

DEVELOPMENTS IN METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

ANNE J. GILLILAND

Department of Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

Archival theory, methodology, and practice together constitute Archival Science, a professional field that is based around several core concepts, including the Record, Recordkeeping, the Archive, Archives, Memory, Evidence, and Accountability. Archival Studies is a broader construct that refers to the rapidly growing multi- and transdisciplinary body of professional and disciplinary scholarship addressing these concepts, related concepts, and other aspects that pertain in some way to the construction, representations, roles, practices, technologies and metaphors of archives and the Archive in society. This paper provides an overview of some of the research frameworks, methods and study designs that have been or that might be employed to identify, explain and examine these concepts and other phenomena within the increasingly complex world of Archival Science and Archival Studies more broadly.

KEYWORDS

analytical frameworks, archival studies, research design, research methods

Introduction

Nineteenth century British author and politician, Edward Bulwer-Lytton once remarked that “Art and science have their meeting point in method.” In other words, these fields, and indeed all areas of scholarship have questions they wish to examine, and their own methodological and practical approaches they tend to draw upon; and the need for appropriate methodologies, is universal, regardless of disciplinary or professional differences in emphases and approaches. In the twentieth century, however, as education, research and practice became more specialized, professionalized, and theorized, different areas of research inquiry often became very separate and distinct. By the latter half of the twentieth century, it was becoming apparent that research questions

or needs often touch upon the interests of more than one disciplinary area, or sometimes they are just too multi-faceted to be fully addressed using only one out of the panoply of analytical, speculative, critical or empirical methods employed by scholars across the humanities, social sciences, sciences and technology. In such cases, researchers, either solo or in collaboration with others, began to apply multi-method research designs that went beyond mixing quantitative and qualitative methods native to their own fields, to drawing upon methods and incorporating additional researchers from very different fields - a process that can be both illuminating and challenging.

This is the context within which research in Archival Science is situated in the twenty-first century. There is a growing realization that research and collaboration are necessities if the field is to progress in a healthy and informed way into the future. The archival profession has been struggling to understand and cope with the impact of increasing complexity, uncertainty and technologically-driven change in all facets of its activities and practices, underscoring the need for new knowledge about the application of digital technology by both the creators of archival materials and by archivists themselves. At the same time, those very activities and practices and underlying archival ideas, as well as the critical notion of the Archive in a societal and human sense have come under intense scrutiny by scholars in the humanities and social sciences stirring a desire among archivists and scholars of archival science to respond to and interface with disciplinary, trans-disciplinary, and other professions' studies of topics relevant to archival ideas, roles and interests.

In 2004, Gilliland and McKemmish identified several factors that have contributed to the burgeoning research impetus in the archival field:

“growth in doctoral education, forums for presenting and publishing research, the numbers and size of graduate archival education programs, availability of diverse funding for research, transdisciplinary and international research collaborations, and application of innovative research methods and tools appropriate for investigating increasingly complex and wide-ranging research questions.”¹

1 Gilliland, Anne J.; Sue McKemmish. Building an infrastructure for archival research. // *Archival science* 3-4(2004), 149.

Indeed, rapidly growing numbers of academics in Archival Science, working over the past two decades in partnership with as well as independently of practitioners, have been building an exciting new corpus of research that seeks to address these concerns, and to develop the kinds of knowledge needed to arrive at more nuanced definitions of central archival concepts and further explicate the world of archives and recordkeeping. Thinking about historical and contemporary records, recordkeeping, and archives has expanded and become significantly more sophisticated over the past two decades archives have found themselves in the center of intellectual, social, and technological, as well as historical and cultural discourses and developments. What has resulted is an intensified focus on research, not just by historians, philologists, lawyers and literary, liturgical and music scholars, but also by anthropologists and scholars in cultural, ethnic, gender and other transdisciplinary studies areas. The outcome is a cornucopia of interests, theories, systems and needs, all needing to be examined, analyzed and tested; and an abundance of ideas about the optimal methodological approaches to do so.

Such abundance, however, also necessitates close contemplation of and innovation in the intellectual and analytical frameworks and methods to be applied. This paper will first define and discuss several concepts that are central to the theory and practices of the professional field of Archival Science and as such have been major objects of study: Record, Recordkeeping, the Archive, Archives, Memory, Evidence, and Accountability. It will then identify and illustrate how different methodologies and research designs can be employed within Archival Science and Archival Studies more broadly, especially in order to investigate research questions that invoke these concepts.

Defining central concepts

What distinguishes Archival Science from other information and evidence-based professional fields is its role as the profession of the record. In the narrowest sense, the *record* is what is generated as a by-product or as documentation of bureaucratic activity. By creating reliable and usable records through systematic *recordkeeping* regimes, transparency is assured and administrations can be held *accountable* for their actions. By identifying records that have long-term legal, fiscal, administrative and research value, and preserving and disseminating them under trustworthy circumstances, be those traditional or digital, archives

ensure the continuing accountability of the creators, and also that important *evidence* of decision-making, policies and programs endures. In the more expansive sense that is increasingly employed by diverse socio-cultural and scholarly communities, the *record* could be any trace that is left behind by any human activity, not just by bureaucratic activities. This would include, for example, many kinds of manuscripts, personal papers, music scores, photographs and moving image materials, oral histories and even artifacts that are often found in library special collections as well as in archives. It would also include born-digital primary source materials such as electronic mail, social media, blogs and mashups. In order to ensure that that evidence is trustworthy, *archives*, the repositories that hold accumulations of inactive but still valuable records, place a premium in all their activities (especially preservation, description, and user access) on ensuring the continued physical and intellectual integrity of those records.

Historically, archives were concerned with textual records, but since the early twentieth century they have inevitably had to incorporate documentation that has been created in other forms, including oral traditions and objects of material culture. However, challenges today include determining where the purview of the archive might end; where that of some other field that also deals with forms of evidence, for example, museology, anthropology, archaeology, or data curation might begin; or even, what it might mean if such distinctions between fields, or between phenomena, were not so sharply drawn.

The modern Archival Science paradigm, which emerged in eighteenth and nineteenth century Western Europe, “studies the characteristics of records in their social and cultural contexts and how they are created, used, selected and transferred through time”² It is based around historical, legal and professional practice-based concerns, principles and techniques, and is especially concerned today with the implications of pervasive digitality for records and archives. From the eighteenth century onwards, modern archivists, often trained to be scholars in ancillary fields rather than specifically to be archival practitioners, predominantly applied historiographical, philological, and bibliographic methods to the study of archival content. And indeed, in that sense, archival work was very scholarly work, influenced by the En-

2 Ketelaar, Eric. Time future contained in time past : archival science in the 21st century. // Journal of the Japan Society for Archival Science 1(2004), 20-35.

lightenment's emphasis on reason, science, and proof, and the growth of secular humanism. At the same time, however, the archival enterprise became a central part of the bureaucratic machinery of emergent nation states, colonial administration and missionary and mercantile expansion, and archivists were also hard at work devising organizational and descriptive practices that supported that machinery as well as the emergent field of professional historical scholarship.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, as more professionally trained archivists who were not necessarily scholars of archival content began to enter the field and the field itself became more standardized and responsive to user demands, there was a growing realization that there needed to be research and assessment of archival practice and emerging phenomena such as those relating to users and usage, preservation needs, and technological implementations. In shifting their objects of study from content to processes, practices and use, archivists, an increasing number of whom had been trained in library and information science programs, applied survey and case study methods imported from the social sciences. Perhaps because of the autonomy and idiosyncracies of individual archives, this research rarely resulted in significant breakthroughs or the development of benchmarks for assessing archival programs and practices, however, since it tended to focus on specific instances and settings with little regard for generalizability or replicability. There were also few instances of a sustained trajectory of inquiry into a particular issue or phenomenon that might result in some substantive knowledge building or awareness of the impact of change over time. Nevertheless, from the 1980s onwards, there has been considerable convergence also between the archives, library and museum fields around issues of preservation, information description and access, and professional ethics, even as each field remains responsible for particular approaches to materials, to knowledge development, and to the communities that created, collected or use those materials and knowledge.

Questioning the traditional archival paradigm

The developments discussed up until this point have both broadened and led to a questioning of the traditional archival paradigm. The communities from which these questions emanate, and the kinds of questions being raised can be loosely grouped as follows:

a) *Archival practitioners*: e.g., What are the conceptual continuities/discontinuities in the field in early modern, modern, and post-modern times, especially given political and intellectual shifts? What are the continuities/discontinuities in professional practices over the same period, especially given technological change? In what ways does the archives' profoundly physical paradigm translate (or fail to translate) into a virtual world? How effective are archival techniques, programs and services? How might those techniques be enhanced to address the impact or potential of new technologies on records creation, management, dissemination and use? What metadata frameworks and practices might be most effective? Who are archival users, what are their needs, and how can their use experiences be made most effective? Are there communities whose needs are not being met by archival programs and services and if so, how might they be better addressed? What kinds of legal and ethical frameworks need to support efficient, effective, and ethical recordkeeping and archival endeavors?

b) *Data and digital curation*: e.g., What are effective and appropriate cyberinfrastructure mechanisms for identifying, validating, describing, preserving, declassifying, and curating digital documentation and data, and can archival ideas and practices help? What role do records and archives play in the conduct of science? How do data and records creators think about and use their data/records? What might be secondary uses for those materials? Which digitally generated research materials should be retained and in what ways might they need to be manipulated in the future? What might be ethical, legal, human rights or technical considerations for repatriating, or digitally repatriating research data to the communities to which it pertains?

c) *Post-modern and post-colonial challenges from scholars in various humanities and social science fields calling for a major reconsideration of the nature and role of the archive and of traditional archival theory and practices*: e.g., How do records and archives support individual, collective and national identity formation and assignment? How are records and archives implicated in dominant power structures? How have they been implicated in colonization, evangelism, warfare, or globalization? What is the nature of the post-colonial or the post-conflict archive? What role have records and archives played or what role might they play in supporting marginalization, exclusion, oppression, empowerment and reconciliation? How can the traditional archival paradigm be pluralized?

d) *Communities historically disenfranchised or disempowered by, or underrepresented in traditional archives and recordkeeping practices:* e.g., What would be the scope and characteristics of a “participatory” or democratized archive? How can small, local or disadvantaged communities preserve their own records? What are the effects of removal of records from those communities? What are the outcomes of physical or digital repatriation of records by or about communities? How might archival description best support or liberate multiple narratives about the creation and nature of records they hold? What might a legal framework supporting co-creator rights in records, e.g., addressing access, intellectual property, preservation and description practices, look like? To what extent might different cultural protocols and regimes for managing archives and records be reconcilable within a single, or overlapping jurisdictions?

When we take into consideration this universe of areas that are preoccupied with questions about archives and their role in society, it becomes clear that many extend well beyond the traditional purview of Archival Science and that there is a need for an extended rubric under which to place these considerations. Archival Studies is the term increasingly favored because it occupies a broad, disciplinarily and methodologically diverse intellectual territory located at various nexuses between:

- *“texts* (regardless of their media and format) that serve to record, document, narrate, educate, and entertain;
- *axiomatic constructs* such as evidence, memory, culture, identity, accountability, trust, ethics, spacetime, enterprise, and power relations;
- *processes* such as testifying, remembering, forgetting, representing, interpreting, investigating, adjudicating, storytelling, and believing;
- *technologies* for communicating, recording, creating, disseminating, retrieving, socializing, monitoring, and controlling; and
- *structures and surrogates* that summarize, represent, and interpret information content, contexts, behaviors, and requirements”³

3 White, Kelvin; Anne Gilliland. Promoting reflexivity and inclusivity in archival education, research and practice. // *Library quarterly* 80, 3(2010), 231-248.

Historically, there was an absence of scholarly forums where those working in these nexuses could come together and present, debate, or publish their work. This situation too is changing. More journals and conferences are interested in these topics both within and external to the field. International and transdisciplinary summer schools for archival doctoral students in Marburg, archives, library and museum doctoral students in Finland, and rare book, manuscripts and archives students in Zadar are all examples of how this need has been identified and is being met. The annual Archival Education and Research Institutes (AERI) in the United States, that bring together international faculty and doctoral students in Archival Studies is another example.

Designing archival research

Archival research today, as already stated, is increasingly collaborative across institutions, fields, and academy/practice, as well as across jurisdictions and national domains. Moreover, it might be argued that because the nature and role of records and archives have been topics of widespread debate and scholarship outside the field, much contemporary research, even when very applied and focused on recordkeeping processes and practices, has a greater sensitivity to societal motivations and implications than might previously have been the case.

Because of the diversity of influences and considerations that swirl around Archival Science today, it would be hard to point to a single method, or epistemological or analytical framework and assert that that is *the* preferred approach for the field today. In fact, based upon data gathered by AERI, it would appear that research archival science employs, repurposes, and adapts positivist or interpretivist and quantitative or qualitative methods from an unusually diverse range of fields. Although new researchers often fall into the trap of wishing to apply the method they know or like best in their research, that is probably not the best way to embark upon research. There are, in fact, many components that go into a successful *research design* and each requires careful contemplation before and during the research endeavor:

a) *The research question(s)*: No matter what the disciplinary background of the researcher, or the method being applied, there should be at least some *a priori* articulation of the question or phenomenon being investigated. There are, of course, degrees of closeness with which this might be specified, ranging from the rigorously stated empirical hypothesis to the ethnographer's initial curiosity about an environment,

behavior or phenomenon. It is important, however, that the kind of question or inquiry in which one is interested drives the selection of the method, rather than *vice versa*. It is also important that research questions are of appropriate scope and “do-ability” for the proposed length and resources available for the research study.

b) *Significance of the research*: There are many reasons for undertaking research in a particular area, including personal curiosity, programmatic exigency, or the identification of an issue of concern by a professional or scholarly body, national or international government funding agency, or corporate or private entity. However, the archival field is still one of low research visibility, and is poorly understood and undervalued in the wider world. It is important, therefore, to be able to state both persuasively and succinctly, the reasons why the research one is undertaking is significant and why others should care.

c) *Epistemological stance and positionality*: Empirical research that applies the scientific method in order to explain and predict phenomena, values objectivity as a hallmark of one’s ability to stand apart from the phenomena being studied, and to promote the replicability, reliability and validity of the research. In the social sciences, however, positivistic stances have become less favored as the use of methods that promote the importance of reflection and intuition when examining the human experience has increased. As a result, the researcher’s epistemological stance (in other words, how one approaches or thinks about knowledge) and sometimes even personal background have become more epistemologically as well as ethically central to many kinds of qualitative research, and should be declared in advance of undertaking the research, and also contemplated as an active factor in that research as it is carried out. For example, since the 1980s, oral historians have been acknowledging that there are two parties in any oral history - the narrator and the interviewer, where the interviewer is the person who shapes the resulting narrative through his or her “motives for doing the project, feelings about the narrator, interviewer’s reaction to the narrator’s testimony, and intrusion of the interviewer’s assumptions and of the interviewer’s self-schema into the interviewing and interpretive processes”;⁴ ethnographers have to declare their positionality, and then continuously reflect upon both how they might

4 Yow, Valerie. ‘Do I like them too much?’ : Effects of the oral history interview on the interviewer and vice-versa. // *The oral history reader* / edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson. London : Routledge, 1998. P. 55.

be changing the environment that they are studying through their presence, as well as how that environment and their observations of it might be affecting or changing them; and action researchers participate directly in collaboration with those in the environment or the community of practice they are studying, with the goal of improving their condition or practices in some way. They continuously have to monitor and declare the balance between their twin motivations - research and action or activism, as well as the participatory nature of their research. In light of recent critiques of the ways in which archives, archival practices and archivists themselves have been integral in shaping historical narratives and the cultural record, it would seem that it is especially important for contemporary archival researchers to be explicit about their backgrounds, perspectives, beliefs and motivations before, during and after the research.

d) *Conceptual framework*: As already stated, there is a wealth of recent research in fields such as cultural, ethnic, gender, media and other interdisciplinary studies, critical theory, literature, anthropology and management that has provided new lenses, conceptualizations, models and frameworks through which a research question might be articulated, modeled or viewed. While not every research undertaking either needs or fits within such a framework, they can be useful in order to provide an explanatory set of ideas, to delineate relevant conceptualizations or establish a vocabulary, to delineate the various dimensions or aspects of the question or problem being tackled, to place the proposed research within a context of prior or similar research, or simply to serve as a "straw man" - a model that can be tested and then either refined or discarded depending upon the outcomes of the research.

e) *Research method(s)*: As already mentioned, the choice of research method or methods will depend upon the nature of the question(s) to be investigated as well as the epistemological stance of the researcher. The method(s) chosen must be capable of yielding the data or insights necessary to answer the question(s) being asked. If one is investigating a complex phenomenon, then it is quite likely that one will need to use multiple methods, each capable of yielding a different kind of data or insight, and then, in one's analysis, to correlate or *triangulate* those data. This can be a messy process, with data of different types and granularities that can be hard to interface or reconcile. However, irreconcilability of certain aspects of different data sources may be a finding in itself, since often the messiness or difficulties in working with all the different data inputs serve as indicators of the complexities of the

situation being studied. The need to apply different methods in different research situations presents us with another practical problem, however, and that is how to ensure competency in the method(s) being applied. This is where collaborative research can be helpful - allowing for the participation of others who might be better versed not only in the application, but also in the underlying epistemological purpose of, as well as the analysis of data generated through, a particular method.

Which methods are best suited to address which kinds of archival questions?

It is possible to discern at least five primary lineages for methods currently being employed in archival research, and within them are a variety of methods that have either adopted, sometimes directly, and sometimes after some adaptation to tailor them to the archival domain. This final section describes salient aspects of those lineages and some of the methods that have been invoked. It also includes some examples of how the methods have been applied either singly, or in combination with other methods, in archival research:⁵

1. *Diplomatic science, modern scientific history, and legal theory* (e.g., contemporary archival diplomatics, Critical Race Theory (CRT), digital forensics): Viewed by many as the inter-related epistemological lineage within which Archival Science is most closely situated, this grouping comprises methods that have a close focus on the actual materials held in archives, in terms of what can be determined from their content, various contexts, and structure. These methods also have the capacity to speculate from surviving partial evidence; identify established record forms, documentary and bureaucratic conventions, and narratives promulgated by records; and establish critical absences and deviations from those conventions.

Examples:

- a) *Diplomatics*: A body of techniques, theories, and principles for analyzing the form, function and genesis of documents originating in eighteenth century Europe, with a particular view to establishing the authenticity (lineage related to legal science, philology and historiography) as well as analyzing changes and continuities

⁵ Descriptions of methods are drawn in part from Gilliland, Anne J.; Sue McKemmish. Building an infrastructure for archival research. Op. cit.

in document forms such as medieval charters, manuscripts, even photographs over time.⁶ *Contemporary archival diplomatics* is an extension of diplomatics developed in recent years to address not only individual documents but also archival accumulations of records, especially those that are digitally born, and how their reliability and authenticity can be ascertained and preserved over time. The most prominent example of this research has been the ongoing series of InterPARES (International research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems) projects,⁷ which focused on the identification of ideal record types and used these as templates to assess actual manifestations in digital systems.⁸

- b) *Critical Race Theory (CRT)*: An approach that emanated in the 1980s out of the American race relations and civil rights context, and with roots not only in history and law (e.g., critical legal studies), but also anthropology, education, sociology, philosophy, and politics, it challenges dominant narratives with counter-narratives, and points out the many “micro-aggressions” that together can cumulate into a bigger picture of racism and oppression. According to Delgado and Stefancic, CRT’s “challenge to racial oppression and the status quo sometimes takes the form of storytelling in which writers analyze the myths, presuppositions and received wisdoms that make up the common culture about race and that invariably render blacks and other minorities one-down. Starting from the premise that a culture constructs its own social reality in ways that promote its own self-interest, these scholars set out to construct a different reality. Our social world, with its rules, practices, and assignments of prestige and power, is not fixed; rather, we construct it with words, stories, and silence.”⁹ Aspects of CRT have been applied by archival researchers to examine the role of records in oppressing specific groups or in promoting dominant narratives, as well as by information studies researchers who have been working to develop a critical theory of information.¹⁰

6 Duranti, Luciana. *Diplomatics : new uses for an old science*. Lanham, MD : Society of American Archivists ; Association of Canadian Archivists ; Scarecrow Press, 1998.

7 International research on Permanent Authentic Records (InterPARES) [cited: 2012-18-01]. Available at: <http://www.interpares.org>

8 MacNeil, Heather. *Contemporary archival diplomatics as a method of inquiry : lessons learned from two research projects*. // *Archival science* 4, 3-4(2004), 199-232.

9 Delgado, Richard; Jean Stefancic. *Critical race theory : the cutting edge*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia : Temple University Press, 1999. P. xvii.

10 Dunbar, Anthony W. *Introducing critical race theory to archival discourse : getting the conversation started*. // *Archival science* 6(2006), 109-129.

2. *Library and information science* (e.g., bibliometrics, surveys, case studies, interviews and focus groups): Archival science adopted many of the methods commonly employed by library and information science, which in turn had adopted them from other social science fields, to examine practice-related phenomena such as use and users. The exception is bibliometrics, a sibling method to sociometrics.

Examples:

- a) *Surveys*: Written or oral surveys are designed to produce systematic, representative qualitative and quantifiable data based on responses provided by individuals within a targeted population to a predetermined set of closed and/or open-ended questions. Archival research applications include identifying archival personality types;¹¹ and studying graduates of a museum studies program.¹²
- b) *Bibliometrics*: “The use of statistical methods in the analysis of a body of literature to reveal the historical development of subject fields and patterns of authorship, publication, and use. Formerly called statistical bibliography”.¹³ This method has been used to examine growth, obsolescence, scattering and influences and influencing in the archival literature relating to particular topics;¹⁴ and to track “invisible college” or social network phenomena among archival practitioners or researchers.¹⁵ In information studies more broadly, it has been extended as webmetrics and applied to examine patterns and linkages on the World Wide Web.

- 11 Craig, Barbara L. Canadian archivists : What types of people are they? // *Archivaria* 50(Fall 2000), 79-92.; Pederson, Ann. Understanding ourselves and others : archives at risk. // *Accountability, vulnerability and credibility : proceedings of the 1999 Conference and Annual General Meeting of the Australian Society of Archivists Inc.*, Brisbane, Queensland, 29-31 July 1999 / edited by Kate Crowley, John McDonald, Shauna Hicks. Canberra : Australian Society of Archivists Inc., 2002. Pp. 61-93.
- 12 Duff, Wendy M.; Joan M. Cherry; Rebecka Sheffield. 'Creating a better understanding of who we are' : A survey of graduates of a museum studies program. // *Museum management and curatorship* 25, 4(2010), 361-381.
- 13 The American Library Association. *Glossary of library and information science*. Chicago : American Library Association, 1983.
- 14 Gilliland-Swetland, Anne J. Archivy and the computer : a citation analysis of north American periodical articles. // *Archival issues* 17, 2 (1992), 95-112; Cox, Richard J. Searching for authority : archivists and electronic records in the New World at the Fin-de-Siecle. // *First Monday* 5, 1(2000).
- 15 Anderson, Kimberly. *Appraisal learning networks : how university archivists learn to appraise through social interaction*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles, CA : University of California, 2011.

3. *Business administration and computer science* (e.g., business process analysis, systems analysis, and metadata modeling): The influence of methods from both of these fields is most notable in research relating to digital systems and interface design and development, electronic recordkeeping, and descriptive standards development.

Examples:

- a) *Recordkeeping and Archival Systems Analysis*: Analysis and evaluation of activities, processes, and functions in complex institutional, human and technological systems. In archival research, these approaches have been used to examine functional, business, and workflow analysis in recordkeeping;¹⁶ building or adapting systems to meet electronic recordkeeping and archival requirements;¹⁷ identifying how records are created and used within recordkeeping systems; and in macroappraisal.¹⁸
- b) *Model Building*: Use of formal activity, entity-relationship, concept, role and data modeling techniques in iterative, exploratory processes, enabling precise description and structuring of functions, processes, information flows, concepts, etc. of records, archives and metadata in their societal, business and documentary contexts. In archival research this has been used to analyze recordkeeping and archival practices and workflow;¹⁹ metadata schema analysis such as that undertaken in the development of MADRAS;²⁰ and developing conceptual/theoretical models such

16 National Archives of Australia. Designing and implementing recordkeeping systems (DIRKS) manual [cited: 2012-18-01]. Available at: <http://www.naa.gov.au/records-management/publications/dirks-manual.aspx>; Bantin, Philip C.; Gerald Bernbom. The Indiana University Electronic Records Project : analyzing functions, identifying transactions, and evaluating recordkeeping systems : a report on methodology. // Archives and museum informatics : cultural informatics quarterly 10(1996), 246-266.

17 International research on Permanent Authentic Records (InterPARES). Op. cit.

18 Cook, Terry. Appraisal methodology : macro-appraisal and functional analysis. Part B: Guidelines for performing an archival appraisal on government records (2001) [cited 2012-18-01]. Available at: <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/government/disposition/007007-1041-e.html>; Cook, Terry. Macro-appraisal and functional analysis : documenting governance rather than government. // Journal of the Society of Archivists (UK) 25, 1(2004), 5-18.

19 International research on Permanent Authentic Records (InterPARES). Op. cit.

20 Gilliland, Anne J.; Nadav Rouche; Joanne Evans; Lori Lindberg. Towards a twenty-first century metadata infrastructure supporting the creation, preservation and use of trustworthy records : developing the InterPARES2 Metadata Schema Registry. // Archival science 5, 1(2005), 43-78.

as the records continuum model,²¹ and the development of the Recordkeeping Metadata Schema.²²

- c) *Systems Design and Development Prototyping*: “a developmental and engineering type of research ... development is always associated with exploration, advanced application and operationalization of theory.” In archival research, as well as in information studies more broadly, these approaches have been used in the development of prototypes, demonstration, or working versions of systems either as proof of concept or as the basis of ongoing research. Prominent recent examples include the metadata broker developed by the Clever Recordkeeping Metadata Project,²³ and MADRAS (metadata registry and analysis system).²⁴

4. *Anthropology and cultural studies* (e.g., ethnography, ethnology, actor-network theory):

Examples:

- a) *Ethnographic Approaches*: These approaches, which also include autoethnography, are characterized by their systematic contextual and reflexive descriptions of individual cultures and practices. The goal is to understand the insider’s (*emic*) view of his/her world and at the same time to exercise reflexivity about one’s own (i.e., the researcher’s) positionality and reactions to what is being observed and experienced. While a rather new methodological approach in archival research, it has been applied by prominent anthropological researchers such as Ann Laura Stoler in their expositions of colonial archival practices and ideas,²⁵ and has found considerable favor as a way to obtain a more in-depth and well-rounded sense of archival activities,

21 Upward, Frank. Structuring the records continuum. Part one: Postcustodial principles and properties. // *Archives and manuscripts* 24, 2(1996), 268-285; Upward, Frank. Structuring the records continuum. Part two: Structuration theory and recordkeeping. // *Archives and manuscripts* 25, 1(1997), 10-35.

22 McKemmish, Sue; Glenda Acland; Nigel Ward; Barbara Reed. Describing records in context in the continuum : the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Schema. // *Archivaria* 48(Fall 1999), 3-43.

23 Evans, Joanne; Sue McKemmish; Karina Bhoday. Create once, use many times : the clever use of recordkeeping metadata for multiple archival purposes. // *Archival science* 5, 1(2005), 17-42.

24 Gilliland, Anne J. [et al.]. Towards a twenty-first century metadata infrastructure supporting the creation, preservation and use of trustworthy records. *Op. cit.*

25 Stoler, Ann Laura. Colonial archives and the arts of governance. // *Archival science* 2(2002), 87-109.

experiences, motivations, and so forth. Three kinds of applications in particular have been named as specific adaptations of ethnographic approaches for the field: *ethnography of record-keeping*, *archival ethnography*, and *ethnography of the archive* and have been applied in in-depth studies of recordkeeping and archival practices, historically and contemporarily in different national, cultural, governance, institutional and personal contexts. Examples include recordkeeping and radiology;²⁶ scientific recordkeeping practices;²⁷ and film preservation decision-making;²⁸ archival reference.²⁹

- b) *Ethnology*: Cross-cultural, comparative study of the everyday beliefs and practices of contemporary or past cultures. In particular, the study of the ways in which people use social interaction to make sense of, or understand their situation and create their own reality. Applications include the study of cultures of documentation, the forms of records and archives, the recordkeeping and archival processes that shape them, the worldviews made manifest in their systems of classification, the power configurations they reflect, and associated memory and evidence paradigms. An example of the use of ethnology is Trace's work examining how recordkeeping ideas and practices and inculcated in young schoolchildren.³⁰

5. *Literature and critical studies* (genre theory, rhetorical and narrative analyses, textual analyses, postmodern and postcolonial analyses):

Example:

- a) *Theory-building*: Systematic building and exposition of new theory, drawing on existing theories, concepts and models; observation; scholarly communication; data derived from other methods; and characterized by reflection, deep thought and a process

26 Yakel, Elizabeth. The social construction of accountability : radiologists and their record-keeping practices. // *The Information Society* 17(2001), 233-245.

27 Shankar, Kalpana. Scientists, records, and the practical politics of infrastructure. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles : University of California, 2002.

28 Gracy, Karen F. The imperative to preserve : competing definitions of value in the world of film preservation. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles : University of California, 2001.

29 Trace, Ciaran B. For love of the game : an ethnographic analysis of archival reference work. // *Archives and manuscripts* 34, 1(2006), 124-143.

30 Trace, Ciaran B. Documenting school life : formal and informal imprints of a fifth-grade classroom. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles : University of California, 2004.

of gestation of ideas.³¹ Theory-building has been used in archival research to reflect upon and augment archival theory and to develop new theories and theoretical models. The pre-eminent example would be Upward's records continuum theory, which was heavily influenced by Giddens' articulation of structuration theory, that recognizes the interplay of both structures and human agency.³²

References

- The American Library Association. *Glossary of library and information science*. Chicago : American Library Association, 1983.
- Anderson, Kimberly. *Appraisal learning networks : how university archivists learn to appraise through social interaction*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles, CA : University of California, 2011.
- Bantin, Philip C.; Gerald Bernbom. *The Indiana University Electronic Records Project : analyzing functions, identifying transactions, and evaluating recordkeeping systems : a report on methodology*. // *Archives and museum informatics : cultural informatics quarterly* 10(1996), 246-266.
- Cook, Terry. *Appraisal methodology : macro-appraisal and functional analysis*. Part B: *Guidelines for performing an archival appraisal on government records* (2001) [cited 2012-18-01]. Available at: <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/government/disposition/007007-1041-e.html>
- Cook, Terry. *Macro-appraisal and functional analysis : documenting governance rather than government*. // *Journal of the Society of Archivists (UK)* 25, 1(2004), 5-18.
- Cox, Richard J. *Searching for authority : archivists and electronic records in the New World at the Fin-de-Siecle*. // *First Monday* 5, 1(2000).
- Craig, Barbara L. *Canadian archivists : What types of people are they?* // *Archivaria* 50(Fall 2000), 79-92.
- Delgado, Richard; Jean Stefancic. *Critical race theory : the cutting edge*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia : Temple University Press, 1999.
- Duff, Wendy M.; Joan M. Cherry; Rebecca Sheffield. 'Creating a better understanding of who we are' : A survey of graduates of a museum studies program. // *Museum management and curatorship* 25, 4(2010), 361-381.
- Dunbar, Anthony W. *Introducing critical race theory to archival discourse : getting the conversation started*. // *Archival science* 6(2006), 109-129.
- Evans, Joanne; Sue McKemmish; Karina Bhoday. *Create once, use many times : the clever use of recordkeeping metadata for multiple archival purposes*. // *Archival science* 5, 1(2005), 17-42.

31 Lynham, Susan A. *The general method of theory building in applied disciplines*. // *Advances in developing human resources* 4, 3(2002), 222-241.; Williamson, Kirsty. *Research methods for students, academics and professionals : information management and systems*. 2nd edition. Wagga : Charles Sturt University, 2002.

32 Upward, F. *Structuring the records continuum*. Part one. Op. cit.; Upward, F. *Structuring the records continuum*. Part two. Op. cit.

- Duranti, Luciana. *Diplomatics : new uses for an old science*. Lanham, MD : Society of American Archivists ; Association of Canadian Archivists ; Scarecrow Press, 1998.
- Gilliland, Anne J.; Sue McKemmish. Building an infrastructure for archival research. // *Archival science* 3-4(2004), 149-199.
- Gilliland, Anne J.; Nadav Rouche; Joanne Evans; Lori Lindberg. Towards a twenty-first century metadata infrastructure supporting the creation, preservation and use of trustworthy records : developing the InterPARES2 Metadata Schema Registry. // *Archival science* 5, 1(2005), 43-78.
- Gilliland-Swetland, Anne J. Archivy and the computer : a citation analysis of north American periodical articles. // *Archival issues* 17, 2(1992), 95-112.
- Gracy, Karen F. *The imperative to preserve : competing definitions of value in the world of film preservation*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles : University of California, 2001.
- International research on Permanent Authentic Records (InterPARES) [cited: 2012-18-01]. Available at: <http://www.interpares.org>
- Ketelaar, Eric. Time future contained in time past : archival science in the 21st century. // *Journal of the Japan Society for Archival Science* 1(2004), 20-35.
- Lynham, Susan A. The general method of theory building in applied disciplines. // *Advances in developing human resources* 4, 3(2002), 222-241.
- MacNeil, Heather. Contemporary archival diplomatics as a method of inquiry : lessons learned from two research projects. // *Archival science* 4, 3-4(2004), 199-232.
- McKemmish, Sue; Glenda Acland; Nigel Ward; Barbara Reed. Describing records in context in the continuum : the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Schema. // *Archivaria* 48(Fall 1999), 3-43.
- National Archives of Australia. *Designing and implementing recordkeeping systems (DIRKS) manual* [cited: 2012-18-01]. Available at: <http://www.naa.gov.au/records-management/publications/dirks-manual.aspx>
- Pederson, Ann. *Understanding ourselves and others : archives at risk*. // *Accountability, vulnerability and credibility : proceedings of the 1999 Conference and Annual General Meeting of the Australian Society of Archivists Inc., Brisbane, Queensland, 29-31 July 1999* / edited by Kate Crowley, John McDonald, Shauna Hicks. Canberra : Australian Society of Archivists, 2002. Pp. 61-93.
- Shankar, Kalpana. *Scientists, records, and the practical politics of infrastructure*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles : University of California, 2002.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. Colonial archives and the arts of governance. // *Archival science* 2(2002), 87-109.
- Trace, Ciaran B. *Documenting school life : formal and informal imprints of a fifth-grade classroom*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles : University of California, 2004.
- Trace, Ciaran B. For love of the game : an ethnographic analysis of archival reference work. // *Archives and manuscripts* 34, 1(2006), 124-143.
- Upward, Frank. Structuring the records continuum. Part one: Postcustodial principles and properties. // *Archives and manuscripts* 24, 2(1996), 268-285.
- Upward, Frank. Structuring the records continuum. Part two: Structuration theory and recordkeeping. // *Archives and manuscripts* 25, 1(1997), 10-35.

- White, Kelvin; Anne Gilliland. Promoting reflexivity and inclusivity in archival education, research and practice. // *Library quarterly* 80, 3(2010), 231-248.
- Williamson, Kirsty. *Research methods for students, academics and professionals : information management and systems*. 2nd edition. Wagga : Charles Sturt University, 2002.
- Yakel, Elizabeth. The social construction of accountability : radiologists and their record-keeping practices. // *The Information Society* 17(2001), 233-245.
- Yow, Valerie. 'Do I like them too much?' : Effects of the oral history interview on the interviewer and vice-versa. // *The oral history reader* / edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson. London : Routledge, 1998. Pp. 54-72.

Biographical Sketch

Dr. Anne J. Gilliland is Professor and Director of the Archival Studies specialization in the Department of Information Studies, and Director of the Center for Information as Evidence, at the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), U.S.A. She is also a faculty member in the UCLA School of Theatre, Film and Television and Graduate School of Education & Information Studies inter-departmental M.A. Program in Moving Image Archive Studies. Her teaching and research interests relate to the design, evaluation and history of recordkeeping, cultural and community information systems, digital curation, metadata creation and management, community-based archiving, and the use of digitized primary sources in K-12 education. A highly published author, she is currently completing a monograph *Telling Stories About Stories: The Archive in a Digital Age*. Professor Gilliland is a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists.

RAZVOJ METODOLOŠKIH PRISTUPA ARHIVSKIM ISTRAŽIVANJIMA

Sažetak

Arhivska teorija, metodologija i praksa zajedno čine Arhivsku znanost, stručno područje koje se temelji na nekoliko ključnih pojmova, uključujući: Zapis, Čuvanje zapisa, Arhiv, Arhivi, Memorija, Dokaz i Odgovornost. Pojam Arhivske studije šira je složenica koja se odnosi na brzorastući multi- i tansdisciplinarni sklop stručnog i disciplinarnog znanja koje se bavi ovim i povezanim pojmovima i drugim aspektima koji se na bilo koji način odnose na izgradnju, prikaze, uloge, prakse, tehnologije i metafore arhiva i Arhiva u društvu. Daje se pregled nekih istraživačkih okvira, dizajna metoda i studija koji su bili korišteni ili bi se mogli koristiti za identifikaciju, objašnjenje i analizu tih pojmova i ostalih fenomena u sve složenijem svijetu Arhivskih znanosti i Arhivskih studija općenito.

Ključne riječi: analitički okviri, arhivske studije, dizajn istraživanja, metode istraživanja