Appraisal as Cartography: Cultural Studies in the Archives

Kit Hughes

ABSTRACT

Joining interdisciplinary conversations within archival appraisal theory, this article asks 1) how does a cultural studies model of appraisal re-imagine the documentary record for institutional archives, and 2) what are the methodological implications of such an approach? In sketching the theoretical overlaps and divergences between archival studies and cultural studies to locate productive tensions between the two disciplines, this article offers a three-pronged approach to appraisal trained on everyday culture and experience. At stake in broadening current appraisal standards are the politics of institutional memory and the limits of archival responsibility.

KEY WORDS

Appraisal, Archival Theory and Principles, Business Archives and Corporate Records, Labor Records

In the interest of expanding the interdisciplinary conversations taking place within archival appraisal theory, this article tackles a pair of interrelated questions: 1) how does a cultural studies model of appraisal ask us to re-imagine the documentary record for institutional archives, and 2) what are the methodological implications of such an approach? Archival studies and cultural studies already share a significant theoretical lineage and, at least in some archival traditions, similar goals with regard to documenting and understanding culture in all of its forms. This article sketches these theoretical overlaps, locating areas in which the two bodies of scholarship diverge, to indicate productive points of tension between the two disciplines that offer new ways of considering methods of documenting culture. At stake in such a project are the politics of institutional memory and the limits of archival responsibility.

As can be surmised by the above, this article emphasizes the cultural functions of archives. Though archives are often imagined to serve administrative needs, for instance by documenting past decisions, financial transactions, and legally required information, it is a mistake to see these functions as completely divorced from archives' social and cultural purposes. Richard Cox took on this debate over archives' function—whether they should be approached as institutions of evidence (for administrative needs) or memory (for social and cultural purposes)—and attempted to settle the dichotomy by arguing that the former function is constitutive of the latter. Cox reminded us that it is often precisely because of their characteristics related to evidence and accountability within specific contexts that records gain social and cultural value.[1] While this is a useful way of considering the multiple overlapping functions of archives, it has the unfortunate side effect of resolving the dichotomy in favor of a single side. Because Cox saw the evidence function as preceding any social or cultural value, he argued that archivists can attend to evidence, and cultural and symbolic value will take care of themselves—as "a kind of added-on value."[2] Without reviving the binary thinking of evidence versus memory, this paper sees archives' cultural functions as *central* to their institutional status and work. As Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg noted,

> archives help define for individuals, communities, and states what is both knowable and known about their pasts. As places of uncovering, archives help create and re-create social memory [. . .] archives produce knowledge, legitimize political systems, and construct identities. In the broadest sense, archives thus embody artifacts of culture that endure as signifiers of who we are and why.[3]

Key to these cultural functions is the practice of appraisal. After all, it is appraisal that determines "what is remembered and what is forgotten, who in society is visible and who remains invisible, who has a voice, and who does not,"[4] and it is appraisal that controls the flow of materials that can be used

by people to construct social identities.[5] The archives' place and the role of appraisal within these processes of social power, identity formation, and community maintenance make this a compelling project not just for archivists but for a range of cultural workers in history, communication, sociology, and adjacent fields. With this in mind, this article hopes to contribute to these conversations concerning the cultural power of archives, speaking not on behalf of, but from within the field of cultural studies.

Fundamentals of Cultural Studies

Though there are many strains within cultural studies tied to various national and historical contexts, for this article, *cultural studies* refers to a body of thought and practice that became institutionalized in the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham in the mid-1960s. The work that came out of the CCCS sought to understand lived popular culture and its complex relationships to class, identity, and structures of power. To approach these issues, cultural studies drew on the fields of sociology, literature, and economics to develop a flexible definition of culture that exploded prevailing high art and high literature notions of the term. Rallying against definitions that followed Matthew Arnold's maxim that culture is "the best which has been thought and said in the world,"[6] Raymond Williams posited that "culture is ordinary"—it is the "*common* meanings, the product of a whole people, and offered individual meanings, the product of a man's [*sic*] whole committed personal and social experience."[7] Culture is thus the patterns of organization (practices, beliefs, categories of thought—whole ways of life) that emerge within and through particular social, economic, and political relations of power.[8] In addition to focusing on the quotidian and popular, key to this expanded definition of culture is an emphasis on both the collective production of culture and the individual's experience of his or her daily life and condition.[9] This "dialectic between conditions and consciousness," or, put otherwise, this tension between structure and agency, provides the key engine of cultural studies work.[10] So, while cultural theorists generate new ways of conceiving of culture as everyday, relational, and lived, culture is ultimately figured as a "problem"—an unresolved historical *process* that conditions people's experiences, expectations, and relationships with others.[11]

To understand this diffuse and shifting process, cultural studies focuses on cultural formations—both the "structures" that organize culture at a given moment and the process of their development. By studying how particular ways of life gain currency, how institutions become dominant or recede, how certain groups of people become affiliated and/or marginalized, how ideologies become established, how difference becomes salient, and how meaning circulates across

groups, geographies, and time, cultural studies hopes to understand both how culture comes to look and be experienced in the way it does for particular people and its relationship to specific political, economic, and social systems.[12] Foundational to cultural studies imagined in this way is a political project that seeks to transform structures of domination, particularly through democratic adult education. The belief that culture is comprised of sets of practices that are "changing and, in the present changeable" recognizes the possibility of agency in processes of cultural formation and works to strategically locate spaces and moments where agency can be enacted to support a project for social equality.[13] Culture is not some juggernaut that fully determines peoples' experiences; it is a complex set of processes always open to political change and social transformation.

This vision of culture as a complex process linking the arts, society, and economics is bound up in cultural studies' methodological and theoretical ties with Marxism. Because culture is figured as always in motion, to understand it requires a precise mapping of real, concrete systems—how different ideas are articulated to certain institutions or people, how various forms of capitalism shape class and social relations, how new subcultures emerge, and how certain classes fall from power. This emphasis on mapping draws heavily from theorist Antonio Gramsci who argued we must attend to difference and historical conjuncture—how different forces "create a *terrain* more favorable to certain modes of thought, and certain ways of posing and resolving questions involving the entire subsequent development of national life."[14] Posited as the cultural materialism approach by Williams,[15] mapping in cultural studies attempts to document the material forms—the "evidence," perhaps—of culture and its formation. Key is cultural studies' diachronic view of culture: mapping hopes to account for both the complex relationships between categories and systems (e.g., gender, class, and race; capitalism, Christianity, and neoliberalism) and how these same categories or systems draw boundaries and gain relevance in the first place.

Given cultural studies' focus on the experiences of everyday life, undertaking this work of mapping required a serious investigation of largely ignored "popular" cultural forms, such as television, fashion, and punk music. This focus on popular culture enabled cultural studies to attend to the experiences of groups that had been excluded from the academy—at first the working classes, women, and youth, then people of color, colonial subjects, and LGBT individuals—and how these people locate themselves and "make do" within larger systems of power.[16] As a tool and method, mapping has enabled cultural studies scholars to understand how ideas and practices become linked to one another and the political implications of these formations. Dick Hebdige, for example, investigated how subcultural youth style (e.g., punk, mod, and teddy) became mapped onto and constitutive of certain relations between race, gender, and

class in 1970s London.[17] While Hebdige was most interested in the drawing of social boundaries and hierarchies through cultural practices, Arjun Appaduri used the language of mapping—his formulation of scapes—ethno-, techno-, media-, finance-, ideo-—to emphasize how certain cultural practices, modes of thinking, technologies, and economic systems *overlap* to structure everyday life as it is experienced globally and geographically.[18] Beyond these two examples of mapmaking—the first focused on an understanding of boundaries, the second trained on overlapping territories and flows—mapping culture also enables an understanding of connection and scale. Just as land maps indicate how tributaries connect to rivers that empty into oceans, cultural maps can indicate how the general links up to the particular—how the economic links to the social or how class links to gender—and how global systems and pressures are revealed in individual experience. It is these elements of mapmaking—its appreciation for complicated relational systems, shifting boundaries, overlapping territories, topology, and texture—that make it a useful strategy for archivists confronted with a multivocal documentary record. Cultural studies' focus on exploring and documenting cultures of the working class, people of color, and other marginalized members of society provides a logical resource for the growing archival interest in combating historical silences resulting from sociopolitical power structures and structural bias in the current archival record.

With this in mind, three facets of the discipline may be useful to an archival appraisal practice that seeks to document lived culture and fulfill the archives' social responsibility: 1) a focus on individuals' lived experiences and their relation to larger structures of economic, social, and political power and oppression as revealed through mapping, 2) a focus on material culture and popular communication forms, and 3) a focus on the potential for progressive social transformation. Rather than point to particular marginalized social groups to champion for their inclusion in existing documentation or macro-appraisal strategies through specialized collections, it is my hope that a turn to cultural theory can invigorate ways of thinking about the documentation of culture more generally by *systematically* including bottom-up perspectives of individuals participating in social institutions beyond the government (e.g., corporations, universities, and nongovernmental organizations) and by documenting the dispersed practices of everyday life. In what follows, I draw on the above three elements of cultural studies to demonstrate how using "mapping" as a framework for appraisal enables archivists to fill in gaps in the documentary record left by common appraisal strategies.

The Archivist as Cartographer

What does all this talk of the complexity of culture, considered in its expanded mode, afford the appraising archivist? How does mapmaking fit into existing strategies of appraisal? What contributions could mapmaking provide practitioners interested in saving a meaningful record without being bogged down in overcollecting? This section moves through key developments in appraisal theory and method to grapple with these questions. After looking at early frameworks of cost and use analysis designed to manage an increasingly unwieldy documentary record, I will chart the turn to more complex schematic approaches to appraisal, including the Black Box theory, the Minnesota Method, and documentation strategy. This discussion of existing appraisal strategies concludes with an examination of functional analysis and macroappraisal. Throughout this section, it is not my aim to create a linear history that implies inevitable evolution—nor to ignore the simple fact that many of these strategies coexist, and productive disagreement challenges the dominance of any one of these strategies. Instead, I hope to point to the persistence of concerns over developing a systematic means for the analysis of modern records. Here I believe mapmaking can be useful as an analytical framework that confronts twin problems for contemporary appraisal—the expansion of both the documentary record and the number of voices recognized to have a stake in archival practices.

Archivists in the twentieth century quickly recognized the need for systematic analysis of records due to new recordkeeping methods and technologies. Cost and use formed two of these early frameworks. For G. Philip Bauer, writing in 1944, a focus on cost meant generating a "basic cost formula" based on use (by whom and for what purposes) and the quality of the records (their information density and arrangement).[19] Using a return-on-investment logic that emphasized the cost of every record retained, Bauer's formulations presaged the language of risk management championed by David Bearman decades later. This latter strategy argued that shifting the focus onto what cannot be lost—rather than what should be saved—substantially decreases the number of records archivists retain.[20] Both approaches appealed to an economic "formula" that weighed records in relation to one another, their return value, and the cost of their loss or replacement. This strategy often ran alongside and incorporated an early focus on use and users. In particular, Theodore Schellenberg's often-cited notions of evidential value—"the evidence [records] contain of the organization and functioning of the Government body that produced them"—and informational value—"the information they contain on persons, corporate bodies, things, problems, conditions, and the like, with which the Government body dealt" implicitly invoked specific users (e.g., government workers versus

amateur scholars) who are placed within a hierarchical framework wherein one (here, the government) is made more important.[21]

Some have since located use as a key element of larger appraisal frameworks[22] or as the *primary* lens of appraisal,[23] while others have cautioned against the potential faddishness in collecting caused by a use-centered model[24] and the possibility of ignoring marginal, less powerful users.[25] While these frameworks enabled archivists to develop a somewhat more systematic analysis of records, they remained ill equipped to handle holistically the complexity of institutional communication and the immense output of modern bureaucracies.

One of the first appraisal systems designed to handle complex institutions in their totality was the Black Box theory developed by Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young. The pair adapted cost and use to a flexible, modular system with three branches: "value of information," cost, and political and procedural "implications," each of which are broken down into over a dozen other elements. Value of information, for example, is divided into circumstances of creation, analysis of content, and use of the records, each of which is broken down even further. Analysis of content is divided into practical limitations (legibility and understandability), duplication (physical and intellectual), and topical analysis (time span, creator's relationship to topic, level of detail, character of information, and quality of information).[26] Although this model's focus on the *relationships between* certain characteristics of records recalls mapmaking to some degree, other scholars pushed this impulse further by developing formal structural analyses of organizations.

Many of the scholars attempting to map the structure of complex institutions have been specifically interested in business records. Historian Joanne Yates drew on her knowledge of evolving communication forms in twentieth-century business to argue for a model that accounts for how organizational structure and technology influence the production of documents.[27] Positing three types of organizations (small, owner-managed; functionally departmentalized; and decentralized multidivisional), she suggested that each type of organization sees information "flow" and "pool" at different levels.[28] By understanding which of the three business structures is under analysis, the archivist can more easily pinpoint where the most information-rich documents are likely to be.[29] Victoria Lemieux developed a similar strategy identifying seven different organizational configurations based on elements such as coordinating mechanisms, power distribution and control, and environmental factors that could be applied to organizations to determine where the most significant records are likely to be located and what types of records they are likely to be.[30] Others used knowledge of organizational structure to identify records at all levels to ensure the collection of the widest variety of voices; such is the case with the Reuther Library, which gained notice for its "vertical" collecting policy related to American labor organization records.[31]

As business structures have become more fluid, archivists have come to terms with records generated through collaborative projects, network organization, and flexible digital recordkeeping systems. Peter Botticelli used organizational theory to grapple with these new advancements, understanding records themselves as "infrastructure" that determine routine, enable collaboration across structural organizational elements, and shape the types of knowledge that can be stored and retrieved by the company and its agents.[32] Drawing on Max Weber, Michael A. Lutzker used human relations studies, theories of structural control, and conflict models to understand how even Fordist-era organizations might not be as "rational" as archivists have so far imagined. By looking to informal structures of decision making, the constraints of communication technologies, the gaps between record and reality, the role of documentation in purely ritual functions, and the conflicting goals that organizations may simultaneously pursue at various levels of the administration, he argued archivists must attend to the idiosyncratic elements of organizational documentation.[33] This appreciation for the fluid and "nonrational"—that which exceeds fixed organizational charts and decision making—pointed to the limits of appraisal built on structural analysis and organizational theory alone.

Richard Cox made this point when he noted that the preservation of key document genres (e.g., minutes) may not be sufficient, since "official" channels only account for a portion of institutional decision making, and thus, "structures of the organization should direct the archivist to look at other sources of documentation, or even to create documentation (such as through the recording of oral interviews)."[34] While I will return to the role of the archivist in actively documenting the institution, it should be noted here that each of these strategies is interested in records that serve the needs of their creators *in the direct service of their institutions*. Even when accounting for the complex ways people navigate and communicate through and beyond organizational structures, the focus remains squarely on institutional aims and activities, rather than on the lived experience of members or employees. In this way, these structural methods share affinities with functional analysis and macro-appraisal, a point to which I will return after a brief overview of another major development in appraisal practice and theory—interinstitutional collecting.

Documentation strategy and its sister initiatives like the Minnesota Method attempt to combat, in part, the gaps, duplications of effort, and rigidity of a system that stopped at the boundaries of a given institution. Emphasizing the potential value of collaborative strategy in 1975, F. Gerald Ham introduced the notion of an archives network system that would enable the coordination of multiple institutions, each of which could then specialize and make better use of the limited resources available to the archival community as a whole.[35] A decade later, this emphasis on cooperation beyond institutional boundaries became

the cornerstone of the formulation of the documentation strategy. As Helen Samuels argued, "Institutions do not stand alone, nor can their archives."[36] In her formulation of documentation strategy, a group of participating institutions generates a plan to document a specific topic or place.[37] This plan focuses not on the available record, but on what types of information would be most useful to document the issue at hand. This shift from material records as the starting point of the appraisal process corresponds with the emphasis on context within appraisal theory in the early 1990s. After the plan is set, archives collaboratively collect toward the project, while each maintains its core mission, a practice that recalls Ham's push for coordination and specialization. Ideally, documentation strategy eliminates both redundancy—since archives are more aware of what others collect—and competition—since part of the strategy includes collectively determining which institutions are the best fit for certain materials.[38] In practice, however, the documentation strategy has proved difficult: documentation plans, particularly those aimed at geographical locations, are often far too broad to make accomplishing project goals possible, and stretched resources mean participation is a luxury for many institutions.[39] Even with these caveats, documentation strategy provides a valuable way of imagining the expansiveness of a documentary universe comprised of materials generated by multiple, intersecting institutions.

Though the brainchild of a single institution—the Minnesota Historical Society (MHS)—the Minnesota Method offers a similar means of grappling with the records of multiple organizations. In a project designed to systematize the collecting of modern business records, the MHS engineered a five-tier schema in which each tier corresponds to a certain level of collecting. Rather than assign individual businesses to each tier, the MHS took a global view of Minnesota business and divided the field into eighteen sectors. Each sector was prioritized based on its economic impact; available documentation; and relationship to Minnesota state history, user demand, archival resources, and MHS's mission.[40] Once a sector was assigned a spot on the hierarchy, any business within that sector would be appraised according to the stipulations of that tier. For example, in this schema, agriculture is a Tier 1 sector, and so the materials of every agricultural firm are collected at Level A—the top, most complete level of collecting. By using a highly selective tiered system, archivists forgo collecting piecemeal records from a wide variety of businesses to preserve instead full swaths of very particular business history in rich complexity. Some have criticized this method of prioritization, arguing that "[the Minnesota Method] has chosen to concentrate on the rich, the big, and the successful . . . but tends to forget the simple and the common, and thus will end up with a distorted picture of the past," particularly since "Business history is not made up only of success stories."[41]

Working within a different historical context, archivists at the Danish National Archives suggested instead an "expanded sector" method whereby "minimum coverage" in *every* sector is a key goal, and issues such as geographical region, social class, branches of trade, and other factors weigh on appraisal.[42] Whatever the specific execution, these methods and the documentation strategy are unique in their attempts to get a handle on an entire field of documentation. Nowhere in appraisal literature are the concepts of mapping so apparent. Before exploring these overlaps further, I will turn to the last major appraisal strategy relevant to this process: macro-appraisal.

Macro-appraisal was developed in large part by Terry Cook during his tenure at the National Archives of Canada. Like documentation strategy and the Minnesota Method, macro-appraisal starts with the context of records creation rather than with the mass of records themselves. Designed to combat historical silences by incorporating marginalized voices, macro-appraisal—within the context of the Canada's government archives—focuses on the impact of government on society through the *process* of governance, rather than on the government as an institution in and of itself.[43] To do so, it attempts to document the "three way interaction of function, structure, and citizen which combined reflect the functioning of the state within civil society."[44] By putting greater stress on the role of citizen-state *interaction* in the records-creation process, including, in particular, "hot spots" of disagreement, variance, and tension, this approach aims to capture a better picture of social values, the wide variety of agents who participate in records creation and use, and the various purposes records serve within the process of governance and communication.[45] Theoretically, such an approach requires a re-imagining of the key questions appraisers ask of the documentary record. Shifting away from content, macro-appraisers attend to

> why records were created rather than what they contain, how they were created and used by their original users rather than how they might be used in the future, and what formal functions and mandates of the creator they supported rather than what internal structure or physical characteristics they may or may not have.[46]

To support this approach, macro-appraisal draws on functional analysis as its major methodological tool. According to Cook, functional analysis proceeds through several key questions: 1) "what functions and activities of the creator should be documented," 2) "who—in articulating and implementing the key functions, programmes and transactions of the institution—would have had cause and the primary responsibility to create a document, what type of document would it be, and with whom would that corporate person interact in either its creation or its later operational use," and 3) "which record creators or 'functions' (rather than which records) are the most important?"[47] Beyond these few initial questions, others have developed rich schema for undertaking this

element of the macro-appraisal process. For example, another key figure in the development of functional analysis, Helen W. Samuels, provided detailed guidance on how to break down the activities and mission of an institution—in her case study, the university—into easily identifiable functions in her monograph-length study *Varsity Letters*.[48] Through its focus on marginalized voices, the context of record creation, and functional analysis, macro-appraisal contributed significantly to work toward a more inclusive archives that saves less material.

However, macro-appraisal is not without its shortcomings. Even when the model's demand for rigorous research was praised as its greatest strength, serious concerns remained over the extent to which this research overtaxes limited resources.[49] Secondly, while the engineers and practitioners of macro-appraisal suggested that textual, audiovisual, and other types of records should be treated the same, doubts remained over the success of the model's move to integrate nontextual records and recordkeeping systems.[50] So, while Cook suggested that archivists should use the documentation strategy to supplement the records of citizen-state interaction with "personal, private records in all media" to "identify who or what has fallen through the cracks," he gave little indication of how to actually go about figuring out what is missing in the macro-appraisal process or how nontextual record types could be used effectively to supplement the record.[51] While he noted at one point that this might mean "searching for *(or creating?)* private-sector or oral and visual sources to complement official institutional records, using the same functional logic," it remained unclear what functional logic would look like in the context of personal records.[52] This feeds into larger concerns over the identification of functions more broadly. While some archivists argued that they are too difficult to discern or bleed too easily into one another,[53] others thought that the process could be streamlined by focusing on an institution's single top mandate rather than breaking its work down into functions.[54] Those who have attempted to refine further the process of function identification argued for different ways to rank functions[55] and adapt functional analysis to firms of different sizes and purposes.[56] These debates over the role of function are key to the politics of macro-appraisal, since "the concept of 'function' within macro-appraisal also reflects its central theoretical assumptions about what is valuable and what is not, what is worth remembering by society and what is not, what should become archives and what should be destroyed."[57] As I will argue, the focus on the "citizen-state dialectic" leaves out certain elements of organizational nature and experience. I turn to the politics of these omissions in the next section.

Throughout each of these approaches, the push toward more systematic methods of appraisal often uses spatialized modes of imagining. "Knowing" the institution and the context of creation often gets mapped onto hierarchy, communication lines and "flows," the position of given records creators, top-down

and bottom-up perspectives, the "documentary universe," geography, and even more foundational archival notions such as provenance and original order. Archivists become cartographers when they try to discern and systematically order the environmental context of records creation. This is not to say that archivists are not keenly aware of the temporal dimensions of appraisal. Simply, this systematic spatialized focus invites greater attention to potentially new modes of configuring the appraisal process that push this spatialization to its limits. By drawing on cultural studies' notions of mapmaking (which account for temporal change by attending to shifts rendered spatially), archivists may be able to better exploit spatially based methodologies to collect a more comprehensive documentary record that still does not overwhelm the archives in unmanageable, unintelligible expansiveness.

Mapping the Documentary Record

Any map can only be a guide—in this case, a tool for finding our bearings amid an otherwise impossible-to-navigate sea of records and evidence. While this approach hopes to point to previously overlooked texts, it by no means suggests we collect everything. Jorge Luis Borges's discussion of the point-for-point map created by a fictional cartography-obsessed empire revealed the folly of such an undertaking when the map became useless since its grand size made navigation of the world impossible.[58] Mapmaking is always an abridgement of the world. With this in mind, this section considers the theoretical contours of mapmaking as archival practice to work through the possibilities and social, cultural, and political implications that result from such a strategy. Then, in light of this discussion, the following section offers concrete suggestions for folding mapmaking into current appraisal practice. One guiding voice in this effort is Terry Cook, who suggested, "postmodern appraising archivists would ask who and what they are excluding from archival memorialization, and why, and then build appraisal strategies, methodologies, and criteria to correct the situation."[59] This is precisely what the mapping perspective hopes to achieve for current appraisal methodologies.

Appraisal of the institution, as it is most commonly practiced, seeks to document what an institution *does*. Mapping, in the cultural studies sense, demands we push farther to understand what an institution *means*—its significance for the myriad people who comprise it. As the following overview of mapmaking argues, we can no longer think of institutions as monoliths where all productive and relevant activity is devoted solely to achieving the aims of the institution. To take such a view when compiling the documentary record is to erase the experiences and agency of workers, members, students, citizens, and individuals. Furthermore, as cultural studies scholars have shown, documenting

institutional culture provides insight into functional decisions that shape the practices and output of institutions—a long-standing appraisal question. Here, I offer mapping not as some wholly new way of confronting the documentary record but rather as a means of refining many of the present approaches and helping achieve the goals already set out; it is a new tool, not a new toolbox.

As noted above, mapmaking coincides with long-held conceptions of the (postmodern) archivist's duties, particularly interpretation, selection, and active documentation. That distortion of reality occurs when activities are sublimated to records (or geographies are forced to appear in two dimensions) is not something to be discussed as either bad or good; it is inevitable. In this way, archives, like maps, are always political. While distortion cannot be avoided, it is vital to continually assess how certain distortions or ways of seeing the documentary universe persist systematically and what the political implications of those frameworks are. Thinking in maps usefully points in several additional directions: the importance of multiple, situated perspectives pertaining to any landscape; topology as a way to link global processes to local conditions; and the political implications of marking and naturalizing borders and categories.

In the first instance, mapmaking reminds us of the infinite ways a single terrain can be mapped: through geopolitical boundaries, transportation routes, military targets, average rainfall statistics, land formations, popular restaurants, animal and human migration patterns, wealth distribution, population, and capital flows, to name a few. Modes of representation are also multiple and can include three-dimensional structures, satellite photographs, highly stylized graphic designs, cartograms, and mathematical projections (e.g., Mercator, sinusoidal, conical). Given these countless ways terrain can be made legible, it is vital to note that every map created through the active selection of these different elements has a distinct agenda and purpose—so too with archival collection. Whether guided by evidential or informational value, use, cost, corporate structure, or the voices of the marginalized, appraisal actively decides how it wants to map the terrain of the documentary record. Mapmaking thus points to the multiperspectival *possibilities* in the documentary record.

Moreover, mapmaking also reminds us that perspectives inhabit specific positions. Every map positions its user in a unique relationship with its various elements. Even with a map of the same terrain in hand, the traveling enthusiast planning a driving route through the country using a vacationer's atlas and the military specialist planning an air attack during a time of war using a target chart are positioned and position themselves very differently in relation to the terrain the map holds out for them—one imagines traveling through and experiencing the space while the other remains in many ways above and beyond the actual ground the map concerns. Translating this to archival concerns, if we consider the institution as a terrain—as many of the archival discourses of

spatialized hierarchies would suggest—then we must also consider the many ways in which the institution is understood from different perspectives within it. What this suggests is not finding the single best map to document an institution, but understanding how multiple maps can elucidate the meaning of an institution for multiple users and participants. Samuels alluded to this problem when she noted traditional appraisal often overlooks actors and actions that tend to produce scant documentation.[60] However, I argue that Samuels's turn to functional analysis does not find a satisfactory solution to her concern. The *top-down* nature of functional analysis—and by association, macro-appraisal—assumes that individual records creators are relevant to the appraisal process insomuch as they are vessels that carry out an institution's key aims and functions. Even Cook, who is ostensibly interested in "how accurately the records project and sharpen the image of the citizen-state dialectic, *and the separate actors, agents,* and functions involved therein," pointed to the significance of understanding "operating culture" only as a means to understand how it impacts (e.g., accelerates/delays) the key functions of the government.[61] Neither of these authors attended to the everyday experience—the "bottom-up" *perspectives*—of those fulfilling the functions of the organization as a significant part of the appraisal process or the record.[62] Instead, both imagined institutions as active agents in and of themselves. I will address the implications of this version of the institution below. Important to note here is that even the attention to citizen-state *interaction* orients appraisal to evidential value, closing off the collecting of materials that exist beyond the narrow functions of an organization that might relate to meaning and experience of actually working (most likely as citizens) in the government. In short, while a healthy body of archives literature addresses methods for documenting large-scale processes and institutional functions and aims (global, regional, and local coordinates on the map), far less deals with the details of the everyday lives of the people who make up such institutions (what we might consider the street level). A map without a street-level view becomes unworkable—while it gives a nice broad overview, it makes intimately knowing a terrain impossible.

Here topology becomes useful as a means to think through the documentation of how the global figures within the local, or how we can integrate functional analysis and the everyday experience of workers and organization members. Unlike its better-known cousin topography, which indicates the physical shape of terrain surfaces such as mountain formations, valleys, and flat expanses, topology represents *connections* between map elements. Perhaps the most famous Western example is the London Underground map, which subordinates an accurate account of geography to an illustration that emphasizes the relationships between tube lines and stops. Similar to functional analysis, appraisal working under the logic of topology would focus on clearly elucidating

and documenting connections and relationships between different elements of the institution. By stressing connections and relationships rather than the surface of terrain, appraisal refines the types and quantities of records identified for collection. Where this departs from macro-appraisal is in its attempt to expand beyond institutional functions to document lived relationships and experiences unrelated to the key aims of a given organization. This enables appraisal to focus on how institutions become meaningful to and impact the lives of their workers—*the very people who make the institution possible*. It is connecting the lives of this myriad people to the aims and actions (and desires) of the institution that presents the biggest challenge for the archivist cartographer.

The third element of mapmaking that figures within archival practice is the concern over how complex relations of power shape and reshape borders, categories, and flows. While this has been accepted truth in mapmaking and archives for some time, increased focus on boundaries' engineering process and their permeability continues to be useful. Anyone who takes borderlines, organizational functions, or institutional communication flows as natural, logical, and fixed does so at the risk of overrationalizing the functions of power. In terms of appraisal, this means that a too-intense focus on locating precise lines of communication, comprehensive functions, subject areas, and geographical locations can obscure materials and practices that do not fit rigid schema. Certainly, this does not mean we must abandon these valuable projects. Simply, it is vital to remember that institutions often house activities and practices that do not always conform to the desires or needs of institutional functions. Although Cook himself warned, "Archival science patterned after the objective, universal laws of the physical sciences would take the human, historical, and idiosyncratic out of a social process (record keeping) in which they are inexorably connected," his own system of macro-appraisal may overly rationalize organizational activities due to a desire to rationalize the system of appraisal itself.[63] This is a lesson for structural, functional, and cartographer appraisers: taking our maps too seriously can obscure that they are often in flux, and the products of human creation. We must remind ourselves, "the history of making and keeping records is as littered with chaos, eccentricity, inconsistency, and downright subversion, as much as it is characterized by jointly agreed order, sequence, and conformity."[64] Where, for example, would one locate office holiday parties on an organizational chart? How do we document the extent to which certain institutions have environments more or less open to cultural change? How do we understand qualitatively how race or gender operates within particular organizational climates? How does organizational culture in the everyday, ordinary sense proposed by Williams differ in various divisions within the same institution? What impact, if any, do organizational relationships have on the functioning of the institution as a whole? The records that might shed light on

the answers to these questions are often not the same records that an appraisal based on institutional structure or functional analysis would keep.

What this calls for is a turn to the idiosyncratic, the illogical, and the conversations that occur parallel to or beyond the reach of hierarchical lines of official communication. As I will argue, to suggest that it is only the record creators acting directly on behalf of the institution who matter abdicates the archivist's responsibility as documentarian. To acknowledge that many people spend a third of their lives working in some sort of institution and yet the only important elements of their work and experience concern the extent to which they fulfilled institutional policies and aims set at the top is to grossly underestimate the importance of individuals and their experiences, relationships, and affiliations to the cultural historical record. It is also to take a political stance that continues to support documentation of the aims and desires of the powerful at the expense of the majority.

Mapmaking as a lens through which to view current appraisal practices thus hopes to achieve several ends. First, by pushing the limits of spatialization, it points to gaps in *systematic* approaches to appraisal. By pointing out that functional and structural analyses often ignore the very individuals who comprise the institutions they study does not mean that workers have never been documented or that records that offer glimpses of worker experience are a black hole in the archival universe. Certainly, these records do exist and were used profitably by many historians in the turn to social history. However, these records often made their way into the historical record by luck, accident, convenience, and random collecting rather than as part of a systematic methodology of appraisal such as those explored earlier. As I have noted, none of the approaches discussed offers substantial assistance for collecting for worker experience and institutional environment—the "street level" of institutions. Secondly, mapmaking emphasizes multiperspectival approaches to the institution, recognizes the situated nature of any given perspective, and asks for the documentation of multiple modes of experiencing the institution (top-down and bottom-up, in the cultural studies sense). Thirdly, through notions of topology, mapmaking emphasizes connections and relationships. Lastly, mapmaking cautions against taking our schemas too seriously, lest we miss out on the irrational, idiosyncratic, and cultural—that which gives an institution *meaning* to its many members. Mapmaking functions both as a lens through which to imagine the documentary record and a documentary process comprised of concrete strategies. To explore these strategies, I turn to the next section.

Documenting the Institution alongside the "Context of Creation"

To ensure the documentation of the institution as its members understand and experience it, I propose a three-pronged system that draws on the theoretical possibilities of mapmaking and corresponds to the previously mentioned goals of cultural studies: 1) emphasizing individuals' lived experiences, 2) understanding material culture and popular communication, and 3) effecting progressive social change. While none of the following strategies may be new in and of themselves, the combination of all of the strategies in the pursuit of capturing the *culture* of an institution provides a novel approach to appraisal practice. In proposing this approach, I draw again on cultural studies, this time on a younger subfield—production cultures—that maps labor cultures within media production industries to understand the relationship between worker experience and institutional practice and product. While I do not suggest that archivists take up production cultures' research agenda, a brief overview of the subfield's accomplishments indicates how methodological approaches similar to those I propose, but adapted for scholarly inquiry rather than archival documentation, provide evidence of the material effects of quotidian institutional cultures and point to the vital importance of moving beyond traditional records in our attempts to document these cultures. Though the world of casters and science-fiction television may seem far afield from archival concerns, by adapting lessons learned from production cultures' pursuit of the everyday cultures that sustain the media industry, we can reconfigure how, as archivists, we understand the meaning and function of institutions more broadly.

Launched in large part by John Thornton Caldwell's *Production Culture* (2008), the subfield draws from a wide range of academic disciplines beyond cultural studies including sociology of work, political economy, and anthropology to explore how workers' localized belief systems and cultural practices shape their labor; or, put another way, how "the microcultural practices of workers and the macrocultural practices of the industry and its management" become mutually constitutive.[65] Essentially, production studies demonstrates that institutional cultures, far from being interesting curios with little effect on the overall operation of companies or organizations, *fundamentally* impact operations. For examples of what this means, we might turn to Vicki Mayer's work on casters, the media workers who select acting talent for media projects. Drawing from interviews and observation—the types of information elided in current appraisal strategies—Mayer detailed how the women and gay men who traditionally find themselves in those positions tend to understand their casting work, which demands communication, empathy, affect, relationship building, and multitasking, as originating "naturally" from their gender or sexual identities. Many casters often go so far as to equate a feminized identity

with "qualifications" for the job. This understanding of their work as flowing naturally from their identity effaces their labor, opening them up to greater exploitation from their workplace and limiting the kinds of people considered "appropriate" for a particular job.[66] In this instance, the link between identity and labor *as it is understood by the workers themselves* can have a host of effects on institutional structure and function, including the distribution of employees along the lines of gender, race, and other attributes; how workers perceive possibilities for mobility and opportunity; or the pace of change in administration.

Likewise, Derek Johnson's work showed how production cultures even shape the primary function of the industry: the creation of texts. Analyzing media franchises—business relationships wherein one company licenses its intellectual property to another company, allowing the licensee to borrow from the intellectual property to create new products, as when Marvel Comics sold an X-Men license to Raven Software so the latter company could develop an X-Men videogame—Johnson showed how media workers' desire to carve out salient creative identities amid shared intellectual resources (and thereby gain recognition and status for their re-authorship of a common property) leads to an emphasis on difference within franchised texts. As an example, he pointed to the reboot of science fiction television series *Battlestar Galactica* (1978, 2003), during which workers labored to create significant differences between the iterations of the two shows to establish credibility as "creative" professionals despite the reliance on a pre-existing property.[67] Emphasizing both the "structural and subjective dimensions" of the franchise relationship, Johnson's analysis of trade press, interviews, and other evidence revealed that it is not the functional demands placed on workers from corporate supervisors that resulted in the particular shape of the 2003 iteration of *Battlestar Galactica*; instead, workers' pursuit of professional identities as *creative* workers operated as a key motivator for the introduction of textual difference within the franchise.[68] Johnson thus offered a second example of how everyday institutional cultures have material effects that would be missed by traditional appraisal strategies that focus only on institutional aims and functions.

Given the significance of these institutional cultures to operations—not to mention their importance for documenting a significant portion of the lives of millions of people—how might we capture this "street-level view" within appraisal?

1. **Interview** members at all levels of the hierarchy, from the CEO/director to guard staff. To make the most of scant resources, taped oral interviews can be combined with occasional surveys conducted at important moments within institutional culture, as when members join, leave, get a promotion, move to another department, or celebrate institutional anniversaries and achievements. While these interviews

should focus on how people understand their positions in their institutional hierarchies and how they believe they fulfill the mission of the institution, they should also seek to understand the place that participation in the institution occupies in members' lives more broadly. While straightforward questions along these lines could be useful (e.g., "where do you find value in your participation and why?"), interviewers want to be sure to ask about legends and other stories that members use and circulate to make sense of the institution and its belief systems. These "trade stories" serve a wide range of cultural functions, from establishing solidarity to demonstrating skill and authority.[69] Furthermore, asking after identity, and the ways in which membership shapes identity, could provide another useful entrée into thinking about how the institution becomes meaningful to people beyond the limits of prescribed duties.

2. **Make "field observations"** of institutional spaces, activities, and rituals. Potentially unorthodox, this requires the archivist to take photographs, film, sketch, or otherwise document the spaces that institutional members occupy on a day-to-day basis. Not only does this allow for documentation of the quotidian, it also provides insight into parts of institutional culture not easily captured in textual documentation (e.g., hierarchical organization of space, how an institution may or may not be physically constructed to enable collaboration, and how the institution positions itself in relation to nonmembers through architecture and space).[70] I suggest creating a plan for capturing documentation of these spaces once every five years or as the pace of institutional change suggests. In addition, this category includes similarly documenting typical activities and rituals (e.g., meetings, trainings, special institutional events, and member milestone celebrations). In the interviews and surveys mentioned as the first prong of this approach, the archivist should invite institutional members to contribute to these "field observations" by commenting on pictures of their workspaces or their understandings of institutional activities and rituals, for example.
3. **Collect institutional material culture**, including any texts or objects that reveal how the institution tries to assert a certain image of itself, how people understand the meaning of the institution and their place within it, how certain members or groups form institutionally affiliated identities, how and why certain members or ways of participating in the institution are recognized and legitimated, and other cultural questions. In particular, this would include ephemeral materials that would not normally make it into the documentary record (e.g., institutional

calendars, t-shirts, member gifts, holiday cards). Photographs could be substituted for three-dimensional objects to sidestep the need for museological preservation.

This three-pronged approach responds directly to the pursuit of documenting everyday life and material culture, the first and second facets of cultural studies mentioned previously. Furthermore, thinking of institutions as cultures and confirming this mode of thought through archival appraisal practices that develop and maintain an understanding of individuals beyond their strict institutional record-creating function responds to the third facet of cultural studies, locating possibilities for progressive social change. Rather than aligning institutions with the elite few that often direct their overarching goals and mission, we should think of institutions as they are experienced by the vast majority of their members. Doing so puts people and communities at the center of our efforts to document our present and our past, and helps us rethink the emphases in our documentary record.

This may seem like a radical re-imagining of the function of appraising archivists. Instead, it is better read as an intensification of the logic that underpinned the paradigm shift from appraising records to the context of records creation. Appraisal that accounts for issues explored here under the context of mapmaking—particularly the attention to marginalized voices that might not be documented by traditional lines of communication and authority—pushes the focus of appraisal from the context of records creation to the context of the institution writ large. Certainly, broadening the responsibility of the archivist from documenting practices of record creation to documenting everyday life within particular institutions runs the risk of overtaxing archival resources. However, the conclusions arising from ongoing archival discussions regarding the cultural purpose of archives, recordness, and the inevitability of archival intervention *demand* such a shift.

While records are obviously central to the work of archives, it is worth asking if records themselves or even record-creating processes should remain the primary focus of appraisal. Gerald Ham called for archivists to take on the "demanding intellectual process of *documenting culture*."[71] As he put it, "if we are not helping people understand the world they live in, and if this is not what archives is all about, then I do not know what it is we are doing that is all that important."[72] As my discussion of cultural studies demonstrates, records creators and records systems are only part of the lived institutional landscape. By focusing only on evidential record making—a practice that privileges certain members of the administration and posits the institution as active agent—we also exclude actions and modes of communication that do not conform as readily to fixed textual formats. If archivists are truly interested in documenting culture, an expanded approach to appraisal and recordness is required.

The role of archivists in "authoring" the meaning of the records under their care is already well established in the archival literature. Simply by lending authority and value to certain records and not others, archivists embed meanings of importance within the documents they select.[73] Some even suggest "archives may actually make a greater contribution to the creation of the record than the inscriber."[74] On a more mundane level, several archival methods, including documentation strategy and macro-appraisal, already incorporate records such as oral histories and photographs created by the archivist or a surrogate.[75] Some might suggest that creating documentation, particularly for those activities that do not "naturally" produce a textual material record interferes with the "objectivity" of the archives, since these documents are not the by-product of record creators acting in the regular course of their duties. Boles and Greene responded that "Directing someone to do something" (such as asking a creator to use deposit schedules, keep orderly records, and use particular record formats) "is, for all intents and purposes, the same thing as doing it oneself."[76] To imagine that any record is not mediated by various pressures and directives is to ignore the reality of modern recordkeeping. Furthermore, as contemporary recordkeeping moves further into digital realms and it becomes apparent that early intervention in the records-creation process is imperative if archives want to save any records whatsoever, the question of archivist involvement in the creation of the documentary record resolves itself—it is unavoidable.

In addition to an active archivist, documenting institutional culture writ large also demands an openness to the notion of recordness. An ongoing debate over what constitutes a record has been a point of contention within different schools of appraisal theory. To understand Terry Eastwood's suggestion that "an archival document is either part of a transaction and evidence of it, evidence of its observance, or related actions taken in support of transactions,"[77] one must note his definition of a transaction: "a species of action which alters the relations between persons."[78] Although the centrality of the "transaction" defined as a force of change unnecessarily limits communication and interaction that *sustain* rather than change relations, Eastwood's notion[79] of records as evidence of particular actions recalls Hugh Taylor's suggestion that "Behind the information and the data lies the 'act and deed.'"[80] In both of these instances, the record only becomes meaningful in relation to an action that preceded it. Though certainly not the intention of these authors, I argue that the primacy of the action in these discussions of records suggests that archivists should attend more to understanding those actions or experiences that do not have the benefit of easy translation to textual form. As I have noted, by restricting attention to those actions that produce conventional textual documentation, archivists leave out particular voices and particular ways of being in the institution.[81] If it is the

actions and not the forms that are important, why should archivists limit themselves only to actions that produce easily saved records?

This orientation to the action-centered elements of records plays out even in appraisal strategies that seek to document nontransactional processes. In her discussion of archivist-created records within the documentation strategy, Samuels noted that archivists can take photographs, conduct interviews, and collect ancillary materials to document processes. Although these materials would be vital to a cultural studies mapping approach to appraisal, Samuels somewhat disappointingly called these records "indirect evidence of essentially intangible processes."[82] Rather than seeing this as a unique quality of nontextual records, however, it is important to remember that many records—unless they are performative (i.e., they complete the action they record, such as a marriage license)—are tangible products of an ongoing intangible process, whether governance, business, education, or something else. Something is always lost in the translation from world to text; if anything, the difference between textual and nontextual records and action-oriented and process-oriented records is one of degree and not of kind. This mapping approach thus argues that the archivist must attend to those forms of communication, interaction, and experience that characterize and shape an institution and its practices that may not so easily be documented through traditional transaction-focused forms.

In taking up this position, we can follow the lead of archivists in the subfields of personal, multicultural, and multimedia records who have laid the groundwork for pursuing documentation beyond traditional records. Not only have archivists of personal records demonstrated the value of collecting materials documenting individuals' social roles and their performance, they provide useful collecting schemas.[83] One such framework comes from Catherine Hobbs's directive to seek out "expression of character"—"the personal, the idiosyncratic, the singular views of people as they go about doing the things they do and commenting on them" as assurance that we document "complex humanity" rather than "surface activities."[84] Archivists of multicultural communities and groups have proven the value of participatory appraisal processes as a means of including multiple perspectives within the documentary record[85] and as a way of engaging with those perspectives more fully (i.e., to understand "the value of community records as the community understands them").[86] Although difficulties remain with undertaking and sustaining collaborative projects, those working in this subfield have developed numerous strategies for working with such groups and their records.[87] Furthermore, group involvement in document creation and appraisal even has the potential to generate support for the archives through the involvement of people throughout the institution if the process can be made empowering or even exciting for participants. Lastly, although nonevidential or nontextual records often seem like afterthoughts to larger collecting

schema, sitting last in priority lists, an increasing number of scholars are undertaking the serious work of understanding how nonconventional records might fit into archival holdings.[88] In addition to the somewhat well-trod path of the use of oral history records, archivists are exploring questions including the permanent value of cell-phone records, the contextual needs for the preservation of tattoos, and content and genre-based rules for audiovisual records.[89] These new perspectives attempt to answer Ericson's call for the "utilization of the entire spectrum of resources available" and end the two-tiered relationship between textual and nontextual records, while emphasizing the importance of visual and aural culture to documenting everyday life.[90]

No doubt, the mapping approach to appraisal seems extravagant in an era of scarce resources. The three-pronged plan I propose may appear too time intensive and costly, particularly as the production of records continues to accelerate. However, mapping is not a mode of collecting to turn to as a last step in the appraisal process only when resources allow. Rather, as I have shown, it is integral to the documentation of any institution, not only in terms of capturing the experiences of the majority of its members, but also in recording the impact of culture on larger institutional aims and functions. While this means that in many cases, archivists will have to refigure priorities to collect less in other areas to accommodate a bare minimum of coverage of member experiences, the records created and collected in this way are *fundamental* to understanding the meanings and functions of institutions, at least if we want to continue to imagine appraisal as a cultural practice. To this end, several strategies can help contain the mapping approach's strain on resources. First, some of the methods proposed above (e.g., surveys) can be routinized and mechanized to work them efficiently into existing practices within the day-to-day functioning of the institution (e.g., orientation, exit interviews). Second, incorporating stakeholders into the documentary process can both lighten an archivist's workload through collaborative projects—such as the five-year "field observation" which could be, for example, folded into routine morale-boosting programs produced by an institution's human resources department—and simultaneously create a greater appreciation for the work and value of the institutional archivist to extensive user groups. Creating alliances with a wide range of institutional participants will be essential, as will be designing projects that are enjoyable and potentially empowering for participants, relatively undemanding with regard to resources and time, and complementary to institutional evidential records (i.e., topologically connected with larger concerns of the institution).

Conclusion

Joan Schwartz and Terry Cook called archivists "keepers of context."[91] The mapmaking approach attempts to consider context more broadly as terrain that expands beyond recordkeeping practices to include everyday experience and culture as key parts of the documentary record. Using a cultural studies approach trained on the metaphor of mapmaking enables appraisal archivists to locate gaps and undefined terrain in the documentary universe, incorporate multiple viewpoints through collective documentation, and account for the nonrational, idiosyncratic, and personal by rethinking recordness. This approach hopes to both engage marginalized voices and understand how the people who comprise institutions actually make sense of what institutions *mean*. As a political point, it also aims to reframe thinking around institutions. Rather than depend on a top-down approach that elides the agency of individuals by casting them as vessels for the active institution's aims and needs, a mapping approach concerned with topological relationships and bottom-up perspectives *alongside* top-down perspectives could show institutions for what they really are—people organized by particular relations of power.

Notes

The author would like to thank Rick Pifer, Michelle Caswell, Evan Elkins, and the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on drafts of this article.

1 Richard J. Cox, *No Innocent Deposits: Forming Archives by Rethinking Appraisal* (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2004), 189.

2 Cox, *No Innocent Deposits*, 170.

3 Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg, introduction, in *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*, ed. Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007), vii.

4 Terry Cook, "Remembering the Future: Appraisal of Records and the Role of Archives in Constructing Social Memory," in *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory*, 169.

5 Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory," *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 16.

6 Matthew Arnold, *Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1869), viii.

7 Raymond Williams, "Culture Is Ordinary," in *The Everyday Life Reader*, ed. Ben Highmore (London: Routledge, 2002), 93, 96, emphasis added.

8 Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms," *Media, Culture and Society* 2 (1980): 60.

9 Hall, "Cultural Studies," 63.

10 Hall, "Cultural Studies," 72.

11 Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 11.

12 Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 174–75; John Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 11.

13 Williams, "The Uses of Cultural Theory," *New Left Review* 158 (1973): 164, 171.

[14] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers Co., 1971), 184. See also Stuart Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10 (1986): 5–27.

[15] Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 5.

[16] Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 19.

[17] Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen and Co., 1979).

[18] Arjun Appaduri, "Difference and Disjuncture in the Global Economy," *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7 (1990): 296.

[19] G. Philip Bauer, "The Appraisal of Current and Recent Records," *The National Archives Staff Information Circulars* 13 (1946): 6–7, 12.

[20] David Bearman, "Archival Methods," *Archives and Museum Technical Report 3* (Spring 1989), 10.

[21] T. R. Schellenberg, "The Appraisal of Modern Public Records," in *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings in Archival Theory and Practices*, ed. Maygene F. Daniels and Timothy Walch (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Services, 1984), 57.

[22] Wendy Duff, "Steadying the Weathervane: Use as a Factor in Appraisal Criteria," *Provenance* 12, nos. 1–2 (1994): 125.

[23] Mark Greene, "'The Surest Proof': A Utilitarian Approach to Appraisal," in *American Archival Studies: Readings in Theory and Practice*, ed. Randall C. Jimerson (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2000), 332.

[24] F. Gerald Ham, "The Archival Edge," *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service, 1984), 326–35.

[25] Greene, "The Surest Proof," 333.

[26] Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young, "Exploring the Black Box: The Appraisal of University Administrative Records," *The American Archivist* 48, no. 2 (1985): 146.

[27] Joanne Yates, "Internal Communication Systems in American Business Structures: A Framework to Aid Appraisal," *The American Archivist* 48, no. 2 (1985): 142.

[28] Yates, "Internal Communication Systems," 146.

[29] Yates, "Internal Communication Systems," 151, 155.

[30] Victoria Lemieux, "Applying Mintzberg's Theories on Organizational Configuration to Archival Appraisal," *Archivaria* 46 (1998): 44–45.

[31] Ben Blake, "The New Archives for American Labor: From Attic to Digital Shop Floor," *The American Archivist* 70 (2007): 142.

[32] Peter Botticelli, "Records Appraisal in Network Organizations," *Archivaria* 49 (2000): 164, 175.

[33] Michael A. Lutzker, "Max Weber and the Analysis of Modern Bureaucratic Organization: Notes Toward a Theory of Appraisal," *The American Archivist* 45, no. 2 (1982): 129.

[34] Richard Cox, *Managing Institutional Archives: Foundational Principles and Practices* (Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 1992), 60.

[35] Ham, "The Archival Edge," 332.

[36] Helen Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?," *The American Archivist* 49, no. 2 (1986): 112.

[37] Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?," 115.

[38] Timothy L. Ericson, "At the Rim of Creative Dissatisfaction: Archivists and Acquisition Development," *Archivaria* 33 (1991–92): 75; and Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?," 120.

[39] Timothy L. Ericson, "'To Approximate June Pasture:' The Documentation Strategy in the Real World," *Archival Issues* 22, no. 1 (1997): 14, 15.

[40] Greene, "The Surest Proof," 308, 337.

[41] Henrik Fode and Jørgen Fink, "The Business Records of a Nation: The Case of Denmark," *The American Archivist* 60 (1997): 79–80.

[42] Fode and Fink, "The Business Records of a Nation," 79.

[43] Terry Cook, "Macro-appraisal and Functional Analysis: Documenting Governance Rather than Government," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 25, no. 1 (2004): 10.

[44] Cook, "Macro-appraisal and Functional Analysis, 10.

[45] Cook, "Macro-appraisal and Functional Analysis," 12, 15; Terry Cook, "Mind Over Matter: Towards a New Theory of Archival Appraisal," in *The Archival Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh A. Taylor*, ed. Barbara L. Craig (Ottawa: Association of Canadian Archivists, 1992), 47.

[46] Cook, "Mind Over Matter," 47.

[47] Cook, "Macro-appraisal and Functional Analysis," 10.

[48] Helen Samuels, *Varsity Letters: Documenting Modern Colleges and Universities* (Lanham, Md.: SAA and Scarecrow Press, 1988). For example, see page 21.

[49] Catherine Bailey, "From the Top Down: The Practice of Macroappraisal," *Archivaria* 43 (1997): 122–23.

[50] Bailey, "From the Top Down," 122.

[51] Cook, "Mind Over Matter," 51.

[52] Terry Cook, "Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts," *Archival Science* 1, no. 1 (2000): 12, emphasis added.

[53] Frank Boles, *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005), 62–63; Bailey, "From the Top Down," 123.

[54] Kerry Badgley and Claude Meunier, "Macroappraisal, the Next Frontier: An Approach for Appraising Large and Complex Government Institutions," *Archival Science* 5 (2005): 261–83.

[55] Marcus C. Robyns and Jason Woolman, "Institutional Functional Analysis at Northern Michigan University: A New Process of Appraisal and Arrangement of Archival Records," *The American Archivist* 74 (2011): 250.

[56] Michael Nash, "Small Business, Manufacturing, and Flexible Specialization: Implications for the Archivist," *The American Archivist* 58, no. 3 (1995): 289.

[57] Cook, "Macro-appraisal and Functional Analysis," 5–6.

[58] Jorge Luis Borges, "On Exactitude in Science," in *Collected Fictions*, trans. Andrew Hurley (New York: Penguin, 1999), 325.

[59] Terry Cook, "Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives," *Archivaria* 51 (2001): 30.

[60] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 6.

[61] Cook, "Mind Over Matter," 59, emphasis mine, and 56.

[62] There is a useful tension between the ways the terms *top-down* and *bottom-up* are mobilized by archival theory and cultural studies. While archival theory uses *top-down* to indicate appraisal that takes the context of records creation as its starting point rather than the records themselves (the bottom-up position), cultural theory uses *top-down* to refer to perspectives that originate in positions of power. *Bottom-up*, on the other hand, refers to the everyday experiences and perspectives of most people. Although the two uses of bottom-up are fairly removed, I argue here that it is no coincidence that the top-down position takes institutional goals and functions as its starting point, as these are often the products of the workings of elite power.

[63] Cook, "Archival Science and Postmodernism," 7.

[64] Schwartz and Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power," 14.

[65] John Thornton Caldwell, *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008), 342.

[66] Vicki Mayer, *Below the Line: Producers and Production Studies in the New Television Economy* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011), 135.

[67] Derek Johnson, *Media Franchising: Creative License and Collaboration in the Culture Industries* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 123.

[68] Johnson, *Media Franchising*, 17.

[69] Caldwell, *Production Culture,* 68.

[70] See in particular "Chapter 2: Trade Rituals and Turf Marking" in Caldwell, *Production Culture*, 69–109.

[71] Ham, "The Archival Edge," 334, emphasis added.

[72] Ham, "The Archival Edge," 334–35.

[73] Tom Nesmith, "Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives," *The American Archivist* 65, no. 1 (2002): 35.

[74] Katie Shilton and Ramesh Srinivasan, "Participatory Appraisal and Arrangement for Multicultural Archival Collections," *Archivaria* 63 (2007): 35.

[75] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 12.

[76] Frank Boles and Mark A. Greene, "Et Tu Schellenberg? Thoughts on the Dagger of American Archival Appraisal Theory," *The American Archivist* 59, no. 3 (1996): 297.

[77] Terry Eastwood, "Towards a Social Theory of Appraisal." In *The Archival Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh A. Taylor*, Barb L. Craig, ed. (Ottawa: Association of Canadian Archivists, 1992), 71.

[78] Eastwood, "Towards a Social Theory of Appraisal," 73.

[79] Which he shares with others, e.g., Cox, *No Innocent Deposits*, 172–73.

[80] Hugh A. Taylor, "Transformation in the Archives: Technological Adjustment or Paradigm Shift?," *Archivaria* 25 (1987–88): 24.

[81] Keli Rylance, "Archives and the Intangible," *Archivaria* 62 (2006): 111.

[82] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 262.

[83] Sue McKemmish, "Evidence of Me," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (1996): 30.

[84] Catherine Hobbs, "The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals," *Archivaria* 52 (2001), 135, 134, 127.

[85] Barbara Craig, "Practicing Appraisal—Common Grounds and Common Problems," *Archival Appraisal: Theory and Practice* (Munich: K. G. Saur, 2004), 96.

[86] Shilton and Srinivasan, "Participatory Appraisal and Arrangement," 93.

[87] For an analysis of concerns ranging from privacy to interpersonal conflict, see Dominique Daniel, "Documenting the Immigrant and Ethnic Experience in American Archives," *The American Archivist* 73, no. 1 (2010): 101. On questions including stakeholder involvement in the appraisal process and the adaptation of archival principles such as of provenance, see, for example, Craig, "Practicing Appraisal," 96, and Rylance, "Archives and the Intangible," 113.

[88] Max J. Evans, "The Visible Hand: Creating a Practical Mechanism for Cooperative Appraisal," *Midwestern Archivist* 11 (1986): 23.

[89] Gary D. Saretzky, "Oral History in American Business Archives," *The American Archivist* 44, no. 1 (1981): 353–55; Michelle Caswell, "Instant Documentation: Cell-Phone-Generated Records in the Archives," *The American Archivist* 72, no. 1 (2009): 133–45; Kirsten Wright, "Recording 'a Very Particular Custom': Tattoos and the Archive," *Archival Science* 9 (2009): 99–111; Robert Kretzschmar, "Archival Appraisal in Germany: A Decade of Theory, Strategies, and Practices," *Archival Science* 5, nos. 2–4 (2005): 238; Elisabeth Kaplan and Jeffrey Mifflin, "'Mind and Sight': Visual Literacy and the Archivist," *Archival Issues* 21, no. 2 (1996): 107–27.

[90] Ericson, "Rim of Creative Dissatisfaction," 189.

[91] Schwartz and Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power," 10.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Kit Hughes is a Ph.D. candidate in Media and Cultural Studies in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin–Madison and an archives assistant at the Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research. Her research explores the intersections between institutional media histories, identity, labor, and the politics of the corporate archives. Her work has been published in *Film Criticism*, and is forthcoming in *Media, Culture and Society*.