

Serving the Truth: The Importance of Fostering Archives Research in Education Programmes, Including a Modest Proposal for Partnerships With the Workplace¹

by BARBARA L. CRAIG

Introduction: Approaching the Millennium

Calendar changes invite us to take stock of what has passed and speculate about the shape of the future—the combination of nostalgia and hope makes a heady brew. Archivists have drunk liberally of this mixture in approaching the twenty-first century and the era of digital archives, whose official beginning may be conveniently pegged as the year 2001. Certainly since the Association of Canadian Archivists held its first conference devoted to the implications of computers in archives in 1988, several professional gatherings in North America and elsewhere have explored a number of issues raised in a records environment which very soon will be dominated by computer technology.² Whether the imminence of a new century, with its promise of an electronic reality, is seen as an end or a beginning for archives depends largely on an individual's outlook. Nostalgia for the lost security of paper archives is historical wishful thinking! Paper is only a substrate: like all others it has a particular relationship to documents and to communication. Paper is no more or less free from problems than any other support for writing. Strategic planning is a more fruitful way to meet the future and its success depends equally on clear forward thinking and historical understanding. The opportune coincidence of the millennium with a new technology provides both an occasion and the need to consider what archivists need to go forth well-dressed and not naked into a new world.³

While the purposes for keeping records seem likely to remain constant across technologies, as do society's needs for credible archives, written communications—with their ethos of personal and corporate rhetoric—are embedded in these technologies, which must be understood on their own terms and as they relate to

documentary forms and processes. Recent responses to this digital challenge, especially high profile special projects addressing archives-related issues, recognize the importance for archives that comes from changes in technologies when these are matched against society's continuing need for credible documents of past activities.⁴ Among their fruits are welcome recommendations for enhancing the archivist's competency in dealing with records in electronic and virtual forms.⁵ These projects, at least by implication, also raise a larger question: What is the role of research in archives education, now and in the future, and what has it been in the past?

Archivists and Their Education: Past and Future

Almost fifty years ago, at the beginning of the post-war epoch and on the occasion of the inauguration of the first post-graduate archives programme in England, Sir Hilary Jenkinson raised his cup in a toast to the new style of archives education and the new professional it was to produce.⁶ His curriculum of 1947, developed with the needs of the mid-twentieth century in mind, has striking similarities to the knowledge areas which contemporary archivists deem important, differing only in detail from those outlined for the twenty-first.⁷ Current thinking generally agrees with Jenkinson's that education for archives work should be focused rather than random. A menu needs to be planned for taste, nutrition, and cost: blindfold shopping off a supermarket shelf does not guarantee a wholesome meal.

Balancing carefully-weighed parts is accomplished by the process of education itself. By 1947 in England, on-the-job training of post-graduates could not explore the range of knowledge relevant to archivists' professional responsibilities. A special programme of archives subjects was better able to develop competencies by a consistent focus on these areas. Moreover, a particular benefit of this new style of education was the opportunity it provided for cultivating habits of mind that promote continuous learning about everything that is associated with the act of record-keeping.⁸ Reading between the lines of Jenkinson's address we can sense his conviction that a lasting benefit of a special archives education would be the sense of place and perspective built over the course of study, one which would ground archivists in a shifting universe of information sources, needs, and providers. These desirable characteristics of an archival frame of mind should be initially nurtured by educators who set high standards, encourage innovation, and cultivate critical skills in directed study and research.⁹

Archives Education and Research

Setting aside the similarities in content and structure which underline archives curricula developed for quite different milieus, Jenkinson's outline does not touch on some topics that are emphasized in education guidelines today. One of these is research methods.¹⁰ This gap in Jenkinson's address is notable. Research skills are important in archives, for the custodian and the user. In fact, this premise is so integral to the idea of archives that it would seem to be axiomatic. 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. Perhaps Jenkinson assumed that acquiring skills in research was understood. He certainly expected post-graduate students in the new archives diploma course to have experience in document analysis from their undergraduate historical training. It is also conceivable that his concept of archives emphasized the virtues of care before those of research. There is much to recommend this latter view. The English archives tradition emerged from a concern for the continuing survival of evidence from the past. Preservation through care rather than research into either the past or the management of its remains were qualities that the moment required. Archivists who had experienced the destruction of both world wars understandably might have protection uppermost in their minds. Looking beyond the address, Jenkinson's life as a practising archivist demonstrated implicitly the importance he attached to research in addressing archives problems, although he did not speak to research directly as part of a special archives education.¹¹

By contrast to the University College London inaugural, writing on education over the past twenty years or so explicitly deals with research as an integral part of post-graduate education and archival work. Whether this is a change in intention or only in emphasis, there is no question that research is discussed and more widely shared than in the past. Some contributions to the archives literature discuss the subject of research itself, particularly its role in meeting archives needs. These are the most articulate examination we have of research as it fits into archival science and practice. Some writers have discussed the pertinence of research courses in archival education and of their potential for equipping professionals to deal with problems in the workplace.¹² But more popular, at least recently, are research agendas—generally agreed priorities for investigation within a particular area. Agenda building is promoted as the model for tackling archival problems which will guarantee the most useable results. Although these projects and their written products are relatively few in number, they suggest the current potential for research in archives and, particularly in this context, about archives.¹³ Moreover, we must expect that new questions will take the place of those that are satisfied. In other words, the need for research in archives will be fairly constant: even as some topics are completed others will have arisen to take their place.

Research and Its Methods

Before sketching a few of the potential advantages of joining research in the workplace with formal teaching programmes, it is important to define "research." Its common usages embrace activities as simple as looking up information to complex team investigations of phenomena in the biological and physical sciences. When intellectual pursuits which, on the surface, are as dissimilar as collecting information and laboratory experimentation are covered by the same eponymous word, it is important to seek the commonalities which underline these divergent examples. These are largely provided by highly abstracted definitions, such as those in the Oxford English Dictionary: "careful search or inquiry" or "endeavour to discover new and collate old facts by the scientific study of a subject" or "a course of critical investigation." Beginning with these generalities as a base, textbooks of methods elaborate the formal elements and rules of research suited to questions posed by different disciplines as

part of their processes of building knowledge—indeed research is a very broad church including a generally accepted array of qualitative and quantitative methods. Each one uses different types of data to support the internal logic of its argument. Fragmentation of the larger research enterprise and any potential conflicts between modes of reasoning are largely avoided because of the shared values that are agreed in scholarly inquiry—respect for evidence that is reliable, logic in argument, and consistency in formal reporting of results and in drawing conclusions.

From among this rich assortment of methods, special meaning attaches to the empirical model for research. Scientific precedents largely shape the methods developed for applied social scientific research, which dominates the recent literature in librarianship and information sciences.¹⁴ A favoured procedure for investigations is the development of hypotheses which are then tested under controlled conditions. While discussions of research in archives journals, particularly of research problems and the methods best suited to their solution are few, they clearly show the influence of social science research and its methods, which emphasize hypotheses, testing, reproducibility of results, statistics, and quantitative measures of phenomena.¹⁵ There is no question that many research question in archives work—for example, explorations of attitudes, needs for services, or uses of materials—are best handled by empirical research into conditions and facts.

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. Nevertheless, investigations using field techniques, while gaining in importance, are dominated largely by agendas developed to solve current practical problems. Historical methods, while recognized as valuable and pertinent to certain types of research, are neglected on the whole because they are not designed to produce usable results in the workplace. History may be interesting, but few examples exist in the literature which either argue or demonstrate its utility and relevance to contemporary concerns.¹⁶

Research Methods for Archivists

All of these methods—statistical, quantitative, survey, qualitative, and historical—have a place in the skill set of archivists; to exclude one or more would impair greatly the archivist's ability as a professional. For archivists, research is not an academic activity centred only in the academy, but an ethical and practical imperative which derives from the responsibility of preserving records and communicating their meaning over time. The only way these responsibilities can be adequately discharged is by constant refinement of process and approach, developed with the support of careful research. However, there is great latitude for using a variety of methods in archives-based research. The choice should be largely determined by the nature of the problem to be studied and the data that is available. Archivists and archival institutions understandably have real needs for research into professional issues and practical problems in the workplace—user requirements, performance measurements, and comparative studies of appraisal methods are just a few areas that have not been touched in any systematic way. Our institutions are hampered in delivering their best service by not having the useful knowledge that would come from empirical and

applied research. However, archival work in its professional and institutional applications derives real benefit from theoretical clarity in concepts and an understanding of the historical “situatedness” of archives institutions and of documentary relationships. The nature of a problem is only partially grasped if the archivist, in framing the question, neglects its roots. Solutions are equally deficient when explanation does not consider either theory or history.¹⁷ Choices are less rational and are poorly supported when they are made in temporal and contextual vacuums. These realities suggest that research into the history of the archives profession’s ideas about its methods, functions, and purposes might contribute to a broader understanding of records as they were situated in systems, procedure, and society. The domains of archives history, situation, and operation are largely unexplored, poorly reported, and generally untapped for the wealth of information they hold about records practices and record-keeping ideas.

Each type of problem, from the theoretical through the historical to the situational, requires a distinct method. Diverse approaches to a problem are not in conflict because their concerns and modes of reasoning complement each other. Methods of the humanities, for example, empower humanistic exploration of archives topics, most often using historical methods, but also those of philosophy, literary and art criticism, and archaeology. Social science methods, particularly those for investigating the nature and characteristics of use and users, or the relationship of costs to benefits in comparative business processes, to take just two examples, release inductive techniques into the archives field. The former builds a rich texture of ideas and models; the latter accumulates data and analyzes concrete experiences. Finally, beyond the legitimate claims for research to fill practical needs in the workplace, research and its related activities should build healthy connections between practitioners and scholars.¹⁸

Education and Its Partnership With the Workplace

If a representative set of archives and archivists were surveyed for the projects involving a significant component of research that they would like to undertake, the results would show, in all probability, that the needs for research far exceed the available number of trained researchers and funds for their work. The scarcity of archives research and trained investigators could be substantially reduced. My modest proposal has two parts: the first is to diversify the methods employed in archives research beyond those most heavily reported in the literature; the second is to promote both research and a variety of techniques in archives education programmes. The former would increase the tools at our disposal, while the latter will be a spring to refresh the pool of researchers now and in the future. Research activity of all kinds in archives has a better chance of taking root and thriving when the implied nexus between teaching, research, and the workplace is explicit. This union would serve both the short- and long-term interests of the students, the universities, and the archival institutions which, in the long run, will be its lasting beneficiaries.

The virtue of framing and asking questions, and the value of being capable of using many methods for investigating them, are qualities of mind and particular skills that education programmes should cultivate in their graduates. One way to incorporate research into the curriculum seamlessly is by enhancing the links among teaching,

research, and the workplace. The value of a course of study in research methods is greatly enhanced when a programme of research, preferably one combining numerous distinct yet complementary methods, is linked with an archives. For the academic and the student, an archives should be looked upon not only as a possible place for professional employment, but also as the laboratory for research. Archives, as places of custody for “legacy systems,” are sites for archives history and its archaeology. Archives are the repositories of our profession’s history and the operational venue for large parts of our daily activities. They are the crucible in which we should forge, test, and refine our understanding and ideas about archives.

Partnerships with archivists to undertake a programme of research in the workplace will not only benefit the student and the faculty or school, but ultimately will tend to improve archival practices. Applied research is especially important for archives. In the past they have found it difficult to support sustained problem-based research which requires long-term commitments, for example, in developing finding-aids that meet user needs and in developing public programmes that build new audiences. In recognition of the importance of archives to education and to knowledge building, archivists should be involved in research programmes at every stage. Particularly important is their role in identifying the specific needs in their institutions. Archivists would be valuable contributors to “research agendas,” through defining them and participating in their execution. Their perspective should also help focus the process of identifying problems and framing questions of a more general nature. Together, academic archivists—if that term can be used—and practitioners could develop projects whose results will fill gaps in our knowledge, improve our understanding of records phenomena, and help solve real problems. Archives may or may not act upon the information produced through research activities; however, in many cases such projects will provide information no single institution could afford or acquire itself, and may provide direction to professional archivists and managers alike.¹⁹

The very practical result of involving students in research as part of their education is that the experience develops useful skills. A successful research project undertaken in an archives and with the participation of archivists is a stronger incentive for continuing research in the future than is a purely academic study of problem solving. Research cultivates a habit of examining received notions for their continuing pertinence and relevance. In the long run, the choice of research area and method is perhaps not as important as is the active pursuit of the research itself and the formal distribution of its results to the larger archives community. Particular emphasis needs to be placed on the importance of this final stage in the research process. Knowledge accumulates when the findings of research and its new ideas are formally reported. Publication of research undertaken by archivists has never been the profession’s long suit. In fact, much of our group wisdom is isolated in reports, position papers, and manuals of standards in institutions: few are published or accessible to the larger archives community. Student research and its reporting may stimulate the current generation to communicate more; it will certainly ensure that the future generation is familiar with its direct beneficial effects.

Archives Research in Education: Some Suggestions

There are numerous areas to be explored by research which could be usefully incorporated into an archivist's education. A brief review of the literature would turn up many useful ideas for the teacher: these suggestions are, I suspect, but the tip of an iceberg, because the quantity of published research in archives is small.²⁰ This means that, overall, there is a general need to explore broadly and deeply, engaging each type of problem—historical, philosophical, practical, or situational—with an appropriate method and perhaps using two or more methods to support a large investigation. The following suggestions are not a “research agenda,” but a sketch of areas in which formal agendas could be profitably developed. This sampler, based on the general proposition that research into the fundamental context of archives and archival knowledge is the place to start and that senior archives students could and should participate, is intended to be suggestive and not exhaustive. Many of these topics would be best pursued by research in archives, as either the laboratory for collecting data or the repository for pertinent evidence. I have selected three: archives and history, archives and technology, and practical case studies of archival methods, in this case, of appraisal. These are offered not as priorities, but as ideas; nor do I suggest that these areas are mutually exclusive.

Archives and History

History and its methods are certainly not unfamiliar to archivists. Archives students are expected to have at least some undergraduate courses in history to give them a grasp of historiography and the history of ideas.²¹ The rationale for this expectation recognizes that archival work requires a knowledge of the past and an historical sensibility as well as specific skills in the analysis of documents and their information. History impinges on the daily work of every archivist, particularly in appraisal and description. The importance of history is also integral to our conviction that documents have a unique relevance to the actions and events of the past. Historical knowledge and a sensitivity to the historical dimension are agreed to be qualities best guaranteed by an undergraduate education in history. However, the historical education of archivists has not in turn fostered a rich archival history. The published literature of research on the history of our institutions, functions, and principles is very thin. This silence, suggesting inactivity, is a curious state of affairs for professionals who are steeped in the past and would be the first to vote for the importance of history. Simon Schama ironically suggests that archives are dead certainties: nothing could be further from the truth for the historian or, equally, for the archivist.

The practical importance of the history of our concepts, records, and professional work is graphically underlined by the tangible negative effects of their neglect. An example will illustrate this connection. We are not well informed about the history of archives and records, particularly as these are situated in their systems and in society. Our level of comfort with records does not rest on a foundation of broad and deep knowledge of records ideas which are theoretically sophisticated and based on careful abstraction from many situations in the past. These gaps in our historical knowledge of records and their keeping is a handicap when change presents a superficial contrast

to the systems and conventions we know. Its clearest sign is a lack of confidence. Knowledge of archives history would equip us better in responding to change effectively and in a way that illuminates the archival continuum.

If we were to examine further the connection between an education in history and a critical perspective on record-making and -keeping, we might be justified, at least in part, in arguing that an undergraduate history education may have some potential drawbacks which need to be recognized so that they can be dealt with in the archives education programme. Historical training may encourage reliance on its methods, perhaps unconsciously inhibiting the exploration of other intellectual domains and disciplines, whose methods and points of view may contribute useful knowledge about record-keeping and the uses of documents in society. Archival probes into the theories of post-modernism, and into the methods of ethnographers, linguists, and cultural anthropologists to take just a few examples, are rare and isolated from a programme of investigation which might explore the relevance of these different perspectives in deepening our understanding of records cultures.²²

Archives and Technology

The connection between record-making and -keeping, and the technology in which both are conceived, is rarely explored either in depth or from any perspective. However, I suspect that archivists have assumptions about the nature of this connection. If someone were to posit that modern archives, collectively, have little if any importance as objects, except for specimens of new types of materials or forms, unusual or idiosyncratic documents, and the personal communications of special people or groups, largely in holograph, most archivists would probably agree. Thanks to a *furor scribendi*, transformed by the typewriter, copier, and computer into a *furor ex machina*, the deluge of prosaic products produced by large bureaucracies has occupied our attention since at least the early 1950s. Paradoxically, in dealing with this problem, archivists developed a high level of comfort with nineteenth- and early twentieth-century paper-based record-keeping systems and with their documentary conventions. North American archivists generally do not have any knowledge of communications technologies before 1800 and do not understand record-keeping history conceptualized from different perspectives—as social process, as information system, as a legal state, or as artifact. The contrast between corporate records and their personal counterparts, suggesting distinctions in purpose and meaning, contributes in large part to the sense that few documents of a public nature are unique and that information is routinely duplicated. Where modern records are concerned, a professional interest in the object, its form, place, relationships, and procedural context, once necessary and pressing requirements in everyday work, is vestigial. Archivists may either overlook or discount the information which is an integral part of the record as object, particularly in those genres of documents that are commonplace. Our concentration on content has not been paralleled by attention to an equally important task, that of mapping the relationships of records to the technology they manifest, to their procedural relationships, and to the culture of record-keeping in which they arise. By neglecting the objective dimension of single documents and their collection in series and archives, our concept of “the context” for them is restricted rather than

embracing. The very objective reality of records is a distinctive aspect of their character and should be one effective rudder for navigating archives safely in a fast flowing river of information.

The application of technology to record-making that is taking place today is not only profound but many believe that it is unprecedented in its impact, effects, and meaning in society. These beliefs may prove to be true; however, their assumptions need to be explored by research into the history of record technologies, the impact of technology on the needs of users, and the appropriateness of our practices to maintaining the “archivalness” of records. Such research does not open up fissures in professional concepts and ideas. Rather, it should strengthen our ability as a profession to respond to change and may even encourage us to initiate it. Historical research, for example, will uncover the role of technology in record-making and -keeping and the dynamics it engenders in organizations. In this context there would seem to be ample room for ethnographic and sociological studies. Together with historical investigations, these should establish the documentary and provenancial relationships within systems by helping us to understand how creators interact with information technology. This knowledge will also help us use technology intelligently as an integral part of archival practices and in providing service to our various users. There is certainly ample room for research into technology from both historical and functional perspectives.

Appraisal Case Studies

Appraisal of material to determine which should be selected for continuing preservation is considered by many to be the first responsibility of the archivist.²³ In our psyche, appraisal rivals preservation in importance, certainly since Schellenberg declared it to be the heart of archival life and Gerry Ham confirmed that diagnosis.²⁴ The assumption that appraisal is our most important responsibility is commonly accepted and virtually never questioned. Only a few have examined appraisal historically with a view to clarifying its role in archives making or “shaping,” and fixing its place among many other archives responsibilities.²⁵ In this same vein, we do not have an extensive literature reporting case studies of appraisal to the professional community at large. This communication gap supports notions of uniqueness in purpose, method, and practice, and is a barrier to the development or even discussion of standards for appraisal in particular, but also in archives work generally. This situation would seem to be in direct contradiction to the assumed importance of appraisal in archival work. In the end, the function many archivists consider to be their most important has neither a thoroughly analyzed history, nor an extensive and widely discussed body of reported case experiences.

The social and professional importance of appraisal would seem to require that its relationship to archival theory and methods, its history, and its actual performance all should be the objects of continuing investigation and research using a variety of methods as appropriate to the inquiry. For example, data generated by appraisal work could be collected to test a number of differing hypotheses using survey frameworks,

ethnographic techniques, and other qualitative methods. The recent upsurge in discussions of appraisal methods, couched largely as abstract models, suggests that the reality of records and documentary relationships is now considered to be subsidiary to our ideas about what should be documented. Appraisal for the twenty-first century may focus on the subjects for documentation rather than on the structures of records and their bond with creators through purpose and procedure. New strategic models suggest that both the Jenkinsonian and Schellenbergian concepts of records, the one holistic, the other based on distinct and exclusive concepts of evidence and information, may be overtaken by other considerations largely grounded in a method to capture context as opposed to records. Research is needed to test the usability of these concepts in appropriate procedural regimes and record-keeping environments.²⁶

Research in the Professional Ideal

In 1947 Jenkinson asked, “why all this fuss about archives?”²⁷ We might also very well voice the same question because there is still a need to demonstrate the importance of archives to the support of a stable and healthy society. In answering his question Jenkinson offered archives as a form of Truth which the archivist was responsible for keeping. The nature of documents and their relationships is a reality sufficient to justify their formal study. He chose to illustrate the connection between archives and truth by contrasting the creation of archives with that of propaganda, something with which the war-time generation was familiar. In fact, Jenkinson defined propaganda as the active selection, preservation, and misrepresentation of facts, terms chosen deliberately for their archival resonance. His peroration has the melodrama of the rhetorical flourish. Nonetheless, the stark simplicity of his moral equation established an imperative for archivists. Whether we manage objects or behaviours, the preservation of the inherent truth of archives is a professional ideal which is as relevant for the twenty-first century as it was for the mid-twentieth. It is not inconsistent with that ideal to make explicit the role of research in its accomplishment.

A productive rather than an immobilizing or destructive tension between theory and the manifestations of records in reality will be nurtured by many types of research. The methods for pursuing them are, I believe, best elaborated in archives education programmes which can strengthen their relevance to archives and records problems. The prospects for archives in the twenty-first century are, I think, tied to the success of education for professional work which, in the future, will not be measured by student assessments, numbers of graduates, or necessarily by the rate of success in finding full-time employment. The indicator of success is the quality of the archives services we provide to society. Research will promote our understanding of all the dimensions inherent in keeping and communicating public faith in documents and enhance our abilities to meet new needs. Indicators of success beyond the classroom should include flourishing partnerships with archives in developing research agendas, participation of students and practitioners in that work using a variety of methods in appropriate settings, and a growing body of literature reporting our history, case studies, and experiences. Energetic and reported research should be stimulated by and will certainly contribute to our professional ideal, to preserve the nature of the record in documentary relationships and to communicate this truth.

Notes

- 1 Revision of a paper delivered for the session "The Body in Question: What Will the Archivist Need to Know in the Twenty-first Century?" at the Association of Canadian Archivist Conference in Regina, June 1995.
- 2 One indication of the interest in the subject of archives and computer technology are the publications which have been produced as a result of conferences. For examples see, Stephen Yorke, ed., *Playing for Keeps: The Proceedings of an Electronic Records Management Conference Hosted by the Australian Archives, Canberra, Australia, 8-10 November 1994*; Donald Harrison Fisher, ed., *Automation in Offices and Archives*, Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, 1993; and Elizabeth Shepherd, ed., *A Window to the Future: Papers for a Conference on Managing Electronic Information Held Between 20-24 June 1994 by the School of Library, Archives and Information Studies, University College London, as part of the School's 75th Anniversary*. Several papers presented at the Twelfth International Council of Archives Conference in Montreal in 1992 addressed the implications of information technology on archives, records-keeping, and the profession. These papers are published in *Archivum* 39. In the same vein see Terry Cook, "Electronic Records, Paper Minds: The Revolution in Information Management and Archives in the Post-custodial, Post-modern Era," *Archives & Manuscripts* 22, no. 2 (November 1994), pp. 300-329 and Richard J. Cox, "Archives and Archivists in the Twenty-first Century: What Will we Become?" *Archival Issues* 20, no. 2 (1995), pp. 97-113.
- 3 Re-engineering of archival functions and processes has been undertaken in some archives in Canada; I am unsure of the number involved and the extent of the impact of these exercises. Richard Cox thinks the process is important for archives. See Richard J. Cox, "Archives and Archivists."
- 4 Two significant research projects directed entirely to electronic records are the National Historic Publications and Records Commission grant 93-030, "Variables in the Satisfaction of Archival Requirements for Electronic Records," Richard J. Cox and James Williams, University of Pittsburgh, Principal Investigators, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada-funded project "The Preservation of the Integrity of Electronic Records," Luciana Duranti and Terry Eastwood, University of British Columbia, co-principal investigators. Both of these projects have produced working papers and reports.
- 5 For discussion of the archivist's needs in technology education see Terry Eastwood, "Educating Archivists About Technology," *American Archivist* 56, no. 3 (Summer 1993), pp. 458-66; Anne Gilliland Swetland, "From Education to Application and Back: Archival Literature and Electronic Records Curriculum," *American Archivist* 56, no. 3 (Summer 1993), pp. 532-44; Margaret Hedstrom, "Teaching Archivists About Electronic Records and Automated Techniques: A Needs Assessment," *American Archivist* 56, no. 3 (Summer 1993), pp. 424-33; and Richard Kesner, "Teaching Archivists About Information Technology Concepts: A Needs Assessment," *American Archivist* 56, no. 3 (Summer 1993), pp. 434-43.
- 6 The inaugural address was delivered on 14 October 1947. Sir Hilary Jenkinson, "The English Archivist: A New Profession." The address is reprinted in Roger Ellis, ed., *The Selected Writing of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (Alan Sutton, 1980), pp. 236-59.
- 7 Jenkinson's address and current curriculum guidelines identify the subject of preservation as essential. Jenkinson's knowledge area of palaeography—the scientific study of script and hand—in modern terms perhaps can be equated to certain aspects of computer languages and codes; diplomatic, in its modern guise, focuses on documents in their systems home, relating these to intentions, systems specifications, metadata, and the official context of records in an information society. Jenkinson's knowledge area of administrative history can be extended to embrace concepts of functional analysis and the study of record-keeping cultures.
- 8 Continuous or life-long learning, currently popular catch phrases, are short-hands for the continuous nature of the learning process which is especially critical in time of rapid change. These concepts have implications for professionals, as learners, as well as for teachers and their teaching units.
- 9 Hilary Jenkinson, "The English archivist," especially pp. 244 and 257.
- 10 The other major areas in current curriculum guidelines which are not present in Jenkinson's address are information technology and user services.
- 11 The scope of Jenkinson's research interests and his contributions to archives generally are demonstrated by the items selected by Roger Ellis for the Society of Archivists memorial volume, *Selected Writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson*. These include essays on palaeography, the classification of archives, English seals, records in war, archives science and diplomatic, and the problem of nomenclature in archives.

- 12 Roy Schaeffer, "From Craft to Profession: The Evolution of Archival Education and the Theory in North America," *Archivaria* 39 (Spring 1994), pp. 21-34. Mary Sue Stephenson, "The Function and Content of Research Methods in Graduate Archival Studies Education," *Archivaria* 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 190-202.
- 13 The following discuss the needs that archives have for research within the context of a general area which is then developed as a planned programme for research, or a research agenda: Paul H. McCarthy, "The Management of Archives: A Research Agenda," *American Archivist* 51, nos. 1-2 (Winter-Spring 1988), pp. 52-72; C.G. Palm, "An Introduction to Archives Research Agendas," *American Archivist* 51, nos. 1-2 (Winter-Spring 1988), pp. 24-27; Ann E. Pederson "Development of Research Programs," *Archivum* 39; Richard J. Cox and Helen Samuels, "The Archivist's First Responsibility: A Research Agenda to Improve the Identification and Retention of Records of Enduring Value," *American Archivist* 51, nos. 1-2 (Winter-Spring 1988); Lawrence Dowler, "The Role of Use in Defining Archival Practice and Principles: A Research Agenda for the Availability and Use of Records," *American Archivist* 51, nos. 1-2 (Winter-Spring 1988), pp. 711-86; David B. Gracy, "Columbus Revisited: The Status of Archival Research Around the World in 1992," *Archivum* 39 (1993), pp. 520-25; and E.G. Franz, "The Vision of a European Archives Institute," *American Archivist* 55, no. 1 (Winter 1992), pp. 66-71.
- The "Pittsburgh Project" grew out of a 1991 conference, entitled "Working Meeting on Records Issues in Electronic Records" and its report *Research Issues in Electronic Records*. Other areas for research suggest themselves, such as citation analysis, using the techniques of bibliometrics, content analysis of archives legislation and of Freedom of Information legislation, and the impact of FOI legislation on the research use of archives.
- 14 Alvin M. Schrader, "The 'R' Word: The Role of Research on Graduate Education for Library and Information Studies," *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science* 18, no. 1 (April 1993), pp. 44-66; D.W. Krummel, "Born Yesterday and Other Forms of Original Sin: Two Perspectives on Library Research," *Journal for Education in Library and Information Science* 34, no. 4 (Fall 1993), pp. 279-86; Sidney E. Pierce, "Dead Germans and the Theory of Librarianship," *American Libraries* 23, no. 8 (September 1992), pp. 41-43; Daniel O'Connor and J. Philip Mulvaney, "LIS Faculty Research and the Expectations of the Academic Culture Versus the Needs of the Practitioner," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 37, no. 4 (Fall 1966), pp. 306-16; and Ron Day, "LIS, Method and Postmodern Science," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 37, no. 4 (Fall 1966), pp. 317-24.
- 15 Published research and graduate theses in archives are analyzed by Richard J. Cox, "An Analysis of Archives Research 1970-1992, and the Role of the *American Archivist*," *American Archivist* 54, no. 2 (Spring 1994), pp. 278-88 and Robin Wylie, "Student Archivistics: The Contribution of the Master of Archival Studies Theses to Archival Professional Literature," *Archivaria* 39 (Spring 1995), pp. 96-107.
- 16 A well-researched history of archives, as documents and as individual institutions, would pay dividends to the manager and the archivist at a fundamental level by supplying a real context rather than an imagined past as the basis for planning. For example, Clark Elliot's study of records-keeping in an American University and Barbara Craig's analysis of trust deeds for a London, England hospital, both for the early nineteenth century, show the importance of linking documents to the record-keeping assumptions of their creators. See Clark A. Elliot, "Science at Harvard University, 1846-1847: A Case Study of the Character and Functions of Written Documents," *American Archivist* 57, no. 3 (Summer 1994), pp. 448-61 and Barbara L. Craig, "Batson's Trust for the Royal London Hospital: Records Management 1820s Style," *Archivaria* 41 (Spring 1996), pp. 188-205.
- 17 Examples of a rooted approach to archives concepts are Luciana Duranti, "The Concept of Appraisal in Archival Theory," *American Archivist* 57, no. 2 (Spring 1994), pp. 328-44 and Angelica Menne-Harritz, "Can We Appraise Archives by Selecting Content?," *American Archivist* 57, no. 3 (Summer 1994), pp. 528-43.
- 18 Mary Sue Stephenson, "Deciding Not to Build the Wall: Research and the Archives Profession," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), pp. 145-151.
- 19 Steve Zoltai, "Twenty-First Century Agora. A Survey of the Attitudes of Canadian Archives Policy Makers to User Fees. A Research Report," Faculty of Information Studies, University of Toronto, 1995. Zoltai surveyed all heads of Canadian repositories on issues surrounding the introduction of user fees for services. The report describes the research and its methods and analyzes the responses received.
- 20 Suggestions for research abound in the archives literature; the problem is not in finding a topic but in mapping a path through a dense forest of problem areas which require research. In addition to research agendas, journal articles and the few archives monographs frequently contain directions for further research. See for example, Janice E. Ruth, "Educating the Reference Archivist," *American Archivist* 51, no. 3 (Summer 1988), pp. 266-76; Susan C. Malbin, "The Reference Interview in Archival Literature," *College and Research Libraries* (January 1997), pp. 69-80.

- 21 F. Gerald Ham, Frank Boles, Gregory S. Hunter, and James O'Toole, "Is the Past Still Prologue?: History and Archival Education," *American Archivist* 56, no. 4 (Fall 1993), pp. 718-29.
- 22 See Brien Brothman, "Orders of Value: Probing the Theoretical Terms of Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), pp. 78-100 and Richard Brown, "Records Acquisition Strategy and Its Theoretical Foundation: The Case for a Concept of Archival Hermeneutics," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991-92), pp. 34-56. For a clear rejoinder to the assumptions of post-modern deconstruction, directed particularly to the substance of Brothman's article, see Terry Eastwood, "Nailing a Little Jelly to the Wall of Archival Studies," *Archivaria* 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 232-52. The exchange demonstrates implicitly the value of exploring "the other" in strengthening the clarity of archives ideas.
- 23 See Richard J. Cox and Helen Samuels, "The Archivists First Responsibility,"; F. Gerald Ham, *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago, 1993); and Hans Booms, "Überlieferungsbildung: Keeping Archives as a Social and Political Activity," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991-92), pp. 25-33.
- 24 T.R. Schellenberg, "The Appraisal of Modern Public Records," *Bulletin no. 8 of the National Archives* (1956), pp. 1-46 and F. Gerald Ham, *Selecting and Appraising*.
- 25 Luciana Duranti, "The Concept of Appraisal"; Frank Boles with Julia Marks Young, *Archival Appraisal* (Neal Schumann, 1991); Sheila Powell, "Archival Re-appraisal: The Immigration Case Files," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991-92), pp. 104-116; Ellen Scheinberg, "Case File Theory: Does it Work in Practice?," *Archivaria* 38 (Fall 1994), pp. 74-78 and Evelyn Kolish, "Sampling Methodology and Its Application: An Illustration of the Tension Between Theory and Practice," *Archivaria* 38 (Fall 1994), pp. 61-73.
- 26 See for example Richard J. Cox, "The Documentation Strategy and Archival Appraisal Principles: A Different Perspective," *Archivaria* 38 (Fall 1994), pp. 11-36; Bruce Wilson, "Systematic Appraisal of the Records of the Government of Canada at the National Archives of Canada," *Archivaria* 38 (Fall 1994), pp. 218-31; Chris Hurley, "Problems with Provenance," *Archives & Manuscripts* 23, no. 2 (November 1995), pp. 234-59; and Jean-Pierre Wallot, "Free Trade in Archival Ideas: The Canadian Perspective on North American Archival Development," *American Archivist* 47, no. 2 (Spring 1994), pp. 380-99.
- 27 Sir Hilary Jenkinson, "The English archivist," p. 236.