uključenosti, te koliki je utjecaj osobe koja stvara opis kao medijatora.

Rasprava donosi interpretaciju, kontekstualiziranje i teorijsko uopćavanje dobivenih rezultata istraživanja. Kod opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejima primjećuje se osobna konceptualizacija kustosa, korištenje muzejskih opisnih standarda ali i naslanjanje na već postojeću institucionalnu praksu te utjecaj odnosno valorizacija pojedine jedinice građe pod utjecajem širog društvenog konteksta koja se posljedično primjećuje i u opisu. Na primjeru fotografija iz fotografskog albuma, a koji je dio muzejske zbirke fotografija, razmatraju se sličnosti i razlike arhivskog i muzejskog opisa zbirke. Dok je pristup opisu arhivskog fonda u arhivu različit u odnosu na muzejski opis kojim se agregacije tretiraju sumarno na nivou opisa zbirke, kategorizacija građe i opis građe u arhivskim i muzejskim zbirkama u mnogočemu nalikuju, što je i prikazano na primjeru opisa navedenog fotografskog albuma koji se čuva u nekoliko različitih arhiva i muzeja. Time se otvorilo i pitanje virtualne reunifikacije građe što je moguće postići opisom koji je usredotočen na funkciju i arhivsku vrijednost građe, donosi detaljniju kontekstualizaciju svojstvenu muzejskom pristupu i analizu sadržaja te može postići kohezivan učinak i služiti kao zamjena stvarnom fizičkom ujedinjavanju raspršenih agregacija dokumenata. Na istom primjeru opisa fotografskog albuma čuvanog u različitim institucijama primjećuje se kako se koncept arhivskog gradiva razlikuje ne samo u odnosu arhiv – muzej nego i u usporedbi opisa dviju arhivskih institucija, koje slijedeći iste međunarodne standarde opisa iste implementiraju na različit način – ovisno o shvaćanju te time i iskazivanju kako različitih svojstava opisanog predmeta tako i elemenata opisa. Fotografije iz albuma vjerojatno neće predstavljati prototip arhivskog gradiva, ali će se naći unutar koncepta arhivskog gradiva kao granični objekti čije će značenje varirati ovisno o zajednici koja ih interpretira. Iako postoji opća pretpostavka da arhivske opise neće koristiti druge baštinske zajednice (obzirom na jedinstvenost gradiva) u slučaju opisa na razini jedinice građe odnosno komada ta se pretpostavka pokazala netočnom. Upravo na razini opisa komada (ili npr. digitalizirane jedinice građe) moguće je uspostaviti izravne veze između jedinice građe čuvane u jednoj instituciji i njenih dijelova, ili različitih verzija iste, u drugim institucijama, s pretpostavkom da će stručnjak koji opisuje prepoznati tu mogućnost kao dio procesa opisa i

krajnjeg proizvoda opisa, u bilo kojem obliku obavijesnog pomagala. Građa i gradivo iz muzejskih i arhivskih ustanova većinom jesu unikatnog karaktera, ali isto ne može važiti kao opće pravilo. Neupitna je jedino jedinstvenost zbirke ili fonda čiji je opis također potrebno stvoriti imajući na umu kontekst nastanka agregacije, upravljanje agregacijom i njenu ulogu spremnika jedinica građe, adresiranih pojedinačno ili kroz hijerarhijsku strukturu. Opis ne služi samo kao metoda fizičke i intelektualne kontrole jedinice građe (ili skupa) nego ujedno služi i kao njena kontekstualizacija (dok se u arhivskom opisu profilirala provenancijalna kontekstualizacija, muzejski opis kontekst je znatno šire percipiran) i kao reprezentacija sadržaja, kao mehanizam komunikacije i kao izvor kustoske interpretacije. Sudionici ovog istraživanja gledaju na opis istovremeno kao na proces i proizvod koji u pravilu nikada nije dovršen, nego je podložan izmjenama budući da je povezan s kontinuiranim istraživanjem kako o jedinici građe koja se opisuje tako i o njenom kontekstu nastanka i različitim uporaba.

Značajan nedostatak u muzejskoj opisnoj praksi, sudeći prema prema praktičnim primjerima u opisima sudionika ovog istraživanja ali i prema njihovim mišljenjima, nalazi se u području kontrole nazivlja što u virtualnom okruženju utječe na pristup opisu jedinice građe odnosno digitaliziranoj inačici jedinice građe. Predloženo „proširenje“ kontrole nazivlja u krajnjem slučaju dovodi do nekontrole unutar samog kataloga i znatno šire, ukoliko se radi o dijeljenom mrežnom okruženju.

Zaključci

Istraživanjem su se prepoznala i analizirala poimanja kustosa i njihovi odnosni stavovi prema dokumentima koji ih okružuju u svakodnevnoj praksi (prikupljenim dokumentima i onim stvorenim) te stavovi kustosa o mogućem opisu arhivskog gradiva u muzejima.

Istraživanjem su se također ispitali stavovi kustosa spram uloge opisa građe u mrežnom okruženju gdje više ne postoje institucionalne granice, korisnike nije moguće predvidjeti, a okviri specifičnog društvenog konteksta su zaobiđeni. Problem arhivskog gradiva u hrvatskim muzejskim zbirkama predstavljen je sažetim povijesnim prikazom prateći kroz povijesnu stručnu literaturu perspektive arhivskih i muzejskih djelatnika, a ujedno je razmotrena nacionalna zakonska regulacija kojom se regulira postupanje s muzejskom građom i muzejskom dokumentacijom. Istraživanjem se ustvrdilo kako problem arhivskog gradiva sadržanog u muzejskim zbirkama nije isključivo posebnost hrvatske prakse i povijesnih

posebnosti, već da je to globalno prisutan problem u okolnostima kada je arhivsko gradivo sastavni dio muzejskih zbirki.

Rezultati istraživanja ukazuju kako je poimanje intervjuiranih kustosa (o pojmu arhivskog gradiva, svojstvima arhivskog gradiva i načina na koji bi arhivsko gradivo trebalo biti opisano) ovisno o načinu percepcije pojma arhivskog gradiva (individualna spoznaja), o načinu poimanja arhivskog gradiva u sklopu suvremenih arhivističkih i muzeoloških diskursa te stvarne prakse (stručne spoznaje) kao i arhivskim i muzejskim zakonima i pratećim pravilnicima (pravni okvir) te suvremenim političko-društvenim kontekstom (društveni okvir).

Istraživanjem je zaključeno kako pitanje opisa postaje zapravo pitanje pristupa gradivu i građi te da su procesi opisa građe i gradiva u hrvatskim muzejima određeni kustoskim svakodnevnim opisnim praksama koje su ograničene institucionalnim smjernicama i praksama, zakonskim okvirima te određene povijesnim i suvremenim kontekstima.

Rezultati istraživanja sugeriraju kako nanovo promišljena praksa opisa može preuzeti ulogu mehanizma kojim bi se premostile granice pojedinačnih ustanova, stručnih zajednica i nacionalnih praksi. Budući da odlučujuću ulogu u opisnom procesu u muzejima predstavljaju upravo kustoske percepcije gradiva i opisa gradiva, moguće premoštenje navedenih granica može biti uspješno jedino ako je temeljeno na jasnom razumijevanju načina na koji kustosi razumijevaju i internaliziraju pojmove i vrijednosti muzejskog konteksta.

Znanstveni doprinos istraživanja

Doprinos ovog istraživanja očituje se u teorijskim i praktičnim idejama u području opisa arhivskog gradiva u muzejskom okruženju na način da detektira pojedina područja prednosti i nedostataka muzejskog i arhivskog opisa, donosi uvid u percepciju osoba koje stvaraju opis građe i gradiva u muzejima stvarajući temelj za razumijevanje različitih pristupa te kontekstualizira problematiku arhivskog gradiva u muzejima kroz dijaloge arhivske i muzejske zajednice te kroz postojeću zakonsku regulativu i međunarodne opisne standarde. Obzirom da nisu postojale čvrste teorijske pretpostavke niti prethodna istraživanja ove problematike usmjerena na razumijevanje kako i zašto je arhivsko gradivo tretirano u muzejima, ovo istraživanje je eksplorativno i indikativno u karakteru i otvara vrlo specifičnu problematiku koji je potrebno detaljnije istražiti na većem broju sudionika i uz otvoreno iskazivanje konteksta u kojem sudionici prakticiraju opis. Rezultati i izvedeni zaključci, iako

ne mogu biti uopćeni i generirati nov teorijski okvir, ipak upućuju na važnost postizanja razumijevanja stručnjaka kao pojedinca (i njegove osobe i profesionalne kognicije), institucionalnog okvira u kojem djeluje te šireg društvenog konteksta budući da svi navedeni elementi utječu na stvaranje opisa, što posljedično utječe i na pristup informacijskom objektu (bilo u obliku obavijesnog pomagala kojem se pristupa lokalno, bilo u mrežnom okruženju). Doprinos ovog istraživanja predstavlja i uporaba autoetnografske metodologije, pomoću koje je čitatelj upoznat s konceptima i predrasudama istraživača kao stručne osobe i sa samim internim tijekom istraživanja i elemenata koji su na istraživanje utjecali. Autoetnografski postupak i krajnje prikazan narativ ujedno se pokazao kao pogodna metodologija istraživanja u arhivistici, kao etički korektiv, te kao metoda kojom se uspješno propituju odnosi reakcija Ja – Drugi u specifičnom okruženju koje je ovim radom istraživano.

Ključne riječi:

Arhivsko gradivo, arhiv, muzej, Hrvatska, opis, metapodaci

Appendix A

Recruitment material

Each of curator will be approached on personal level using telephone call and then e-mail with recruitment letter. Interviews will take place in curator's chamber in museum in which she or he works.

Research subject recruitment letter Conceptualization of archival materials held in museums, 2014. (English)

Dear Madame / Sir

My name is Tamara Štefanac and I am a postgraduate student enrolled in the PhD program in "Knowledge Society and Information Transfer" at the Department of Information Science, University of Zadar, Croatia.

As an integral part of my doctoral thesis entitled "Conceptualization of archival materials held in museums" I am conducting a study of curators employed in Croatian museums. The main presumption of my research is that how museum items, specifically those of an archival nature, are described, ultimately determines how they are accessed and used. In order to elaborate this hypothesis I would like to gain insight into the opinions of curators on topics such as the appraisal of heritage items, description, digitization, access and other relevant areas closely connected with their daily work handling documentation in museum settings.

One part of my research will consist of a series of in-depth interviews. Each interview session will last approximately one hour. Totally five interview sessions will be held. The scheduling of sessions would be adjusted to the wishes of each individual subject. Interviews will be conducted from February to November 2014²⁷². After first interview session you will be asked to produce basic catalogue records of 4 digital copies of museum material. The purpose of this exercise is not accuracy of description but reflection on elements of description.

²⁷²The study was approved to 2016.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary and without any fee, and all resulting data will be anonymized to the fullest extent possible.

Results of the research will be used only for the purposes of the research and the dissemination of its outcome.

Since your professional work and every day work routine with handling different sorts of documentation closely corresponds with my research interests I would be grateful if you would agree to take part in this research.

With kind regards,
Tamara Štefanac

Pismo namjere ispitanicima u istraživanju Konceptualizacija arhivskog gradiva u muzejima (Croatian)

Poštovana gospođo / gospodine

Moje ime je Tamara Štefanac i studentica sam poslijediplomskog studija „Društvo znanja i prijenos informacija“ na Odjelu za informacijske znanosti, Sveučilište u Zadru.

Kao sastavni dio moje doktorske disertacije naslova „Konceptualizacija arhivskog gradiva u muzejima“ provodim studiju kustosa zaposlenih u hrvatskim muzejima. Osnovna pretpostavka mojeg istraživanja jest da način na koji su muzejski predmeti opisani određuje način na koji su pretraživani i korišteni. Kako bih detaljno razradila ovu hipotezu željela bih steći uvid u mišljenja kustosa o temama kao što su vrednovanje građe, opis, digitalizacija, pristup i druge relevantne teme blisko povezane sa dnevnom rutinom kustosa pri baratanju dokumentacijom u muzeju.

Jedan dio mojeg istraživanja činit će serija dubinskih intervjua. Svaki intervju trajat će otprilike jedan sat. Predviđeno je ukupno pet intervjua. Vrijeme održavanja intervjua bit će prilagođeno željama svakog pojedinog ispitanika. Intervjui će biti održavani od veljače do studenog 2014. godine. Nakon prvog intervjua bit ćete zamoljeni da izradite osnovni kataloški zapis ukupno 4 digitalnih kopija muzejskih predmeta. Svrha ove vježbe nije točnost opisa nego refleksija na elemente opisa.

Sudjelovanje u ovom istraživanju sasvim je dobrovoljno i bez ikakve naknade, a svi dobiveni podaci biti će anonimni u najvećoj mogućoj mjeri.

Rezultati istraživanja bit će korišteni samo u svrhu istraživanja i razmatranje njegovih zaključaka.

Budući da Vaš stručni rad i svakodnevna rutina u baratanju različitim vrstama dokumentacije blisko odgovara mojim istraživačkim interesima bila bih zahvalna ukoliko pristanete sudjelovati u ovom istraživanju.

S poštovanjem,

Tamara Štefanac

Appendix B

Informed consent form (English)

Supervisor

Professor Anne Gilliland, University of California, Los Angeles

Investigator

The principal and only investigator in this project is Tamara Štefanac, a PhD student enrolled in the program Knowledge Society and Information Transfer at the Department of Information Science at University of Zadar, Croatia.

Research

This exploratory research is investigating what museum curators think about description processes and practices while conducting everyday management on museum collections for which they are responsible. The research title is Conceptualization of archival materials held in museums. The results will be discussed in my doctoral thesis. Data will be gathered through a series of interviews with museum curators that will be conducted between February and November 2014.²⁷³

Anticipated risks and discomfort while participating in this research are minimal, but one could feel professional discomfort while reflecting on professional practice.

The benefits for archival and museum descriptive practice are several. First, heightened interdisciplinary understanding of opinions regarding descriptive practice benefits both the archival and the museum community. Second, increased awareness of how descriptive standards are viewed and implemented in practice could help in bridging differences between them on the conceptual level and also in standards design. Third, research on descriptive practices of archival material in non-archival institution could help to test the research design itself.

Your participation

Your participation in this research is voluntary and without any fee. Your participation is manifested in the form of a series of in-depth interviews, each lasting about 1 hour. There are 5 sessions anticipated. You will be asked to answer questions and give opinions on topic such as: the identification of archival material, descriptive practice in daily work routine, user

²⁷³The study was approved to 2016.

access to material held in collections, and digitization. Beside interviews I will ask you to produce basic catalogue record of 4 digitized museum items. The purpose of this exercise is not accuracy of description but reflection on elements of description.

Data on your identity will be protected through a code known only to the investigator and will not be mentioned in any part of research.

Your answers will be recorded by digital recording device only for the purpose of more accurate data processing.

You are not obliged to answer to any question that might make you feel uncomfortable and you may end your participation in this research at any time without any consequences to you. In this case all evidences regarding your prior participation will be destroyed.

If you wish to have transcripts of these interviews please provide the investigator with an e-mail address and a transcript will be send to you.

If you will have any question during the research or at any time after the research please contact the investigator: Tamara Štefanac, tamara.stefanac@gmail.com, gsm: +38591 2513 374

You may also wish to contact the supervisor: Professor Anne Gilliland, Gilliland@gseis.ucla.edu

If you have questions about your rights while taking part in this study, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers about the study, please call the OHRPP at (310) 825-7122 or write to: UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program, 11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694.

By signing this form I agree to participate in the research study Conceptualization of archival materials held in museums under the abovementioned terms.

(signature)

(date)

Informirani pristanak (Croatian)

Mentor

Prof.dr.sc.Ann Gilliland, University of California, Los Angeles

Istraživač

Glavni i jedini istraživač na ovom projektu je Tamara Štefanac, studentica poslijediplomskog studija „Društvo znanja i prijenos informacija“, Odjel za informacijske znanosti, Sveučilište u Zadru.

Istraživanje

Ova istraživačka studija jest ispitivanje mišljenja kustosa o procesima opisa i njihovoj praksi u svakodnevnom upravljanju muzejskim zbirkama za koje su odgovorni. Naslov istraživanja jest „Konceptualizacija arhivskog gradiva u muzejima“. Rezultati će se razmatrati u mojoj doktorskoj disertaciji. Podaci će se sakupljati u nizu intervjua sa muzejskim kustosima u periodu od veljače do studenog 2014.

Očekivani rizik i nelagoda pri sudjelovanju u ovom istraživanju su minimalni, ali pojedinac može osjetiti nelagodu raspravljajući o stručnoj praksi.

Koristi istraživanja za arhivsku i muzejsku praksu opisa je nekoliko. Prvo, naglašena interdisciplinarnost u razumijevanju mišljenja o opisu građe koristi arhivskoj i muzejskoj zajednici. Drugo, povećana svijest o načinu na koji su standardi opisa razmatrani i implementirani u praksi može pomoći u premošćivanju međusobnih razlika na konceptualnoj razini ali i u standardima. Treće, istraživanje o opisnim praksama arhivskog gradiva u ne-arhivskoj ustanovi može pomoći u ispitivanju samog plana i metodologije istraživanja.

Vaše sudjelovanje

Vaše sudjelovanje u ovom istraživanju je dobrovoljno i bez naknade. Vaše sudjelovanje očituje se u nizu dubinskih intervjua. Svaki intervju trajati će do jednog sata. Predviđeno je održavanje ukupno 5 intervjua. Od Vas će se tražiti da odgovorite na pitanja i izrazite mišljenje o temama kao što su: identifikacija arhivskog gradiva, prakse opisa u svakodnevnom radu, pristup korisnika gradivu iz zbirki, digitalizacija. Osim intervjua zamolit ću Vas da napišete osnovni kataloški zapis prema ukupno 4 digitalne kopije muzejskih predmeta. Svrha ove vježbe nije točnost opisa nego razmišljanje o elementima opisa.

Podaci o Vašem identitetu biti će zaštićeni metodom kodova poznatih samo istraživaču te neće biti spomenuti niti u jednom dijelu istraživanja. Vaši odgovori bit će digitalno snimljeni samo u svrhu točnije obrade podataka.

Niste dužni odgovoriti na bilo koje pitanje koje bi Vam moglo prouzročiti nelagodu. Sudjelovanje u istraživanju možete okončati u bilo kojem trenutku i bez ikakvih posljedica. U tom slučaju svi dokazi Vašeg sudjelovanja bit će uništeni.

Ukoliko želite prijepise intervjua molim ostavite Vašu adresu e-pošte istraživaču i prijepisi će Vam biti poslani.

Ukoliko imate pitanja u vrijeme istraživanja ili nakon istraživanja molim obratite se istraživaču: Tamara Štefanac, tamara.stefanac@gmail.com, mob.: +38591 2513 374

Možete se obratiti i mentoru: prof.dr.sc. Anne Gilliland, Gilliland@gseis.ucla.edu

Potpisujući ovaj obrazac pristajem na sudjelovanje u istraživanju „Konceptualizacija arhivskog gradiva u muzejima“ prema navedenim uvjetima.

Ukoliko imate pitanja u vezi osobnih prava za vrijeme sudjelovanja u ovom istraživanju, ili imate pitanja I prijedloga te želite razgovarati s drugim osim istraživača molim nazovite OHRPP na broj(310) 825-7122 ili pišite na: UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program, 11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694.

(potpis)

(datum)

Appendix C

Questions and topics of discussion – in-depth interview protocol

Each subject will participate in a series of open-ended interview sessions. These sessions will be adjusted according to the schedule and institutional contexts of individual subjects.

Sessions will be adjusted to each subject individual.

General frame of topics to be addressed within sessions and basic questions:

Session 1.

1. Education and professional training?
2. Duration of employment in museum and responsibilities?
3. Prior employment?
4. Museum collections for which is responsible, conversation about variety of items, individual examples
5. Professional interests? Preferred aspects of museum work?
6. Opening of topics: how does description relate to exhibition, user searches, description of knowledge or description of item

At the end of the session 4 digital copies of museum material will be given to the subject.

The subject will be asked to describe, as she/he would describe in his/her daily work routine, the following items: a photograph that depicts the construction of a bridge, a plan – section of front of public building, a Commission report on the conclusions of Parliament and a topographic map.

The subject will be asked to produce these descriptions in written form and to add to description some other categories that he/she finds important.

Session 2.

1. Discussion about descriptions that he/she made after the previous session
2. Discussion about what description means, why is it needed and for whom it is made
3. Discussion of how the curator defines key words when describing the item

3 digital copies of famous and known museum and archive materials will be left with subject to reflect upon. Discussion of these reflection will be held in oral form on next session.

Session 3.

1. Discussion about famous museum and archive material, their origin, possible usage history, values they represent
2. Discussion about catalogue records of abovementioned material
3. Discussion about usage of museum material
4. Discussion about exhibitions of museum material and exhibition records
5. Discussion about availability of curators' documentation

Session 4.

Content and form analysis of curatorial documentation

1. What are the differences between an item's description and the curator's documentation that was made during research on item?
2. How many times did the curator return to the catalogue record and add in new information?
3. Present and future usage of curator's documentation?
4. Information and documentation flow within institution?
5. Information and documentation flow from institution to users not related to the institution?

Session 5.

1. Is any part of the collection under the curator's responsibility digitized?
2. If so, then who has done the digitization (the curator, an inside or outside agency)? Where are digital copies saved and in what formats? Are digitized copies managed separately or in connection with the physical object, as part of its documentation?

What are the plans for migrations and possible conversion?

Is the digitized copy only a visual representation of the original museum object or does it have its own information value?

3. To what extent does the digital replace the physical object? To what extent are digitized materials effective to include in exhibition?
4. Opinions on how information about digital copies of objects from his/her museum collection might correspond with information about digital copies of objects from some other similar institutions if they were connected virtually?

Appendix D

Karlstadt-Fürmaner Bahn.



Schloss Svečalj.

Svečalj vár.

Grand Zvečový.

Appendix E

Karlstadt-Fümaner Bahn.




Kulpa-Brücke.

Most na Kupa.

Kulpa; híd.


Appendix F



Appendix G



Appendix H



Appendix I

[Türkçe](#)

[MAIN PAGE](#) [MUSEUM](#) [COLLECTIONS](#) [EXHIBITIONS](#) [EXCAVATIONS](#) [SUPPORT](#) [VISITOR INFO](#)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM

ANCIENT ORIENT MUSEUM

TILED KIOSK MUSEUM

ANCIENT ORIENT MUSEUM ARTIFACTS



DEVOTIONAL STATUETTES
The statuettes sitting on patios are cubic human figures...

* Ancient Orient Museum - Gallery 1



THE OLDEST LOVE POEM
This inscription, dating from the 8th century BC and...


* Ancient Orient Museum - Gallery 5



CODE OF HAMMURABI
Hammurabi was the sixth one of the 11 kings of the Old...

* Ancient Orient Museum - Gallery 5

[Click to sign up...](#)



TREATY OF KADESH

The Treaty of Kadesh, the earliest peace treaty known, was concluded between the two big political and military powers of the 13th century BC, the Hittite and Egyptian empires. The clay tablet containing the text of this treaty sealed by Hattusili III, the king of the Hittite empire and the Egyptian Pharaoh Ramesses II was found during excavations at Bogazkoy in 1906.

Before the emergence of this artifact, only the text of this treaty carved on a stele in the Egyptian Temple of Karnak in Egyptian hieroglyphs was known. In the inscription, it is stated that Hattusili III had made the text of the treaty carved on a silver plate and sent to Egypt; but this version could not be found yet. The tablet in Akkadian, then the language of diplomacy, had many missing pieces and contained only about half of the text. During later excavations, four pieces belonging to the main text were found and the missing parts were completed. The text of the treaty sealed under equal conditions reads:

"It is concluded that Reamasesa-Mai-amana (the cuneiform transcription of Ramesses II), the Great King, the king (of the land of Egypt) with Hattusili, the Great King, the king of the land of Hatti, his her, for the land of Egypt and the land of Hatti, in order to establish a good peace and a good fraternity forever among them." I ir, information about the ancestors of the two kings and their efforts aimed at achieving peace are described repeatedly, before # rticles of the treaty. Those articles may be listed as follows:

"If domestic or foreign enemies marches against one of these two cc ries and if they ask help from each other, both parties will send their troops and chariots in order to help. If a nobleman flees from Hatti and seeks refuge in Egypt, the king of Egypt will catch him and send back to his country.

If people flee from Egypt to Hatti or from Hatti to Egypt, those will be sent back. However, they will not be punished severely, they will not shed tears and their wives and children will not be punished in revenge."

Since it is the first written peace treaty in the history, a 2-meter long copper copy of the original tablet was hung on a wall of the United Nations building.

SITEMAP

MUSEUM	COLLECTIONS	EXHIBITIONS	EXCAVATIONS	SUPPORT	VISITOR	LINKS
ABOUT THE	ARCHAEOLOGICAL	EXHIBITIONS	MUSEUM	SPONSORS	INFORMATIONS	www.goturkey.com

Appendix J (page 1)

30.05.2015.

British Museum - architectural drawing

Website survey

We want to improve the British Museum website. Please help us by giving your feedback through our survey. You can complete the survey once you have finished using the website. It will take a couple of minutes and all responses are anonymous.

[Start survey](#)
[Close](#)

The British
Museum

[Research](#)
[Collection](#)

Collection online

Free text search _____
Simple search _____
Search collection Michelangelo
Images only _____
 Images only _____

[Advanced search options](#)
[How to use this search](#)



Searching...

architectural drawing

Object type

· [architectural drawing](#) [?]

Museum number

1946.0713.33.a

Description

A ground plan of a chapel Black chalk

Producer name

· [Drawn by: Michelangelo](#) [?]

School/style

· [Roman](#)
· [Florentine](#)

Date

· [1490-1564](#)

Materials

· [paper](#)

Technique

· [drawn](#) [?]

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=716016&partId=1&searchText=Michelangelo&images=t... 1/3

Appendix J (page 2.)

30.05.2015.

British Museum - architectural drawing

Dimensions

- Height: 242 millimetres
- Width: 211 millimetres

Curator's comments

Lit.: A.E. Popham, 'Catalogue of Drawings in the Collection formed by Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., F.R.S., now in the possession of his Grandson, T. Fitzroy Phillipps Fenwick of Thirlestaine House, Cheltenham', London, 1935, pp. 64-5, no. 1

Bibliography

- Wilde 84 [?]
- Phillipps-Fenwick p.64(1) [?]

Location

Italian Roy XVIc

Exhibition history

1964, BM, Michelangelo, no.85 1975 Feb-Apr, BM, Drawings by Michelangelo, no.173 1995 May-June, Ferens Gallery, Hull, 'Drawing the Line', no.135

Subjects

- church [?]

Acquisition name

- Donated by: The Art Fund (as NACF) [?]
- Previous owner/ex-collection: Samuel Woodburn (Christie's, 4.vi.1860/part of lot 149 as Michelangelo 'ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS, WITH INSCRIPTIONS -) [?]
- Previous owner/ex-collection: Sir Thomas Phillipps [?]
- Previous owner/ex-collection: Sir Thomas Lawrence [?]
- Previous owner/ex-collection: Thomas Fitzroy Fenwick [?]

Acquisition date

1946

Department

Prints & Drawings

Registration number

1946.0713.33.a

Feedback

If you've noticed a mistake or have any further information about this object, please email: collectiondatabase@britishmuseum.org.

[View open data for this object with SPARQL endpoint](#)

Object reference number: PDO8279

[Support the Museum.](#)

[Donate online](#)

The Museum makes its collection database available to be used by scholars around the world. Donations will help support curatorial, documentation and digitisation projects.

[Donate now.](#)

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=716016&partId=1&searchText=Michelangelo&images=L... 2/3

Appendix J (page 3.)

30.05.2015.

British Museum - architectural drawing

British Museum collection data is also available in the W3C open data standard, RDF, allowing it to join and relate to a growing body of linked data published by organisations around the world.

[View this object](#)


Newsletter sign up

Enter email

Follow the British Museum

© Trustees of the British Museum

Appendix Ja



Appendix K

09.06.2015.

Jüdisches Museum Berlin - Red Cross letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer

- [Home](#)
- [Collection](#)
- [Red Cross letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer](#)

Red Cross letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer



"Don't ever give up hope, stay healthy," Marianne Simion wrote to her mother Emma Warschauer in April 1942. Marianne had fled from Berlin to England in 1939 and was able to reestablish contact with her mother and send her Red Cross letters.

The International Red Cross began setting up a message service in 1936. Red Cross letters enabled emigrants to stay in touch with relatives in Germany and with deportees, even if they could not use the regular mail service.

Family members were allowed to write each other a maximum of twenty-five words on a standard form, but it often took several months for the messages to reach their recipients. Fearing censorship, the letter writers used harmless-sounding phrases to relate bad news. For example, the deportation of a relative was often described as a "trip" or "emigration."

When Marianne received no word from her mother for several months, she sent another message to her mother's address in August 1942. This was answered anonymously: "Unfortunately, your beloved mother emigrated to Theresienstadt in late June."

Mother and daughter stayed in contact through Red Cross letters until April 1943. In January 1944, Emma Warschauer perished in Theresienstadt.

Object details:
Red Cross letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer
London, April 22, 1942
Paper, pencil, ink, stamp-pad ink
22.7 x 14.6 cm
Gift of Renate Simion

- [Share](#)
- [Home](#)
- [Collection](#)
- [Red Cross letter from Marianne Simion to her mother, Emma Warschauer](#)

Stay in touch


- [Newsletter](#)
- [Facebook](#)
- [Google+](#)
- [Instagram](#)
- [Twitter @jmb Berlin](#)
- [YouTube](#)

Appendix L

SUK14046



Item copyright: Copyright expired - public domain

 This item is in the Public Domain

ID number	SUK14046
Collection type	Photograph
Object type	Black & white
Physical description	Black & white
Description	Lussin Island, Yugoslavia. 1945-01-11. Smoke rising from targets after an air attack at Senj by South African Air Force rocket-firing Beaufighter aircraft of the Balkan Air Force.

